Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter One: Standards 1, 4 & 6	8
Chapter Two: Standards 2, 3 & 5	22
Chapter Three: Standards 8 & 9	36
Chapter Four: Standard 10	49
Chapter Five: Standards 11, 12 & 13	67
Chapter Six: Standard 14	83
Chapter Seven: Standard 7	100

Introduction

The Self-Study of The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey illustrates the remarkable progress achieved since the 2002 Middle States team visit and the 2007 Periodic Review. As stated in the Periodic Review Report, Stockton's "institutional self-awareness has undergone a sea change since its last self-study, partly the result of an emphasis on renewal and accountability." That same sentiment opens this Self-Study, as *New Jersey's Distinctive Public College* celebrates its 40th Anniversary of Teaching.

The 2012 decennial review finds Stockton in a year that is focused simultaneously on reflection and projection: reflection on the innovative philosophies, structures and processes that have sustained Stockton through these first 40 years, and projection toward a future that will build on these traditions. Since its founding, Stockton has engaged in imaginative experimentation, in careful self-scrutiny and in responsive improvement, always striving to provide an environment for excellence where students can grow. This Self-Study and accompanying virtual Evidence Repository not only presents evidence of how well Stockton meets the *Characteristics of Excellence*, but also includes such highlights as these:

- 70% of all undergraduate courses are taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty
- 80% of first time freshmen reside on campus
- 87% of first time freshmen return for third-semester retention
- 95% of all full-time faculty hold the terminal degree in their field
- *The Carnegie Foundation* recognizes Stockton as an Elective Community Engaged Classification
- *US News and World Report* ranks Stockton 15th among public Masters North Universities
- *The Princeton Review* designates Stockton among its "Best in the Northeast"
- *The College Sustainability Report Card* awards Stockton an "A" in Climate Change and Energy

Self-Study Organization

The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey built a strong foundation for the self-study process with workshops for faculty and staff on strategic planning, preparation for reaccreditation and the assessment of student learning. Faculty and staff attended Middle States workshops (7.1.1) for professional development. The President appointed a Planning Committee to facilitate nominations to the Steering Committee, and to make preliminary recommendations to conduct a comprehensive self-study, organizing the Standards of *Characteristics of Excellence* in groups appropriate to Stockton. The Self-Study is therefore organized as follows:

Chapter One: 1, 4 & 6:	Mission and Goals; Leadership and Governance; Integrity
Chapter Two: 2, 3 & 5:	Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal; Institutional Resources; Administration
Chapter Three: 8 & 9:	Student Admissions and Retention; Student Support Services
Chapter Four: 10:	Faculty
Chapter Five: 11, 12 & 13:	Educational Offerings; General Education; Related Educational Activities
Chapter Six: 14:	Assessment of Student Learning
Chapter Seven: 7:	Institutional Assessment

The Planning Committee further recommended that each Work Team be co-chaired by one faculty member and one administrator, and that each co-chair serve as a member of the Steering Committee. The President reviewed, discussed and approved these recommendations.

Self-Study Steering Committee Members

Planning Committee	Dr. David L. Carr, *Co-Chair*, Professor of Political Science & Senior Fellow, William J. Hughes Center for Public Policy Dr. Joseph Marchetti, *Co-Chair*, Interim Dean of the School of Education and Professor of Education; Dr. Debra A. Dagavarian, Assistant Provost Mr. Robert D'Augustine, Esq., Associate Vice President for Administration & Finance Dr. Sonia Gonsalves, Professor of Psychology Dr. Claudine Keenan, Chief Planning and Budget Officer Dr. Harvey Kesselman, Provost and Executive Vice President Dr. Marissa Levy, Associate Professor of Criminal Justice
Team Co-Chairs, Admin.	Dr. Cheryl Kaus, Dean of the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences Dr. Claudine Keenan, Chief Planning and Budget Officer Dr. Peter Hagen, Director, Center for Academic Advising Dr. Xiangping Kong, Director of Institutional Research Dr. Dee McNeely-Greene, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs Dr. Thomas Grites, Assistant to the Provost, Academic Support Dr. Marc Lowenstein, Associate Provost for Personnel, Programs and Policy
Team Co-Chairs, Faculty	Dr. Robert Helsabeck, Professor of Sociology Dr. Tait Chirenje, Assistant Professor of Environment Studies Dr. Sonia Gonsalves, Professor of Psychology Dr. Jennifer Barr, Associate Professor of Business Studies Dr. Donna Albano, Associate Professor of Hospitality and Tourism Dr. GT Lenard, Associate Professor of Writing Dr. Linda Wharton, Associate Professor of Political Science
Students, Undergraduate	Ms. Erin Clay Ms. Eileen Gentile Mr. Russell Heitzman
Student, Graduate	Mr. Brent Howard, Professional Science Master's
Alumna	Ms. Joanne Hackett '84, President, Stockton College Alumni Association
Board of Trustees	Mr. Stanley Ellis, Chair

	Ms. Barbara Morvay
Technology	Mr. James McCarthy, Associate Provost, Computing and Communications
Co-Editors of Self Study	Dr. Marissa Levy, Associate Professor of Criminal Justice Dr. Debra A. Dagavarian, Assistant Provost

Work Teams

The Work Teams are a diverse blend of faculty, staff, students, alumni and Trustees. Members of the Work Teams are listed below.

Team 1-4-6 Mission and Governance
Co-chairs:
Dr. Cheryl Kaus, Dean of the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Dr. Robert Helsabeck, Professor of Sociology, First President of Faculty Senate
Faculty:
Dr. Arthur Worthington, Associate Professor of Business Studies
Dr. Kathleen Vito, Associate Professor of Nursing
Dr. Rodger Jackson, Associate Professor of Philosophy
Dr. Sara Martino, Associate Professor of Psychology
Administration:
Mr. Brian Jackson, Chief of Staff
Ms. Melissa Hager, Esq., General Counsel
Ms. Millie Romanelli, Professional Services Specialist
Dr. Robert Gregg, Dean of the School of Arts and Humanities
Ms. Sharon Schulman, Spec. Asst. to Pres./Executive Dir. Hughes Ctr for Public Policy
Student:
Mr. Connor Sullivan
Board of Trustees:
Mr. Stanley Ellis, Chair

Team 2-3-5 Planning and Resources
Co-chairs:
Dr. Claudine Keenan, Chief Planning and Budget Officer
Dr. Tait Chirenje, Associate Professor of Environmental Studies
Faculty:
Dr. Amy Hadley, Assistant Professor of Speech Pathology and Audiology
Mr. Robert Kachur, Assistant Professor of Business Studies
Dr. Kimberly Lebak, Associate Professor of Education
Dr. Lisa Honaker, Associate Professor of British Literature
Dr. Peter Straub, Professor of Biology
Administration:
Mr. Alexander Marino, Director of the Carnegie Center
Mr. Robert Heinrich, Associate Director of Computer Services

Ms. Dawn Kanaan-Hans, Manager of Special Events
Mr. Donald Moore, Associate Vice President for Administration and Finance
Mr. Michael Wood, Director of Budget and Fiscal Planning

Alumna:

Ms. Joanne Hackett ‘84

Student:

Mr. Pablo Zapata

Foundation Board:

Ms. Gayle Gross, Chair

Team 7 Institutional Effectiveness

Co-chairs:

Dr. Jennifer Barr, Associate Professor of Business Studies
Dr. Xiangping Kong, Director of Institutional Research

Faculty:

Dr. Bess Kathrins, Professor of Physical Therapy
Dr. Carra Leah Hood, Associate Professor of Writing
Dr. Diane Holtzman, Assistant Professor of Business Studies
Dr. John Quinn, Associate Professor of Education
Dr. Joshua Duntley, Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice
Ms. Marilyn Vito, Associate Professor of Business Studies

Administration:

Ms. Theresa Brooke Lew, Controller
Dr. Linda Feeney, Director of Computer Services
Ms. Natalie Havran, Director of Human Resources
Mr. Pedro Santana, Dean of Students
Mr. Carlton (Skip) Collins, Internal Auditor

Student:

Ms. Eileen Gentile

Team 8-9 Student Life

Co-chairs:

Dr. Dee McNeely-Greene, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
Dr. Donna Albano, Associate Professor of Business Studies

Faculty:

Dr. Donnetrice Allison, Associate Professor of Communications
Dr. Emari DiGiorgio, Assistant Professor of Writing
Dr. Joseph Rubenstein, Professor of Anthropology
Dr. MaryLou Galantino, Professor of Physical Therapy
Dr. Michael Scales, Associate Professor of Business Studies

Administration:

Ms. Alison Henry, Associate Dean of Admissions
Ms. Jeanne Lewis, Director of Financial Aid
Ms. Jill Glasser, Assistant Director of Residential Life
Mr. Jonathan Heck, Associate Director of Athletics and Recreation
Mr. Nelson Morales, Assistant Director of Admissions

Ms. Stacy McIntosh-Zacharoff, Director of the EOF Program
Mr. Thomas O'Donnell, Assistant Dean of Students
Ms. Patricia Krevetski, Director of Auxiliary Services
Mr. Walter Tarver, Director of the Career Center

Student:

Ms. Erin Clay

Team 11-12-13 The Curriculum

Co-chairs:

Dr. Thomas Grites, Assistant to the Provost
Dr. GT Lenard, Associate Professor of Writing

Faculty:

Dr. Wondi Geremew, Assistant Professor of Developmental Mathematics
Mr. Robert King, Esq., Professor of Business Law
Dr. Jessica Fleck, Assistant Professor of Psychology
Mr. John Boyle, Instructor of Business Studies
Dr. Kate Ogden, Associate Professor of Art History
Dr. Michael Rodriguez, Associate Professor of Political Science
Dr. Norma Boakes, Associate Professor of Education
Ms. Pamela Cross, Coordinator of Writing Skills Center
Dr. Ron Tinsley, Associate Professor of Education
Dr. Russell Manson, Associate Professor of Computational Science
Dr. Vincent Cicirello, Assistant Professor of Computer Science

Administration:

Ms. AmyBeth Glass, Assistant Dean, School of Graduate/Continuing Studies
Ms. Claire Lopatto, Assistant Dean of the School of General Studies
Dr. Cynthia Sosnowski, Associate Dean, School of Graduate/Continuing Studies
Mr. David Pinto, Director of the Library
Mr. Dennis Fotia, Assistant Director of Distance Education
Dr. Janet Wagner, Dean of the School of Business
Ms. Patricia Weeks, Director, Educational Technology Training Center (ETTC)

Students:

Jennifer West
Russell Heitzman

Team 10 The Faculty

Co-chairs:

Dr. Marc Lowenstein, Associate Provost for Programs, Personnel and Policy
Dr. Linda Wharton, Associate Professor of Political Science

Faculty:

Dr. Christine Tartaro, Professor of Criminal Justice
Dr. Beverly Vaughn, Professor of Music
Dr. Heather McGovern, Associate Professor of Writing
Dr. John (Jack) Connor, Professor of Writing
Dr. James Mac Avery, Assistant Professor of Political Science
Dr. Kristen Hallock-Waters, Assistant Professor of Chemistry

Dr. Kristin Jacobson, Assistant Professor of Literature
Dr. Margaret Lewis, Associate Professor of Biology
Dr. Marion Hussong, Associate Professor of Literature/Holocaust and Genocide
Dr. Ronald Caro, Assistant Professor of Teacher Education
Dr. Thomas Kinsella, Professor of British Literature
Dr. Victoria Schindler, Associate Professor of Occupational Therapy

Administration:

Ms. Beth Olsen, Director of the Grants Office
Dr. Jan Colijn, Dean of the School of General Studies
Ms. Paula Dollarhide, Associate Director of the Center for Academic Advising

Student:

Kenan Kurt

Team 14 Learning Assessment

Co-chairs:

Dr. Sonia Gonsalves, Professor of Psychology
Dr. Peter Hagen, Director of the Center for Academic Advising

Faculty:

Dr. Brian Rogerson, Associate Professor of Biochemistry
Dr. Cheryle Eisele, Professor Emerita of Nursing
Dr. Frank Cerreto, Professor of Mathematics
Dr. Jennifer Lyke, Associate Professor of Psychology
Dr. Ekaterina Sedia, Associate Professor of Biology
Dr. Maritza Jauregui, Assistant Professor of Public Health
Dr. Ramya Vijaya, Associate Professor of Economics
Dr. Robert Nichols, Professor of History
Dr. William Reynolds, Assistant Professor of Social Work

Administration:

Ms. Donna Wanat, Assistant to VP for Student Affairs
Mr. John Smith, Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities

Student:

Brent Howard

Online Resources for the Visiting Team

The Self-Study is both an online and hard copy document. The online version uses hypertext to link to appropriate resources in the Evidence Repository (www.stockton.edu/msaevidence). Most of the hypertext in the document can be accessed easily by clicking, or if reading a hard copy, following the indexed notations. For example, 2.2.3 refers to Standard 2, question 2, bullet 3 under that question. In order to assist those using the hard copy document, evidence that is presented multiple times in the online repository is marked with the original location in parentheses.

The repository was devised initially for the Work Teams, based on the charge questions, and was expanded as the drafts were being written. After the entire community reviewed our draft Self Study, it is now an ideal resource for the visiting team, and serves as convenient appendices.

Use of External Consultants

In the interest of establishing an ongoing public repository to document its evidence to support the Self-Study, the College engaged the services of a consultant whose expertise is in creating institutional portfolios online, and designing user-friendly online self-studies: Dr. Susan Kahn, Director of IUPUI ePortfolio and Director, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Division of Planning and Institutional Improvement, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

The College also engaged its former Middle States liaison, Dr. Andrea Lex, to present a day-long workshop in 2010 on the Standards, focusing primarily on Standard 7. The workshop was well attended by faculty, staff, students and the Board of Trustees Chair. Dr. Lex granted her permission to members of the Planning Committee who developed and presented 22 workshops based on her materials to more than 100 additional staff and faculty members on the Middle States Self-Study process in general, and on Institutional Effectiveness in particular. These sessions have also been available online since 2010 (7.1.1). Dr. Lex will return to campus in early February 2012 to review the final Self Study with students, faculty, staff and administrators in preparation for the team visit in March.

Acknowledgements

Stockton College is indebted to the members of the Steering Committee and Work Teams, who spent hours upon hours researching and writing. This Study could not have been prepared without the cooperation and assistance of many other faculty and staff throughout the College who provided Work Team members with data, documents, calculations and other information. One person who deserves special thanks is Dr. Kenneth Tompkins, Professor Emeritus of Literature and one of Stockton's initial class of faculty, for granting use of excerpts from his eloquent essay on academic freedom.

Chapter One
Standard 1: Mission and Goals

The institution's mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates whom the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are utilized to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

Stockton's Distinctive Teaching Mission

The guiding principles of the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey's Mission Statement (1.1.1) are excellence in teaching and dedication to learning. At Stockton, breadth, as well as depth, are integral components of degree programs. Accordingly, the very organization of the curriculum requires that faculty and students become intimately aware of the need to approach teaching and learning in an interdisciplinary fashion. Not only is there a mission-driven requirement that students accrue credits in courses related to but not identical to their majors (cognates), and courses altogether different from their primary disciplines (at-some-distance), there is also a requirement that each student take specially designed and designated, interdisciplinary, General Studies courses. As such, institutional, divisional, school and program goals are all aligned to facilitate delivery of this curriculum. From Vision 2010 (1.1.2 Stockton's prior and completed strategic plan) to Stockton 2020 (1.1.3 the current strategic planning framework), every institutional goal is designed to support this interdisciplinary mission.

Similarly, divisional goals in Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Administration & Finance and Development align to mission and vision in support of teaching and learning, as exemplified by the annual Program Reviews (1.1.4). From there, each of the academic schools and administrative departments sets annual goals that, in turn, align with divisional and institutional goals, demonstrated both on the institutional assessment Web site (7.8.2) and on the Web sites for individual Schools (1.1.5 Academic School Goals, and 1.1.6 General Studies, for example). Operating from these goals, every academic school is therefore aligned to support the mission-driven focus on delivering an interdisciplinary curriculum that embraces both breadth and depth. For example, the arts and sciences faculty at Stockton dedicate one-third of their teaching to the General Studies curriculum, the goals for which are clearly articulated, not only in the College Bulletin, but also on the Web site and throughout every "G" course (1.1.6 General Studies Goals, and Bulletin, p. 152). Thus, every faculty member teaches beyond the traditional bounds of her/his discipline. The importance of Stockton's interdisciplinary underpinnings is underscored by the fact that General Studies is housed in its own academic school, and managed by the Dean of General Studies. Several interdisciplinary minors are also housed in the School of General Studies. In addition, the academic societies encourage students to get involved by joining clubs and organizations that promote learning, in partnership with Student Affairs (9.2.3).

Having a distinctive curriculum necessitates orienting both new faculty and students to this emphasis on the interdisciplinary. Stockton's interdisciplinary curriculum is communicated to undergraduate students before they enroll through Open Houses, Early Decision Days, and the Faculty Ambassadors with whom they can meet. When students arrive, the curriculum is addressed again through summer orientation sessions when they create their schedules. These communication points are so vital to Stockton's aligned mission, vision and goals, that they are also archived in a video presentation for students and faculty (1.1.7). Visitors and newcomers who learn about our curriculum in their orientation activities also reinforce their understanding via preceptors (faculty advisors) and Stockton's online degree evaluation system, Curriculum, Advising and Program Planning, or CAPP (1.1.7 CAPP Resources).

Operating completely within these aligned mission, vision and goal-driven philosophies, then, institutional practices continue to support the interdisciplinary curriculum that makes Stockton distinctive. Because "it is imperative that the executive administration and the trustees provide the resources and the atmosphere, which will make such exceptional effort both possible and appreciated," Stockton administration has implemented practices to accomplish just this section at the heart of the mission (1.1.1). In the hiring of full-time, tenure-track faculty, for example, each candidate meets with the Dean of General Studies (or his designee) and views the aforementioned video that explains the "G" or "commons" curriculum. Similarly, the hiring of adjuncts to teach G courses requires that the individual understand the College's philosophical moorings in order for the adjunct to teach the course from the perspective of a faculty member who may have designed the course. Lastly, all staff hired, some of whom are involved in teaching, are introduced to Stockton's culture in the New Employee Orientation (6.1.12).

Breadth in the curriculum partners with depth in the selected field of study. The emphasis on breadth "does not preclude an emphasis on depth of study in the major disciplines but rather, supplements it. Our academic programs must offer students a real understanding of the ideas and methods of their disciplines, including those most recently developed" (1.1.1). In keeping with the institutional strategic planning framework that emphasizes continuous improvement informed by measureable results, each degree program is reviewed every five years, and assessed by an external consultant (1.1.5).

In response to the last section of the mission to serve the region, some of Stockton's undergraduate degree programs have been developed to address particular concerns, such as Environmental Science, or Holocaust and Genocide Studies. Stockton's graduate and continuing studies programs also respond to regional needs. Recent examples include a Master of Social Work, and Master of Arts in Educational Leadership; both resulted from persistent community demand that now promote "the positive development of southern New Jersey" (1.1.1).

Excellence in Teaching

Stockton's mission to excel in teaching is well communicated and reinforced widely. Stockton 2020 emphasizes "learning" as its first theme, with several specific, measurable objectives in this theme tied directly to excellence in teaching. Accordingly, teaching excellence is a stated priority in Stockton's policies and procedures for faculty evaluation (see 7.3.2 Policies), and is central to Stockton's Institute for Faculty Development. Following its mission to support

excellence in teaching, scholarly activity and service (1.1.9), the Institute conducts workshops and offers in-house resources on teaching, learning and the assessment of student learning. Each new full time, tenure-track faculty member receives one course release to attend Institute workshops, demonstrating once again that operational practices are aligned under mission, vision and goals at every level of the institution.

The assessment of teaching has been a faculty-driven priority and is reinforced by the administration. Thus, excellence in teaching is a shared cultural value aligned with the College's mission. The culture of assessment at Stockton is so ingrained that faculty and staff are occasionally surprised to be reminded that the insistence on continuous improvement is actually evidence of ongoing assessment activities. For example, as part of their shared governance activities in the early 2000s, after faculty conducted a review of the various standards and instruments used in teaching assessment, they recommended the national IDEA system which was implemented in 2006. Both faculty and administration also agreed upon a mechanism of peer observation and evaluation of teaching. In fact, the Faculty Senate has formed a committee charged with studying the effectiveness of this system to date, again demonstrating that Stockton faculty are engaged in institutional assessment every day of their professional lives (4.1.4**,** 7.3.4 and 10.3.4). Also, because Stockton values precepting students as an important element of teaching (10.4.3), the faculty participate regularly in ongoing improvements to their advising practices, having recently agreed on the elements of a precepting award for research that is funded by the Provost. Stockton also partakes in the performance-based Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), disseminating these results widely to multiple stakeholders as part of ongoing institutional assessment processes (7.7.3 and 7.7.6).

Research and Professional Development

Engagement in research and professional development is consistent with Stockton's mission to participate in the development of new ideas (1.1.1). In support of this aspect of mission, the College sustains such endeavors by various funding streams and mechanisms, each repeatedly assessed for its sufficiency and effectiveness. Faculty write proposals for Research and Professional Development (R&PD) monies through the Grants Office. Through grants of varying size, Stockton's R&PD program provides funding for research and creative endeavors. The Provost also supports faculty scholarship and creativity through Junior Faculty Support funds for pre-tenured faculty, and Provost Opportunity Funds. Importantly, these funds have remained stable, and actually have been enhanced in recent years despite budgetary constraints. There are also a number of initiatives designed to reward the scholarship of faculty and students together, such as the Research Experience for Undergraduates (REU) and a high proportion of graduate assistantships are designed to support faculty/student research projects. These budgetary commitments at various levels, for both faculty and students, demonstrate that the mission to engage in research is promoted universally at the College.

Notices and application deadlines of all scholarly support mechanisms are transmitted throughout the College, and are available on relevant Web sites, and thereby widely communicated. To celebrate scholarship and creative activities, and to further communicate the importance of these activities campus-wide, Stockton organizes a Day of Scholarship, and publishes these and other scholarly activities for the Board of Trustees in an annual Scholarly

Activity Report**,** which comprises a listing of faculty and staff contributions to scholarship and creative work (7.3.5).

Additionally, faculty and staff can take free training workshops on Wimba, Camtasia Studio, creating fillable PDF forms, Dreamweaver, how to buy a digital camcorder and much more. And anyone, including members of the public, can take standardized test preparation courses (i.e., for the GRE, LSAT, etc.) that are less expensive than other similar courses, or free summer courses on Latin, Ancient Greek and Modern Greek.

In addition to the support and celebration that are given to scholarship and creative endeavors, faculty productivity receives considerable emphasis in the personnel process. There are clear expectations for faculty productivity in order for tenure and promotion.

Co-Curricular Activities

A core element of Stockton's mission is the availability and promotion of out-of-classroom activities to further enhance the education and development of students, faculty and staff. As with other aspects of Stockton's mission and goals, the development and support of these activities occur in every College unit. In Academic Affairs, the Provost provides funding for faculty-student scholarship, and School budgets allow for faculty-student field trips and honorary receptions. In conjunction with Residence Life, faculty provide a number of activities and workshops in Living Learning Communities. Both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs promote internships and service learning, including the campus-wide Day of Service. These initiatives (9.1.4, 9.1.5**,** 14.5) document Stockton's commitment to the co-curricular activities advanced in the Mission Statement, and are consistent with the strategic planning theme of engagement. Strong evidence for the alignment of Stockton's concept of engagement is its recent selection as a Community Engaged Institution (14.4.3) by the Carnegie Foundation.

Diversity

Stockton has a strong commitment to attracting and retaining diverse bodies of faculty, students and staff (1.1.1). The communication of, and adherence to, this mission-driven priority occurs in student admissions and at every level of College employment. Before programs go forward in soliciting candidates for faculty positions, the program must submit a Search Plan outlining proactive attempts to diversify search pools. Program faculties must also meet with the President's Officer for Affirmative Action and Ethical Standards (10.6). Likewise, the Diversity Workforce Analysis and Stockton's policies and procedures (5.2.4) indicate both commitment to, and success at, diversifying human resources at all employment levels. The College's consistent commitment to diversity, both in recruitment and retention, is illustrated by a Cultural Diversity Audit that solicited input regarding the College's cultural atmosphere from every stratum of the College community (5.2.3).

Community Commitment

Stockton's commitment to the region has been evidenced since its early years. The Performing Arts Center, for example, has been providing relatively inexpensive, quality entertainment for

southern New Jersey for over 30 years. Alongside this, Stockton has been very committed to service learning and internships that help area businesses and organizations. The area of Continuing Studies has been growing over the years; it is now overseen by an Associate Dean, and is vitalized by healthy marketing and promotion. Centers have developed around the region's interests (e.g., Lloyd D. Levenson Institute on Gaming, Hospitality, and Tourism; William J. Hughes Center for Public Policy; Coastal Research Center; Small Business Development Center, and more) and demography (e.g., Stockton Center on Successful Aging). In addition, faculty have been successful in obtaining grants to train students in better meeting the needs of the State (e.g., Social Work's Baccalaureate Child Welfare Education Program). Also, Continuing Studies has garnered several New Jersey State Department of Labor and Workforce Development Customized Training Grants that supported the Atlantic City gaming industry.

The renovation of the Carnegie Library; the negotiated agreement with the Noyes Museum of Art and with the Arts District of Atlantic City, including Dante Hall; the acquisition of the Seaview resort and conference center and the Woodbine Heritage Museum, along with efforts to expand the College's presence in Hammonton have ensured that Stockton has a very strong reputation as a positive contributor to the region. Even as Stockton establishes plans for teaching classes at these and a new healthcare partnership location in Manahawkin, Ocean County, the College continues to explore additional partnerships throughout the region, wherever appropriate. The College includes each instructional site on the Annual Institutional Profile, and as of this review, has earned Substantive Change approval for one Additional Location at the Carnegie Library Center, the only one of Stockton's instructional sites where students may earn at least 50% of their credits necessary for a degree. Stockton's engagement with the community occurs through academic programs and scholarship, in partnerships with community agencies, and at the level of College governance and leadership. "The positive development of southern New Jersey" (1.1.1) is a value that resonates throughout the life of the College. Having received the Community Engagement Classification by the Carnegie Foundation is prestigious validation of the College's success.

Stockton 2020

As Stockton continues to live its mission, and focuses on the next decade of growth and service, a governing set of themes that honor its forty years of commitment to breadth, depth, scholarly activity, diversity and service has been developed to guide the College forward: Learning, Engagement, Global Perspective, and Sustainability (1.1.3). Stockton 2020 is discussed in greater detail elsewhere; indeed, this chapter provides only a prelude to what makes Stockton unique among its peer institutions, and exemplary in its commitment to aligning all institutional activities to mission, vision and goals. The Stockton 2020 themes are mentioned here to indicate that there has been broad input into their development, and they have been communicated and reinforced, in keeping with the institutional values and culture of sustained assessment and improvement. They have recently been the focus of unit retreats, and now appear in Program Reviews and in faculty applications for funding, demonstrating once again how naturally Stockton's processes align to its mission, vision and goals. The College community embraces these themes and recognizes that they are well aligned with the mission statement.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

The institution's system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

Stockton's governance system contains the standard elements of collegiate governance: a board of trustees, administrative councils, a faculty senate, a student senate and several other boards (the Richard Stockton College Foundation and the Stockton Affiliated Services, Incorporated [SASI]). In addition, Stockton employees belong to several unions that interact on issues related to working conditions (4.1**,** 1-8).

Internal Functioning of the Units

The College's Board of Trustees is regulated by New Jersey code regarding selection, appointment, authority, composition, conflicts of interest and orientation (4.1.1) and remains committed to engaging in continuous improvement. The Board secured the services of a consultant to conduct a "360 degree" self-evaluation (4.3.1). Over the course of several months, the performance of the Board and the President was evaluated by 45 individuals who represented key constituencies of the College: all Trustees, the President, senior officers, deans, students, faculty, Foundation Board members, union leaders, government leaders, donors, and leading community organizations. In addition, the consultant led an intensive retreat with the Trustees and President that focused on the Board's performance, policies and practices. Strengths included mutual respect between the Board and management groups, the Board's focus on strategy, and Board solicitation of input from campus constituencies (4.3.1).

Administrative Councils are key decision-making units of the administration. The President meets weekly with the Provost and bi-weekly with members of his immediate staff, the other Vice Presidents and the President of the Faculty Senate (The Cabinet). The Provost meets bi-weekly with the Council of Deans, his senior staff, a number of directors, the President of the Faculty Senate, and other staff as appropriate. The deans of the several schools meet with their faculties and the coordinators of programs regularly. In addition, the Provost meets regularly with his inter-divisional colleagues to ensure open communication and improve "cross campus" information sharing and decision-making. Participants report that the meetings are open, candid and useful.

The Faculty, in accordance with the AAUP (4.1.3) position on faculty involvement in governance, exercises a prominent position in the oversight of the curriculum and in the establishment of academic policies. The Faculty also assumes its responsibility to consult in all matters affecting the well being of the College and has established a committee structure to insure a means of shared governance. For most of Stockton's history, the Faculty expressed its collective will through a Faculty Assembly, a meeting of the entire faculty. However, for reasons that are discussed below, the Assembly, in 2008, adopted a new constitution (4.1.3)

establishing a Faculty Senate (4.1.3) as the proper means for expressing the collective will of the Faculty. The Faculty Senate began functioning in September, 2009.

The question of whether the original faculty governance structure was effective had been a growing concern in recent years. As a result, in Fall 2007, the Faculty Assembly established a special task force on faculty governance (4.1.4), which was charged with conducting a comprehensive assessment of faculty governance. The nine person group embarked on a one-year evaluation of the Faculty Assembly. This effort is a prime example of institutional assessment done in a qualitative manner. The detailed results of the assessment can be found in the reports by the Governance Task Force. (See 4.1.3, Faculty Senate Constitution, 4.1.4, Faculty Governance Memo, and 4.1.4, Governance Assessment.) As a result of the comprehensive assessment, the Task Force determined that the Assembly was becoming less effective as Stockton grew larger and more complex and proposed a representative Senate of 31 members, one member for each ten faculty members. That proposal was implemented in the 2008-09 academic year.

The faculty union, the Stockton Federation of Teachers (4.1.5), represents another means by which faculty and administration collaborate on important matters. For example, although the substantive aspects of personnel decisions are made by elected faculty, the structure for that process was negotiated in joint meetings. In most decisions that impact the role of faculty, the SFT bridges the gap between faculty and administration. Specific local interpretations of the statewide agreement are negotiated between the SFT and administration. The SFT provides a forum for formal disputes, if such disputes are not settled adequately at other levels.
The Stockton Student Senate (4.1.6), whose 27 representatives are elected to office by the student body, represents the interests of the students. Each senator takes part in a week long orientation, which includes meetings with key faculty and staff, and they are assigned to a specific committee (Academic Policies, Finance, Public Relations, School Spirit and Student Welfare). The Student Senate is embarking on a survey of the student body to gain a sense of its effectiveness as the student body's agent. The student governance structure also consists of four Class Councils, freshmen through senior years. Each Council has class representatives and an advisor. The President of each class council meets jointly with the Student Senate, where they hold ex-officio seats on the Senate.

Other College Boards

The Stockton Foundation and Stockton Affiliated Services, Inc. are additional entities involved in College leadership and governance. In an effort to improve and enhance relations among, and to more clearly define and explain the roles and responsibilities of these governing entities, The Board of Trustees and Foundation Board of Directors, in 2005, executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Although the Foundation is separately incorporated, the MOU acknowledged that the College, and thereby its governing Board, has the responsibility to establish and prioritize the purposes and projects for which the institution will seek philanthropic support. It also recognizes the Foundation, and thereby its Board of Directors, as a separate but dependent organization supported by the Office of the President of the College and the Development Office staff in order to carry out its mission. The MOU further stipulates that a member of the Trustees will serve on the Foundation Board as an ex officio member, and

conversely, the Trustees' development, audit, and investment committees consist of members of the Foundation Board members.

In the 360 degree review of Board of Trustees and President, it was recommended that the Board and the Executive Committee of the Foundation's Board of Directors meet annually to discuss substantive issues; also, at least every other year, there should be an event that is strictly social for members of the two Boards (4.3.1). The two Boards have been meeting jointly at least once a year since 2005, and more frequently when appropriate. The Executive Committees of each Board also meet periodically in formal meetings, as well as socially, to further strengthen relations. With the College in the silent phase of its first-ever comprehensive campaign, there has been significantly more cooperative interaction between both Boards. Both Boards jointly serve as a single development committee in support of the fundraising initiatives for the College (4.4.3).

In 2008, Stockton Affiliated Services was incorporated (4.4.1 SASI) for the purpose of supporting the mission of the College by raising and managing private resources; acquiring and developing property; and managing auxiliary services, grants, contracts and land development to create new revenue streams that support long-term academic and other priorities of the College.

Similar to the MOU with the Foundation Board, the MOU between the College and SASI is clearly aligned and consistent with the Stockton's mission and articulates the role and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees and President, and the role and duties of the SASI Board of Directors, which is comprised primarily of business and community leaders (4.4.3). The Vice President for Administration & Finance serves as the president of the corporation, while the President is the chair of the Board.

In just two years, SASI, in cooperation with the Board of Trustees and President, has developed and is managing a significant portfolio of projects and initiatives, which include:

- Building and managing eight homes located near the College campus, which are rented to graduate students, faculty and staff.
- Having acquired shuttle vans and buses for use by students and the College community. The shuttle also runs to the Absecon train station, with additional services currently being planned throughout Galloway Township.
- Significant enhancements to food service and bookstore operations.
- Seaview resort and conference center acquisition.
- Initiating several long-term contracts (a first for the College) with vendors such as Chartwells Dining Services, Pepsi and Follett Bookstores.
- Establishing affiliation with the Noyes Museum.
- Developing the Hammonton, NJ instructional site project.

Each of these initiatives would not have been possible if it were not for the positive collaboration that exists between SASI (4.4.1) and the College (4.4.3).

As is evidenced above, assessment is ongoing in each of the units of governance. The Student Senate's assessment has yielded preliminary results (4.1.8). The Faculty Senate has been nascent

only two years; its current President has said that he is committed to assessing the Senate's viability after a two or three more years of operation. Governance, as always, is a work in progress. This section has attempted to preserve the integrity of the separate voices of the units of governance while simultaneously strengthening the partnerships among them.

Interaction among the Governing Bodies

The boards of the College, the College's Foundation and the College's auxiliary corporation, Stockton Affiliated Services, Inc. (SASI), are coordinated in their governance activities via clearly defined missions, shared memberships and shared staffing.

The missions of the Foundation and SASI are linked to and subordinated to the mission of the College. The Foundation's mission is to support the College by soliciting, receiving, holding and managing funds and property for the benefit of the College and its programs. The mission of SASI is to operate auxiliary and service functions in support of the College and its programs; surplus revenues not needed for the operations of SASI are turned over to the College for its use. In all activities, decisions and deliberations of the boards of these three organizations, the mission and needs of the College are the paramount considerations. Because the missions of the Foundation and of SASI are so clearly and narrowly defined, there are few occasions in which governance complexities arise involving the three boards.

The memberships of the boards and their subordinate committees also provide significant linkages among the governance roles of the boards. Both the SASI board and the Foundation board include a member of the College's board. The SASI board also includes two faculty members, two students and two members of the College's administration. Students also serve on the College's board and on some of the College's board committees, while faculty serve on some of the College's board committees. Members of the Foundation board serve on committees of the College's board, including the Investments Committee, the Audit Committee and the Development Committee.

Less than a decade ago, the President and Board of Trustees announced a reassessment of the role and structure of the Board of Trustees committees. At that time there were six Board committees -- executive, academic affairs, finance, development, nominating (ad hoc), and student affairs. Each committee was comprised of Board members only, with College vice presidents serving as staff to the committees. The finance committee was the most active, with the remaining committees meeting less frequently.

Recognizing the importance of candor, transparency and accountability in the way in which the College conducts business and governs itself, the Board of Trustees, under the leadership of the Board chair at that time and the current President, revamped the committee structure and revised its bylaws (4.1.1) to include several additional committees (buildings and grounds, investment, audit). The establishment of the Audit Committee also represented what has come to be recognized as a best practice for higher education derived from the Sarbanes-Oxley rules for publicly-held corporations. For the first time, faculty, students and community members were also appointed to each of the nine standing committees. The newly-structured and -appointed committees met for the first time in December 2004 and continue to meet regularly or as needed.

Faculty appointments to the Board Committees (4.2.1) are selected through consultation with the Provost and President of the Faculty Senate. The result of that consultation is to agree to appoint the chairs of key faculty committees in addition to a few other faculty who bring special expertise. Student representatives are selected through consultation with the Vice President of Student Affairs and involve the appointment of some key Student Senate chairs as well. Community members, including College Foundation Board members, are also appointed to appropriate Board Committees.

Recommendations from the Board Committees (4.2.1) are moved forward to the full Board for consideration and approval, and information from those meetings is shared with their respective senates. This new structure is a direct outcome of the Board of Trustee's request to improve the level of candor, transparency, accountability, and participation of the overall governing structure at Stockton, thereby improving relationships between the Board, the Senates and the College administration. Moreover, the Trustees have indicated that faculty, student, and community involvement on the standing committees has provided them with unique insight to important issues that impact policy at Stockton and has enriched their overall experience as Board members. Communication and participation from all constituent groups at Board of Trustees public meetings is encouraged.

The Faculty has re-established its constitutions to insure that linkages with the administration and students are strong. The Faculty Senate has key college administrators serving ex officio on all of its committees and has student participants on those committees relevant to student issues. In addition to having administrators and students serve on Faculty committees, key members of the Faculty serve on the Provost's Council of Deans, the President's Cabinet, and as mentioned earlier, represented on standing committees of the Board of Trustees. Finally, a great deal of informal consultation occurs between the faculty leaders and the administrative leaders. Comments by members of the administration and the faculty have been uniformly positive regarding the effectiveness of these governance linkages.

The change from a Faculty Assembly to a Faculty Senate is only three years old and the new Senate has had only one group of leaders. This transition is almost over, and it will soon be time to conduct a formal assessment of the Faculty Senate as a structure and as a designed set of processes.

The Student Senate, working with key administrators, makes a serious effort to become fully informed of the issues facing the College. At the beginning of each school year, the President of the College hosts a dinner retreat at his home for the Student Senate and Class Councils. Members of the administration and the President of the Faculty Senate are also invited to interact with the newly appointed Senate. The President gives a presentation to the Senate highlighting accomplishments of the previous year and issues and initiatives impacting the upcoming academic year. These meetings are helpful to the Student Senate leadership as they develop yearly goals and projects, as well as long term initiatives.

In addition, the Student Senate also invites the President and the Cabinet members to participate in Town Hall meetings each semester to address issues and questions brought forward by the

Senate and student body. Informal conversations among student, faculty, and administrative leaders further enhance the collaborative efforts in governance.

With the advent of Web sites, all of the governing units of the College have been able to better communicate their primary functions and the processes of doing business (4.1, 4.2, 4.4).

Finally, administrators of the College assure that the governance activities of the three boards are coordinated effectively. The College president serves as chair to the SASI board and plays a similarly active role in the deliberations of the other two boards. The College's Vice President for Administration & Finance is a member of the SASI board and is also a member of four committees of the College's board and three committees of the Foundation's board. The College's Executive Director of Development provides active support for all the activities of the Foundation's Board and committees, and serves on the Development Committee of the College's board. These administrators assure that all three boards engage in deliberations that are based on the same facts and the same operating desiderata.

The linking forces work quite effectively in maintaining connections and coordinating the deliberative and decision-making processes of the governing boards.

Standard 6: Integrity

In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.

Best Practices

The College complies with requirements for publicizing and maintaining fair, impartial, ethical and equitable policies and practices in all areas of integrity: constituents including students and personnel, and areas of practice including publications and finances. For example, budgetary and IRS information, as well as all public disclosure requirements, guidelines and best practices for financial and policy information are all regulated and routinely enforced by New Jersey and federal code. In addition, much of the most frequently requested information is available on the College's public Web site (6.1), which is updated frequently. Furthermore, upon request, College officials make the IRS statements (6.1.8) and related budget information available for review as well. Finally, while the College is not bound by the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, Stockton follows its guidelines nonetheless.

The extent to which the College complies with requirements and best practices that relate to Affirmative Action, Conflicts of Interest, Ethics and complaint forms also adheres to the standard on integrity. The documents listed under the Affirmative Action and Ethical Standards are easily accessible from the Web site and employees are reminded to submit the electronic Annual College and University Disclosure Form (5.2.1).

Another example of integrity is Stockton's compliance with the Clery Act. Full disclosure of crimes and fire statistics, along with safety and security information, is displayed on Stockton's Web site on the Campus Police Department's page.

The College demonstrates effective provision for uniform, professional and respectful treatment of all constituent groups through the labor contracts (4.1.5), the cultural diversity audit (5.2.3), the anti-discrimination policies (6.1.14) and the codes of conduct for both employees and students (6.1.18, pp. 97-113). Furthermore, the College continuously improves its standing structures for handling confidential student information, infractions of the student code and encouragement of intellectual and academic freedom (6.1.19). Faculty and staff rotate through service on all of these structures, including the Institutional Review Board to oversee the ethical conduct of research, and the Campus Hearing Board to adjudicate Code of Conduct infractions. For the protection of faculty, staff and students, the Campus Code of Conduct is published in the Student Handbook (6.1.19), the Bulletin (1.1.6), and the Web site (6.1), and therefore easily accessed. All information pertinent to employees is also available on the Human Resources Web site (6.1.17).

Communication

The College's communication to its constituent groups, including prospective students, is consistent with the institutional mission, goals, academic and other programs. Documents showing mission and goals of the divisions and programs are easily accessible from the College's Web site, and goals across several years are posted annually, specifically in divisional program reviews (1.1.4). In addition, Human Resources includes this information in orientation sessions provided for every new employee (6.1.12). Communication of career and educational opportunities can be found by reviewing departmental and divisional Web sites (6.2.3). In addition, the Career Center staff members maintain constant contact with external employers and host two annual career fairs for students, which remain open to alumni as well. There is also adequate information on the Web and announcements are made to students via email. Of note is that communication of service-learning opportunities and community engagement projects are clearly set out on user-friendly College sites. Additionally, opportunities for continuing education for both credit and non-credit are provided online, giving students, faculty and staff the opportunity to continue lifelong learning.

The communication of information regarding courses, graduation and retention rates (2.3.3), and licensing/certification is clear and sufficient. The schedule of courses**,** course catalog and Bulletin, Faculty Handbook and Student Handbook are easily accessible 24/7 from the Web site, and the faculty preceptors as well as professional advising staff interact frequently with students to be sure that everyone understands their curricular options. The Bulletin and Handbook are also available on the convenient flash drive students receive at orientation.

Whereas registration for popular courses may have been problematic in the past, the practice of an electronic waitlist now allows students to see the number of waitlist seats available, be added to the waitlist, and be notified via email if a spot in the course opens up. They are then allowed 24 to 48 hours to add the course manually. These best practices have improved the quality of

interactions between students, faculty and staff, particularly during high-activity registration and drop/add periods.

Useful information can be found in multiple locations through the College and its Web site. For example, emergency guidelines (6.2.8a) and safety information are provided in numerous communication venues, including the Web site, text and voice messaging, and internal/external kiosks. In practice, emergency drills and actual events follow the published procedures, including orderly evacuation, emergency text messaging, telephone alerts and Web site announcements.

Academic and Intellectual Freedom

Since its inception, Stockton has championed academic and intellectual freedom through its curricula and faculty perspective. Through its General Studies program, Stockton offers faculty the opportunity to design courses from the perspective of one or more disciplines to approach a topic of interest. This choice extends to students, as well, who can select the General Studies courses (G-courses) they apply to their degree programs. As long as certain broader guidelines are met, choice is part of the degree program in most majors.

Academic freedom is addressed in the ***statewide agreement*** as negotiated by the faculty union. "Academic freedom derives from the nature of the quest for knowledge. It is essential to the full search for truth and its free exposition, applies to both teaching and research, and shall not be abridged or abused. Academic freedom does not relieve the employee of those duties and obligations, which are inherent in the employer-employee relationship." As well, "Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning." At Stockton, academic freedom extends to every aspect of the faculty role.

There are two parts to any concept of academic freedom. The first has to do with the degree of restrictions laid on the individual by the group. The second has to do with the individual and how s/he responds to the directions of that group. Stockton, as a new institution, was in the unique position of having the new faculty design *and* implement the curricula considered, by them, to be appropriate and relevant to themselves and to their students. In a very real way, they designed the institution in which they were going to teach. They became both the group and the individuals in that group.

In 1970, both the administration and the faculty understood that the faculty brought with them appropriate professional goals and that those goals would be realized in individual, program curricula. Administration assumed that faculty knew how to construct a curriculum appropriate to their field, one that could stand the scrutiny of similar departments in other colleges. And though faculty had freedom to create courses in any way they wanted, most faculty taught traditional material in traditional ways.

In accepting and supporting the General Studies curriculum, Stockton's early administration agreed to the widest latitude of academic freedom. Where disciplinary curricula are somewhat narrow and even traditional, General Studies has traditionally been "wide open." General

Studies was a place where faculty could take risks, and Stockton has been fortunate in having a place where faculty can discuss current issues should they so choose and students can experience cutting-edge content.

Stockton was built on the premise that faculty are free to express their beliefs, but that they also be prepared to accept the consequences of that expression. This balance is absolutely essential in an institution of higher learning.

Looking Forward . . .

As Stockton experiences two more years of a new system of faculty governance, the Faculty Senate, the College anticipates scheduling an evaluation of its effectiveness. The Faculty Senate might examine questions such as the extent to which they represent the will of the Faculty, and the effectiveness of their interactions with the administration, student groups and the Board of Trustees.

As with the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate will follow through with its survey of Stockton students to determine its effectiveness as representative of the student population; also important is the value of linkages between the Student Senate and other governance bodies of the College.

Chapter Two

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal

An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

This chapter examines the integral connections that Stockton maintains between planning, resource allocation, institutional renewal and administration. Since its founding, Stockton has remained engaged in continuous quality improvement, structured around a systematic cycle of planning, implementing, assessing and acting on assessment results to inform future plans. By following this cycle and by *integrating* all of its various plans to cross-inform adjustments in each Division (2.1.1), the College consistently improves institutional performance in mission-focused ways.

Stockton 2020 Strategic Planning

Stockton completed a successful cycle of strategic planning named Vision 2010 just after the 2007 Periodic Review Report concluded. Having assessed the results of Vision 2010 (2.1.2), President Saatkamp selected a comprehensive Balanced Scorecard® approach to strategic planning and management: Stockton 2020. This approach incorporates annual measurements, results-based action plans for improvement and alignment of facilities, enrollment, financial, academic and student support plans.

Appointing a Steering Committee initially co-chaired by the current Provost and the Vice President for Administration & Finance, the President also appointed key representatives from faculty and staff leadership, the various bargaining units, each Division of the College and nearly every academic discipline. Now permanently staffed by the Chief Planning Officer, the President and the Stockton 2020 Steering Committee have led the College through a two-year pre-planning phase that has solicited input from every constituency: alumni, Board of Trustees, Foundation Board members, faculty, students, staff and community partners. As a result, the College is now pursuing the clear "2020" vision to become known as "an environmentally-responsible learning community of engaged citizens embracing a global perspective." Pursuing four strategic themes (Learning, Engagement, Global Perspectives and Sustainability) the College seeks to meet 26 measureable strategic objectives over the next decade, all depicted on its strategy map (2.1.3). Standing committees comprised of faculty, staff, students, alumni, Board and community members are now in the process of generating strategic initiatives proposals for each of the four themes (2.1.3).

Master Facilities Planning

In support of both the Vision 2010 and the Stockton 2020 strategic plan, the College conducted successive iterations of the Master Planning cycles, as noted by the 2002 Middle States Visiting

Team and by the 2007 Periodic Review Report Review Team. The 2005 Master Plan revision identified space shortages constraining the College's ability to pursue strategic objectives. Stockton administration began planning to increase capacity to accommodate enrollment growth commensurate with population growth in the region. After earning Pinelands Commission environmental approval in 2010 for the current plan (2.1.4), the President and Board of Trustees also approved purchase of the nearby Seaview resort and conference center to benefit the plan's strategic theme of Learning, particularly for the Hospitality Program, with the added benefit of supplementary College residences to increase Engagement between Stockton and the Galloway Township community. Strategically, acquiring the historic hotel also aligns with the Sustainability theme by enabling the College to forgo what otherwise would have been the resource-dependent construction of a "heavy carbon footprint" hotel on the main campus in the protected Pinelands.

To further enhance the strategic theme of Engagement, the College has also negotiated with the nearby town of Hammonton to restore an historic building so that it may be used in the future as an education center. If the Hammonton site proves viable, and the Seaview facilities prove to boost Hospitality program enrollments by fulfilling the promise of offering experiential learning in a resort hotel setting for Stockton's students, the College will continue to pursue its strategic themes in this manner. In summary: Stockton's renewal plan will develop additional revenue streams that will enable the College to meet additional strategic objectives.

Enrollment Planning

In terms of enrollment projections, the College has planned for steady planned growth averaging three percent per year. This carefully considered, intentional growth plan has yielded a stable source of revenue during Stockton's construction expansion, even in the face of reductions in state allocations since the 2007 Periodic Review Report. In addition, the President charged the undergraduate enrollment plan with goals to attract a more highly-qualified incoming freshman cohort to align with the Learning theme. To further strengthen the theme of Engagement as well, the College has also expanded residential life and student services under the Master Facilities Plan (Housing and a Campus Center, each with accompanying programs and personnel). These integrated plans have served as effective cycles for institutional renewal, particularly as faculty, staff and administrative leaders review their measureable outcomes each year (2.1.5) even as the state has challenged the College with its successive budget decreases.

During this period of intensive planning and building, the College has also expanded graduate programs to satisfy previously unmet regional needs for professional education. This strategy has allowed the College to augment its traditional undergraduate tuition revenue stream with graduate tuition as well, maintaining a 10% FTE cap, in keeping with its plan to remain focused on a "Very High Undergraduate" emphasis as categorized by the Carnegie Foundation. Every semester, the College publishes a comprehensive and consistent Enrollment Report that is presented to the Board and reviewed by the entire community (2.1.6). Each of these measurable, actionable plans demonstrates that the College has developed a solid infrastructure for strong, reliable revenue streams to support the strategic plan, while balancing facilities resources.

Financial Planning

In alignment with Resource Stewardship, the fourth perspective of a Balanced Scorecard ® approach, the institution's annual financial plan identifies targets for increasing revenues, establishing efficiencies in expenses and providing good stewardship of the resources the College maintains. The financial plan is tightly integrated with the facilities and enrollment plans, as well as with the academic plan. Weekly, monthly, quarterly and annual effectiveness measures are also integrally woven throughout the financial planning approach at Stockton. The President holds weekly meetings with financial and planning professional staff to ensure that the College is following the plan and to be apprised of changing conditions in markets, receivables, gifts and payables. Board committees on Investment, Finance, Facilities and Development also provide quarterly opportunities for the faculty, staff and administration to discuss and review the effectiveness of these plans in a public setting (2.1.7).

The Division of Administration & Finance also works closely with the Office of Development to provide technical and accounting support, as well as assistance in preparing financial statements in collaboration with the annual audit process. The Office of Development has been preparing for Stockton's first comprehensive campaign, which is also closely aligned to Stockton 2020, and will ultimately provide some resources to further enhance the strategic plan (2.1.8).

Academic Planning

Like all other planning cycles at the College, academic planning follows a pattern of setting goals, targeting initiatives, measuring results and taking action based on those results. Annual Program Coordinators' reports contain a review of the prior year's goals, reports on the success of initiatives, complete assessment plans and goals for the ensuing year, based on results from the current year's assessment. Similarly, five year comprehensive reviews of academic programs follow this same pattern, including vital information on faculty productivity, student characteristics, outcomes and longer-term goals that align to strategic themes (2.1.9). By 2011, following a series of divisional retreats and presentations, the academic plan reached a complete alignment of goals from every level of the division, from program to school to Academic Affairs overall, as depicted in the 2011 Program Review (2.1.5). Similarly, between 2009-2011, academic planning on the annual and five-year review cycles became more comprehensive, data-informed and systematic, first through a series of piloting and improving consistent templates, and second through the acquisition of Sedonaweb software for ongoing maintenance and sharing of these review cycles. (See Chapter Seven: Standard 7 Institutional Assessment for more details about this progression as another illustration of institutional effectiveness.)

Consistency of Allocation Decisions with Mission and Strategic Objectives

The College's mission emphasizes excellence in teaching, learning and service to an increasingly diverse and constantly changing region. The strategic objectives for Stockton 2020 challenge the College to improve student learning, engagement, global perspectives and sustainability. To support both mission and strategic objectives, the College allocates resources based on a cycle of continuous improvement that culminates in what is learned from functional and academic departments each year. The annual system of program review incorporates closed-loop feedback

from each area, aggregated upwards to each of four College Divisions: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Administration & Finance and Development (2.1.5). These program reviews each contain a line-by-line allocation request to reflect increases needed for specific departments.

For example, in the Student Affairs Division, Stockton's Career Center conducts regular surveys of graduating seniors and alumni, assessing its effectiveness in fulfilling the College mission to prepare students to serve the region in their chosen field of study or profession. Based on survey results, the Career Center shapes its future goals and makes allocation requests to the Division of Student Affairs. As depicted on chart 2.2.1, the requests between 2005 and 2006 resulted in an infusion of much-needed resources to bring the unit up to a level where it could meet all of the needs that graduates had articulated in their exit and follow-up survey results. Although resource allocations since that point have been reduced in state appropriations, funding has been restored for relocating the Career Center to the new Campus Center facility, where adequate space will allow it to provide services commensurate with student demand and expectations.

Comparable to the Career Center example, in the Academic Affairs Division, Library allocations in 2.2.1 illustrate both the impact of responses to external changes (loss of state consortium support for shared databases in the face of increased prices from providers) and the effect of solid management expertise. The Library uses assessment data on printed resources circulation to recommend selective reductions in paper subscriptions for programs where the full-text digital collections have begun to outpace demand for print versions of the same resources. This careful use of data illustrates that administrators collaborate with faculty members and student to make good resource allocation decisions that maximize student learning and faculty teaching.

Similarly, the Academic Tutoring Center on chart 2.2.1 has always had strong institutional support, providing assistance to those with math and writing needs. In recent years, the College has increased allocations to strengthen its commitment and emphasize Learning as a strategic theme. Future plans for this area include opening a full wing in the main academic building for tutoring and skills, with adjacent areas for testing and the Learning Access Program, merging all of these resources in one physical location to continue improving student learning and services.

As with many institutions, Stockton has struggled to keep pace with the rising costs and rapidly changing manifestations of technology to facilitate its mission and goals. From internal processes, student information systems and employee training necessary just to stay current, Computer Services' funding needs fluctuate greatly; these funding swings result from major capital projects, such as converting classrooms to "smart" technology and making the "LEAP" from Sungard's SIS to its Banner ERP class suite. Nonetheless, funding for Computer Services is aligned with the Information Technology Strategic Plan and Technology Projects Portfolio (2.2.4) that a College-wide committee has been shaping concurrently with the Stockton 2020 Strategic Plan. Overall, Stockton's commitment to steady growth in both enrollments and resource allocations continues to be clearly linked and carefully planned.

As is the case with many organizational plans, external changes can precipitate unexpected consequences to the College's resources. For example, Stockton's 2005 Master Plan calls for enhancing its Hospitality and Tourism Management program by constructing a teaching hotel. However, when an historic resort hotel in Galloway Township became available during a real

estate buyer's market, the College allocated resources from its investment account to purchase the Seaview property, rather than to build new construction on its Pinelands-protected campus.

Effectiveness of Resource Allocation Decisions for Learning Outcomes

As part of the planning process of aligning allocations to its mission, vision, goals and results from measurement effectiveness cycles, the College has identified scores of learning outcomes that encompass general education, the major and minor academic programs, experiential and co-curricular student development. As a baseline, each of these sets of outcomes is managed every year by the departments directly responsible to measure performance and to interpret the results of measurement into continuous improvement. For example, when the College completed its PRR in 2007, most academic programs were just beginning systematic assessments of learning outcomes, while several student development offices were already conducting regular reviews of their areas. Fiscal affairs units were focusing on demonstrating strong bond ratings and clean audits as standard assessment mechanisms (2.2.3, p. 8).

Since the 2007 PRR, the College has implemented a far more comprehensive and systematic program of learning outcomes assessment, including augmenting its regular bi-annual NSSE cycle with an alternating Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) bi-annual cycle to measure directly the value Stockton adds to students' ability to think analytically and write critically. Richard Stockton College now alternates these two major institutional data collections every year, and shares the results with the entire College community, including the strategic and operational planning groups, for their use in shaping future goals, planning strategic initiatives and adding interim measurements. These results routinely become the subject of institutional conversations among faculty, staff and students, and are also published on the College Portrait (2.3.1) as part of the Voluntary System of Accountability.

To ensure that the College remains systematic and transparent in its ongoing planning and assessment cycles, the President has instituted the Office of Planning and Institutional Research (2.3.2), which services the data reporting needs for the entire College. The data are shared in a wide variety of published "dashboard" indicators, consumer information profiles, standard reporting archives and trend analyses, all of which furnish important information about the effectiveness of specific operational goals (2.3.2). Furthermore, the College maintains an overall Institutional Assessment inventory that links to major assessment efforts throughout the entire institution, including allocations and financial indicators (7.8.2).

Specifically, the College can regularly demonstrate that resource allocations have remained tightly aligned to the success of key initiatives (2.2.1), including size of the incoming freshmen class, the quality of the students' academic qualifications, the (in)sufficiency of square footage in instructional and service space, as well as instructional resources such as faculty and computers.

The carefully planned, measured growth and development of the College has remained consistent and attentive to continuous improvement during this past decade. Continuous improvement to admissions policies for each successive incoming class has also begun to impact the retention and graduation rates (2.3.3). In spite of fiscal constraints, the College has done well by its students, providing increased learning resources commensurate with enrollment growth.

During the long periods of time required to issue bonds for capital improvements and to obtain permits from the Pinelands Commission, the College has laid much of the groundwork for continued expansion, particularly given the addition of another 154,000 square feet of Campus Center space. This addition has allowed Stockton to plan on rededicating much of the main building back to classrooms and faculty office space, sufficient not only to maintain quality outcomes, but also to provide room for continued focused expansion well into the future. The College has been extremely effective at engaging in intentional, cyclical planning to align resource development and allocation in support of strategic and learning goals. Several Master Plan projects are now in construction or under design within the constraints of environmental regulations. Given the increased capacity, Stockton is now ready to serve more students. Concurrently, the College has strengthened its academic reputation with national ranking groups, and the faculty have increased scholarly productivity and grants success. In alignment with the strategic goals to improve Learning and to increase Engagement, new programs in graduate education, health science, hospitality and computational sciences, in particular, and new synergies with local institutions including the Noyes Museum, the Hammonton Education Center and the Seaview resort and conference center, offer an expansion of opportunities for student enrollments and revenue growth. The College has also earned Voluntary Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement (9.1.1), having demonstrated its resource alignment to this important strategic goal.

A past challenge for the College was the perception of the Vision 2010 plan by various constituency groups to have been deployed in a manner where "top-down" outweighed "bottom-up" structures and mechanisms. Based on what was learned from that process, Stockton 2020 has involved a representative Steering Committee of faculty, staff and administrators, each of whom has communicated with the entire college community. After taking one year to establish draft themes and objectives, the Committee then circulated those drafts and solicited input from students, faculty and staff in a wide variety of public forums for one additional year of broad-based feedback. The revised planning framework has been posted to the Web site. One remaining challenge of which the College is very aware is ensuring consistent communication and coordination with the entire community during the implementation, alignment, measurement and reporting stages of the process. The 2020 Initiatives Implementation Teams include more than 100 members of the College community, sliced diagonally through the students, staff, faculty and community members who comprise the Stockton family. These teams will continue to promulgate the strategic themes among the broader communities they represent (2.1.3).

Organizational charts and Program Reviews are available online for all departments, to assist all stakeholders to better understand the budget request and reporting structure. The Office of Budget & Fiscal Planning has collaborated with each Division to establish a public calendar with important deadlines, decision-points and key contacts (2.1.10). Concurrently, the College has revised and re-indexed all of its policies and procedures into a single, searchable Web site, which includes the policy and procedures on institutional planning that clarifies roles and decision points in the concentric strategic and operational cycles (2.1.10). Taken together, these additions to Stockton's philosophy of transparency go a long way to demystify the allocations processes that align so closely with the plans each cycle.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

The human, financial, technical, facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution's mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution's mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution's resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

Adequate Resources to Fulfill Mission and Achieve Goals

In response to reductions in direct state appropriation that have declined a cumulative 18% in the last five years, Stockton has been developing alternative revenue sources to ensure its ongoing financial stability. The graph figure 3.1.1.1, (3.1.1) depicts state appropriations decreasing $4.7 million in the last five years, forcing the College to rely on alternative revenue sources in order to achieve its mission and goals.

While the enrollment plan has been effective in increasing both the quality and the size of incoming classes, the academic plan has simultaneously increased the number of programs offered to these students, maintaining a careful balance between mission-driven faculty resource expenses and tuition revenues. Concurrently, the facilities plan has also expanded the campus and the financial plan has adjusted tuition policies. These integrated changes demonstrate how Stockton has advanced its educational mission with careful planning and resource management.

By managing enrollment with both increasingly selective admissions and regionally-responsive graduate program growth, Stockton's annualized headcount has increased 13% in the last five years graph figure 3.1.1.2, (3.1.1) with the largest increase percentage by graduate FTE (3.1.2). The College tuition and fee revenue has also increased 52% and by 23.5 million in the last five fiscal years graph figure 3.1.1.4, (3.1.1).

In 2009-10, the College adjusted undergraduate tuition policies to a flat rate system (3.1.3), designed to provide more incentive for students to complete their undergraduate degrees in four years. This policy change has also allowed the College to implement relatively modest tuition increases during a time period when appropriations have decreased dramatically.

In addition, federal and state grants and contracts in support of producing scholarship and serving the region have continued to increase, as shown in graph figure 3.1.1.5, (3.1.1) . Faculty and staff at the College have increased federal, state and local grants and contracts 70% or $9.6 million in the last five years, all of which provide additional resources to support the College's mission and institutional goals.

Clarity of Resource Allocations Decisions

Among the most complex and interdependent set of processes in any higher education setting are those related to resource allocation. From the intricacies of organizational structures by Division, School, Department and Program, all the way to the sensitive considerations of personnel development in a collective bargaining environment, Stockton's allocation decisions necessarily

involve many iterative processes and participation from dozens of colleagues at several levels of the institution.

In an effort to clarify and communicate these processes to the public, the College has recently updated and posted all of its policies, as noted above (2.1.10). In particular, newly revised, from 1977, policy I-12 on Strategic Planning (2.1.10) connects both strategic and annual operating plans to allocation processes clearly. The Planning policy contains five stages that take place during each fiscal year, from goal-setting to initiatives to allocations requests, accompanied by measurements and analyzing results. The accompanying Strategic and Annual Planning Procedure (2.1.10) follows an annual budgeting calendar and outlines how each stage plays out from the base departments, up through the Academic School Deans or Associate Vice President levels, then on to the Cabinet level for Program Review (2.1.5) and for Presidential and Board approval. The Divisional Program Reviews take place in large campus meeting rooms between January and February each year, highlighting the results of the previous year, the goals for the current year, and the allocations requests for the upcoming fiscal year. These reviews conclude in time for the New Jersey Governor's budget address and legislative hearings that take place on the state level from February to May (2.1.10 Budget Process p. 2). In compliance with state and federal regulations, the College acknowledges and implements any recommendations that appear in its clean annual audit reports and management letters.

During the process of this Self-Study, the need for even more clarity and transparency for the entire College community became clear. In response to this need, leaders from the Division of Administration & Finance collaborated with Deans and other administrators to develop calendars that chart the budget process through the year and across College structures (2.1.10). Prior to the Self-Study research, the central Office of Budget & Fiscal Planning communicated individually with each divisional VP, who in turn would communicate with Department Managers and/or Deans to develop budget requests for the Program Reviews. The calendars and charts provide even clearer processes for the entire College population. Additionally, the College now has highlights in the FY12 budget publication, aligning allocations to strategic priorities (3.2.6).

Constraints on Resources Relative to Achieving Goals

An analysis of the past five years' program reviews from four major Divisions of the College reveals that the College has maintained an effective balance on constrained resources through its dedication to systematic planning, assessment and improvement. During each of the program reviews, the management teams from each Division complete a SWOT analysis to evaluate strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (2.1.5).

One of the most important strengths related to learning outcomes has been in the increasing academic reputation of the College. This is reflected in the College's overall reputation and standings with national ranking groups (e.g., *Princeton Review, US News and World Report*) and as evidenced by increased scholarly productivity and grants success mentioned earlier in this chapter. Similarly, as noted above, new programs in graduate education, health science, hospitality and computational sciences, and new partnerships with local institutions including the Noyes Museum, the Hammonton Education Center and the Seaview property offer expanded opportunities for student learning.

The recurrent weaknesses that the Divisions of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Administration & Finance identified across many of the past years have generally been addressed over time. Even the strain on physical facilities continues to be mitigated as the facilities expansion program continues. The facilities space shortage has restricted the ability to enroll more students in these programs that need specialized space such as laboratories and clinics. The lack of facilities such as a state-of-the-art science center has presented significant challenges (2.1.4), hence, the new construction of a Unified Science Center is on track for completion by 2013.

The opening of the Campus Center in late Spring 2011 has presented many opportunities for utilizing the backfill space on the main campus for faculty offices, additional classrooms, and an upgraded art gallery.

However, there is also a strain on facilities that support the Athletics and Recreation programs. This strain may impede the College's efforts to recruit student athletes and to support co-curricular activities. During this intense construction period, the College has also been working to provide additional parking spaces to offset those lost to staging and safety zones surrounding the building sites. This effort has impacted an athletic practice field, which has now been converted to a sustainably-designed parking area. In response, the College opened a new synthetic practice field on Pomona Road and plans for additional athletic facility expansions included in the overall master plan (2.1.4).

The balance of on-campus and off-campus housing currently meets demands, which allows the College to guarantee full-time, first-time freshmen housing for all four years of their college experience. As enrollment increases, there will need to be a review to determine the appropriate mix of on-campus versus off-campus housing. This region offers ready availability of seasonal rental properties. However, as discussed earlier, the recent acquisition of Seaview increases the College's ability to offer housing options for residential students in selected programs such as Hospitality and Tourism Management Studies.

In addition, the persistent threat of ever-decreasing public funding remains, recently the subject of a Governor's Task Force report (3.1.4). Much as the College is reluctant to raise them each year, student tuition and fee increases still do not keep pace with the rate of state-negotiated salary increases. As noted previously, one challenge is to continue increasing enrollment towards targeted goals while maintaining tuition and fees in the College's relative position among the other state colleges (3.3.2) even as state appropriations continue to decline. Among the nine public colleges, Stockton has traditionally remained an accessible, affordable choice for students in its region. The past five years have seen increasing costs resulting from external, state-level control of employee salaries and benefits. As noted earlier in this chapter, the College has met some of these challenges by judicious budgeting, increased grant activity and the careful use of investment funds. Even during difficult economic times, the College has remained committed to expanding its facilities, faculty and other resources necessary to achieve the institution's missions and goals.

The College has continuously strengthened its commitment to generating stable revenue through a diverse portfolio of alternative sources. As described later in Chapter One, Standard 4, Stockton has an independent Richard Stockton College Foundation whose sole mission is to support the needs of the College through philanthropy. The Foundation's efforts over the past several years have increased scholarship aid to incoming and continuing students. In addition, the College is in the silent phase of a comprehensive fundraising campaign, which will provide future support for the strengthening endowment, ensuring another stable revenue source, far into the future.

Resources as Supported Through Development

In December 2010, the College successfully completed its national search for a new Chief Development Officer (CDO) and Executive Director of the College Foundation. The new CDO brings more than 25 years of comprehensive development experience to Stockton, and leads the Office of Development and Alumni Affairs, and the Richard Stockton College Foundation. The addition of a seasoned professional in this key role is an important step in the growth and evolution of Stockton's fundraising program. The Office of Development and Alumni Affairs currently consists of thirteen full-time employees, more than ever before. A new Associate Chief Development Officer has been hired in 2011 to increase the use of information technology that informs the campaign.

Since the 2007 PRR and with the assistance of the nationally-recognized development consultant firm, the Office of Development & Alumni Affairs has developed improved gift acknowledgement, gift processing and gift tracking procedures. An Annual Report of Giving is now distributed to donors who have given in the previous fiscal year. The Foundation is now audited on an annual basis and reports regular measures of effectiveness.

The Richard Stockton College Foundation (3.3.3) and the Office of Development & Alumni Affairs continuously seek to improve their ability to work with various key donors in an effort to raise, manage, steward and cultivate gifts to support the mission of the College. Notably, the Foundation established an annual donor recognition society, The Richard Stockton Society (3.3.4), to thank and encourage donors who give at least $1,000 a year in support of the College's mission. This initiative has stimulated growth in donations.

The Foundation has also worked toward improving its philanthropic outreach. Each member of the Foundation Board of Directors is now asked to sign a Statement of Expectations. Among those expectations is annual membership in The Richard Stockton Society. Also increasing its presence in the community, Foundation members host Community Gatherings in their homes or places of business with the goal of introducing their neighbors and friends to Stockton and the work of the College Foundation. The Foundation also sponsors two primary fundraising events each year: a golf tournament and the highly successful Scholarship Benefit Gala (3.3.5). These events regularly net a combined $400,000-plus in support of the College and its students. The Foundation supports fundraising efforts, Presidential initiatives, academic programs and scholarships on an annual basis.

The College is in the active phase of a comprehensive fundraising campaign, which will provide future support for the College. As of December 31, 2011, $19,999,317 has been raised toward a 20 million dollar campaign. . The first $1 million gift was received in June 2011 (3.3.6) and a multi-million dollar endowed property gift was announced in September. Total Foundation assets have risen from approximately $3 million in 2003 to more than $18 million as of September, 2011.

Of significant importance is the role of the Annual Fund (3.3.7) in meeting the needs of the College. For much of its 40-year history, the Annual Fund at Stockton has not been actively supported or promoted. However, within the past two years, Stockton has updated and professionalized its database of alumni contacts, and as a result has experienced significant growth in this area, receiving donations from alumni, parents and friends of the College. Unrestricted Annual Fund support benefits the College's top priorities. In FY 2009, the Annual Fund raised $74,155 from 483 donors (305 of whom are alumni). In FY 2010, the Annual Fund saw a dramatic increase, raising $121,994 from 1409 donors (923 of whom are alumni). Annual Fund giving and participation continued to increase, in FY 2011, $188,098 was raised from 1627 donors (964 of whom are alumni). The focus on the Annual Fund as a priority within the campaign should help to contribute to a solid foundation of giving for the future.

The Office of Development & Alumni Affairs continues to build upon existing programs that have proven beneficial (e.g., Scholarship Gala, Richard Stockton Society, Homecoming, Scholarship Recognition Dinners, Annual Fund, Major Gifts, etc.) while expanding its efforts through the public launch of the comprehensive campaign, celebration of the College's 40 years of teaching, and engagement of alumni and extended community members. This solid foundation bodes well, in general, for the support of institutional resources.

Standard 5: Administration

The institution's administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution's organization and governance.

Continuous Improvement of the Administration

President Saatkamp leads a team of highly-qualified administrators who possess and consistently update the professional skills and knowledge required for effective administration (5.1.1). The President himself sets the tone for the entire administration, and remains professionally active not only in his intellectual contributions, but also in his service to higher education and community organizations (5.1.2). The President has also participated in 360-degree evaluation procedures as discussed in Chapter One, Standard 4, that assess how effectively he has led the College in fulfilling its mission and attaining its goals. Similarly, the President revised the personnel evaluation procedures for all administrators, which now incorporates annual performance-based assessment on both measurable goals and contractual responsibilities. Furthermore, the managerial review and reappointment process is now conducted completely online, using the Workflow extension to the Banner system (5.1.3).

In addition, the President has worked successfully with a Cabinet of seasoned Vice Presidents and Special Assistants, augmented by some seasoned and new Chief Officers during his administration. Two of the President's direct reports have remained in their Cabinet roles since President Saatkamp arrived. During those first five years, the President created a succession plan that would create a more professional Advancement team, an increasingly innovative Division of Administration & Finance, an independent School of Business, an enhanced campus and residential program, and a tighter integration of all Divisions for planning and assessment.

To that end, President Saatkamp brought new leadership to the Division of Administration & Finance in 2008; facilitated the succession of the Vice President for Student Affairs with the former Dean of Students and hired a former Deputy Attorney General of New Jersey to represent Stockton as Chief Counsel in 2009; and held a national search in 2010 that culminated in the selection of the current Provost and Executive Vice President. To further strengthen professionalization of the Advancement area, the President created an Office of External Affairs that became tightly integrated with the Office of Development & Alumni Affairs in 2010. Finally, to align planning among all of the major administrative divisions, the President centralized an Office of Planning & Institutional Research in 2010. The President's direction of these reorganization and succession plans has demonstrated excellence in aligning leadership resources to ensure that Stockton will be able to continue establishing, measuring and assessing its future objectives, plans and outcomes.

Since the 2007 PRR, the College has also continued to strengthen both the Professional Development staff and the Richard Stockton College Foundation. As noted in the PRR (2.2.3), the College began the process of focusing its efforts on developing a strong fundraising effort and infrastructure within the Office of Development and Alumni Affairs. Since then, the Development Office has been restructured and currently includes the following areas: Development; Alumni Affairs; The Richard Stockton College Foundation; Annual Fund; Major Gifts; Special Events; and Advancement Information Systems. A current set of organization charts is available at 4.1.7.

Effectiveness of the College's Administrative Practices at Impacting Diversity

Similar to many other public institutions, Stockton College has both an Office of Human Resources and Office of Affirmative Action and Ethical Standards (AAES). At Stockton, the head of the Office of AAES sits on the President's cabinet and works with the various college offices to ensure that they follow federal and state guidelines with regard to the hiring of minorities, women and disadvantaged groups. The Office of AAES maintains a Web site (5.2.1) that lists hiring guidelines, policies and procedures. The Office of AAES also maintains workforce analysis figures and charts on the demographics of staff over 10 years.

Richard Stockton College also has very specific guidelines for increasing the diversity of the applicant pool for its professional, administrative and teaching positions. Each search committee for faculty, professional and administrative positions is required to submit a search plan to the Office of AAES and meet with its head to, among other things, discuss ways to ensure that the advertisement venues for that position does not bias the applicant pool (5.2.1). Stockton also has

a College Committee for Diversity, Equity and Affirmative Action. Its purpose is effectively conveyed on this same Web site, to "serve as an advisory body to the president to assist the college in meeting its commitment to affirmative action and the continuing transformation from a campus that believes in diversity to a campus that lives its commitment to diversity."

Among its many responsibilities, the Office of Human Resources (HR) is tasked with development, implementation and interpretation of Human Resource Policy and programs, maintaining a stable labor relations environment and providing training and development opportunities for faculty and staff (5.2.2). The AAES Web site (5.2.1) shows that The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey rigorously follows state and federal guidelines for hiring and retention of women, minority and disadvantaged groups. As noted in Chapter One, Standard 6, the Office of AAES also posts all documents dealing with the Cultural Audit, Affirmative Action Policies, Discrimination Policy and Procedures, Recruitment and Search, Reasonable Accommodations, Workforce Analysis, Committee for Diversity, Equity and Affirmative Action, Ethics, Ethics Intranet Complaint forms, the Whistleblower Act, and other forms (6.1).

Discussed in Chapter One, Standard 6, the College hired consultants to conduct a cultural audit in 2008 (5.2.3) to review diversity initiatives and to develop future plans. According to the audit, Stockton has advantages over other institutions including:

- Not having a history of overt discrimination.
- Having named an African American woman as President of the College early in its development, sending a strong message
- Valuing an inclusive culture, evidenced by having conducted a cultural audit.

In the past ten years, the College has worked diligently to increase faculty diversity. The College has made significant progress in the past ten years in terms of gender. Tenured and tenure-track women faculty numbered from 81 in 2000 to 128 in 2009 for a 58% increase. With the substantial increase in the hiring of women faculty, greater balance has been achieved. In 2000, 40% of faculty members were female, 60% were male. By 2010, 50% of faculty members were female, 50% were male (5.2.1).

The College also has clear policies for the various classes of employees, including a transitions retirement policy for faculty members, a tenure "clock-stop" policy for faculty with work-life balance changes, a donated leave bank for classified employees and a professional discretionary approach to managerial vacation leave. Policies are disclosed on the HR Web site, and HR personnel are available to answer questions that help clarify the differences between these policies based on employee categories.

One challenge has been the relatively modest increase in the number of minority faculty. In 2000, minority faculty made up 20% of tenured and tenure-track faculty. In 2010, this percentage increased to 24%. The percentage of tenured African American faculty decreased from 10% in 2000 to nine percent in 2009, while tenured Hispanic faculty had a modest gain from three to four percent. The Office of Affirmative Action and Ethical Standards conveys that this is not due to a lack of effort, but the stiff recruiting competition in the surrounding urban areas.

Looking Forward . . .

As the College grows, it needs to be attentive to the effects of its acquisitions of off campus faculties, such as the Seaview and Hammonton Education Center. The College should carefully balance its growth of on- and off-campus populations, maintaining appropriate resources to ensure community engagement and sustainability in keeping with the strategic plan.

The Stockton 2020 plan, facilities master plan, enrollment plan and academic plan must remain tightly integrated, so that steady, measured growth can continue with sufficient resource allocation strategies during the next ten year planning cycle.

Chapter Three

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students' educational goals.

Admissions Goals

As part of the transition from Vision 2010 to Stockton 2020, the current strategic planning framework, Stockton has pursued the goal of attracting and retaining a more highly-qualified cohort of incoming freshmen who engage more fully in campus life, with an end goal of becoming more of a residential campus (8.1). This enrollment plan has yielded several promising results, as well as some results that bear continued study.

While the College has succeeded in attracting more students with higher SAT scores and in the top of their high school graduating class (8.1.1), Stockton's average combined SAT (math and verbal) for regularly admitted students has remained fairly consistent, ranging from 1105 to 1143 over the last five years, with a class rank in the 74th to 81st percentile (8.1.2).

Incoming Class Statistics

Year	Fall 2011	Fall 2010	Fall 2009	Fall 2008	Fall 2007
SAT	1117	1122	1143	1130	1105
Class Rank Percentile	78%	79%	81%	80%	74%

A recent shift in the methodology for determining selectivity that has been adopted by the Carnegie Foundation demonstrates that Stockton's incoming cohorts are becoming slightly bi-modal (8.1.3). These data comprise the bases for ongoing study of the College's enrollment strategies for continuous improvement.

Stockton participates not only in the NJ Student Unit Record of Enrollment (SURE) and the federal IPEDS data reporting systems, but also in every major survey informed by disclosure of admissions statistics to the Common Data Set and the Review Data Set. Admitted students' information is regularly published and widely available via a wide variety of Web sites that include the College Navigator, Peterson's and Princeton's Guides and the College Portrait. Stockton's Admissions Web site is also clear and easy for both students and parents to navigate, containing admissions policies, information about major academic programs and learning outcomes information from the Voluntary System of Accountability (2.3.1) that assists prospective families in making informed decisions.

The evidence that Stockton is becoming a more residential community shows that the number of freshmen who have chosen to live on campus has risen steadily over four years, fluctuating downward only during the year when retention also dipped unexpectedly. The College has a

fairly even distribution of on-campus residents across all four classes from freshman to senior (8.1.4).

Residential Freshmen

Year	Fall 2011	Fall 2010	Fall 2009	Fall 2008	Fall 2007
Freshmen	710	685	660	674	579

As a result of the College's enrollment strategy to become a more residential college, the percentage of on-campus residents has grown steadily over the years. The 2007 Periodic Review Report noted that the shortage of student housing on the campus was a "pressing issue," which had the potential to dissuade students from attending Stockton and limit out-of-state and international recruitment. In the Fall of 2008, a policy was adopted that guaranteed housing to new freshmen for two years; in Fall 2010, Stockton guaranteed *ongoing* housing for all new freshmen. This move coincided with an active northern New Jersey marketing and recruitment plan to attract more northern New Jersey students to Stockton. The opening of Housing V in 2008, a state-of-the-art residential complex of 382 beds, the purchase of the Seaview resort and conference center in Fall 2010, and the ability to place students in a local hotel, has enabled the College to offer guaranteed housing for four years. Additionally, SASI has purchased five private houses adjacent to the campus, which house 22 graduate and veteran students. A five year trend analysis of the campus residential population clearly demonstrates Stockton's efforts to use this strategy to enhance retention efforts (8.1.4). Currently, the College is realizing the need to market more aggressively that freshmen are guaranteed housing for four years.

Scholarship Program

The importance of the scholarship program has been elevated in light of the recent recession and increased competition for the College's target profile students. The College is concerned about access and affordability and regularly monitors loan indebtedness, which ranges from $18,591 for non EOF students to $24,633 for Educational Opportunity Fund (EOF) students (8.2.1). The College also has studied the sources of grant aid and scholarships (8.2.1 Financial Aid Analysis).

Merit Scholarships

These scholarships are granted to first-time freshmen (i.e., Presidential, Provost, Dean and Stockton scholarships) and new transfers (i.e., Phi Theta Kappa and Excellence in Academics) to encourage students to attend. The current merit scholarship program may have had an impact on the average SAT scores of entering freshman, which has risen, and the program has enrolled more students with higher SATs than in previous years. It is important to maintain and improve this program continuously because a strong scholarship plan is one important factor in an overall plan to continue attracting and retaining students at Stockton's targeted academic profile.

At the peak of its lifespan in year FY12, the current program requires $12 million plus of funding, which may necessitate the use of outside capital for further funding, increases in enrollment, reduced expenditures in other areas, or all three. As the three-year trend analysis (8.2.1) indicates, College leadership frequently examines the impact of this program and makes

continuous adjustments that respond to both internal and external fluctuations in other funding sources and student demographics.

Targeted Scholarships

These scholarships are supported by the Stockton Foundation and funded by alumni, friends and the community to support Stockton programs, scholarships for both undergraduate and graduate students, and initiatives for growth. The College has managed its partnership with the Foundation effectively to reward students based on academic performance at the undergraduate level, which is associated with a higher retention of these students. These funds are financially sustainable because they do not come from Stockton's budget. The funds are pledged by friends and alumni and some may be converted into endowed funds.

Need-Based Scholarships

These are specific Educational Opportunity Fund (EOF) need-based scholarships (8.2.2)**.** This signature program for New Jersey has been very effective in attracting and retaining students from historically disadvantaged circumstances because EOF students are high-risk and high-need students. Although EOF-based aid typically has assisted students through the first two years, which are traditionally the most high risk for attrition, recipients would be eligible (per state guidelines) to receive 10 EOF grant-paid semesters.

In response to changing needs of this population and to ensure access, the College has increased funding. The FY 2011 award totaled over $500,000, and the size of the population is managed judiciously. Additionally, retention and graduation rates demonstrate that this particular scholarship program is extremely successful in retaining students for their second year, and above the national average for graduating this at-risk population (8.2.2 EOF Five Year Trend).

Furthermore, graduate students are eligible to apply for Graduate Assistantships that are typically worth three credits of graduate tuition. The College expends nearly $250,000 per year to support these Graduate Assistantships (8.2.2).

Stockton Grant-in-Aid

In FY 2012, the College established a hybrid grant-in-aid program that combines financial need and academic achievement to determine eligibility. This grant program is designed to enhance the College's yield on accepted freshmen.

Integration of Academic and Enrollment Planning Processes

Globally, Vision 2020 addresses the College enrollment strategy by delineating new program guidelines and curricular expectations based on strategic themes. Additionally, the Master Plan lays out planned growth in facilities, which greatly impact enrollment strategy. For example, while the College receives many applications for science-based and graduate health care-related programs, it must manage the numbers of acceptances in these areas carefully because of its

limited facilities at present. The long-awaited realization of a new Unified Science Center, launched by a groundbreaking in summer 2011, will help alleviate these issues.

A number of initiatives across all divisions effectively integrate the academic and enrollment planning process in a systematic and continuously improving manner. The annual, public program reviews by each division of the College allow faculty and staff to understand the goals and accomplishments of other areas of the College, so they can take these into account when setting their own future goals. As discussed in previous chapters, included are SWOT analyses, new goals and past accomplishments, budget requests for the upcoming year, and an overall budget overview (8.3.1). Final funding is determined by the President and his Cabinet after the annual State budget is received.

Ongoing meetings by Enrollment Management staff members with the academic schools and other institutional offices regarding enrollment strategies and projections have been instituted. Yearly meetings known as the "enrollment summit" were initiated several years ago to share plans and strategies with representative campus offices and academic schools. Discussions include admissions growth targets, financial aid and, in particular, scholarship distributions and cost of attendance with room and board. These sessions prove to be very informative and helpful in soliciting feedback from campus constituencies regarding enrollment planning.

The Deans Council regularly considers all issues regarding enrollment management and admissions. With staff responsible for enrollment management at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, Deans Council discusses issues related to open houses, enrollment in particular disciplines, orientation/registration sessions and early decision days, among other events. In one recent example of this continuous improvement process, the Natural Sciences and Mathematics School has collaborated with the Admissions and Advising offices to pilot test, evaluate, improve and fully implement Accuplacer testing for all prospective Biology students whose SAT or ACT math scores fall within the testing range. Information about these requirements is widely available from the Admissions and Advising offices, and the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

Faculty contribute through a Faculty Senate presence at Deans Council meetings. Initiatives such as the establishment of a Faculty Ambassador Program (8.3.2) demonstrate collaboration between the Office of Enrollment Management and the Deans Council.

Through the Enrollment Management Study Group, the Office of Enrollment Management presents information and data about enrollment, including statewide comparisons, with College constituencies from Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, Administration & Finance, and Planning & Institutional Research.

Open House Programs (8.3.3) are held four times a year to give prospective undergraduate and graduate students information related to admissions and programs. Faculty, admissions representatives and other College staff formally address students and parents and answer individual questions at these structured events. Post-event debriefing sessions include administrative staff, deans and faculty members who review not only student and parent

participant survey data, but also qualitative feedback from all of these collaborators. The results inform planning for future events.

Registration and Orientation are when Enrollment Management, in conjunction with the Office of the Registrar, faculty and academic staff, host summer orientation sessions to register students and provide information to incoming students. Faculty participation in these programs, as well as the Stockton Orientation Adventure Retreat, or S.O.A.R. (9.1.4) program are effective in initiating early retention-relationships among students, staff and faculty as a prelude to the precepting relationship described in Chapter Four (10.4).

The Office of Enrollment Management goes on an annual retreat to discuss initiatives, strategy, and other issues. An integral part of the retreat is working with faculty to discuss new ideas and collaborative projects. Each of these mechanisms is an effective pathway for collaboration, helping to facilitate seamless, integrated enrollment management.

Availability of Information

Incoming students, both freshmen and transfers, attend an orientation session as mentioned above. The Orientation (8.3.4) is a day-long event that takes students and parents through a series of informational and practical workshops. Students are given a flash drive that contains copies of the Bulletin (1.1.6 Stockton's catalog), Student Handbook (6.1.18) and other critical information. They learn about degree program planning, are introduced to college life by students and faculty, receive account information (and have ID photos taken) and actually register for courses in computer labs that are staffed by faculty, staff and student ambassadors solely to assist them.

Parents are with their students for part of the time, but then are ushered to sessions that are specifically designed for them. These answer their questions about campus facilities, accommodations, safety and security, finances and much more.

It is important to note that all new students are provided with comprehensive information in different formats (print, online, oral instruction, etc.) to assure that they have access to everything they need to know to begin their Stockton experience. Both freshmen and transfers get similar services, though each orientation is tailored to them specifically. Stockton is recognized throughout New Jersey as one of the most "transfer-friendly" institutions in the state. Admissions and Advising office staff offer extended hours to each individual transfer student, working not only with the various articulation agreements Stockton maintains with county colleges, but also applying as many credits towards degree-completion paths as possible. Transfer policies, guidelines and requirements are also well-disclosed in both print and online formats, reinforced by the individualized advising sessions that staff provide. Stockton admits a large number of very well-qualified transfer students each year, ensuring that the College remains faithful to its public mission to serve the residents of southern New Jersey.

Retention Programs and Services

According to retention data from Fall 1998 through Fall 2009, Stockton has an average first to third semester retention rate of 87% for full-time first-time freshmen (8.4.1 and 8.4.5.e). Increasing retention is a decentralized College goal, as responsibility for retention does not fall under any specific College division, office or individual; retention is everyone's responsibility. The College produces documents that report the numbers of first-time full-time freshmen of the entering cohort by gender, ethnicity, age of entry, state residency, county residency, admittance status, attendance status, class level, total credits earned, GPA, SAT score, and major. Using these Student Unit Record Enrollment (SURE) data reports, the College has conducted studies of retention among participants in both the Scholars and SOAR program (8.4.2 and 8.1.5). These retention rates, both above 90%, are quite encouraging.

Until recently, myriad retention strategies have been employed, some focused on special populations. The intensity of these efforts has often been modulated by where retention fell as an office priority. Certain cohort student groups, such as athletes, EOF, and the former, grant-funded Community of Scholars, as well as some allied health programs and graduate student cohorts, have benefited from more coordinated and consistent retention interventions. In some cases, the retention rate of specialty student groups exceeds that of the traditional students (8.4.2). In response to these intermittent efforts, the College formed the aforementioned standing Enrollment Management group that meets frequently throughout the semester (on average, three times per month) to examine retention more systematically.

"SQUARE (8.4.3) to CARE (8.4.4)" is an example of Stockton's commitment to ongoing improvement in retention. In 2007, Student Affairs instituted a broadly-defined retention program termed SQUARE (Student Quality Undergraduate Active Response Effort) with the goal of addressing attrition amongst at-risk students. This cross-divisional staff group drew from academic and student affairs and recommended targeted one-on-one interventions between these staff members and the at-risk students. In Spring 2011, based on assessment data (8.2.3 and studies of students on probation and academic dismissal), a revitalized version of this group launched a similar initiative under the acronym CARE (Coordinated Actions to Retain and Educate) Team, but with a broadened audience. This initiative, managed by the relatively new Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities, targets students on academic probation with a GPA under 2.0 with a history of judicial episodes. This proactive approach to minimize recidivism that is targeted at freshman and transfers, pairs mentors with the at-risk student to develop and monitor specific retention goals and activities. Currently, this population totals approximately 160 students. As this illustrates, Stockton faculty and staff are closing the loop on how they use assessment results of at-risk student populations to plan future initiatives in the area of retention.

Building on lessons learned from past iterations of retention efforts, in Spring 2011, Student Affairs initiated a new retention effort aimed at categorizing and delineating all current retention efforts, and evaluating them in view of recent literature in the field (8.4.5). Each month in Spring of 2011, a different high risk cohort was examined to determine specific strategies to help that group persist. Findings are being used to make recommendations for new retention initiatives for a Fall 2011 kickoff. An example of the challenges involved includes the students achieving less

than a C in Basic Skills classes. This new retention effort will result in a group of students who will need supplemental instruction to ensure success.

In July 2011, the Office of Financial Aid responded to new federal regulations with respect to satisfactory academic progress (currently defined as students maintaining a 2.0 GPA and successfully completing a minimum of 80% of attempted credits). Students failing to make satisfactory academic progress will not be eligible to receive financial aid unless they meet stricter documentation guidelines of their rationale for poor performance, and attend mandated meetings with an academic advisor to develop a plan of specific, measurable and achievable goals to reach satisfactory academic progress by the end of the year. If they remain unsuccessful in making satisfactory academic progress after that, they will no longer be eligible for financial aid at Stockton. As noted above, the CARE Team's efforts in counseling a subset of these students promises to reduce the number students who become ineligible for financial aid.

The School of Graduate and Continuing Studies meets twice monthly with students to review their concerns and find ways to address issues. Additionally, staff reach out to students who did not register for the next term, make necessary referrals, and identify barriers to registration. Physical Therapy faculty institute similar initiatives to improve retention rates for minority students. In addition, they pair students with professionals in the community for additional academic/career planning and support. As well, the Physical Therapy state professional association initiated a student /new graduate mentorship program.

The School of Education has created cohorts of graduate students from specific school districts and the Master of Social Work, Master of Science in Occupational Therapy and the Doctorate in Physical Therapy programs have utilized student cohort groups to increase retention. Additionally, the recent acquisition of SASI housing for graduate students has contributed to graduate student satisfaction. This effective practice may become a widespread model for forming similarly homogeneous groups of special populations in the future to track and study the effectiveness of such carefully targeted retention efforts.

While Stockton is not required to examine student athlete graduation and retention rates for Division III status, the mean GPAs of student athletes over the last four years consistently has ranged above 3.0 for women's sports and 2.5 for men's (9.3.3).

Standard 9: Student Support Services

The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.

A Unified and Comprehensive Approach to Civic Engagement and Personal Responsibility

In the 2002 decennial Middle States and 2007 PRR evaluations, Stockton was commended by the Commission for its commitment to community service. Encouraged by this commendation, the College has worked consistently towards systematizing, assessing and improving its engagement with the community. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching recently awarded Stockton with Elective Classification for Community Engagement after

reviewing its extensive self study of these ongoing efforts, aligned with its 2020 strategic theme of Engagement (9.1.1). To receive this recognition, there must be evidence of a strong commitment to community engagement from all levels of an institution. Specifically, the reports cited internships, service learning, noncredit continuing education and training, volunteerism and academic programs. These efforts are positive, and are now being formally systematized under the collaborative leadership of a Director of Community Partnerships who convenes a monthly practice group throughout the College (9.1.2).

Many of the events that students attend are offered for Undergraduate Learning, TRaining and Awareness (9.1.4) credit (ULTRA), which provides a unique system to document students' co-curricular involvement at Stockton by providing a transcript outlining their broader involvement in civically-related campus activities (9.1.4).

Current Academic Affairs civic engagement projects include the nationally recognized Political Engagement Project (9.1.3) and the American Democracy Project (9.1.3), both of which are linked to the William J. Hughes Center for Public Policy (9.1.3) through their community services. Other campus activities relate to Constitution Day and Voter Registration Events. Service-Learning (9.1.3) activities, which also fall under the purview of Academic Affairs, offer support for instructional field applications in real world settings. Additionally, the entire College participates in Day of Service (9.1.3) activities twice annually, with more than 400 participants.

Faculty and staff from both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs collaborate on all of these initiatives every month during the semester, and at least once per summer to finalize plans for the ensuing academic year (9.1.3). One example of extensive and effective collaboration is the S.O.A.R. orientation for freshman (9.1.4), as discussed above, at which faculty and staff take self-selected freshmen to a local camp for a two-day intensive program of fellowship-building activities to introduce them to campus life.

Another opportunity for students is Board of Trustees Fellowships for Distinguished Students (8.2.2). In this program, undergraduate students who meet the criteria apply for research grants of up to $1000. For example, one student was awarded funding for her research interviewing Holocaust survivors and transcribing their oral histories for a book, another for his research on underwater acoustic absorption.

Similarly, civic engagement and personal responsibility are stressed in Living Learning Communities (9.1.4) in Global Citizenship, Diversity, Sustainability, Positive Living and Creative Arts. A new Living Learning Community titled Community Engagement is launching in Fall 2011. Also in Fall 2011 is a pilot Living Learning Community for first-year students. Prior to this, the Living Learning Communities were directed to upperclass students.

Numerous clubs and organizations (9.1.4), such as Water Watch (9.1.4) and S.A.V.E. (9.1.4) target these objectives, as do the Greek Organizations (9.1.4) in the performance of their frequent and myriad community service projects. As in the Academic initiatives, these Student Affairs initiatives involve effective collaborations between faculty and staff from both Divisions of the College (9.1.4).

Community engagement is a hallmark of Stockton, with both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs aimed at improving community life. Some examples include SCOSA, Community Mediation Services, Institute for Community Development, Stockton Center for Community Schools (9.1.5) and the Lloyd D. Levenson Institute of Gaming, Hospitality and Tourism. Stockton is currently pursuing mechanisms for further refining its success in strengthening formalized and coordinated procedures between the Divisions of Academic and Student Affairs to effectively and efficiently create and develop projects of civic engagement and personal responsibility.

One of the College's more recent initiatives is Green Dot (9.1.6), a Violence Prevention Strategy that focuses on the individual choices, behaviors and attitudes that help create a campus culture that does not tolerate violence. Green Dot teaches students how they can be proactive during two-part training sessions and raises awareness about the issues of power-based interpersonal violence. The Green Dot Initiative began in Spring 2011 and will continue through FY 2012 and beyond. Activities include workshops, student organizations, interactive on campus map and more. After several years, the College will assess the effectiveness of this initiative. Similarly, the College signed a partnership agreement with the HERO campaign in Fall 2011, and is now the official campus home of the Elliott family's work for John's Law, designated drivers and positive character development. The College continues to seek community partnerships.

Communication and Co-Curricular Life

Stockton's Residence Life, Student Development, Athletics and Event Services departments use multiple methods of communication with students, each with varying degrees of effectiveness in isolation, but the combination of which succeeds in keeping students aware of the services the College has to offer them. Most campus activities are advertised through multiple venues.

Student Communication Venues

Email	Web Based	On Campus
Star-Rez (comprehensive housing assignment management software)	R25 (comprehensive scheduling software that manages and disseminates event-related details through reports and the Web calendar interface)	Campus TV
Email	Office Web Pages	LED Signs (VKF Drive)
	Annual Program Calendar	Flyers
	Web Portal	Posters
	Facebook	Campus Mail Boxes
	My Space	Argo
	Twitter	WLFR Radio

Evidence from NSSE trends (9.2.1) over the last ten years has shown increasing student participation in co-curricular activities. Students are getting the support they need to thrive socially. Direct evidence of student satisfaction with co-curricular activities can be found in the

Educational Benchmarking Inventory (9.2.2), which is administered to a sample of residential students annually to measure the effectiveness of, and satisfaction with, the housing program.

The outcomes are used to inform, drive and sustain Residential Life's improvement program. For example, students indicated they wanted to improve peer relationships and have more floor involvement, so they purchased televisions for the lounges. Results are reviewed annually as part of the Annual Report Process, and have demonstrated that students are satisfied with co-curricular residential life programs and activities. Similarly, student services offered to the entire population (residents and commuters alike) are measured in a wide variety of ways, and results used to inform continuous, systematic improvement for all co-curricular departments (9.2.2, 7.5.1 and 7.5.2)

Services for Special Populations

Support services for students from special populations are generally effective. As noted previously, retention rates for EOF students are consistently higher than those of the general population (8.4.1).

Informed by literature that suggests that strong relationships enhance retention, another recent collaboration paired the Academic Tutoring Center and Residential Life in offering evening tutoring in the residential hall meeting rooms. This program was a direct result of information gleaned from the Educational Benchmarking Instrument (9.2.2), in which 29% of students requested faculty involvement and tutoring sessions. Additionally, there are other individual goals set by the divisions; for example in the Division of Student Affairs Annual Report 2009-2010 (8.4.6 pg. 6), the third divisional goal was to "support curricular and deliver co-curricular learning opportunities" including an action item to "Expand Living/Learning Community options to further integrate the academic and residential experiences." (Division of Student Affairs Annual Report 2009-2010, 8.4.6). The Living Learning Communities (9.1.4) project has been successful based on the results of student focus groups (9.4.1).

For students who are interested in athletics, the College offers a broad array of Division III intercollegiate and intramural activities. Stockton's intercollegiate sports display strong gender equity, with slightly higher numbers of women athletes than men competing each year. Of all the schools in the New Jersey Athletic Conference (NJAC), Stockton produces proportionally more opportunities for women in intercollegiate play (9.3.3). To honor its athletes, Stockton initiated a Hall of Fame, inducting nine athletes in 2010, its inaugural year, and five in 2011 (9.3.3).

The Academic Tutoring Centers (9.3.8) offer assistance to any student who requests it. The Centers comprise two halves, the Math Center and the Writing Center. These serve as an extension of the classroom experience, supporting the efforts of Stockton's faculty to help students achieve success in their courses. The Math Center provides peer tutoring to all students at Stockton enrolled in all mathematics and science courses, as well as business, economics and computer sciences. The Writing Center assists students in all phases of the writing process, from pre-writing and developing a thesis to organizing and editing. Writing Center tutors receive training as Library Mentors to help students become better researchers and research writers. Both

Centers encourage students to come early and often. The Center holds a strong commitment to assisting students enrolled in Basic Studies and other first-year courses, while at the same time welcoming students who are upperclass or transfer students. And as mentioned above, the Center has offered on-site evening hours Sundays through Thursdays in a residential area of the campus since 2009.

Another innovation that started several years ago is the Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT). BIT is coordinated by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities and includes administrators from the Offices of the Dean of Students, Campus Police, Counseling Center, Athletics, Residential Life and the Provost. Weekly meetings address behavioral issues such as aberrant classroom behaviors, high risk behaviors in Residence Life and off-campus encounters with law enforcement, which could have ramifications beyond one area of the College. For example, a member of the Team might report that a student was identified by a faculty member as having written a paper expressing suicidal thoughts; the Team will determine whether this warrants an outreach by the Counseling Center. With weekly discussions and confidential reports, this group of concerned administrators works with appropriate staff and faculty to address any issues that involve questionable behavior. The Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities implements policies and procedures, as well as maintains records of student complaints or grievances.

Services for the 344 students registered in the Learning Access Program (9.3.6 LAP) appear to be well received, with 87% reporting satisfaction with services on the annual Student Satisfaction Survey (9.3.6). The Learning Access Program assists students with physical, psychological or learning disabilities, and its services include the coordination of services, individual services with a Learning Disabilities teacher/consultant, educational counseling, and assistance with housing and auxiliary aids.

Student affairs and academic affairs jointly advise a club called The Pride Alliance (9.3.9), which addresses the needs of GLBT students. This group most recently proposed a program for gender neutral housing, which is being piloted in the Fall of 2011. The group has made other suggestions for campus accommodations for gender neutral bathroom facilities in the newly remodeled, decanted spaces.

Other collaborations between Academic and Student Affairs involve pairing student clubs with academic programs, such as the Speech and Hearing Club, as well as clubs in Psychology, Criminal Justice, Social Work, Economics, Political Science and Hospitality. These clubs provide increased opportunities for students to form bonds with other students and for faculty-student interaction. Additionally, some programs promote student-faculty connection through picnics, meet-and-greets and other social events.

The College has designed several programs and activities targeted toward commuter students that attempt to increase student involvement and continues to work on better serving this group.

Organizational Administration in the Division of Student Affairs

The transition in the vice presidency has been seamless, due, in part, to the fact that the new Vice President is a 26-year veteran of Stockton. While the overall philosophy of the Division of Student Affairs providing support services has not changed, the approach to delivering the services has. Under current leadership, the emphasis for student services is on meaningful learning experiences and human interactions, as opposed to technology-based services so necessary in prior years. The combination of these two areas of emphases has brought Student Affairs to a new level of practice in continuous assessment and planning efforts (9.4.1). Combining technological infrastructure to information-gathering capacity enabled the new Vice President to focus on implementing results into action plans for ongoing effectiveness.

In order to promote the global awareness of students, the Division of Student Affairs works collaboratively. Services are designed to work interdependently to engage the broader sense of each student as student, athlete, scholar and community member.

Centralized Services and the Campus Center

Although the concept of a "One Stop Shop" originated after both the 2002 Visiting Team Report and the 2007 PRR, the consolidation of student services into such a core focal point on the campus landscape far transcends even those suggestions. Rather than focus only and narrowly on combining offices and services into an architecturally-designed "One Stop," the College has simultaneously created a virtual One Stop approach with the Banner upgrade and Self Service options for students (9.5.1). Having done so has reduced the need to have removed walls and restructured service offices for the physical One Stop, enhancing both the quality of student services and the efficiency of staff support efforts.

Once the significant improvement of Virtual One Stop was accomplished, the Campus Center mission became focused on the broader ways that the architecture could transform the quality of interactions between students, staff, faculty and community members. For example, interviews with key administrative staff members revealed several factors that drove the decision of what offices would be part of the Campus Center. Respondents indicated that market studies, focus groups, data from event services, senior administrative initiatives, requests from students and the desire to accommodate students with a convenient centralized location in which to conduct their business, were critical inputs. Visits to other campus student center models also provided valuable insight. The new Campus Center contains the Offices of Enrollment Management, Financial Aid, Bursar, Academic Advising, Career Center, Student Development, the Dean of Students Office and Event Services, as well as expanded student club/organization space, bookstore, theater and additional food service venues with brand name offerings from national brands.

Another example of the College's responsiveness to student needs is in having the bookstore offer textbook rentals and digital versions of textbooks to students. In fact, textbook rentals increased by 61% in 2011 over the last year, which equates to a savings of $241,000 to students. Additionally, digital textbooks have increased from zero in 2010 to 55 in Fall 2011.

To continue ensuring that the College is planning effectively for this significant change to its campus culture, a transition team met from the summer of 2010 to help coordinate the move into the building, develop new operational procedures and address potential issues arising from the new facility (9.5.2). Changes as demonstrated in the Campus Center include the "Information and Service Center," a consolidated visitor guest-services component on the main floor; the relocation of key student service offices to be geographically proximal, affording convenient student personal service; the expectation of increased traffic; and some changes in staffing patterns. Increased personal contact among office staff members and the ability to work closely, as well as an easier flow for students, are already in evidence at the Campus Center. During the transition, some offices have created a "greener" (2020 strategically themed "Sustainable") work environment, due to the reduction in duplicative paperwork and the use of online resources for students and staff. Notably, in compliance with New Jersey archival records maintenance regulations, the Registrar's Office located in the Campus Center now maintains far fewer paper files than at its previous location. In further compliance with FERPA, the Registrar's Office now also offers the increased convenience to authorized personnel of accessing secure electronic versions of many forms directly from the Banner Xtender service. The Registrar's Office maintains student directory information and student requests to maintain privacy in accordance with all federal and state regulations, in both print and now more increasingly electronic formats.

Looking Forward . . .

The College should consider developing a formal enrollment management plan with defined targets by academic program. Additionally, to balance the funding targeted to residential students, Stockton would benefit from specific retention strategies designed for commuter students.

Chapter Four

Standard 10: Faculty

The institution's instruction, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

Number and Composition of the Faculty

The faculty at Stockton – full-time and part-time – are prepared and qualified for their roles. Ninety-five percent of full-time faculty hold the highest degree in their field. In the 2010-2011 academic year, some 271 full-time faculty published 40 books, 139 other published works, delivered 100 performances and exhibitions, gave 404 presentations of scholarship, served on 66 boards, and received 184 awards and grants (10.1.1 Scholarly Activity Reports). In recent years, full-time faculty have substantially increased not only the number of successful awards but also the total revenue obtained from grants and contracts (3.1.1.4 Grants and Contracts).

Student-Faculty Ratios

As the College continues its measured, steady enrollment growth in both undergraduate and graduate programs, the School Deans, Provost and President have made a concerted effort to assure that the faculty complement keeps pace and that resources are allocated to fulfill the mission of the institution (10.1.4 Stockton's Work on Student:Faculty Ratio 2001-2010).

Stockton places a high premium on engagement, and one measure of this is the level of student contact with full-time faculty. Data for the fall semesters since 2003 show that during this period, approximately 70% - 73% of undergraduate courses and up to 77% of graduate and post-baccalaureate classes were taught by full-time faculty, and these percentages have seen only minor fluctuations even as enrollments grew at both levels (10.1.5 Courses Taught by FT and PT). For example, in Fall 2009, 72% of Stockton's classes were offered by full-time faculty, the highest percentage of the New Jersey state colleges and universities (10.1.4 Faculty Tab).

Stockton's student/faculty ratio has improved significantly over the last decade: from 20.9:1 in fall 2001 to 17.5:1 in Fall 2011. (10.1.4 FT:PT Faculty Ratio). Common statistical methods for calculating student:faculty ratios can mask the differences between types of faculty members engaged in classroom teaching. For example, at Stockton 50% of faculty are full-time, tenured/tenure track, and (as discussed above) they teach over 70% of all courses offered at the College (10.1.5 Courses Taught by FT and PT Faculty). Given the College's emphasis on the teaching and precepting role of the full-time faculty, Stockton strikes a deliberate balance between faculty complement and headcount ratio in order to maintain the high academic quality promised by the College mission, vision and goals (10.1.4 Student:Faculty Ratio).

Furthermore, the ratios of student majors to program faculty for each undergraduate program illustrate that Stockton offers a variety of academic programs that span the size spectrum from intimate to large-scale (10.1.5 Percentages over time, by program). These ratios vary widely and generally grow larger as the number of majors increases – with the highest ratios in the four

programs with the most student majors (Biology, Criminal Justice, Psychology and Business). Stockton's tapestry is a tightly interwoven fabric and interpreting these data is not easy for a number of reasons: many programs have few majors but high service enrollments (e.g., Economics, Sociology, Chemistry, Math and Physics); some faculty teach program courses outside their home program; the popularity of certain majors goes up and down over the years; some faculty teach in graduate courses (not depicted in this chart); some programs have small class sizes to address accreditation requirements; and all faculty teach General Studies courses (1.1.6). Finally, several of the smallest programs are traditionally recognized as evidence that a college provides a true liberal arts education (Philosophy and the Arts, for example).

In addition to providing students with rich experiences, the College's recent recognition by the Carnegie Foundation as a Community Engaged Institution (9.1.1 Self Study; 14.4.3 Press Release), its acceptance into the Consortium for Innovative Educational Learning Environments (10.1.6), and the recent advancement of the School of Business to candidate status for Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) accreditation indicate that the College continues to ensure an adequate complement of engaged faculty and professional staff.

Recognizing the imperfect measures of student:faculty ratios and allocation of faculty to programs, the College acknowledges a desire to continue to monitor course offerings and provide necessary classes in all areas of the curriculum. As budgetary constraints permit, it will continue to look to add faculty resources, especially in areas of greatest distress. Judicious use of well qualified adjuncts, that does not significantly lower the full-time-faculty teaching percentage, will enable Stockton to maintain flexibility and lower the student:faculty ratio at the same time.

Part-time and Adjunct Faculty

The College has engaged part-time and adjunct faculty in selective and intentional ways that support and enrich the contributions of its full-time faculty complement. Forty-three percent of the 220 part-time faculty at Stockton hold terminal degrees in their fields of study (10.1.2 Qualifications of PT faculty). Moreover, a sample of part-time faculty resumes illustrates that approximately ninety percent of part-time faculty have specialized practitioner experience in their field of teaching (10.1.3 Adjunct Practitioner Survey). In some schools all part-time faculty have practitioner experience related to their teaching as well as graduate degrees. For example, all adjuncts in Health Sciences must have Masters degrees in their field and at least two years of experience in their field with expertise in the specialty they are teaching. Part-time faculty without practitioner experience generally include individuals who have recently competed graduate work (e.g., M.Ed., Ph.D., M.F.A.).

Examples of Program Policies for Adjuncts

Some programs, like those in the School of Education, review adjunct syllabi and keep public record of adjuncts (10.1.3 School of Education adjuncts). The Education program follows rigorous policies and procedures regarding adjuncts, outlined in the Teacher Education (TEAC) Annual Report (10.1.3 TEAC). Other programs have created committees to oversee the adjuncts who teach in their programs. For example, the Criminal Justice program Adjunct Oversight Committee reviews adjunct syllabi prior the start of the semester, conducts scheduled classroom

visits on a semi-annual or annual basis (10.1.3 Adjunct observation form) and reviews adjunct performance based on the policies and procedures (10.1.3).

In most Schools recommendations for adjunct hiring are delegated to the Program Coordinators or Skills Center Staff but the Assistant Dean is responsible for reviewing credentials and finalizing the hire. Most Schools also hold a formal meeting including Dean, Assistant Dean, Program Coordinator, and adjunct candidate. Once hired, the adjunct works with the Program Coordinator and Assistant Dean to schedule classes (see 10.1.3 Arts & Humanities Screening). Meanwhile faculty in the program provide assistance to adjuncts by providing sample syllabi, statements of course goals, text book selection, assistance with disruptive students and preparing and interpreting student evaluations. At the end of the semester, deans of each School review the IDEA (course and instructor evaluation) forms and alert potential problems to the Program Coordinator to discuss with the adjuncts.

College Policies and Resources for Adjuncts

In addition to the program-specific procedures for organizing and evaluating adjuncts, the College provides an adjunct workshop at the start of each semester. This workshop is organized by the Director of the Institute for Faculty Development. The three hour workshop includes a meet and greet with the Provost, a primer on student evaluations, discussion with union representatives on the benefits of union membership, and a mini-workshop on technology and teaching led by the Director of Computer Services. In the 2010-11 academic year, 87 adjuncts attended the workshops. These workshops provide adjuncts with technological skill to explore different pedagogical methods in the classroom. They also provide a forum for adjuncts to feel welcome and appreciated at Stockton. The College is cognizant of the need to treat full-time faculty and adjuncts similarly; resources must be provided to both full-time and part-time faculty.

Graduate Programs

When Stockton began offering graduate programs just prior to its last Self-Study, some faculty expressed concern for its potential impact on the undergraduate programs. They believed that the graduate programs might reduce faculty availability to undergraduates. Two types of data analysis put these concerns to rest. First, data collected about adjunct usage in undergraduate programs where faculty were likely to be impacted show little to no impact. Second, a survey generated and distributed to graduate program Directors and undergraduate program Coordinators who would likely feel the burdens of the graduate program revealed similar results.

One indicator of strain on undergraduate programs would be a decrease in the percentage of undergraduate courses being taught by full-time faculty. Table 3 in 10.1.5 (Percentages over time, by program) includes data for specific undergraduate programs. The Criminal Justice, Nursing, Education, Business and Social Work programs help to support MA/MS programs at Stockton in those same disciplines. While the MS program in Nursing began in 1998, prior to the data collection period, Criminal Justice (Fall 2005), Education (Fall 2004) and Social Work (Fall 2009) are relatively new programs. The College does not have graduate programs in Psychology, Biology or History, but some of the faculty in the History Program faculty teach in

the Master's program in Holocaust and Genocide Studies. The Psychology and Biology faculty generally teach undergraduate courses, but both of these programs are popular majors for students hoping to be admitted to the MS program in Occupational Therapy or the Doctoral Program in Physical Therapy, so they are included as well (see also 10.2.1 and 10.2.2).

The data show that the percentage of undergraduate courses taught by full-time faculty in Criminal Justice and Education actually increased after the introduction of the graduate programs (10.1.4 see link to student:faculty ratio by Stockton program). The percent of full-time faculty teaching in undergraduate courses fluctuated in the Nursing Program, declining slightly near the end of the study period, and Social Work gradually increased its use of adjuncts over the past several years. While the addition of the Master's in Social Work Program may contribute to the reliance on adjuncts in the undergraduate program, the use of adjuncts had been fluctuating for a few years prior to the start of the graduate program. It is important to note that temporary surges and drops in enrollment or changes in faculty workload, such as sabbaticals or course releases for major grants (10.2.3) or service to the College, can result in fluctuations, especially in small programs. In Nursing the first ten years of the graduate program appear to have had no impact on undergraduate teaching (10.1.4); the shift seen at the end of the decade is more likely related to the addition of a new *undergraduate* degree.

During the data collection period, there was little difference in the Psychology Program's participation in undergraduate courses. The Biology Program did have some fluctuations in full-time faculty offering undergraduate courses between 2003 and 2010. The Environmental Sciences program did experience a slight drop in the percentage of undergraduate courses taught by full-time faculty a year after the Professional Science Master's Program was introduced. The History Program does not appear to have been negatively impacted by its faculty's involvement in the Holocaust and Genocide MA Program. (See 10.1.5, Percentages over time, by program).

Similarly, most of the graduate Directors and undergraduate Coordinators surveyed in 2010 expressed little concern about the impact of the addition of graduate programs to the college. One graduate Director, while noting that there was little impact on the workload of the feeder undergraduate program, expressed concern about library funding increasing commensurate with the addition of graduate programs. Evidence of the increase in library funding can be found in the College's response to Standard 3 (Chapter Two). Another graduate director noted the strain that graduate program accreditation processes put on the faculty and stated that it is difficult to focus on both an undergraduate and graduate program simultaneously. One undergraduate Program Coordinator indicated that the start of a graduate program has impacted the corresponding undergraduate program since the faculty must now spend a good deal of time mentoring graduate students and participating on graduate thesis committees rather than working with undergraduate students.

Faculty Evaluation

A 2004 *Report from the Task Force on New and Non-Tenured Faculty* (10.3.1) signaled the need for a comprehensive review and reform of policy and procedure. The report noted shifts in emphasis regarding scholarship and service. Then, a 2005 Faculty Assembly Task Force Report on Evaluation of Teaching called for changes in student evaluations and additions of other

measures of successful teaching (10.3.4). Beginning in 2007, new evaluation policies and procedures for faculty reappointment, tenure and promotion were introduced (10.3.3 2007 and Prior Personnel Policy and Procedures). These policies and procedures replaced those that had been in effect since the 1970s and introduced a number of new elements that addressed eight of 10 of the recommendations in the report (10.3.2).

The new policies were phased in over a five-year period (10.3.5). The following sections evaluate how well the new policies and procedures are working at Stockton, using as evidence a survey conducted on campus in Fall 2010 to which 128 faculty replied (10.3.6), a survey done through the *Bringing Theory to Practice* project, to which 33 faculty replied (10.3.7), an examination of the aggregate positive and negative personnel recommendations at each level in the personnel process (10.3.8), and a comparative analysis of the 1999 *Policies and Procedures* (10.3.9) and new documents.

The College defines an effective personnel process as one that optimizes the initial investment in faculty hires by

1. Providing clear standards and pathways toward reappointment, tenure and promotion

Overall, the new policies and procedures are clearer and more detailed than in the previous system:

- The new policies (10.3.2 2007 and Prior Personnel Policy and Procedures) provide more detail about file construction (e.g., indicating that "qualitative judgments are best made when copies of presentations are made available," that "some assessment should be made as to the quality of the journal in which the piece appears," and that the "significance of participation, the impact of service, the scope of responsibilities, and the effectiveness of participation" should be documented).
- Programs now have their own standards that add program-specific details about excellent teaching, scholarship and service (10.3.2). For instance, several programs do each of the following: refer to professional standards, specify expectations regarding teaching evaluation scores, specify a minimum number of peer-reviewed articles and/or conference presentations, require teaching observations by program faculty, require demonstration of success teaching core courses, list program-specific service expectations, and either define valued scholarship broadly or specify that some research must be in a specialty area within the discipline.
- New faculty now create, through consultation with their program, a faculty plan that sets out for them how they will meet the College, School and Program standards for tenure and promotion. The procedures build in annual feedback and opportunities to revise the plan.
- A majority of faculty (53%) agree or strongly agree that College standards are clear (25% disagree), and 82% agree or strongly agree that Program standards are clear (10.3.6).

2. Providing transparent and corrective feedback to keep applicants on course

For the most part, it is too early to tell whether the feedback given to applicants is transparent and corrective. Also, due to the confidential nature of the feedback, the Work Team was not able to study feedback systematically. Results on the faculty survey about the clarity of feedback

indicate that faculty do not always perceive that they get clear feedback (10.3.6). Data from respondents for whom the question was applicable indicated that 82% agreed or strongly agreed that they received clear feedback from the Program Review Committee (PRC) letters, 66% from deans, 61% from the Faculty Review Committee (FRC), and 68% from the Provost. One possible explanation is that after the PRC level, reviewers may be less likely to add their own detail, especially given generally high levels of agreement in decision recommendations.

However, the Office of the Provost has noted that sometimes letters from the FRC did not always provide clarity as to what prompted its split decisions, but this has been remedied this past year following discussions between the FRC and Provost. Notably, the College does not have any evidence that feedback is less clear under the new processes. As faculty continue to learn and use the new procures clarity will likely increase.

3. Providing a common understanding of expectations among review levels, ensuring reasonable congruity among the levels of evaluative review

Although the aggregate nature of the data may mask disagreement about individual cases, available data affirm that there is a reasonable level of congruity within and among levels of personnel review. For instance, split decisions at the PRC and FRC levels are relatively rare—of 36 candidates for tenure, the PRC had split votes in only four cases and the FRC in only seven. Of 34 candidates for promotion to Associate, programs had split votes in only five cases and the FRC in only seven. Of twelve candidates for promotion to Full, programs had split votes in only two cases and the FRC in only three. The overall numbers of supported and unsupported candidates at each level are nearly identical (10.3.8).

In addition, a majority of faculty responding to the *Bringing Theory to Practice Survey* (10.3.7) perceive that teaching efforts are adequately valued for tenure (85%) and promotion (76%) and that they are valued more at Stockton than in academia at large. This parallels the emphasis that the personnel policy places on teaching at The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey.

4. Newly required items in the file yield information that is used in decision-making

According to a faculty survey (10.3.6), faculty file reviewers are using many of the new sources of information provided by the new policies and procedures to inform decisions. This supports the notion that the new information is valuable and helps inform better decision-making.

- Most faculty respondents on the PRC use the new peer observations (78%), student evaluations (78%), and the candidate's self-evaluation of teaching (93%) "somewhat" or more to help evaluate candidates
- Most faculty respondents on the FRC use the new peer observations (21 of 24 respondents), student evaluations (20 of 25 respondents), and the candidate's self-evaluation of teaching (all 25 respondents) "somewhat" or more to help evaluate candidates

The College has made tremendous progress on this standard. Most faculty feel the new policies and procedures have created more clarity with regard to the expectations of reappointment and promotion and that the mechanics of the review cycle are more succinct. The new standards have

produced a more transparent process for those entering every stage of the review cycle. Though there are still some bumps in the road, the faculty anticipate that when the first cohort of tenure-track faculty complete the journey from first year faculty to tenured faculty, most of these bumps will even out. Until that time, the College will focus on addressing the results of the faculty survey (10.3.6).

According to the results of the 2010 Faculty Survey about the 2007 Personnel Policy and Procedures (10.3.6), 25% of faculty responding believed that the College standards are not clear. As mentioned above, this number will likely decrease as faculty become subject to and more familiar with all aspects of this policy. The results of the faculty survey also suggest that a high degree of clarity is already reported for program standards; they likely provide some context when the College standards are not clear to the reader. It has also come to light that Program standards are unevenly detailed—some are very specific and others default to the College standards. Divergence by program in the new standards is intentional, to vest program faculty with specific authority. However, as more candidates go through the full personnel cycle under the new standards, faculty and administrators might discuss this divergence. Programs standards may be altered as a result of Five-Year Academic Program Reviews or as a consequence of revised college-wide standards.

Another area of faculty evaluation that needs to be reviewed is the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) tool that is used to evaluate teaching. Faculty commented about the length and complexity of the tool (six comments); the weight of student evaluations in the process (five); and the lack of more qualitative student feedback (five). Similarly, respondents expressed reservations about peer observations of teaching, e.g., on the absence of rubrics (18); on the desire to separate peer feedback for formative classroom change vs. evaluation (four), or on a preference for unannounced peer visits (four) (10.3.6). In response to these results, the Faculty Senate created a task force in 2011 to study the new teaching evaluation processes, recognizing that the negotiated agreement on use of the IDEA system sunsets after 2012.

Since personnel policies and procedures at Stockton are created in a collective bargaining environment, recommendations to refine the new policies and procedures are negotiated. The College and Union continue to gather data and identify areas that need improvement.

Preceptorial Advising

At Stockton, advising is a form of teaching, officially referred to as "precepting." Precepting is a contractual responsibility of all full-time faculty. Each semester, just prior to pre-registration, classes are cancelled on two days to allow time for students and preceptors to confer. In the spring term students are asked to fill out evaluations of their preceptors. Since the 2002 self-study, the most significant change in institutional support for precepting has been implementation of the Online Degree Evaluation System or CAPP Audit system, which came online in the Fall of 2006 for faculty and Fall of 2007 for students (10.4.1 CAPP Audits).

Concurrently, institutional support has aimed to facilitate discussion of best practices in precepting. The Center for Academic Advising has inaugurated a variety of support features to aid faculty in enhancing their role as preceptor: precepting is discussed with new faculty in the

Institute for Faculty Development; a series of Brown Bag Advising Colloquia (10.4.2) held each semester to discuss issues in advising (inaugurated in 2008); the Stockton Advising Council, drawing from faculty and staff across campus, and formed in 2007 as an advisory board to the Center for Academic Advising (10.4.3 Advising Council). In addition, the Center for Academic Advising continues to introduce the basic tenets of precepting at new faculty orientation, has further developed its advising Web pages and continues to publish its resource handbook for preceptors (10.4.2 Preceptor Resources). A central aspect of this institutional support is the conviction that precepting *is* "advising as teaching" and that precepting plays a significant role in preparing students for lifelong learning. To this end, the College held the first "Advising as Teaching" conference in May 2011 (10.4.3 Conference). Furthermore, in 2010 the College presented the first award for academic advising at Stockton. The award created much discussion about the role of advising and how to best recognize its importance. Subsequently, the first Provost's Awards for Research and Professional Development in Academic Advising were awarded to faculty recipients in 2011 (10.4.8) page 2.

Faculty Commitment to Precepting and Understanding of Broad Role of Preceptors

Focus groups with faculty point to the range and complexity of activities that fall under the heading of precepting (10.4.5 Faculty). Some majors have highly proscribed requirements while others offer multiple tracks and many possible cognates; precepting needs differ for undecided freshmen, community college transfers, students nearing completion of a major, and graduate students; some students are more self directed than others. Nevertheless, most faculty appear to embrace the role of preceptor, viewing it as akin to interpreter, negotiator, coach and/or counselor. Faculty were in unanimous agreement about the importance of precepting, understanding it as a multilayered process. Precepting is meant to guide students as they navigate the requirements of the College and their major, but it also offers the opportunity to develop a relationship between faculty and students outside of the classroom. Conversations about time and course management, study strategies and extra-curricular opportunities take place along with discussions about choice of major, careers and first jobs (10.4.5). Faculty see part of their role as directing students to academic and professional resources available on and off campus. Survey results demonstrate that a majority of faculty members (ranging from 55-78%) spend precepting time engaged in these sorts of conversations with students (10.4.6).

Benefits of CAPP system

The majority of faculty queried about the new system believe that CAPP Audits have streamlined paperwork, providing an opportunity to focus more fully on the development of robust advising relationships with students. Eleven faculty in three separate focus groups stated that CAPP Audits were an important advising tool, describing audits with a range of comments from "useful" to "indispensible" (10.4.5 Faculty). A survey of 128 members of the faculty shows that 72% believe the CAPP Audits has simplified and improved their ability to track student progress toward graduation (10.4.8). Correspondence with Program Coordinators suggests similar attitudes. The few critical comments that focus group participants shared centered on improvements that might make the CAPP Audit interface more user friendly.

Student Understanding of Precepting and Satisfaction with Preceptors

Two focus groups with students suggest that they see the role of precepting as chiefly one meant to keep track of college requirements: to help students select appropriate courses; to make sure credits are completed; and to assure an efficient path to graduation. Students hinted at a deeper relationship: that preceptors should keep students from making decisions that overload them; help with issues such as study abroad; and write letters of recommendation (10.4.5 Students). In Spring 2010 evaluations of precepting, approximately 80% of students stated that they were "very satisfied" by the precepting they received, suggesting that most students believe the system is working well (10.4.8).

Less Student Contact with Preceptors

The fact that students generally seem to be comfortable using the CAPP Audit system has meant, for some students, less frequent (or no) meetings with preceptors (10.4.5 Students). They are finding their way through the curriculum with limited advice. The Advising staff are working with faculty to examine the impact of this change on student progress.

Precepting Loads

At the same time, Stockton continues to strive towards achieving equity in precepting loads among academic programs and schools (10.4.7 Chart). Although the issue of unequal precepting loads was not raised by participants in Self Study focus groups, the Center for Academic Advising continues to examine and adjust faculty precepting loads when assigning new freshmen and transfer students each semester (10.4.9). In order to achieve equity whenever possible, the Center for Academic Advising staff tend to assign new freshmen and undecided students to those service programs with higher faculty complements and lower student majors. Professional staff in the Center for Academic Advising themselves absorb many of the undecided students and other highly subscribed majors in order balance precepting loads. The addition of more tenure-track faculty members between the Periodic Review Report and this Self-Study has begun to alleviate some of the precepting burden (10.4.7). Business programs in particular now have lower case loads as a direct result of having added more tenure-track faculty lines, even as the individual majors continue to grow. However, professional programs in Health Sciences are increasing and illustrate the wide variation between program caseloads within the same School.

Shared Faculty Office Space

Over the past few years, a significant number of faculty preceptors have shared office space, which is not conducive to quality precepting, especially on designated precepting days. This issue, however, was not raised by participants in focus groups. With the additional space created by office moves into the new Campus Center, faculty offices were improved in AY2011-12.

The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey excels in the area of precepting or "advising as teaching." Faculty understand that precepting seeks to move beyond the simple act of registering students into courses – the CAPP Audit system provides reasonable advice for that. At its best, precepting seeks to develop relationships among students and faculty that help students make

informed and engaged decisions about course work and beyond. Precepting is meant to be, and very often is, teaching that takes place outside of the classroom. It helps students navigate through the College, better understand their majors, prepare for post-college careers, and establish the habits of lifelong learners.

The College continues to review student attitudes of precepting and seek ways to deepen student understanding of available resources. Reinforcing the importance of the student-preceptor role during undergraduate and graduate student orientations may help achieve this goal. Students have the opportunity to evaluate their preceptors each spring term, which provides them with an opportunity to provide input into what works (and what does not) in precepting. It is also an indicator of the importance of the precepting role.

Going forward, the College should capitalize on the generally positive view that both faculty and students have of the advising relationship. If properly cultivated, the entire student body should be able to reap the benefits of precepting.

Faculty Development

The College supports the advancement and development of the faculty in the three areas required for tenure and promotion: teaching, scholarship and service. While the emphasis on excellence in research has increased during the last few years, support exists for all of the required areas of excellence. In fact, much of this support is designed to enhance more than one of the three areas. Under the leadership of the Office of the Provost, both the Grants Office and the Institute for Faculty Development ensure that faculty members receive equitable, effective support for their professional development. Comprehensive reviews (10.5.1) of these areas include extensive descriptions of core functions and full results of a faculty satisfaction survey (10.5.4).

Growth in Internal Awards

These reviews and survey results indicate that both the Grants Office and the Institute for Faculty Development have experienced consistent growth and continuous improvement since 2006. Internal award and support programs have responded to growth in faculty numbers, as well as in strategic goals established by the College. For example, the overall amount of Research and Professional Development (R&PD) funding has increased from $70,550 in 2006 to $170,700 in FY 2010 (10.5.1, p. 1; 10.5.2). At the same time, the number of full-time faculty has grown from 248 in Fall 2006 to 271 in 2010. This dramatic increase in funding represents a 2.23 fold increase relative to full-time faculty (i.e., from roughly $284 to $630 per faculty member) (10.5.2). Increases in the overall amount of Career Development Committee (CDC) funds available for faculty who have been assessed in their post-tenure five year review has allowed this pool of money to keep pace with faculty growth (10.5.1, p. 1; 10.5.2). Likewise, the number of sabbaticals awarded to faculty has increased from six semesters awarded in 2006 to a high of 18 semesters awarded in 2010 (10.5.7 Sabbaticals). Although, the College is limited by a state-wide agreement to adhere to its proportionate share of sabbaticals awarded state-wide, the College has substantially increased faculty salary supplements during sabbaticals, resulting in an increase in the number of faculty applying for those awards. (10.5.1, p. 2).

Equitability of Internal Awards

As depicted in the equity analyses, the number of applications from each academic School has been the strongest predictor of the number of R&PD awards made (10.5.2). Likewise, the number of sabbatical applications from each academic School was an excellent predictor of the percentage of sabbaticals that a school was awarded. (10.5.1**,** p. 2; 10.5.7)

Growth in External Awards/Scholarly Outcomes

As support for scholarly activity has increased, the portion of grants and contracts that the Grants Office manages has grown 183% from $4.78m to $8.73m between 2006 and 2010 (10.5.3). Both internal and external funding have resulted in an array of scholarly and creative outcomes (10.5.1, p. 5 and 10.1.1).

Growth in Internal School Grants

The amount of money disbursed to faculty by each school for travel to meetings, conferences and receptions and related membership expenses increased slightly relative to growth in full-time faculty from FY 2006-2009, with a slight decrease occurring in FY 2010 (10.5.1, Table). The overall R&PD budget was increased by 11% in FY 2011 to begin to address the issues raised during the self study process. Moreover, reforming accounting methods for tracking college spending on travel will allow for better analysis of the adequacy and equitability of faculty funds allocated for travel (10.5.1).

Institutional Effectiveness

Concurrently, faculty satisfaction with the Grants Office has remained high in most areas, as the survey results illustrate (10.5.4). Indeed, among faculty respondents who had sought assistance from the Grants Office in the past five years (79%), 97% reported that the assistance that they received was helpful (with the majority of those saying it was “very helpful”) and that the staff assisting them possessed the knowledge and expertise that they needed (95%). (10.5.1**,** p. 1; 10.5.4). Survey results also suggest some areas for future improvement, as described below.

Similarly, the Institute for Faculty Development (IFD) has continued to refine its role, narrowing its focus to specialize in support for teaching, aligning programs more precisely with the recently revised promotion and tenure policies and procedures (10.5.1 and 10.5.5). This evidence indicates that the IFD engages in a continuous improvement cycle of examining goals that faculty and Academic Affairs set, planning programs to support faculty in accomplishing those goals, measuring for the results of those programs, and taking action to refine future goals and programs in light of those results. As such, the IFD exemplifies institutional effectiveness. The Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs remain similarly focused on institutional effectiveness, which is evidenced by increased funding towards targeted goals (10.5.1). For example, in conducting an extensive review of learning outcomes assessment systems after the 2007 Periodic Review Report, Academic Affairs strengthened the role of the Assessment Committees (10.5.6), began a system for standardizing annual Program Coordinator reports (14.1.1) and Five-Year Program Reviews (14.1.2), and allocated additional funds to support

faculty work in assessment (10.5.6).

Stockton has shown a commitment to faculty development by providing an array of monetary and physical resources to support faculty in their research, creative work, pedagogical activities and service/community engagement activities. As documented here, this support has resulted in scholarly and creative output, pedagogical creativity, and a flourishing number of community partnerships. When Stockton faculty engage in all three areas of teaching, scholarship and service at the same time, they are providing students and the community the greatest possible educational experience. Some examples of such linkages are School of Business and School of Social and Behavioral Sciences faculty who take senior seminar students into Atlantic City to help local businesses create better advertising or marketing plans, design the business to prevent crime or educate the business owners or community members (10.5.8). In these instances, the faculty member is engaging in teaching (the students in the senior seminars), service (providing the community with a valuable experience) and scholarship (if the data collected or the services provided can be part of a scholarly article). While these opportunities will not happen in every course, Stockton students regularly enjoy them in senior seminars and service- learning courses. This report documents the specific forms of support available to faculty as well as challenges faculty face at each stage of their career (10.5.1, p. 10-13). The college has taken clear steps to improve services for faculty. The College will need to continue assessing the effectiveness of its support and continue to pave possible paths to future improvement. Stockton has demonstrated itself to be responsive to faculty needs and within current budgetary constraints.

Recruitment and Non-discrimination Practices

The College has multiple practices in place to help assure the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty. The College's dedicated recruitment and nondiscrimination practices and documentation of those practices include:

- Search Plan Template (10.6.1)
- Faculty Search Procedures (10.6.2)
- Discrimination Policies and Procedures (10.6.3)
- The College Committee for Diversity, Equity and Affirmative Action (CCDEAA: created in 2003 as an advisory body to the President to assist the College in meeting its commitment to affirmative action, equity and diversity) (10.6.4)
- Workforce Analysis Reports (by race, gender, rank/status) (10.6.5)
- 2008/9 Cultural Audit (CCDEAA recommended the Cultural Audit as a result of discussions in the committee about the cultural climate on campus. The CCDEAA received funding from the President's initiative fund to engage a consulting firm to conduct the audit) (10.6.6)
- Academic Affairs Search Plan Template (Prior to advertising positions, all schools in the College are required to complete a "Search Plan" that includes an account of how the unit will proactively encourage minority applicants.) (10.6.1)
- Reasonable Accommodations (10.6.7)
- Bildner Family Foundation Grant ($225,000, 2002): grant activities related to faculty included faculty development workshops (10.6.8)
  Other practices that contribute to diverse faculty recruitment and nondiscrimination include:

- Tenure and promotion policies and procedures (10.6.9, 2.1.9 and 2.2.4, both speak directly to diversity)
- Faculty mentors: untenured faculty members are assigned two faculty mentors, one inside and one outside of his/her tenure granting program
- Faculty groups focused on women and/or racial/ethnic and/or sexual minorities, including the Council of Black Faculty and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer Faculty and Staff Association.

The above recruiting and retention practices have resulted in positive increases in diversity since 2000, as evidenced in the Workforce Analyses reports (10.6.5). Specifically, faculty recruitment and retention practices have increased the number of female faculty. Women faculty (tenured and tenure-track) increased from 86 in 2001 to 135 in 2011 for a 57% increase. Women faculty (tenured, tenure-track and visiting faculty) increased from 89 in 2001 to 141 in 2010 for a 58% increase. Women faculty (tenured) increased from 56 in 2001 to 102 in 2011 for an 82% increase. In 2001, 40% of tenured faculty were female and in 2011, 50.5% of tenured faculty were female.

Faculty recruitment and retention practices have also increased the number of minority faculty. The number of total minority faculty (tenured and tenure-track) increased from 36 in 2001 to 72 in 2011 for a 100% increase. The number of total minority faculty (tenured, tenure-track and visiting) increased from 38 in 2001 to 74 in 2011 for a 95% increase. Minority faculty (tenured) increased from 28 in 2001 to 54 in 2011 for a 93% increase. Tenured minority faculty in 2001 comprised 20% of the tenured faculty and 27% of the tenured faculty in 2011. Hispanic tenured faculty increased from four percent of the tenured faculty in 2001 to six percent in 2011. While in 2001 both Black, non-Hispanic and Asians comprised eight percent of the tenure-track and tenured faculty, Asian faculty comprises the largest ethnic/racial minority in 2011: in 2001 there were 15 tenure-track and tenured Asian faculty members and in 2011 there were 32, which constitutes a 106% increase.

However, there were some setbacks and minimal increases for individual ethnic/racial minority groups. Despite an additional five faculty members, Black, non-Hispanic faculty remain at eight percent of the total faculty: In 2001 there were 12 tenured and three tenure-track Black, non-Hispanic faculty members (15 total) and in 2011 there were 17 tenured and five tenure-track Black, non-Hispanic faculty members (22 total). Hispanic tenure-track and tenured faculty only increased slightly from three percent of the faculty in 2001 to five percent in 2011. Tenured American Indian faculty increased marginally from zero percent of the faculty in 2001 to less than one percent in 2011.

Furthermore, the Cultural Audit found the recruitment and retention of faculty of color "inconsistent" (10.6.6 Final Report, Appendix E). In addition, the Audit addressed the cultural climate of the campus. As the Cultural Audit states, "Miller et al. (2002) suggest that, often and mistakenly, Affirmative Action and Diversity and Inclusion are used interchangeably as if they are equivalent" (14). Increases in women and EEOC defined minority faculty, in other words, do not necessarily reflect a culture of inclusion. The section, "Highlights: Macro/Themes and Trends" (31-34), speaks to this tension between increasing faculty diversity and faculty perceptions of discrimination. Indeed, as the above statistics illustrate, not all individual minority

groups have seen significant growth. The Cultural Audit confirmed "there were significant differences found between groups (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, organization affiliation student or employee, etc.) on this [fair treatment regardless of racial or ethnic background] and a number of other factors which were examined in this study" (63).

The Cultural Audit (10.6.6) represents a recent and important step in determining a baseline for the improvement of attracting and retaining a diverse faculty. The consulting firm made three "Core Recommendations" that relate directly to faculty recruitment and nondiscrimination:

- 'Develop, integrate and implement diversity and inclusion competencies as a normative part of all employees' performance management and work evaluation process. Link these competencies to compensation, promotions, and tenure. Create mechanisms for accountability" (Cultural Audit, 7).
- "Convene meetings with people with physical disabilities (students and employees) to determine additional services and support RSCNJ can consider providing" (Cultural Audit, 8).
- "Create *Diversity Champions* initiatives for both students and employees" (Cultural Audit, 8).

These recommendations provide avenues that the College is exploring further. The Special Assistant to the President for Affirmative Action and Ethical Standards reports, "Planning for the implementation of the recommendations is being discussed by the committee. We are identifying the recommendations [that] can be implemented immediately and how to address the others. This is an ongoing project." To retain and enhance faculty diversity will require continued and additional attention to affirmative action initiatives and compliance (a demonstrated strength in the increased recruitment and retention of women and total racial/ethnic minorities from 2000 to 2009). It will also require the implementation of new institutional practices that speak to the recommendations outlined in the Cultural Audit, namely the "statistically significant differences found between groups" and the highlighted concerns of a broad range of "official" Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) (e.g. declining numbers of African American faculty) and "unofficial" minority groups (e.g., gay faculty, disabled faculty) that would benefit from a more inclusive culture (10.6.6 p. 84).

The CCDEAA is poised to take a leadership role to address such exclusions and the daily micro-aggressions that inhibit greater change and success. Currently, the committee is building on the existing Search Plans by developing new diversity training and is considering making at least one member of every search committee someone who has completed that training. More work might be done across the College to address the "tacit intentionality" that promotes inequality. The 2020 Vision theme of Global Perspectives is also an important step toward fostering an inclusive culture for the faculty and the entire College community.

As the College looks forward, faculty and administrators will continue to promote the recommendations in the Cultural Audit. The College will also consider how additional data about faculty diversity and inclusivity might be collected on an ongoing basis. Specific data that would be useful includes data on the wage gap between those of equal rank, accommodations for disabled faculty, definitions of EEOC data categories and who is included in those categories,

and strategies for promoting an inclusive campus environment for gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered and questioning faculty. In addition, deeper analysis of existing data related to female faculty, minority faculty and school strengths (10.6.6 p. 5) might provide valuable insights into how to enhance diversity and nondiscrimination goals.

In addition to these, the CCDEAA may partner with the Institute for Faculty Development, the Council of Deans and faculty leaders to evaluate the most feasible partnerships for implementing the recommendations on inclusiveness. Additionally, a regular, systematic communication mechanism (e.g., public yearly report and/or regular newsletter distributed to the College) would improve faculty knowledge of recruitment, retention and nondiscrimination efforts and initiatives.

Curriculum Development

At many institutions the principal means by which faculty exercise their traditional curricular authority is a curriculum committee. Early in its history Stockton intentionally elected to create a decentralized, rather than centralized curriculum review process, because flexibility and the capacity to implement new ideas quickly were valued over control and uniformity of decision-making. Forty years later the College still maintains a number of robust, decentralized mechanisms that, taken together, serve some of the same purposes a monolithic curriculum committee might serve. Left to function independently, however, innovation and creativity continue to thrive within the Stockton curriculum.

Stockton was born with a philosophy of valuing innovation and experimentation over structure and process. The General Studies curriculum in particular (discussed in detail in Chapter One and Chapter Five) was the locus of an extraordinary amount of faculty autonomy at the level of the individual course: initially there was no systematic oversight except that an instructor's dean needed to approve his or her teaching schedule. The following section evaluates the College's subsequent efforts to strike an appropriate balance between autonomy and design.

A second evaluation in this section is the relationship between the roles of faculty and administration in this area. In the College's initial years, academic administrators played a substantial role in shaping the contours of curricular frameworks, by authoring a series of Academic Working Papers (10.7.1). From that point forward, faculty have assumed primary responsibility for the curriculum. The Deans and Provost have procedural oversight of the curricula in their Schools and institution-wide, (indeed a proposed degree program requires Board of Trustees action). But initiative and content lies with the faculty, through a range of mechanisms. One example of this is the mention of updating curriculum as a core responsibility of a Graduate Program Director (10.7.2 Director).

Faculty are primarily responsible for the curricula within degree programs (10.7.2). Faculty are also involved with curricular initiatives involving multiple programs within a School; with College-wide changes through such faculty governance structures as the Faculty Senate and Assembly, which have Committees on Academic Programs and Planning, Academic Policy and General Studies); and with the operational approval of courses in the College's interdisciplinary General Studies commons. Finally, the College deploys ad hoc Task Forces, e.g., the current

General Education Reform Task Force. To study the effectiveness of these mechanisms the College team reviewed Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate minutes (10.7.5), examined the process for approval of General Studies courses (10.7.3), surveyed Program Directors/ Coordinators (10.7.8 Survey) and surveyed the faculty at large (10.7.8).

One mechanism that typifies the attempt to balance individual autonomy with curricular integrity is the "G-Group." General Studies courses are placed within one or another of five categories, each with its own course acronym that represent a range of general education learning goals. Faculty who regularly teach in each of the categories convene periodically to evaluate new courses proposed for the respective category, looking at fit with the category's goals, academic rigor, readings and so forth. Minutes of G-Group meetings show that 315 new courses were approved by faculty committees in the most recent five year period (2006-2010). Attendance records (which exist for 252 courses) show that 236 faculty were involved in this process (10.7.9). If one eliminates the 38 who participated only once (presumably attending the session in which their own courses were under review), the remaining figure is 198, a solid majority of the faculty, especially as the approval documents did not include attendance data in 63 cases.

Although General Studies remains an area in which faculty have ample room for creativity, the course approval process is a rigorous one (10.7.3). The General Studies curriculum proposal Web site provides evidence of the seriousness of the process, but also of the supports that are available to faculty. Assistance that is particularly important for new faculty is also offered by the Institute for Faculty Development (10.7.4).

As Chapter One on Leadership and Governance explains, the Faculty Senate replaced the Faculty Assembly in 2009 as the primary instrument of faculty decision-making. Both Assembly and Senate minutes were reviewed for the most recent five year period (2006-2010), which saw the approval of three major degree programs (two Master's programs), three minors, one overturn of a GIS course vote, and the establishment of the Senate. With regard to decision timelines there is no clear pattern (10.7.5). Timelines for approval of proposals ranged from one to 22 months, with the majority passing on first presentation to the Faculty Assembly/Senate (after committee).

Two important improvements that have come with the change to the Senate can be seen readily on the Senate's Web site (10.7.6). One is a clear description of the process that the Senate and related bodies will follow in considering proposals; the other is transparency with regard to the content of proposals that are under consideration. Senators, faculty at large, administrators, anyone in the Stockton community can refer to the texts of the proposals at will.

To better analyze the role faculty play in curriculum development, faculty were surveyed regarding their level of conviction that they have effective tools for designing, maintaining and updating the curriculum. One hundred twenty-eight faculty responded out of a full-time cohort of 271 (10.7.8 Results). Highest ranking percentages of faculty responders include: 25% for 5-9 years on the faculty, 20% for 25 years or greater, and 19% for 10-14 years. Seventy-eight percent of responders were tenured faculty and 20% were tenure-track.

The survey results illustrate that faculty participation in curriculum development and revision is highly effective at several levels (program, school, governance and college-wide committees).

Within these four venues, responses on the survey suggest that faculty participation in the curriculum is highest and most effective at the program level followed by school, governance and college-wide committee levels. Faculty autonomy is especially evident at program levels where only external agency, e.g., discipline-based accreditation, may limit such autonomy – sometimes in significant ways. In the faculty survey (10.7.8), 60% reported that the Program faculty had jurisdiction over the curriculum and rated this as very effective while 33% of faculty viewed this process as somewhat effective. Faculty are also effective in college-wide curricular development. Sizable majorities rate each of the four levels as very effective or somewhat effective: 93% do so for the program level; 70% for the school faculty as a whole, and 70% for the Faculty Senate and the General Studies Committee. There are two caveats: a high percentage of "somewhat effective" responses for School faculty as a whole (54%), and for the Faculty Senate (51%). With regard to the former, it should be noted that two schools, i.e., Health Sciences and Business, are of recent vintage and that some schools, e.g., Arts and Humanities, contain a variety of disciplines not easily grouped together in a curricular commons. With regard to the Faculty Senate, this body only recently replaced the Faculty Assembly as the main governing body.

Reponses to the faculty survey (10.7.8) also demonstrated the role of College-wide faculty committees in jurisdiction over the curriculum. The three committees involved in this process received the highest level of responses in the category of Somewhat Effective (Committees on Academic Planning – 46%; Committee on Academic Policy – 46%; Committee on General Studi*es* – 38%); when combined with "very effective" ratings, these percentages increase to 67%, 66% and 70%.

Stockton faculty have some mechanisms for curriculum development that would be familiar to academics elsewhere, such as the degree program faculty having the primary responsibility for their own curriculum. Other mechanisms for development and review are particular to the College's history and culture, such as the General Studies groups. The College has never found it necessary to establish a curriculum committee to centralize decision-making – a means that would be foreign to Stockton's history and culture. The mechanisms that faculty use are well established and transparent. The Faculty Senate and its committee structure are still rather new compared to the other mechanisms. Evidence of its effectiveness (and of faculty perception of that effectiveness) is not yet as complete, and will require continued study. On the whole, however, Stockton faculty do have effective means of designing, maintaining and updating the curriculum.

Looking Forward…

As the College moves into the next five years, the focus will remain on keeping a low Student:Faculty Ratio and a high percentage of courses taught by full time faculty. As demonstrated in the past few years, Stockton faculty are committed to providing excellent teaching and the administration is dedicated to maintaining small, personal relationships in the classroom (10.1.4 Stockton's Work on Student:Faculty Ratio 2001-2010) whether it be via full time faculty (10.1.5 Percentages over time, by program) or adjuncts (10.1.2 Qualifications of PT faculty). In addition, the Office of the Provost and the Center for Academic Advising should

continue to examine methods for maintaining balance in preceptorial loads, particularly for large programs.

Faculty will continue to uphold high standards in the classroom. These classroom interactions will continue to be evaluated in part by using the current IDEA system (10.3), but since the implementation of this program started five years ago, the time to assess its effectiveness is approaching. The IDEA Task Force is currently working on a faculty survey to review the current IDEA practices during the Fall 2011 semester. The faculty survey will solicit anonymous feedback from faculty on the IDEA process in place now. The IDEA Task Force is planning to report the survey results to the faculty and staff during the spring or summer of 2012. The Task Force also expects that faculty need more training on how to properly select objectives and analyze the results. Finally, a timeline for periodic review of such an instrument will need to be established in order to ensure that the IDEA system continues to meet the needs of Stockton faculty into the future.

Another component of faculty evaluation is classroom observations. This requirement was added during the revamp of the Policies and Procedures in 2007. Since that time, some faculty have reported a wide variation in the procedure by which classroom observations are conducted. In response to this concern, the union and administration have been working on an agreement that will standardize the classroom observation procedure. This agreement will likely include better training of tenured faculty members who will serve as observers and will provide consistent observation documents for all untenured faculty members who are under review. It is expected that these procedures will be implemented within the next year.

The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey is committed to assessing every function of faculty work and providing resources to make student:faculty interactions meaningful and enriching now and in the future.

Chapter Five

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

The institution's educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

Guided by a unique interdisciplinary mission focused on breadth and depth of learning (1.1.1), The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey has established academic programs recognized for their quality and innovative approaches to learning (11.1.1). Throughout its history, the College has effectively balanced the freedom to innovate with the desire to assess the efficacy of the institution's educational offerings. The College maintains this balance by following the dynamic four-step cycle of developing clear learning outcomes, designing learning experiences that enable students to meet those outcomes, measuring student performance of those outcomes and planning improvements based on the results of those outcomes. Over the past ten years in particular, the College has fostered a pedagogical "culture of evidence" documented in the *Evidence* newsletter collection (11.1.2), that is sustained by the actions of individual programs, the constituent Schools, and the College as a whole.

The Educational Offerings

To insure an early and substantial foundation for its students to achieve the expected outcomes of its educational offerings, Stockton capitalizes on its interdisciplinary mission and focus to provide a required Freshman Seminar that is delivered through existing General Studies (and basic skills) courses. Seminar courses are reviewed annually for their inclusion of Common Elements (11.1.3), which include information literacy, writing and oral presentation.

Although not as extensive, and not a requirement, College faculty have begun designing a similar effort with transfer students using both program and General Studies courses (11.1.3 Sample List of Transfer Seminars). Anecdotal evidence for this concept is very positive, and some faculty have advocated for it to become a requirement for all transfer students.

The Freshman Seminars are also the fundamental component of the overall First-Year Experience (FYE) effort at Stockton (11.1.3 Goals and Objectives). Seminar faculty select a common reading for all first-year students and the FYE Advisory Council then selects an FYE theme. A Freshman Convocation is held in mid-September and other curricular and co-curricular thematic (or first-year focused) programs are sponsored during the year (11.1.3 FYE Themes).

Faculty assess Goals and Objectives of the FYE (11.1.3) through an annual survey of Seminar students (11.1.3 2006 2007 2008 2009) and the initiation of ULTRA transcripts (9.1.4). The FYE Council reviews results of the surveys for program planning and occasionally, follow-up focus groups. Initial ULTRA transcripts for first-year students have been increasing at about two percent each year (See also 9.1 and 9.2 for a sample of the wide variety of student support services and programming that supplement the FYE effort.)

Students move beyond the First-Year Experience either on the path to a program major (11.1.3 Choosing a Major), or to explore the curriculum through the lens of the undecided student for a bit longer; the interdisciplinary and flexible Stockton curricula enable both options. Undecided students can still experiment with a variety of course options that will "count" towards fulfilling their graduation requirements. Ultimately they will select and pursue a major that complements their skills, abilities, interests and goals. Undecided students, or those intending to change majors, can run a CAPP Degree audit (11.1.3) to evaluate their progress toward a specific degree. This feature allows a student to model "what if" scenarios of their earned credits.

Once committed to a major (11.1.3 Program of Study) students are able to move into the early and carefully planned sequence of educational offerings of that program. Still, they have the opportunity to sample the broader curriculum through General Studies course offerings and other more specialized program courses that are "at some distance" from their chosen major, thereby pursuing special interests (such as a minor) or extending the breadth of their overall education. Faculty and students assess the effectiveness of their curriculum choices in precepting activities (see Chapter Four). Additionally, successful completion is determined not only by fulfilling all the course requirements, but also by each program's assessment plan and tools (11.1.11).

Since Stockton enrolls a substantial number of transfer students, the educational offerings must always be reviewed in light of their articulation with the New Jersey community colleges. This process is monitored regularly through reviews of the Comprehensive State-Wide Transfer Agreement (11.1.3) and updates to the state-wide transfer equivalency data base, NJtransfer.org (11.1.3). Because of this flexibility and diligence, Stockton has earned the reputation of being among the most "transfer-friendly" institutions in the state.

Similarly, Stockton's flexible curriculum and innovative nature has enabled more nontraditional, returning adult students to complete degrees within reasonable time frames through distance education, Saturday classes, off-site courses, and independent study classes that supplement the 8:30 a.m. to 9:50 p.m. standard face-to-face modular schedule. Stockton's recognition and membership as a Servicemembers Opportunity College (11.1.3) and Yellow Ribbon institution (11.1.3) also demonstrates its commitment to the veteran student population.

Given the College's mission-driven emphasis on interdisciplinarity, breadth and depth and all of its alignments with transfer populations as described above, Stockton has established rigorous curriculum proposal, review, assessment and revision mechanisms that support both its mission and alignments. As detailed in the next chapter on General Education, the curriculum review cycles rest with interdisciplinary G-conveners, which allow for faculty from every discipline offered at the College to participate fully in the "common" core of the curriculum. More traditionally, Stockton's faculty are also each the custodians and reviewers of the major program curricula in their respective disciplinary areas, participating as proposers, reviewers, assessors and revisers throughout the entire curriculum review process, both in annual program reports and in five year self-studies (7.8.2 Assessment by School and Program, 7.7.4 Academic Program Review, 7.7.5 Director and 7.7.5 Coordinator Reports). Importantly, the founding philosophy of the College emphasized that administrative structures should foster interdisciplinary collaboration, so Stockton relies on program coordinators, rather than chairpersons, and also

relies on program faculty assisted by external reviewers rather than a centralized curriculum committee.
Additionally, the co-curricular efforts that permeate the campus throughout the academic year enable students and faculty to engage in numerous out-of-class lectures, demonstrations, performances, clubs, organizations, and exhibits (9.2.5) that contribute to the total educational environment and promote the development of life skills of Stockton students.

The Assessment Processes

Evidence from a variety of measures ranging across programs, Schools and the College as a whole demonstrates that Stockton is meeting the dynamic cyclical approaches expected in Standard 11. As noted throughout this Self-Study, while efforts in each of these areas may reflect different points along the planning loop, collectively they document an ongoing, useful, systematic and purposeful inquiry into the quality of the educational offerings within the context of the institutional mission. Furthermore, faculty and administrators examine educational offerings both on an annual basis and during five-year review cycles, each of which are carried out first by individual instructors on the program, School and College levels. Their efforts are then aggregated and augmented by broader assessments of student learning outcomes and by examinations of additional program components. These examinations range from personnel policies that apply to individuals with curricular responsibilities (11.1.4 Personnel Policies), to annual reports for programs, Schools and the Division of Academic Affairs (7.3.3), to institution-wide strategic planning (1.1.4 and 7.8.2 Institutional Assessment). Since the last Self-Study, the College has collected many external assessments of Stockton's educational offerings; these have provided additional results and recommendations for continuous improvement (7.8.2 Program Assessment).

Faculty in all undergraduate and graduate degree programs are contractually responsible to develop and assess student learning outcomes (11.1.5 p. 18 item 7.3.5, and 14.1.8, p. 91 of the file). While some of these broader objectives (e.g., critical thinking, clear writing, analytical reasoning) unite the entire curricula, other objectives are more unique or specific to a particular program, e.g., the appropriate use of APA format in the social sciences, the understanding of ethical issues in computer science, or passing licensure exams in many of the health-related sciences and education. These expected outcomes may be found in course syllabi, course descriptions, five-year self-studies, accreditation reports and reviews, and assessment plans for each program (7.8.2).

Stockton faculty and academic staff employ a variety of review and assessment strategies and measures at both the undergraduate and graduate levels that include: faculty recruitment and hiring processes (to insure program quality from the beginning), student evaluations of teaching in individual courses, both alumni and current student survey data, exit surveys of graduating seniors and graduate students, course syllabi and curriculum sequences. Still other data sources include student research projects, senior seminar papers, internship evaluations, results of student conference presentations and competitions, course blogs, online homework assignments, laboratory reports, case studies, accreditation documents, licensure and other programmatic examination results, the Collegiate Learning Assessment and focus groups.

As described in more detail in Chapter Six: Standard 14, faculty members use the results from these strategies and measures varies according to the stage at which any given program finds itself during this snapshot of its overall assessment planning loop. It is clear that those programs that require external accreditation or licensure tend to have more elaborate assessment plans and may have implemented them earlier than others. However, programs without licensure or other governing bodies have made great strides in various areas of program assessment and have clearly demonstrated engagement in a meaningful, systematic, comprehensive a loop-closing strategy (14.1.4).

Once students have completed their degree programs, both individual program and institutional follow-up efforts have been undertaken to determine how well Stockton students have been prepared for graduate and professional schools and for the workplace (11.2.1). Since Stockton does not acknowledge a separate graduate faculty, the ability to maintain consistent and inclusive assessment strategies at both levels is enhanced. The programs that already attempt to gather this information do so via alumni surveys (11.2.4 sample instrument) and internship or clinical evaluations by supervisors (11.2.4 sample results). The overall responses from these two sources clearly indicate that Stockton students, especially in applied fields, meet their respective industry standards and many are successfully employed in fields related to their degree programs.

Additional survey data from three sources indicate further external evaluation of Stockton's educational success. The Hughes Center for Public Policy surveyed very satisfied alumni in August 2010 (11.2.2). Also, the Career Center has recently conducted employer surveys of those participants in its Career and Internship Fairs (11.2.3) and of prospective graduates at the Grad Finale event held each term (11.2.1). The latter two surveys indicate that Stockton is a preferred site and source for seeking future employees. The student survey is administered somewhat early for them to have secured employment or admission to a preferred graduate school, but clearly some have already achieved their goals in both areas. This suggests that Stockton students are reasonably well-prepared for both post-graduate options. Similar surveys will be conducted at the annual Graduate and Professional Schools Fair in the future.

Integrating Curriculum Requirements for All Programs

Faculty carefully develop goals, objectives and student learning outcomes for each and every undergraduate and graduate program of study, providing a solid, comprehensive basis for the design, review, and revision of courses, sequences of courses and requirements, and often culminating (senior) experiences. As a result, graduates are well prepared for an academic or professional work environment (11.2.5). Given that the traditional undergraduate student only samples about two percent of the entire Stockton curriculum, this is a strong accomplishment.

Furthermore, information literacy skills begin with the Library instructional program and continue developing in their respective programs. Similarly, these skills and competencies are enhanced for both students and faculty through the Common Elements for All Freshman Seminars (11.1.3), the Library Web site (11.2.6), and Graduate Student Orientation (11.2.6) sessions. Librarians also encourage faculty to bring students to the Library to discuss information literacy, to show students how to access library resources and to provide answers for general library questions. This collaboration between library and classroom faculty demonstrates

Stockton's commitment to the curricular experience mentioned in the College mission and provides students with necessary skills as they enter the workforce or a graduate program. The Library faculty estimate that they reach about one-quarter of all Stockton students each semester. Graduate programs, by their very nature, are more focused on professional skills and contemporary issues. However, faculty members at Stockton teach in both the General Studies and the disciplinary parts of the curriculum. This increases the likelihood that the interdisciplinary approach transcends graduate education as well. This provides an exceptional experience for students and is a direct result of Stockton's commitment to interdisciplinary approaches and innovation. By the time students leave Stockton, with an undergraduate or graduate degree, they are prepared with the breadth and depth of knowledge that will assist them in reaching their career goals.

Standard 12: General Education

The institution's curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency.

Stockton's unique, multi-faceted approach to general education is at the core of its institutional identity as well as institutional mission (1.1.1). General Education is the foundation for what Stockton faculty teach, how they teach it, what they expect of themselves and what they expect of students. The context of this Standard in terms of the *Characteristics of Excellence* virtually defines the nature of Stockton's General Education program.

The General Education program at Richard Stockton College embodies its educational philosophy; incorporates essential knowledge, enhances students' intellectual growth; and demands that not only students, but faculty be drawn into new areas of intellectual experience. More than any other single element of the College's educational offerings, the General Education Program is developed, owned and reviewed by the College's faculty. Moreover, this "educational commons" provides the institution with a pedagogical *lingua franca* that frames other curricular discussions, as well as the Stockton approach to academic advising (12.1.1). At Stockton, faculty have always practiced the same assumption that general education courses supply the *breadth*, and the major the *depth*, of each student's experience, regardless of major.

General Studies courses are interdisciplinary and not confined to any particular "major." What the courses have in common is that they are designed to explore ideas, stimulate critical thinking and provide breadth of perspective for all students regardless of major (12.1.1 History and Philosophy). In this way, general education at Stockton exemplifies the point made in *Characteristics of Excellence* that states that general education "draws students into new areas of intellectual experience, expanding their cultural and global awareness and sensitivity, and preparing them to make enlightened judgments outside as well as within their academic specialty" (p. 47).

Faculty Participation and Excellence in General Studies

The College is effective in ensuring that it has a continuously improving, faculty-led, outcomes-based general education program. Consistent with best practice, students engage with the general education program throughout their academic life at the College and not merely as freshmen. The curricular language of the academic programs (majors) at Stockton incorporates and reinforces the learning objectives of general education (Bulletin, 1.1.6, p. 152). Both General Studies and program courses may also include "subscripts"—courses designated "A" (Arts), "I" (International/Multicultural), "V" (Values/Ethics), and "H" (Historical Consciousness), which also comply with the *Characteristics of Excellence*. Similarly, Stockton operates both a Writing Across the Curriculum and a Quantitative Reasoning Across the Curriculum distribution under the same auspices of the General Studies program (Bulletin, 1.1.6, p. 152).

Although the general education program is institutionalized within the School of General Studies with its own dedicated Dean, faculty and staff, all Schools follow a contribution model to ensure that the courses are creative, interdisciplinary and sufficient to meet the needs of all students (12.1.2). As the formula for contributions illustrates, faculty members who teach in programs that offer only graduate courses are not only permitted, but are also welcomed, to teach General Studies courses. In addition, individual faculty contracts require that they contribute to the educational commons in both General Studies and At-Some-Distance (Faculty Responsibilities, 10.3.3, p. 2, paragraph 2.1.2). The quality of this contribution is regularly evaluated during the personnel review process for both tenured and untenured faculty (see Chapter Four on Standard 10: The Faculty).

The entire institutional faculty body "owns" the intellectual commons of General Studies. Courses originate with faculty (12.1.3 Professional Development and How to Propose a Course), are presented to other faculty and "G"-conveners (12.1.3) by faculty, and approved (or not) by faculty (12.1.3 How to Propose a Course). As the evidence in these documents shows, faculty have made consistent improvements to these procedures and courses (12.1.1 Assessment). In the past few years, the process has been formalized to ensure rigor and consistently high-quality courses; before that, the process, while rigorous, was more informal. Since the start of the College, the faculty have continued to contribute creative, engaging courses that align with Stockton's General Education learning outcomes.

Similarly, all faculty participate in the ongoing review and continuous improvement of courses, as detailed in Chapter Six on Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. In brief, General Studies courses undergo a systematic review process after five years; instructors bring materials to the "G" meetings to report on it since it was first approved, and they receive feedback from other faculty on how to improve or otherwise revise the course, if necessary (12.1.5). While these meetings are cordial, they also involve a great deal of preparation on the part of the faculty member proposing the course review. The College also provides ongoing support for faculty professional development and faculty peer review of G-course proposals at numerous levels within the College (12.1.3).

In keeping with Stockton's ongoing commitment to continuous improvement these past 40 years, general education has gone through several reviews and been successful in reinventing itself,

often with grant support from prestigious sources such as the National Science Foundation and the American Council for Learned Societies (12.1.4). The success of Stockton's efforts has been recognized by external organizations such as Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Consortium for Innovative Environments for Learning (CIEL 12.1.5).

Student Participation and Excellence in General Studies

Students are required to take approximately 50% of their courses in General Studies and At-Some-Distance classes (12.1.1). As noted in the evidence pertaining to course proposal requirement, in addition to meeting the rigors of each G-distribution category, General Studies courses must also emphasize critical reading, writing, speaking/listening and information literacy. Yearly syllabus reviews show that most courses are covering all four areas. Recent, illustrative highlights include examples from the Writing Program, the QUAD Program, the General Education Task Force, the Interdisciplinary Minors (most of which are also housed in General Studies), as well as the First Year and Transfer Seminar Programs, whose ongoing assessment cycles are described below in brief, and elaborated on in Chapter Six.

The Writing Program has recently assessed direct evidence of students' progress in three of its courses—College Writing, Rhetoric & Composition and Argument & Persuasion. Data demonstrate that students are doing well in several key areas: employing different rhetorical strategies, writing a debatable, non-obvious thesis and supporting this thesis, employing logical transitions, and writing unified paragraphs. Noting that students need improvement in their ability to integrate source material into their writing, the program has identified several opportunities for strengthening these skills in the final section of their review (12.1.7 pp 77-78).

The College views information literacy as central to a student's success, starting in the freshman year. All first-year students are required to take a freshman seminar, in which one of the essential elements taught is information literacy. Similarly, writing intensive (W1) courses at the College have a research component that stresses information literacy. Preliminary data from the Writing Program's assessment suggest that students still need help in this area, although the figures are improving (12.1.7).

Similarly, the Quantitative Reasoning across the Disciplines (QUAD) Program is in the early stages of its most recent cycle of assessment. In preparation for its five-year review, the QUAD program has already been developing and/or collecting data for three indirect measures of assessment: a student survey that will assess students' attitudes towards the QUAD program; Q1 grade frequency distributions compared to a grade distribution for the College as a whole; and a frequency distribution of Q courses taken by students, also in disaggregated form by degree program. In addition, the program has developed a direct assessment test that was piloted in March 2011. This direct assessment measure focuses on twelve quantitative concepts, e.g., ratio/proportion problems, and interpreting graphical relationships (12.2.3).

In Fall 2010, a General Education Reform Taskforce was formed to develop more systematic mechanisms for ensuring the extent to which students enrolled in G-courses continue to meet goals and outcomes established for each of the General Studies categories. In January 2011, a group of faculty members gathered to blind-read direct evidence: student essays from each of the

G course categories. While most students' work tested positive for meeting many of the goals of these courses, a substantial number of students struggled with critical analysis of data and corresponding analytical writing. Identifying a weakness in critical analysis is the first step toward looking for solutions and moving forward with such remedies (12.1.6). In response, the Assessment Institute during Summer 2011 was devoted to this loop-closing use of the valuable examination of direct evidence (12.1.6), further detailed in Chapter Six.

The General Education Task Force also scrutinized several years of Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) results and the Fall 2010 pilot assessment of student performance in twenty five General Studies courses (12.1.6). Based on results that suggest some students are not as skilled at data analysis as Stockton faculty would like and not as advanced as one would hope in analytic writing, the College has established a working group of faculty to design new and redesign existing courses in critical thinking/informal logic beginning in Summer 2011 (12.1.6). The first set of these courses will then be offered in Spring 2012 and student progress in these courses will be monitored to see what works and what does not yet work. In the long run, it is anticipated that the critical thinking/informal logic effort will become as prominent as the quantitative reasoning and writing across the curriculum foci.

Also within the past decade, the Freshman Seminar program at Stockton, housed in the School of General Studies, has undergone some fine tuning. Stockton now uses a common reading for all freshmen; the book is given to each student at summer orientation. Faculty teaching Freshman Seminars voted to include Common Elements for All Freshman Seminars (critical reading, writing, speaking/listening, information literacy) in each class (11.1.3). Assessment of the Freshman Seminar courses has been based on these elements, measured through yearly syllabus review (in the Spring semester) and IDEA results (11.1.3 Common Elements and 11.1.3 Goals and Objectives). All Freshman Seminars are "G" courses, spanning four of the five "G" areas (GIS is limited to Juniors and Seniors and, therefore, freshmen cannot take seminars in GIS). All Freshman Seminars are taught by full-time faculty from all the Schools at Stockton (a few are taught by gifted, experienced and vetted full-time staff members with advanced degrees). They are academic courses with a theme or focus (as are all "G" courses), not "College 101" courses.

In summary, the General Studies curriculum is faculty-driven and faculty-run, and systematically assessed. There is strong institutional support for the General Studies Program, as evidenced by the Mission Statement's assertion: "[T]he College is committed to faculty-wide involvement in general education" (1.1.1). There is a robust slate of General Studies courses each semester, indicating faculty's support for the general education of Stockton students, and each cycle of program and course review lead to loop-closing course revisions based on learning outcomes data and faculty review feedback.

The College is effective in advancing all students: first time freshmen, transfer students, and economically disadvantaged students towards the goals/objectives of the general education program. Consistent with best practice, students engage with the general education program throughout their academic life of the College and not merely as freshmen. The curricular language of Stockton's academic programs incorporates and reinforces the goals of general education.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

The institution's programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.

Related Educational Activities is a standard that spans numerous activities whose importance varies within institutional context and over time. Related Educational Activities often demonstrate how institutions of higher education have adapted to changing circumstances and to emerging demands for new ways of accomplishing their mission.

Richard Stockton College has made access one of its mission-driven priorities. Several of the elements tied to Standard 13 pertain to providing access; indeed, the College's mission historically has been to provide access to students of varying preparation for college work. As the Self-Study documents show, Stockton has a proven record of success in preparing students to succeed. As measured by its record of success, the College is providing meaningful, effective services through programming and support services for all of its students.

Basic Skills

The College has a long history of serving underprepared students. Since 1976, the College's Basic Studies (BASK) program (13.1.1) has provided developmental instruction to freshmen entering the College with weaknesses in writing, critical reading and mathematics. Although their incoming test scores place them into BASK courses, these students graduate at rates close to and sometimes even better than students who tested out of BASK courses as freshmen. These results provide compelling evidence of program effectiveness and outcome success. These data also indicate that program effectiveness has continued at a steady rate over the long term (13.1.1 Assessment Plan).

The Academic Tutoring Center (9.3.8), discussed earlier in Chapter Three, supports the BASK program in many ways. Consisting of two labs, one for mathematics and science and the other for writing, the Center offers individual and small group tutorials. Students may use the Center on a drop-in basis or by appointment. The Coordinators reach out to students who are underperforming in their BASK courses and set up more structured or intensive tutorials as needed. The services of the Center are not limited to BASK students, however. As such, any student who needs tutorial assistance in areas related to writing, math or the sciences is eligible for tutoring. The extent of usage of the Academic Tutoring Center is assessed at (7.6.2).

Also discussed in Chapter Three, Stockton's Educational Opportunity Fund (EOF) program serves students from low-income families, many of whom come to college with gaps in their academic preparation (9.3.1). Several indicators point to the success of this program, including consistently strong percentages of students with strong GPAs, an excellent ratio of credits earned to credits attempted, and high percentages of students making satisfactory progress toward their degree. Retention rates show that Stockton's EOF students are faring as well as, or better than, students who enter the College through regular admissions (13.1.2).

The College has recognized that some of its transfer students come to Stockton underprepared to make the transition to a four-year college. Also, transfer students may struggle to feel connected to their new campus, especially those who commute. Beginning in 2003, the College has designated some courses as Transfer Seminars, open only to new transfer students. Besides the regular content of the courses, faculty members teaching these sections often allot class time to discuss campus resources or to field generic questions. The program has grown each term, with more and more courses offered. In the Spring 2011 term, there were nine courses designated as Transfer Seminars (11.1.3).

Certificate Programs

Stockton provides a limited number of certificate programs. By far, the largest of these is the post-baccalaureate program for teacher certification. This undergraduate program in Teacher Education is both a post-baccalaureate degree program and a certification program. All students are post-baccalaureate students earning New Jersey teacher certification, and most are eligible to earn a second Bachelor's degree as well. The undergraduate Education degree is offered only as a second Bachelor's (13.1.3).

Stockton recommends dozens of students for elementary, middle school and secondary certification each academic year upon successful completion of their professional course work and field experiences, as well as having satisfactorily completed the appropriate Praxis exams for their certification areas (13.1.4). Stockton's School of Education also provides the instructional component for the New Jersey Alternate Route Provisional Certification Program for individuals to enter the teaching profession without completing a traditional teacher education program (13.1.5). Approximately 650 students at six sites have completed this program in the past five years (13.1.6).

The College has recently developed credit-bearing certificate programs in the areas of Substance Abuse Counselor (SAC) on the graduate level and Preparation for the Health Professions (medical, dental, veterinary) on the undergraduate level (13.1.7). A certificate in Paralegal Studies was offered by Stockton for approximately three years. The initial demand for this program was determined to be adequate and sustainable due to a projected change in state regulation to require a Bachelor's degree for such certification. Since this regulation did not materialize, the enrollments did not occur and the program was discontinued in 2009 after 26 students completed the program (13.1.8).

Experiential Learning

Stockton's experiential learning opportunities dovetail nicely with Stockton 2020, the College's Strategic Plan (2.1.3). Goals focusing on value-added learning experiences and promotion of liberal arts ideas to develop lifelong learners are consistent with the goals of Stockton's Washington Internship Program (9.1.3), Study Abroad (13.2.1), Service Learning (9.1.3), the Baccalaureate Child Welfare Education Program (10.2.3), internships (13.2.4) and other community outreach projects (9.1.2).

As part of its Global Perspectives strategic planning theme, Stockton provides opportunities for students to study abroad, both in the traditional sense and through a robust series of international study tours. Students are able to pursue some form of international study in any of nearly 50 different countries. In the past three years, approximately 125 students have experienced international study for a full semester or summer, and over 400 students, faculty, staff, and community members have participated in over 30 different study tours in the past five years (13.2.1). Recently the College has begun efforts to develop international exchange programs with students from China. Stockton's internal report (13.2.2) on Internationalizing the Curriculum and its recent membership in the ACE International Collaborative further describes many of the efforts related to its Global Perspectives theme (7.6.7).

The Career Center sponsors the Regional Internship Center of Southern New Jersey (13.2.3). Some programs sponsor internship programs for their students; some are prescribed for students as graduation requirements, for example, in Public Health; and others are simply good opportunities for students to explore careers in their majors, but are not required. Similarly, some classes require Service Learning as a component of the class. The Office of Service Learning provides students with opportunities to engage with the community off-campus. These experiences do not carry credit, but are co-requisites of a course. When Service Learning is linked to a specific course, the Coordinator of Service Learning and the faculty work together to decide on appropriate placements, and the instructor decides what percentage of the final grade (if any) is tied to the Service Learning experience (9.1.3 and 7.6.4).

The assessment of these varied experiential learning activities was somewhat fragmented until 2009. Since then, a new Executive Director of Community Partnerships has brought together various constituencies of the College who deal with experiential learning (7.6.5). Stockton's previously "scattered" approach to experiential learning resulted in the denial of its prior application for Elective Carnegie Classification, but Stockton was granted the Carnegie Classification in 2011 (7.3.6).

Coordinators' Reports for various programs sponsoring internships and the other kinds of non-program-specific internships (13.2.4) also include assessment and other information about internships. An excellent example of the "published and implemented" criteria is found within the Social Work Program's application for fieldwork, which describes in detail the major and the fieldwork expected in order to complete the Program (13.2.5).

Many opportunities for experiential learning and community engagement are open to students at Stockton, whether they are required for graduation in particular majors or not. These opportunities for engagement are important components of Stockton 2020 (1.1.3), and they fulfill the stated goals of the Strategic Plan in the areas of Learning, Engagement and Global Perspectives. Students truly have the opportunities to become engaged citizens of their communities, as well as engaged citizens of the world, in accordance with Stockton 2020.

Professional Development

The need for educational services extends beyond the granting of degrees. Needs for continuing professional growth, skill enhancement, and new skill sets are part of every employee's life in

today's fast-paced economy. Richard Stockton College has responded with a growing presence in the areas of non-credit, continuing professional development and certificate programs.

Stockton offers non-credit programming through two units of the institution. One is through the Division of Continuing Studies (13.3.1) in the School of Graduate and Continuing Studies, which offers programming for a wide variety of health sciences and human services, corporate, and community education audiences. Another is through the Southern Regional Institute and Educational Technology Training Center (SRI & ETTC), which develops and delivers continuing professional development programming for PreK-12 educators throughout the region (13.3.1).

Continuing Education

The current Division of Continuing Studies (13.3.1) offers workshops, seminars, certificate programs and conferences in a wide variety of professional disciplines; in FY 09-10, over 5,000 professionals participated in non-credit offerings.

Continuing Studies programming is responsive to the needs of the professional community Stockton serves. Stockton is an approved provider of continuing professional education for social work, marriage and family therapy, licensed professional counseling, occupational therapy (through American Occupational Therapy Association), speech/language/hearing (through American Speech-Language-Hearing Association), addictions, certified public accountancy, and public health, and also offers courses approved for physical therapy professionals (through the New Jersey State Board of Physical Therapy Education) and health educators. The process of becoming an approved provider and the quality assurances to maintain that approval ensure that national standards for excellence have been met or surpassed. Learner feedback on course evaluations (7.6.3 Feedback) regularly indicates that the programming is perceived to be of high standard and an excellent value in the region (13.2.6).

Continuing Studies assesses community needs through interest surveys, using responses to develop certificate programs and courses that are further refined by feedback from faculty, informal input from area professionals, and feedback on the course evaluations distributed at the conclusion of every program. In addition, Continuing Studies staff track the mandated Continuing Education regulations and cycles for the professions served by the institution, and thus are aware of the specifics of the Continuing Education requirements for each profession.

Southern Regional Institute and Educational Technology Training Center

The Southern Regional Institute and Educational Technology Training Center (13.3.1 SRI & ETTC) provides teachers, technology coordinators, school administrators and school staff throughout the state of New Jersey with professional development opportunities on relevant subjects including the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards, instructional technology, computer technologies, ESL strategies, special education, classroom management, mentoring and a variety of other topics requested by school district personnel. In 2008-2009, nearly 8,000 educators attended over 600 individual workshops and programs sponsored by the SRI & ETTC.

Since 1997, when the ETTC was first established, over 6,000 workshops, programs and seminars have been offered through this extraordinary resource.

Distributed Learning

Since Stockton's last Self-Study, the College has significantly enhanced its utilization of alternative modes of delivery, including several varieties of experiential learning described above and in distance education. Stockton faculty have benchmarked practices in distance education to the broadly accepted standards for this delivery mode (7.6.6).

Stockton's Distance Education program (13.3.2) consists of hybrid graduate programs in Physical Therapy (the transitional DPT) and Nursing, and numerous courses offered under the instructional methods of "online," "hybrid" or "telecourse." The instructional method of a course is the faculty member's choice. Working around the parameters of bargaining units and reviewing Middle States Best Practices for Distance Education guidelines, as well as other organizations such as Sloan-C, Stockton has supported faculty best practices in online learning in a number of ways. Along with the Computer Services Help Desk (13.3.5 Call Data), Stockton has encouraged faculty new to online or distance education to seek a peer faculty mentor to help them with technology and pedagogy through the Academic Support for Distance Education (13.3.3 ASDE). Workshops regarding pedagogy related to Distance Education are offered through the Institute for Faculty Development, the Office of Computer Services and the Office of Distance Education. From May 2006-May 2011, 832 faculty and staff participated.

A Task Force on Distributed Education of the Faculty Assembly reviewed a number of different issues surrounding Distance Education and Stockton and put forth a report with several recommendations (7.6.6**)**. Faculty and staff formed a Distributed Education Academic Advisory Board to continue reviewing professional development and support for faculty teaching Distance Education courses. The Office of Distance Education created and conducted a Distance Education survey for students, the survey is administered each semester (13.3.7). The committee also examined the use of course management systems, resulting with a set of guidelines for Learning Management Systems at Stockton (13.3.4).

Distance Education has been used strategically to satisfy regional demand. Stockton's online Transitional Doctorate in Physical Therapy (tDPT) track of the DPT Program was created to meet new minimum degree requirements for physical therapists in a way that allows practicing physical therapy clinicians to continue their educational requirements while continuing their practice(s). A Substance Awareness Coordinator (SAC) certificate program was recently developed for education professionals wishing to become (SAC) certified through the NJ State Dept of Education; this certificate is taught as an executive-style, hybrid program. The Master of Science in Nursing has continued to be offered as a hybrid program. Nowhere is the response to demand more evident than in Stockton's Summer School offerings (13.4.1). In the past five years the demand for distance education course offerings in the summer has grown from approximately 33 to over 50% (13.4.1).

In addition to the credit-bearing Distance Education offerings described, Stockton Continuing Studies offers a small portfolio of online workshops through a third-party remote vendor, using a

revenue share model 13.3.6). The success of these and other Continuing Studies offerings is validated in evaluation surveys and, most clearly in the growth of offerings and demand for them (13.2.6).

Additional Locations and Other Instructional Sites

As with most institutions of higher education, Richard Stockton College has experienced demand for and has sought new approaches to delivering educational services at sites other than the main campus. An example of this is the Commission's recent approval of Stockton's Carnegie Library Center in Atlantic City as an "additional location" that engages in regular assessment of its offerings (7.6.5). In fact, based on survey responses and student demand, the Master's in Social Work (MSW) is offered exclusively at the Carnegie Center. One hallmark of the quality with which Stockton provides such offerings is the use of regular, full-time faculty to deliver most MSW courses at both the main campus and the additional location.

Stockton also offers a variety of single courses in several off-campus locations besides the Carnegie Library Center. For two years St. Joseph's High School in Hammonton, NJ has hosted single course offerings. This location has been used as a preliminary and pilot site for a more fully developed set of offerings that will become available at another building that is currently under renovation to accommodate academic space in the town of Hammonton (7.6.5).

In addition, the School of Education enrolls a number of school district teacher cohorts in several graduate programs. Currently, 10 cohorts exist with students enrolled in the Master of Arts in Instructional Technology, Master of Arts in Education, and Master of Arts in Educational Leadership degree programs and a P-3 certification program (13.4.11). Two other pilot efforts include a graduate course in Holocaust and Genocide Studies to be offered in Cherry Hill, NJ and a non-credit Orientation to Stockton course to be offered at Atlantic Cape Community College for students who will transfer to Stockton in the next year (13.1.5 flyer and syllabus).

Stockton continues to make a concerted and carefully designed effort to extend its credit and non-credit course offerings throughout the southern New Jersey community. Despite rapidly growing competition for off-site delivery from a substantial number of both in-state and out-of-state institutions, Stockton has remained fully cognizant and committed to the academic content, rigor and coherence appropriate to its mission.

Contractual Relationships and Affiliated Providers

Stockton has recognized that it cannot provide all desired academic degrees and programs that its students might desire and/or that the region demands; therefore, collaborative partnerships have been sought, developed and secured with a variety of affiliated providers.

The most long-standing partnership exists in the College's 3-2 Dual Degree Engineering Programs with Rutgers and the New Jersey Institute of Technology (13.4.2). A similar program in Medical Technology has recently been established with the University of Delaware; the first two Stockton students to attend this program started in the Fall of 2011 (13.4.3).

A 3-4 Program leading to the Doctor of Pharmacy degree at Rutgers University was begun in Fall 2005; 27 students have been admitted to the Program, 21 of whom met the academic standards to move on to Rutgers (13.4.4). Other pre-professional agreements exist with University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ) The New Jersey Medical School, the UMDNJ School of Osteopathic Medicine, the UMDNJ The New Jersey Dental School, the UMDNJ Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, the State University of New York College of Optometry, and the New York College of Podiatric Medicine, although few Stockton students have attended these schools.

The newest affiliations (as of 2011) have been made with the Rothman Institute (13.4.5), through which Stockton students have opportunities for clinical placements, instruction and supervision under some of the finest practitioners in the greater Philadelphia area; and with Cornell University (13.4.5), to incorporate the Seaview into academic programs at both institutions.

Although no longer contracted with the State of New Jersey, the original funding source for the Governor's School on the Environment, Stockton has committed to the sustainability of this important environmental effort for high school students by establishing the Stockton Summer Sustainability & Environmental Academy (SSSEA) in the summer of 2011 (13.4.6).

Stockton has begun to establish partnerships focused on a small number of elite high school academic programs, whereby certain students will be able to earn dual credit in Stockton courses or have the courses fulfill prerequisites for advanced Stockton courses. These include the Marine Academy of Technology and Environmental Sciences (MATES) high school in Ocean County, NJ (13.4.7), the three schools in the Greater Egg Harbor Regional School District (13.4.7), and the proposed Medical Science Academy at Egg Harbor Township High School.

Stockton has discontinued one contractual relationship in the area of Criminal Justice. After 13 years the combined BA/MA in Criminal Justice with Rutgers-Newark was discontinued in 2006 when Stockton began its own Master of Arts in Criminal Justice and subsequently initiated its own accelerated dual degree program (13.4.8). The graduate program at Stockton was awarded certification in 2011 by the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, an achievement that Rutgers-Newark has not attained (13.4.9)

Since these affiliated programs have very high standards for admission, continuation and completion, Stockton faculty and administration have been quite cautious and selective as to which ones should be pursued. The success rates of those students selected, however, have been commendable. Additionally, as with any program that requires and achieves national accreditation and includes significant hours of field placement work, Stockton's undergraduate programs in Teacher Education, Public Health and Social Work insure that the institution's integrity is maintained in the selection and placement of students in their field experiences. Site and supervisory selection is monitored by field placement specialists and/or faculty in the above-named programs; regular site visits are conducted throughout the student's experience; and summative, reflective efforts are required in the form of written papers and/or oral interviews.

Stockton continues to take pride and pays special attention to all of its Related Educational Activities, which greatly enhance the overall curricular experience. Students in all majors have

multiple opportunities to engage in these activities and are encouraged to do so, especially through the preceptorial advising relationship and experience.

Looking Forward . . .

The College is committed to unique classroom experiences that offer students the liberal arts educational opportunities that they cannot find at other colleges. Recently the Faculty Senate reviewed proposals for minors in Jazz, International Studies, and Digital Literacy. In 2011, a B.A. and B.S. in Sustainability and a B.S. in Health Sciences were approved by the Faculty Senate. On the docket for the 2011-2012 academic year is a proposal for a Master's in American Studies and a Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies. The College is committed to reviewing and updating curricula in order to meet student demand.

In the next five years, the College will work to implement these new majors and minors while also working to ensure that students who leave Stockton have the basic skills they need to move into a career of their choice. To this end, the Basic Skills program is working to evaluate the need to revamp curriculum, Continuing Studies will continue to offer certificate programs, and the College will focus on experiential learning through several arenas including Study Abroad, Internships, and the Office of Service Learning.

Chapter Six

Standard 14: Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.

Student Learning Outcomes at The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey

At the institutional, program and classroom level, student learning outcomes support the College's themes of learning, engagement, global perspectives and sustainability, all aligned to its mission. The objective to "deliver high value-added learning experiences" drives careful attention to the assessment of student learning in all phases of the curriculum cycle. At the institutional level, Stockton plans learning outcomes, articulates clear learning goals, measures and collects evidence of significant abilities, skills, attitudes and knowledge, then analyzes the findings of these measurements; the College disseminates them to the appropriate constituencies who act on these findings. The Divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs have also been articulating Essential Learning Outcomes that would exemplify every Stockton graduate and that would map to a framework based on the Lumina Foundation's Degree Profile (14.1.13). Because the assessment process is continuous and complementary on all levels (institutional, divisional, school, department, program and course), at any given time the scrutiny of assessment will present only one snapshot of an ongoing series of events.

Systematizing Learning Outcomes by Organizational Structure

Like many medium-sized public colleges, Stockton offers dozens of academic programs for undergraduate majors, minors and general studies. In addition, Stockton offers several master's degrees, post-baccalaureate programs and one doctoral program. One distinctive element about Stockton is that the faculty complement works collaboratively, across disciplines and levels, sharing responsibility to teach throughout the entire College as one faculty collective. For example, in a given term, a professor in the School of Education may offer one methods course to her post-baccalaureate majors, one Origami (quantitative reasoning) course to undergraduate General Studies students from across the College, and one graduate course in the master's program. Similarly, a physicist in the School of Natural Science and Mathematics may offer one graduate course in the Computational Science master's program, one undergraduate course for his Physics majors and one course on Energy and Ethics to General Studies enrollees from any major. In addition, faculty may cross-list courses from their major or general studies teaching assignments to any of the interdisciplinary minor programs in Africana Studies, Gerontology, Holistic Health, or Women's Gender and Sexuality Studies, to name a few. This mission-driven approach to a highly-collaborative faculty body necessitates that the College manage learning outcomes on the Program level, School level, Division level and College level (7.8.2).

Furthermore, Stockton's mission-based commitment to an interdisciplinary approach translates into faculty leaders who serve rotating terms as Program Coordinators and Directors, rather than as fixed Department Chairs. As such, their systematic, collective approaches to establishing and

assessing learning outcomes is managed first within the annual Program Coordinators' and Directors' reports, which have progressed from loose guidelines within each of the Schools to a standardized college-wide template developed in 2010-11 (14.1.1). After four successive annual reports, each program (including the Library, Academic Advising and other support units) conducts a Five Year Academic Program Review. The Office of the Provost has developed a standardized template that includes a full review of the preceding annual assessment plans and an external reviewer to evaluate the extent to which programs have acted upon results from those successive planning and assessment cycles (14.1.2). The Service-Learning Program and Office of Academic Advising are scheduled to start using the Five Year Academic Program Review template during their next review cycle.

The Outcomes-Measures-Results-Action Process

Each year, Program Coordinators and Directors prepare an annual report that identifies learning goals, collects performance measures and asks and answers at least one question based on results of the prior year's learning outcomes assessment cycle. Program Coordinators and Directors consult with their own assessment coordinator. One faculty member serves in this role for every program, and each serves on a college-wide assessment committee (14.1.3) to gather assessment results and formulate future action plans in these annual reports.

Next, Program Coordinators and Directors submit their annual reports to the Deans of their Schools, who in turn review and discuss the learning outcomes results with the program faculty, not only within their own major or minor, but sometimes in School-wide faculty meetings among multiple programs, both undergraduate and graduate. This technique is extremely effective for disseminating best practices on both the Program and School level, particularly where the action plans from one program impact another program with an interdisciplinary, service or sequential relationship (undergraduate CRIM to graduate MACJ programs, for instance).

Deans then send copies of the outcomes assessment results to the Office of the Provost so that these action plans based on learning outcomes results may figure into their annual allocations Divisional Program Review (2.1.2). Deans also forward assessment-focused excerpts from the reports to the Office of Planning and Institutional Research, which coordinates institutional assessment on the College level, and to the Institute for Faculty Development, which archives the assessment plans as teaching models for new faculty members, for experienced faculty members new to serving as Program Coordinators and for experienced Program Coordinators from one School who may be interested in adapting action plans that worked well for another school (14.1.4). The Institute also oversees publication of the faculty-authored *Evidence* newsletter, which features articles that focus on assessment results from every level of Academic Affairs (14.1.5). In this way, the academic programs are not only using learning outcomes results effectively within their own programs, but also among and between all of the programs and levels of the organization.

From a Comprehensive System to Technology-Supported Best Practices

During this transition stage from idiosyncratic formats to standardized reports, the Office of Planning and Institutional Research has also worked with the Institute for Faculty Development

and the Schools to publish not only the assessment excerpts from annual reports, but also the assessment excerpts from the Five Year Academic Program Reviews (7.8.2). Several work teams assigned to examine these documents for this Self-Study observed that technology enhancements would have improved the process even further. As a result, even as the teams were completing their reports, the Office of the Provost expanded a software license from the School of Business for SedonaWeb to include faculty and programs from every School and every level of the College. As Program Coordinators and Directors begin to complete their annual reviews, the Assurance of Learning module from SedonaWeb will automatically refresh what is now a manually-compiled, static Web site into what will be a dynamic, real-time, searchable database of best practices in learning outcomes assessment for the entire College (7.8.2).

Clearly, the processes for systematizing annual results from student learning outcomes assessment continues to improve with each innovation that the faculty adopt. In this way, program faculty members continue to thrive on the effectiveness of a system that has already achieved college-wide "ground-level competence" and has even begun to establish "pillars of excellence" among many of its programs.

Pillars of Excellence: Examples of Program-Specific Assessment Cycles

All programs at The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey engage in assessment of student learning in one form or another, taking care to include both direct and indirect measures and always formulating action plans based on each cycle of measurement results. The way in which each program crafts its assessment plan depends on the specific needs of students in the program. Some programs must meet accreditation standards and, thus, their assessment plans are proscribed by specific curricular content (e.g., Social Work, Master's in Criminal Justice, Physical Therapy, to name a few). In other programs faculty evaluate the skills that students must have upon graduation and they design assessment evaluations that can capture competency in those skills (e.g., Anthropology and Political Science). The one commonality is that all programs at Stockton recognize that assessment is a cyclical process, one that certainly has defined phases but never an end. Below are some examples of that process.

An Example from the School of Arts and Humanities

The History Program continued implementing its annual assessment plan by hiring an external consultant in 2006 to analyze program assessments of learning outcomes. The consultant found that there were some problems with their senior theses, specifically that they revealed weaknesses in hypothesis formation, lacked focus on scholarly journals to strengthen historiography, a need to link inferences to strengthen arguments, weaknesses in bibliography, and a need to incorporate thematic concepts in the assessment rubric. The program then revamped their Historical Methods and Thesis Seminar, reduced class size, increased faculty participation in advising thesis students, mandated standard formatting for footnotes and bibliography, and included thematic concepts in their assessment rubric. Closing the loop, the History Program invited a second external consultant visit in 2008 to document improvement in the program and to note any areas that still needed improvement. The program faculty continue to take further actions each year to address the remaining concerns and are re-assessing with an external consultant in 2011 (14.1.6 History).

An Example from the School of Business

Similarly, the Business Studies program has implemented an ongoing, systematic process focusing on core courses. A timeline was developed for establishing when and where assessments will be conducted and a determination was made of which core courses emphasize the various learning goals that were identified. In recent years, writing skills and information literacy were assessed in the capstone course (BSNS 4112). Moreover, problem-solving skills were assessed in Managerial Accounting (ACCT 2120). Also, ethics were assessed in the introductory law courses (core courses) and via student internships (an elective). Furthermore, to assess discipline-based knowledge for Management track students, the Management Skills course (an elective) utilized rubrics to examine student generated portfolios. Likewise, Marketing seniors were assessed using a locally developed test in the capstone course (MKTG 4470). Future semesters will include assessment of oral presentation skills, writing, critical thinking, and program knowledge and business analysis. Program-wide evidence also includes Business Program-specific results from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), National Society of Experiential Education (NSEE) and exit surveys (14.1.6 Business).

An Example from the School of Education

The School of Education is somewhat different from the other academic schools because, in addition to meeting program learning outcomes, all students must also pass external licensure examinations. The School of Education offers several master's degree and certificate options as well. Students at the graduate level must receive a grade of B- or higher in all courses. Graduate students must complete a capstone project that is reviewed by the Education Program faculty. Every two to three years, the School of Education conducts surveys of their recent graduates on the day after commencement to measure the students' satisfaction and perceived value of their educational experience. All courses in all degree and certificate programs are required to link course objectives and assessment to New Jersey education standards. In addition to these teaching-related responsibilities, faculty members regularly attend assessment conferences and maintain open lines of communication with the field work supervisors (14.1.6 Education). One result of these assessment efforts showed that pre-service teachers who struggled in student teaching also tended to struggle on the Praxis II test for state licensure. In the original sequence, students would do their student teaching and then take the Praxis II to complete licensure. As a result of these direct assessments, the Education Program decided to reverse the order of these two requirements. Now students must pass the Praxis II prior to enrolling in their student teaching experiences.

An Example from the School of Graduate and Continuing Studies

The School of Graduate and Continuing Studies serves as a clearinghouse and provides admissions functions for graduate degrees. The staff members in this office are charged with marketing and recruitment initiatives and providing support for graduate student programs. The supervision of the programs of study and the assessment of those programs fall under the administration of other academic schools. Despite this bifurcated system, the School of Graduate and Continuing Studies provides an annual report of the assessment efforts undertaken by each graduate program. Graduate programs require a capstone project that is reviewed by all program

faculty. “As a rule, the capstone project consists of a Master’s thesis, research project, or other scholarly or creative work and communication of it orally and in writing. A student presents her/his work in a “public” forum of students, faculty, and invited administrators.” (14.1.8 Graduate School Self-Study, p. 81). Most of the graduate programs are externally accredited and some attain licensure or certification. As a result, many programs have had decades of experience using learning outcomes results to improve programs and meet accreditation standards.

An Example from the School of Health Sciences

Assessment activities in the Nursing Program exhibit an ongoing, systematic process of assessment at various stages in the curriculum through the use of the Assessment Technologies Institute testing. Critical thinking assessment utilizes data collected over time using the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education Essentials of Nursing Practice. Results are applied to curriculum revision/development and identify additional concepts to be measured. Multiple sources for assessment are used including curriculum surveys, alumni surveys, National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX) sources, graduate certification examinations and job placement rates. Data are used to restructure curriculum and course content (14.1.8 Nursing). One example is assessment in the capstone course and the final clinical course, which center on major program concepts and quantitative and writing skills. Furthermore, Educational Benchmark Institute is used for both undergraduate and graduate Nursing students after graduation.

Several Examples from the School of Natural Science and Mathematics

Biology, Chemistry, Computational Science, Environmental Science, Marine Science and Mathematics programs from the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics provide yet another example of the interdisciplinary nature of program assessment. Many of these programs offer course sequences that serve one another’s majors: Introductory Biology, Chemistry, Calculus and Ecology courses, for example, span nearly every one of the majors in this School. These programs also demonstrate an excellent balance of direct and indirect measures in their learning outcomes assessment plans. For example, the Biology program reports on data collected from alumni on the number of students going to graduate school/professional school and the pass rates of students on Medical Skills Admissions test (MCAT) and GRE. The Program developed specific test items and uses these and existing standardized test items to assess a recent change in the order of the first two Biology courses. This change appears to have led to a slight improvement in student learning. Program-specific standardized tests are already administered to upper-level students to confirm basic knowledge of Biology. A different instrument on scientific literacy has also been used with upper-level Biology students. The results guided a restructuring of course content. Students also took the ETS Computer Literacy Test (14.1.8 Biology). Another excellent example of a program using assessments to improve effectiveness is the Marine Science program. As a result of assessment data, the Program changed the sequence of material for MARS3105 Biostatistics so that some of the procedures could be applied to other courses that require this material, such as BIOL2110 Genetics (14.1.8 Marine Science).

Several Examples from the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Assessment activities in the Social Work program are of special note. The Social Work program has been continuously reaccredited through Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). This Program has a detailed assessment process that links learning outcomes to CSWE Education Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS). The EPAS are reflected in the Social Work Program Curriculum. The Social Work Program also receives feedback from employers on their satisfaction with Stockton graduates. Additionally, students in the Social Work Program complete 400 hours of fieldwork. In fieldwork, students take their class work and immediately apply it in real world situations (14.1.8 Social Work). Social Work faculty, through the Summer Assessment Institute held in 2009, have also developed an authentic performance task to assess the critical problem-solving, writing, cultural awareness, and ethical skills of its seniors.

Also in the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the Psychology program has employed both standardized and locally developed measures of outcomes that are identified by the American Psychological Association (APA) as important ones for psychology majors. The Program has analyzed the performance of its majors on the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) for direct measures of critical thinking and on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) for indirect measures of students' report of their opportunities for contact with students of different backgrounds (14.1.9 Learning to Improve). The Program has repeatedly measured students' ability to interpret statistical data in published research using a direct authentic measure that was developed and validated several years ago and they have used the findings to fine-tune instruction in statistics classes. Psychology has made extensive use of data from the IDEA student-ratings to provide input for the evaluation of the alignment of course objectives with learning outcomes (14.1.9 Psychology).

The College will continue to infuse best practices in the classroom with a highly-effective system of assessing student learning outcomes. The introduction of SedonaWeb will provide the College with a significant technological improvement; assessment efforts that currently require a period of time before they can be shared, will not only be publically available for all staff and faculty to see, the data will also be updated automatically, providing faculty with immediate access to the results and the ability to "close the loop" of the assessment cycle (14.1.10 Essential Learning Outcomes).

Pillars of Excellence in General Studies: Mission-Critical

Perhaps most unique to Stockton is the School of General Studies, an "educational commons" that serves the entire undergraduate student population. Because virtually every faculty member offers a course or more each year to the School of General Studies, assessment of learning outcomes is managed and disseminated on a school-specific Web site (14.1.6 General Studies). In addition to measuring learning outcomes by program level objectives, the School of General Studies has a history of examining its courses for their integration of 13 school-wide competencies (14.1.7 p. 152). Since General Studies is the heart of Stockton, no program-specific curricular decisions are made without careful consideration of the impact on the educational commons.

As noted elsewhere in this Self-Study, at Stockton, the mission and vision of general education are realized through a separate curriculum administered by a separate School of General Studies and delivered by the entire faculty complement. Thus, at Stockton, the mission of each one of its General Studies courses is solely to foster the ideals of general education and not necessarily to provide the first step toward specialization in a major. The vision of general education recognizes that such courses are intended to "enrich one's learning, to provide for explorations of new fields, to provoke and stimulate new thinking, to encourage experimentation, and to test one's perspectives; these intentions are often addressed in ways that cross the boundaries of individual academic disciplines" (14.1.7 p. 151). As described in detail in Chapter Five, the instantiation of this vision is that undergraduate students take one or sometimes two courses in each of the following areas:

- General Arts and Humanities (GAH)
- General Interdisciplinary Skills and Topics (GEN)
- General Integration and Synthesis (GIS)
- General Natural Sciences and Mathematics (GNM)
- General Social and Behavioral Sciences (GSS)

Thus, Stockton's General Studies courses, instead of offering a narrow introduction to a single discipline, "may study a problem or theme or offer a survey of related topics. Across the entire institution, faculty assess learning outcomes based on what the courses have in common: that they are designed to explore ideas, stimulate critical thinking, and provide breadth of perspective for all students regardless of major" (14.1.7 p. 151).

Assessing the General Studies Program

As a result of a series of faculty task forces, inquiry panels and study groups over the past several years, the Dean of General Studies has undertaken a wide, evidence-based assessment of student learning across all of the General Studies categories that advanced significantly during AY 2010-2011 (14.2.1). For each of the five course categories above, faculty review teams devised a rubric of desired student learning outcomes and convened a panel of faculty to read randomly selected student essays gathered in five or more courses from each category. The panel of faculty were assigned to the groups using a double-blind approach and read a random sample of essays from representative courses.

Results of the General Studies Program Assessment

Student essays in the GEN category were rated very highly with respect to meeting the learning goals of that category. The five classes that participated in the GAH assessment rated similarly highly and were found to be meeting learning outcomes in the arts and humanities. In the GIS category, two-thirds of students' work was rated as acceptable or better with respect to three wide-ranging goals. The assessors felt that the questions posed to the students in this category should have been "more focused," although this may not have been structurally possible due to the diffuse nature of the category itself. The readers' recommendations informed the Dean and the GIS faculty leadership that this assessment mechanism is not the best fit for this unique aspect of the General Studies Curriculum. Having ruled out this mechanism, the Dean and

faculty leaders are already at work on constructing another, more appropriate mechanism for the future. Student essays in the GNM and GSS areas indicated that the students were not able to analyze data or were less capable than desired of demonstrating analytic writing outcomes. Faculty are already working to improve instruction methods in those courses. In the GSS category, students made a marked improvement from the pre-test to the post-test, but overall the assessment indicated that "the capacity to write analytically about pertinent material needs our focus." (14.2.1, p. 9)

In all five cases, the assessment data are being used to enhance future course offerings in General Studies, either to reinforce strengths in the GEN and GAH areas, to improve the assessment process in the GIS area or to improve instructional methods in the GNM and GSS areas (14.2.1).

The College will continue to administer this successful assessment approach to GAH, GEN, GSS and GNM courses, as it has yielded meaningful, useful, efficient and systematic information to the faculty members who can continue to monitor learning outcomes in these areas. Based on these results, the Dean of General Studies has already enacted a plan to reform and replace some G courses to better align their content and delivery with intended learning outcomes (14.1.5 Spring 2011 issue).

Based on the misalignment between the double-blind, randomly selected essays from representative courses method and the GIS curriculum, the Dean and faculty leadership from this area are redesigning a more appropriate method for systematically assessing student learning outcomes in the GIS aspect of the program. The Dean of General Studies has called for continued participation in the area of General Studies Curriculum Reform (14.2.2) in connection with the General Studies Objectives (14.2.3).

Using Assessment Results to Inform Planning, Allocations and Improvement

In the ongoing effort to improve learning, the schools, programs and faculty routinely use assessment data to answer student-learning questions at the meso- and micro-levels; the institution does the same for macro-level learning questions. At Stockton, the approach to assessment at all levels is to view data as an iterative process, one that requires users to review, evaluate, disseminate, discuss and respond to assessments. These processes take place at every level: program, school and institutional, any and all of which generate assessment questions, measure or test for answers to those questions, and share results for decision-making and continuous improvement actions. The assessment process even carries over to non-degree, interdisciplinary program initiatives like the Freshman Seminar Program. The Freshman Seminar Program involves approximately 850 students annually and has relied heavily on several assessment findings in planning instructional approaches, selecting materials and in directing resources (14.4.1.c).

At the broadest institutional level, academic leaders have posed several questions about student learning outcomes, namely: how much value is added to students' critical thinking, analytical and writing skills during their Stockton experience? Furthermore, how well is Stockton engaging students in every form of learning at the institution? And, finally, how are students responding to instructors, courses and their learning environments? Seeking answers to these three questions,

the College has participated regularly in direct measures such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) (14.3.1), and indirect measures such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE, 14.3.2) and the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) student ratings (14.3.3).

Analysis of these standardized test results takes place in several ways. The Director of the Institute for Faculty Development analyzes results and a) meets with the Provost to discuss findings as they relate to the instructional processes and faculty resources, and b) disseminates the results in manageable portions to the faculty community. The Deans review the performance of the students from their schools and they determine how each school will use its assessment findings. Programs can parcel out the relevant assessment results and take criterion-referenced and comparative looks at the performance of their majors (14.3.4). All users take steps to ascertain that the assessment findings are reliable and based on data from representative samples of students prior to taking any action.

Institutional-Level Response: Addressing the Results of the NSSE, CLA and IDEA

The NSSE results several years earlier prompted Academic Affairs to conduct an engagement audit and to direct resources to course development in support of civic engagement. Also in direct response to the NSSE results, the Divisions of Academic and Student Affairs collaborated to launch new programs to increase engagement. At the institutional level, the Division of Administration & Finance frequently allocates additional resources to fund these projects, particularly where follow-up measures indicate that the projects are impacting student learning outcomes on the NSSE items (14.3.5).

The Office of Institutional Research also publishes CLA and NSSE results in its annual Voluntary System of Accountability College Portrait, which is one of several "key performance indicators" for measuring progress on the Stockton 2020 Strategic Plan. Disseminating these results on the College Portrait complements the analyses that faculty conduct in their articles for *Evidence*, the Institute for Faculty Development newsletter. College-wide conversations take place in shared governance venues, all aimed towards interpreting the results, formulating hypotheses, and developing action plans for improvement (14.3.6). For example, after a second round of unsatisfactory CLA results several years ago, the Faculty Assembly President and the Provost held a special meeting of the Faculty Assembly to discuss ways to help students develop more of the critical thinking abilities that are essential learning outcomes for Stockton's students.

As a result of these discussions, the IFD set critical thinking assessment as the agenda for the subsequent Spring Assessment Institutes. The Provost requested additional funding for the Institute, for these workshops, and for additional faculty leadership training in the Collegiate Learning Assessment "in-the-Classroom" Institutes. Fifty-five faculty have participated in the institutes over four years (14.3.6) and have developed local ways of measuring students' critical thinking that are in use in Psychology, Social Work, and a Writing Tutor Practicum course, just to name a few.

Similarly, faculty members whose summary IDEA feedback places them below the expected standard of instructional practice are counseled by their Deans to work with the IFD to improve

their teaching. Through the use of Professional Development Portfolios, these faculty members may request additional development funds for travel to effective teaching and assessment-related workshops. This money is allocated by the Deans specifically for this purpose, and is in addition to money that the faculty member may receive for development of other aspects of the faculty member's file. For all of these responses to assessment findings, the institution has dedicated appropriate resources to motivate, instruct and correct deficit situations.

School-Level Response: Addressing the Results of the NSSE, CLA and IDEA

At the school-level, academic Deans make use of assessment findings in planning and resource allocation and the process varies across the schools, in keeping with the distinct needs of each. The schools of Education, Business, and Health exemplify different and appropriate approaches to evidence-based planning and resource allocation for each unique setting.

School of Education

In the School of Education (14.3.7 EDUC), strategies to improve student learning outcomes are identified and incorporated into academic program plans each year. As part of the yearly program review process, this information is used to develop budgets that support goals and new initiatives resulting from assessment reviews. Programs in the School of Education align with New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS), and accreditation bodies such as the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) conduct regular reviews of Stockton's programs in Teacher Education and the Master of Arts in Education program. Their feedback further informs planning and resource allocation processes. An example of how this process works can be found in the changes made in the assessment of student teachers; this took place in 2009. After review and evaluation, it was determined that the school needed to improve its process and a new assessment framework was put in place for 2010-11.

School of Business

The School of Business (14.3.7 BUSN), as well as participating in institutional-level assessment activities, also has to conform to "Assurance of Learning" standards as part of its seeking of AACSB accreditations. (As mentioned above, Stockton is in the AACSB accreditation process. It was formally accepted into candidacy in December 2009, had the Accreditation Plan accepted in March 2011, and will be writing the self-study report during AY '12-'13 for a Fall 2013 visit.). Specifically required by AACSB, and useful for Stockton as well, all programs in the School of Business have developed a set of student-focused learning objectives, and all of the programs are involved in implementing a formal assurance of learning plan. This plan calls for each objective to be examined (with varying means) on a periodic schedule (usually at least once every three years). Annual program plans thus call specifically for (14.3.7 BUSN):

- a three-year schedule of learning goals to be assessed,
- details for specific assessment activities to be conducted in the upcoming year,
- requests for program changes and/or new initiatives that spring from previous assessments.

The School of Business is using SedonaWeb to manage its Assurance of Learning module, thereby piloting this systematic way of disseminating learning outcomes results and actions in advance of the entire College migrating to this system in the 2011-12 assessment cycle.

School of Health Sciences

The School of Health Sciences balances the assessment needs and resource allocation requirements of four accrediting institutions. The Nursing, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy and Speech Pathology and Audiology Programs all undergo annual rigorous assessment protocols on the student, faculty, school and college levels in order to qualify their graduates for licensure examinations (14.3.7 HLTH). Resource allocation varies by program and year, generally in keeping with the assessment cycles of learning outcomes. Frequently programs require extensive resource outlays for assessment instruments such as the Nursing Educational Benchmark Institute (EBI) tool that provides feedback on virtually every learning outcome, and then benchmarks the program nationally on those outcomes. The use of instruments like the EBI is mandated for Nursing and its use has led to revisions of course content and changes in the credit allocation for two of the Nursing undergraduate courses.

As these three schools exemplify, the processes may vary slightly, but the iterative cycle remains consistent: schools ask authentic assessment questions, measure student learning outcomes using direct and indirect methods, disseminate results and formulate action plans for which the Deans and the Provost allocate resources (14.3.8).

Program-Level Response: Addressing the Results of the Assessment in Increasingly Systematic Ways

Finally, at the Program level, specific plans form the basis for budgetary requests and decisions for the upcoming year. Many assessment activities are already part of the ongoing operations of their Schools, and thus do not need specific budget allocations. However, over the past three years the College has expended additional resources for specific assessment support activities including funding faculty attendance at assessment-related conferences and providing staff support to develop, administer and collect data from surveys. One example of the increasingly systematic cycle of assessment is evidence in the interdisciplinary minor Holistic Health program. In 2010-11, the minor program conducted its Five Year Academic Program Review with a Self Study (14.3.11) and a visit from an external consultant. As has been the case for decades of these reviews, the consultant prepared a report of recommendations (14.3.11 Report), and the program faculty prepared a response to the report. What increased the systematic link between planning and allocations was a new step in the process called a “loop-closing meeting” in which the Provost met with the Dean, the Program Coordinator and the Chief Planning and Budget Officer to translate the program response into an annual coordinator’s report, complete with an appropriate allocation request for use towards implementing specific recommendations to improve the program (14.3.11). Not only has this program completed an exemplary cycle of assessment for its own use in its subsequent Annual Coordinators’ Report (14.3.11), but the program coordinator presented a summary of her process to the Summer 2011 Assessment Institute (14.3.11 Presentation) and Academic Affairs Retreat for faculty colleagues.

In laying the groundwork that made this example possible, the Deans and the Office of the Provost have collaborated with the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to further refine the annual Coordinators' Reports process that forms the basis for annual planning, learning outcomes measurement and allocations requests. Since the 2007 Periodic Review Report, this process has progressed from a simple Word-document template to an online reporting and database system called SedonaWeb, available to all Program Coordinators, Deans and the Office of the Provost. Assessment of student learning outcomes is thus part of the strategic continuous improvement processes as well as the operational processes of all academic programs, schools and the institution, overall (14.3.9).

Programs are able to respond quickly to reliable findings and they do so in a variety of ways. At the program level there is a wealth of examples of dissemination of assessment findings at local and national conferences and of curricular modifications based on these findings (14.3.10). These adaptations require program members to review and discuss assessment data and evaluate appropriate ways to respond.

The use of assessment data at The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey to inform planning and resource allocation has become standard practice, having evolved from preliminary plans during the 2002 Self-Study and pilot projects during the 2007 PRR. Increasing across Schools and Programs, evidence-based planning, as it relates to student learning, is automatically factored into the annual budget allocations and Program Review cycle.

Learning Outcomes of Co-Curricular and Experiential Learning Tightly Aligned to Mission

In addition to its mission- and vision-driven curriculum, Stockton offers an extensive array of co-curricular experiences that intentionally complement the learning outcomes of its academic offerings. As noted specifically in the institutional mission (1.1.1):

> At Stockton we believe that co-curricular activities complement the academic curriculum and, along with classroom education, help students develop the capacity for making intelligent choices. While we offer students assistance in and out of the classroom, we emphasize and encourage student initiative in their co-curricular life, and responsibility for their education.

Accordingly, the Stockton 2020 Strategic Plan articulates the intent to "Create mutually reinforcing intellectual and co-curricular experiences" as a primary objective for the College's Engagement theme (2.1.3). Over the past several years while Stockton had been constructing the now completed Campus Center to house many services in one central location, the College has concurrently strengthened the alignment of several key co-curricular programs, including First Year Experience, Living Learning Communities and Community Partnerships. Now the Campus Center is open and the co-curricular programs have a common home.

These three areas of co-curricular and experiential learning illustrate how well their respective learning outcomes align with the educational mission of the College. In addition, a thorough review of the evidence for these three areas indicates that assessment activity is, as in all degree

and minor programs described above, used for future planning. Each of these three co-curricular programs demonstrates the strong connections both within and between the Divisions of Academic and Student Affairs. The First Year Experience program is co-sponsored by the entire senior faculty who teach Freshman Seminar courses and the Student Affairs departments of Residential Life (14.4.1), Student Development and Events Services. Living Learning Communities are programs co-sponsored by Residential Life and several areas of the Division of Academic Affairs (14.4.2). The Community Partnership Program (14.4.3) is offered cooperatively by the Sociology program and the Director of Community Partnerships in the School of Education, who convenes a college-wide standing committee on Engagement.

Alignment of First Year Experience (FYE)

Stockton's commitment to the First Year Experience (FYE) goes back at least to 1988 when the first group of freshman seminars was offered and made mandatory for all first semester freshmen. Since then, the First Year Experience has grown to encompass a series of optional seminars for first semester transfer students, the first one being offered in Fall 2005 (currently there are about six offered per semester) and a true FYE council to oversee these programs. The distinctive feature that sets Stockton's Freshman and Transfer Seminar programs apart from those of other colleges is that they are NOT "University 101" courses. Each one is discipline-based and counts fully toward the student's degree requirements. These are fully enfranchised academic courses with academic and co-curricular learning outcomes that follow the mission (14.4.1a) and goals (14.4.1b) of the FYE program.

Assessment of the Transfer Seminar program is in its earliest stages, and it will be modeled on the use of assessment that has been well established for the Freshman Seminar Program (14.4.1h Assessment 2008 and 14.4.1h Assessment Goals 2010). The assessment reports clearly show that learning outcomes have been established for the Freshman Seminar Program (14.4.1.d), that there is a coherent assessment plan (14.4.1.e), that learning outcomes are being assessed in accordance with that plan (heaviest use is made of IDEA and of the review of syllabi (14.4.1.f) prior to the start of the semester to ensure that learning goals are being properly targeted), and that these assessment data are being used to guide the Freshman Seminar Program in future semesters (14.4.1.g). The data collection methodologies for the Freshman Seminar Program include student surveys and a pre/post test of student understanding of academic honesty, just to name a few.

In tandem with the Freshman Seminar program, a faculty-led initiative, the Division of Student Affairs staff have articulated outcomes for complementary co-curricular experiences for first year students that align perfectly to the learning outcomes of the seminars and to the College's general education program (14.1.7 page 152).

Alignment of Living Learning Communities (LLCs)

In addition to its broadly evaluative Educational Benchmark Incorporated (EBI) assessments (7.5.4) the Office of Residential Life also requests detailed assessments from periodic external consultant reviews. The findings from these reviews have been a catalyst for the implementation of several residential programs, including partnerships with the Academic Tutoring Center and

the Living and Learning Communities. The Division of Student Affairs incorporated these assessment results and action plans into its 2007 Annual Program Review (2.1.5). The President subsequently authorized an influx of fiscal resources and staffing to facilitate the launch of this collaborative program, including faculty mentors, academic programming within the themed residences, linked courses wherever feasible and outbound field trips for additional enrichment through experiential learning activities. These budgetary allocations have led to a realignment of fiscal resources, space, personnel and highly collaborative programmatic offerings.

Embodying the mission-driven concept of complementary co-curricular programming, the Living Learning Communities are also consistent with several strategic themes. The Global Citizenship, Creative Arts and Sustainability LLCs each contain their own residential mission statements that align to the institutional mission, and a series of learning outcomes that the faculty and staff measure each year (14.4.3). As is the culture at Stockton, the results inform continuous improvement plans for each successive cycle of students.

Alignment of Community Partnerships

After Stockton's first bid for Elective Carnegie Classification was rejected in 2008, the Provost consulted with the Carnegie Program Officer for her feedback on the shortcomings in Stockton's application. The Carnegie Program Officer noted that Stockton's extraordinary fidelity to its mission-specific "commitment to the positive development of southern New Jersey" (1.1.1) was already well-served by extensive community engagement efforts that have been a part of Stockton's programming since 1971. However, she also noted that most of these programs operated in isolation from one another, lacked an overarching centralized system of continuous assessment and would benefit from stronger coordination. As a result of that feedback, the Division of Academic Affairs 2007 and 2008 Program Reviews requested funds for an Executive Director of Community Partnerships who would coordinate these extensive efforts (2.1.5).

The Division hired an Executive Director in 2009, and she quickly convened a Community Partnerships Working Group of constituent groups (14.4.3 Working Group). Under her direction, the working group conducted a year-long Self-Study of the dozens of engaging projects that combine credit-bearing course work with community-based experiences in alignment with the College mission and strategic themes and objectives (14.4.3 Lessons Learned). The Carnegie Classification was attained this year (14.4.3 Press Release).

Stockton Systematically Supports Ongoing Assessment Work

Stockton provides support for assessment of student learning through the Institute for Faculty Development (IFD), the Schools and directly from the Division of Academic Affairs. All three provide leadership, organizational, peer, resource and financial support for faculty in all stages of their career development and in all roles in their programs.

The IFD conducts assessment workshops and institutes, provides print and electronic resources on assessment for faculty, helps faculty with data entry and analysis, sponsors Webinars, buys instruments and standardized tests, assists in the college-wide CLA process, and helps with interpreting the results of assessments for faculty and programs. The IFD Director, who is also

the Assessment Coordinator, helps with peer support for assessment by chairing, informing and tasking the Assessment Committee, a group of 25 faculty and two administrators. The IFD has sponsored teams of faculty to work with the Association of American Colleges and University's Assessment Institute and the Collegiate Learning Assessment's CLA in the classroom workshop. Finally, the IFD, through its newsletter, *Evidence*, recognizes the scholarly work that faculty do in the assessment of student learning (14.5.1 Institute for Faculty Development).

School-Level Response: Supporting Assessment Initiatives

Deans fund conference travel that is related to scholarly work on assessment and they all provide leadership and support for the assessment work that the program faculty do in their Schools. All deans have provided support for faculty to attend workshops and training sessions. Faculty Librarians, who have no Dean, have also received direct support from the Division of Academic Affairs to fund the assessment of information literacy as part of a library study (14.5.1).

Some deans are careful to support assessment as part of the work that is expected of teachers and not as an activity outside of the normal professional responsibility of a faculty member. Others take the approach that strong financial support for assessment will be motivating to faculty and will show them that the institution values their efforts and achievements. In the School of Arts and Humanities (ARHU), the Dean provided funds for two programs to hire external reviewers to assess senior theses for students in the majors. The reviewers use rubrics designed by faculty and consider goals identified by faculty to rate all the theses and to provide the supervising faculty with a comprehensive learning progress report. The Dean of ARHU also supports faculty who seek special qualifications in assessment, such as paying fees for faculty to become certified in language assessment and for the faculty member to keep up certification credentials (14.5.1).

In the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SOBL) the Dean has one staff member with data analysis expertise who works with all faculty to organize, analyze and interpret assessment data. The Dean of SOBL notes faculty involvement in assessment of student learning in her personnel evaluation letters for early career faculty and has assigned assessment projects (thereby supporting assessment work) for faculty on non-teaching workloads. All program coordinators in the School of SOBL must submit a student learning assessment question to the Dean each academic year and submit a status report the succeeding year (14.5.1).

In the School of Health Sciences (HLTH), funds for purchasing instruments, Webinars, workshop, external training and conference participation dominate the list of financially supported activities. Faculty in the Schools of Health, Education and Business are more established in assessing student learning because many programs have accrediting bodies that mandate assessment of student learning outcomes. Faculty in the School of General Studies (GENS) do not have mandates from accrediting bodies, but they have direct and concrete support from their Dean who meets with faculty groups, provides resources, monitors progress, and gives feedback to coordinators about the use of their assessment data. Likewise, the Dean of Natural Sciences (NAMS) supports faculty in professional development activities that relate to the assessment of student learning, conference attendance and presentations; and in some cases, Deans provide stipends for assessment (14.5.3 Faculty Scholarship in Assessment).

Assessment of student learning is being supported, recognized and valued by the administration and senior leadership of the College. At the Academic Affairs Retreat of Summer 2011, over 40 faculty along with academic and student affairs administrators were invited to work in small groups to identify the "top ten" Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs). These ELOs transcend the learning goals identified in the General Studies areas of study, and are skills and knowledge that every Stockton student was deemed necessary to have acquired.

The Academic Affairs Retreat began with a presentation by the Provost (14.1.10). Amid the morning and afternoon small-group discussions, several faculty also made presentations on the assessment they were conducting in their programs (14.1.11, 14.1.12). This focus on assessment at the institutional level was also the main topic of the Fall Faculty Conference of 2011, followed by a Fall launch meeting with team members from every area of the College.

The College is also examining the Lumina Foundation's "Degree Profile" (14.1.13), which helps institutions to define and measure the learning outcomes they desire from their students. Stockton has developed a draft "learning map" matrix that combines the five categories from the Degree Profile with the Essential Learning Outcomes identified at the Academic Affairs Retreat.

The matrix will be able to be viewed by all stakeholders: students, parents, faculty, staff, Trustees, legislators, etc. This matrix would illustrate, at a single glance, what Stockton students should learn. The goal is to have a document that can be understood by all stakeholders so each has a common understanding of what a Stockton education means. At the time of this writing, the Essential Learning Outcomes entered into the Degree Profile is still in draft form.

Through the Schools and the Institute for Faculty Development, faculty are able to get procedural, material, and peer-support for their work in assessment. Faculty are upgrading their professional expertise in assessment because of the professional growth opportunities that are supported by the College (14.5.3 Faculty Scholarship in Assessment). Despite all of these resources, there are a minority of faculty who do not see assessment as part of the teaching requirement. Until the fine lines between classroom teaching and assessment of student outcomes can be erased, there are plenty of faculty in each program who are willing to engage in assessment and understand its intrinsic value. The incentives provided by the administration to include assessment scholarship as part of the scholarship requirements for tenure and promotion will surely help new, untenured faculty to recognize the importance of assessing student learning outcomes.

Looking Forward…

Stockton College provides students with a plethora of degree programs ranging from those true to the liberal arts spirit (Liberal Studies) as well as degree programs with more specificity (Education, Physical Therapy). The College has established certain criteria that all undergraduate students must meet (writing, quantitative reasoning, art, historical consciousness, values/ethics, and international/multicultural) but beyond these across-the-board requirements, each program has certain requirements and assessment tools devised to measure the quality of learning in the program. Some programs are more advanced in their use of assessment tools and others are still finding a path that makes all faculty comfortable with the process.

In the next five years, all programs will continue to focus on valid, meaningful, loop-closing assessment.

The implementation of Sedona will provide faculty with easy access to assessment examples across all disciplines and will make outcome sharing between schools and programs seamless. The Institute for Faculty Development will continue to work with faculty on program assessment but will also provide a home for campus-wide initiatives.

One such initiative is the Essential Learning Outcomes, comprising ten groups of faculty and staff who have begun working on articulating level-specific *institutional* outcomes for all Stockton undergraduate students. The levels are currently loosely based on the Lumina Foundation Degree Profile Framework, and will be piloted in Summer 2012. Initiatives such as this are examples of the many ways in which Stockton continually engages in the assessment of curriculum and learning on campus.

Chapter Seven

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

The College's approach to Standard 7 in the Self-Study was informed by two guiding principles: first, that the overall effectiveness of an institution consists largely of meeting or exceeding all of the standards of Characteristics of Excellence; and, second, that the most thorough approach to ensuring the College's overall effectiveness is to make an assessment of the assessment processes and results for each of the other standards.

The College has made purposeful strides to embrace a culture of assessment during the past decade. Evaluating institutional effectiveness across divisions, schools, departments and programs has become an integral component of the ongoing operational processes at The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey. Strategic planning has been instrumental in aligning these processes. Indeed, the progression from the Vision 2010 framework to the 2020 Strategic Planning management system has provided the foundation for this decade-long transition. The Balanced Scorecard® approach introduced in the latter model is indicative of the College's commitment to systematically aligning planning, measurement, and resource allocation with decision-making. The strategic vision emphasizes excellence in learning, engagement, global perspectives, and sustainability. Moreover, evaluating institutional effectiveness is explicitly addressed in every aspect of the 2020 Strategic Planning framework insofar as "processes will be tied to existing review structures, annual budget and assessment" (2.1.3). Pilot programs using the scorecard approach to evaluate ongoing institutional effectiveness have been completed or are currently underway.

A testament to the value placed on the peer review process and reaccreditation, in general, and assessing institutional effectiveness, in particular, is Stockton's commitment to send many faculty members and administrators to Middle States conferences, seminars and workshops about Institutional Assessment between the 2007 PRR and this Self-Study (7.1.1). More evidence of Stockton's commitment is that a group of faculty and staff who worked on this Self-Study are presenting a session on institutional effectiveness at the 2011 Middle States Commission's Annual Conference (7.1.1 Call for Papers). To continue disseminating best practices throughout the entire college community, several of those administrators and faculty members have followed Middle States experts' advice by offering additional workshops on campus to foster a culture of institutional assessment.

To kick off the Self-Study process, the College's former MSCHE liaison, Dr. Andrea Lex, gave a workshop to nearly 100 participants that included students, faculty, staff, administrators and Board members. Dr. Lex subsequently granted permission to members of the Self-Study Planning Committee to adapt her slides for even further dissemination. Concurrently, members of the Planning Committee developed workshop materials specifically aimed at institutional assessment. During Fall 2010, members of the Planning Committee and a training manager

presented 22 workshops to more than 100 additional staff and faculty members who were interested in learning more about the Middle States Self-Study process in general and about Institutional Effectiveness in particular. These sessions are now available online for all employees (7.1.1 Middle States Sessions) in keeping with the Stockton 2020 Employee Readiness perspective of the strategic planning map.

Strategic planning is vital to the long-term growth and viability of the College. Stockton's President instituted a consistent system in which annual reviews are undertaken in each administrative division (2.1.5) and connect to annual reports from each department, as well as to five-year reviews from each academic program. The continuous loop of establishing assessment criteria, measuring outcomes, recording results, and implementing changes based on those results is a College-wide mandate and a key theme of every chapter throughout this Self-Study. In fact, archiving evidence for this Self-Study led to the realization that institutional data and reporting methods should be standardized and accessible in a centralized location for the academic programs. Hence, in Fall 2010 the Office of the Provost designed a template for use by the academic programs in their annual reports (7.1.2.c), for another in their five-year review process (7.1.2.b) and for an information management database to systematize these processes (7.1.2.d). On a broader level, it also became apparent that there was a compelling need to formalize responsibility for institutional effectiveness at the College in terms of organizational structure and processes, all of which are now organized centrally in the President's Office of Planning, Budget & Institutional Research.

Mission, Vision and Goals

Since the Board of Trustees' adoption of the Mission Statement (last revised in 1982), the institutional and divisional goals and objectives derived from the Mission have been and continue to be widely communicated to the constituent groups. These goals are appropriate to the College's role in the areas of teaching, learning and public service.

The Mission's goals and objectives that center on the College's guiding principles of "excellence in teaching and dedication to learning" (1.1.1) are implemented through the strategic plans known as the recently completed Vision 2010 (1.1.2) and the recently launched successor plan, Stockton 2020 (1.1.3). During the Vision 2010 planning process from 2001-2003, subcommittees and task forces consisting of faculty, staff and students were charged with implementing specific goals in the areas of curricular development, learning assessment, technology, enrollment capacity, affordability, and facilities. When the Vision 2010 was reviewed in 2008, the College had met most of the goals envisioned (7.1.3).

To lead the institution into a new decade, the President charged a Strategic Planning Steering Committee with drafting a new vision statement, which was then revised by a yearlong process of College-wide feedback, and subsequently approved by the President as the Stockton 2020 Vision. The College assesses its effectiveness in achieving mission, vision and goals in several ways, including institutional assessments of student learning, core processes and goal attainment (7.2.1). In addition, in advance of transitioning between Vision 2010 and Stockton 2020, the President implemented a systematic way for each division to measure the effectiveness of the College in fulfilling its mission and achieving its goals: the annual Administrative Program

Review Process. There are four major divisions at Stockton – Academic Affairs, Administration & Finance, Student Affairs, and Development & External Affairs – each of which makes a presentation to the President in a public forum. This presentation includes the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the organization (SWOT matrix of analyses). It highlights a dashboard summary of goals, achievement of organizational goals, and establishment of new goals for the coming year. These all provide context for each year's budget allocation requests.

Following are some examples of how effectively these major areas have been assessed through the annual program review.

Academic Affairs

In the Academic Affairs division, a number of new academic programs have been developed in the past ten years to meet the needs of the changing job market for graduates and undergraduates in their academic professional careers (7.1.4 see "Program Announcements" for rationale on curriculum development). The new programs most recently developed since 2007 include the undergraduate and graduate programs in the following fields:

- B.A. in Fine Arts
- B.S. in Hospitality and Tourism Management Studies
- M.A. in Criminal Justice with a track in Homeland Security
- Dual B.S./M.S. in Computational Science
- M.A. in Educational Leadership
- M.S. in Communication Disorders
- Master of Social Work
- Professional Science Master's in Environmental Science
- Doctor of Physical Therapy

By Fall 2010, student enrollment in some of these new programs had more than doubled since their inception (8.1.2). The expansion of academic programs resonates with the institutional goal of "helping our students develop the capacity for continuous learning and the ability to adapt to changing circumstances in a multicultural and interdependent world by insisting on breadth, as well as depth, in our curriculum" (1.1.1).

Faculty and academic administrators are actively engaged in assessment activities through direct and indirect measures. Student learning outcomes are evidenced and assessed at the course, program, and institutional levels (see Chapter Six on Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning). Effectiveness of academic programs is assessed through a College-wide program review process and the annual program coordinator's report (7.1.2). Under the guidance of the Stockton 2020 Vision, a new program review template was developed and first used in 2010 to more comprehensively review academic programs on a 5-year cycle. This new program review format is helping programs to examine their effectiveness and efficiency, find strengths and suggestions for continuous program improvement, and better determine how resources can be reallocated in support of the mission and strategic objectives of the College. Based on lessons learned during the 2010 cycle, the template has already been revised, and a new "loop-closing"

meeting and concluding memo have been implemented to strengthen the connection between the five year review and the annual coordinators' reports (7.1.2b).

Administration & Finance

To provide alternative funding for the College's fiscal needs, the Administration & Finance division identifies and implements various cost-saving measures such as those listed below:

- Successful negotiation of long-term contracts with various vendors has resulted in total contributions by the vendors of $7 million toward capital improvements in College facilities. Examples include Chartwells [food service], which invested $4.6 million in the construction of the food court in the new Campus Center, and Follett's, which invested a total of $850,000 in construction of the new bookstore in the Campus Center and renovation of the old bookstore, which is now largely devoted to textbook sales. A contract with Ikon provides the Stockton community with copiers and outstanding service and is another revenue source for the College. Negotiating sound contractual agreements such as these not only benefits the students and staff, but provides alternative funding for the College (7.1.5).
- The College continuously evaluates, consolidates and streamlines all aspects of travel with a travel Web page that was created to provide information to faculty and staff on travel request and approval procedures (7.1.6).
- Commitment to ensuring accountability and regulatory compliance: newly created in 2009, the Department of Risk Management & Environment/Health/Safety is responsible for auditing the current practices in the College's regulated community against the applicable environmental standards published in the Federal Code of Regulations and the New Jersey Administrative Code. The creation of this new administrative unit was based on the rationale that the existing structures within the regulated community of the College may compete for their attention causing the unwanted possibility of hindering currency with regulatory changes, a differing perspective of the rules, or practices that are not harmonized throughout the College. The new office ensures ongoing effectiveness in regulatory compliance (7.1.7). The College-wide oversight of the compliance system by this new office is working and measured to date by the enhancements implemented in several management areas (7.1.7).

Student Affairs

In the last several years, the Division of Student Affairs has been focusing on enhancing student enrollment, retention and technology services. As evidenced in the annual program reviews (7.1.8 Student Affairs Program Review), the division has met specific goals such as improving the overall quality and composition of incoming students and targeting various groups of students for their academic success. The Office of the Dean of Students coordinates a retention initiative in collaboration with the Office of Academic Affairs to provide intervention and coordinated support services for "at risk" students. This initiative program offers assistance to students "at risk" of leaving or being dismissed from Stockton. Assessment is built into the program and reported on an annual basis (7.1.8 Continuous Improvement Inventory).

Development & External Affairs

Significant accomplishments have been made in the Division of Development & External Affairs since 2006. The Division's priorities aligned with the College's strategic plans and academic priorities have been implemented successfully and measured by increased donations and endowment primarily to benefit student scholarships. For instance, more than $1 million was raised in 2007, a 5.2 % growth from the prior year for the four new endowed scholarships. In 2008, scholarship funds were added with another $1.95 million. Alumni donors and the donor pool overall continued to grow from year to year; until 2009, donors overall had increased by 190%, and the annual donated fund had grown by 71%. Looking forward, particularly with a new Chief Development Officer, the Division is setting goals and objectives in support of the theme of Engagement as per the Stockton 2020 Vision. In addition, the Office of External Affairs works in tandem with Development to articulate the College's brand promise in all of its advertising, marketing, public relations and integrated communications. The President established this office as a result of some goals the Development Office was unable to achieve to its fullest expectations during prior Program Review cycles.

Leadership and Governance

The existing structure of shared governance at Stockton ensures that the College community is working together to achieve the institutional goals and objectives, and that administration, faculty, staff and students have the opportunities for input regarding the assessment of programs and processes. Stockton has policies and procedures in place for measuring the effectiveness of its leadership and governance (7.3.1). While some of the assessment processes are well established, most are evolving as part of an ongoing, continuous improvement modality. The Board of Trustees and senior administrators make effective use of the existing assessment processes in the development of strategic plans and annual budgets.

The College President and Board of Trustees launched a comprehensive evaluation process which reviewed the performance of the President and Board of Trustees in 2007. This review was conducted under the auspices of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (7.2.2 AGB), and was carried out through confidential interviews with 45 members of the internal and external communities of the College. Candid views of how the College was faring under the Board's and President's leadership were sought (7.2.2 June 2007). Data results in the AGB's report, including strengths and suggestions, were shared with the Board and President. While both the Board and President earned high marks on their performance, "they pledged to consider seriously those helpful insights and suggestions" (7.2.2 December 2007).

Annually, the President presents his goals to the Board of Trustees by October 1 and reports on these goals by June 1. The Board provides an evaluation of the President's work by September 1 of each year. Complementing the pattern for presidential evaluation is the process for evaluating Cabinet members. Annually, each Cabinet member presents goals to the President by May 1 and reports on the goals during the Annual Program Review presentations in February and again by September 1. Cabinet members' goals and reports are included in the President's goals and are presented to the Board each year.

In 2004, the President initiated and implemented a Management Performance Evaluation instrument (7.2.3) that is to be completed each year by Cabinet members. This form measures completion of individual goals and the supervisor's judgment regarding responsibilities outlined in each individual's contract of employment. The first year that this instrument was used, performance reviews resulted in a variation of merit-based salary increases that recognized a variation in the successful achievement of established goals for individual managers. The instrument is considered to be a valid and reliable measure of achievement. During the second year of its use, the instrument was converted to a technology-assisted workflow process to ease and consolidate the documentation that accompanies each review.

In addition to the administrative program review of the four major divisions as discussed above, a new process has been established to evaluate the performance of school deans. These evaluations are administered cyclically and on an ongoing basis. The locally-developed instruments were piloted with the Dean of the School of General Studies during AY 2009, and the Deans of the Schools of Business and Health Sciences in AY 2010. In Spring 2011 the Dean of the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics and the Interim Dean of Graduate and Continuing Studies were evaluated. Like the managerial reviews, these too, were migrated from a paper-based approach to an online database to facilitate administration and reporting tasks (7.2.4).

The Faculty Senate, evolved over the years from the Faculty Assembly and re-established in 2009 in the new faculty governance format as a Senate, is committed to representing the faculty on academic matters and addressing concerns on other matters. After the year-long assessment (7.2.5 Assembly Task Force) of the Faculty Assembly structure, a revised constitution (7.2.5) was unanimously adopted to form the new Faculty Senate. The Senate President convened a retreat of Senators and completed annual activity reports for the first two years of its operation to assess and determine the effectiveness of the newly changed structure of governance (7.2.5 Senate Year End Report).

To further demonstrate shared governance of the College, the BOT approved a practice of appointing faculty members to its committees beginning in 2006; the Faculty Senate president is invited to attend monthly meetings of the President's Cabinet as well as bi-weekly meetings of the Deans' Council (7.2.5 Board Resolution). This provides opportunities for two way communications on emerging issues that require attention from both faculty and administrators.

The Student Senate (7.2.7), a self-governing body of Stockton students, is the student voice responsible for promoting the social, academic and physical welfare of the institution and for sustaining communications between students, faculty and administration. It also represents the entire student body in the programs that directly affect their intellectual, social and economic life. The Student Senate measures the performance of the student organization through various sources—articles in the Argo (student newspaper), a suggestion box in the Student Center and via emails, Facebook, and town hall meetings. If an issue arises, the Senate communicates the issue or suggestion to the appropriate administrator for a resolution. The Senate then reports the issue and resolution in the Argo.

The Student Senate has recently developed a more structured instrument to assess their activities (4.1.8).With support from the Student Development staff, the Senate is analyzing the effectiveness of existing measures and considering new ones. Stockton students are also represented on the Board of Trustees. A Student Trustee is elected to a two-year term, the first as an alternate. Candidates must be full-time, regularly matriculated students in good academic standing, and are required to submit a petition with the signatures of 30 Stockton students in support of their appointment. While there is no mechanism in place to assess the impact of the Student Trustee, specifically, all participants in the Board of Trustees meetings will be reviewed again in the next AGB review cycle.

Faculty

The guiding principles of Stockton's mission are "excellence in teaching and dedication to learning," and the College remains committed to "continuous research, learning, and professional development for our faculty" (1.1.1) This is reinforced through the objectives of the Stockton 2020 Vision; specifically, to "deliver high value-added learning experiences and promote scholarly activity" (1.1.3). In response to their ongoing measurements of effectiveness, the President, Provost and faculty leaders have systematically introduced more clarity and rigor during the last several years through a number of changes to faculty assessment procedures and policies (10.3.3). Revisions and modifications such as a new teaching evaluation system, and the introduction of peer observation of teaching and individual faculty plans have been driven by reasonable, cost-effective, accurate and planned institutional evaluations of faculty assessment standards.

There also is evidence that the assessments are tied to resource allocations as reflected, for example, in the Provost's 2010 Program Review (2.1.5). Further, as part of the agreement between faculty and the administration, outcomes for each set of modifications or new instruments introduced into the evaluation process are reviewed by both parties. This has been undertaken to ensure that adopted changes meet targeted goals.

Stockton's faculty assessment processes have been effective in aligning faculty career development with the College mission. This includes the negotiated inclusion of individual plans for pre-tenured faculty in the procedure for evaluation of faculty as well as the self-assessment and periodic review of tenured faculty every five years (10.3.3). Moreover, improvements documented towards achieving Stockton's mission-driven, 2020 strategic objectives in community engagement (including the recent external recognition by the Carnegie Foundation 7.3.6) and scholarly contributions provide evidence that the assessment process provides proper incentives to faculty for their individual efforts at continuous improvement in those areas. While these processes overall are effective, Stockton continues to assess each level and stage for ways to continue improving, particularly in the evaluation of senior faculty.

Faculties also receive internal grants for sabbatical leaves, career development, and research and professional development (10.5.2). Moreover, faculty have shown initiative in seeking to improve their teaching assessment process in order to secure more extensive feedback on which to base career development goals. In negotiating changes to the review procedures, the

administration has committed to funding necessary tools for the sought-after feedback and appropriate career development support (2.1.5).

Similarly, for the effective assessment of teaching, scholarship and service, the College has followed an aligned, well-planned and systematic approach to setting goals, allocating resources, measuring results and taking action based on those results to proceed through the next cycle of improvement. The evidence repository in 7.3 contains a detailed review of institutional effectiveness for teaching, research and scholarship, and summaries of that review are particularly noteworthy, each based on the 2007 revised Promotion and Tenure Policies (7.3.2).

Teaching

Recognizing the success of steady, controlled enrollment growth, College leadership has identified the need to maintain a balance between both the full-time:part-time faculty complement and the student:faculty ratio. Toward that end, the Academic Affairs program reviews consistently reflect requests for additional tenure-eligible faculty lines. Quantitative data from the tables on the New Jersey Consumer Information Act illustrate that Stockton has made excellent progress in maintaining a balance between these two ratios. In fact, the faculty members are justifiably proud that 70% of all Stockton courses are taught by full-time, tenure-eligible faculty (7.3.3).

Concurrently, the College has engaged in several cycles of continuous improvement that the College measures in qualitative terms (7.3.4). For example, the former Faculty Assembly charged a 2004 Task Force to examine the effectiveness of Stockton's in-house Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) system, in use for decades, as one source of input to the effectiveness of teaching. Their Task Force report in 2006 recommended a transition from in-house SET to vendor-based IDEA system of student ratings. The IDEA system norms scores to adjust for student biases towards particular disciplines, perceptions of difficulty/challenge and self-reports of student effort, providing faculty members with a four-page report for every course they teach. Stockton faculty evaluate nearly every course during every term, so the recommendation to improve qualitative feedback on teaching resulted in the Office of the Provost allocating funds to the IDEA Center as an ongoing budget item. These inputs became only one of several assessments (observations, reflections and professional development plans) that now inform the continuous improvement of teaching under promotion and tenure policies revised in 2007.

Scholarship

Similarly, the College has been emphasizing the role of scholarship in professional development, recognizing Boyer's taxonomy in its comprehensive overhaul of promotion and tenure policies. Following the President's guidelines for developing three clear levels of scholarly review, the faculty and administration collaborated to develop standards for program-level, school-level and college-level reviews of faculty scholarly work.

Simultaneously, allocations for internal support and faculty resources (in the Grants Office and Institute for Faculty Development) increased to align with these clear sets of goals. As intended,

these increased internal resources yielded successful measures in terms of increasing external resources for scholarship (grants and contracts). Each year, the Grants Office reports data on faculty productivity in scholarship; this, in turn, continues to inform the planning and allocations cycles for Academic Affairs (7.3.5 Scholarly Activity Reports).

Service

Faculty at Stockton have consistently engaged in service to their programs, schools and colleges, and in recent years, have begun to align some of that service to the Stockton 2020 theme of engagement. Both student engagement and community engagement have received additional support from administration, through the Office of Service-Learning, the Centers (Community Partnerships, Hughes Center, Successful Aging Center, Hospitality and Tourism, etc.) and the Grants Office. Quantitative and qualitative measures of community engagement informed the College's successful application for Elective Classification to the Carnegie Foundation (7.3.6). Having earned this designation provided one strong indicator that these efforts have yielded success in laying the foundation for continuous improvement in service. The Community Partnerships working group continues to assess the impact that Stockton service has on the College's partners through a series of survey and focus group instruments that are already well under way (7.3.7).

Culture of Respect, Fairness and Academic Integrity

Stockton has a long history of committing itself to diversity, with distinguished records of accomplishments in many areas of diversity and inclusion. In the past two Middle States reaccreditation visits, Stockton was commended for its efforts in achieving social and intellectual diversity. The College was recognized in 1999 by Templeton Foundation for outstanding leadership in the field of character development. The Holocaust Center has continued to contribute to teaching and research in academic programs. In most recent years, the College was awarded a Bildner Family Foundation Grant to further its commitment to diversity and inclusion. The College also maintains an active Office of Affirmative Action and Ethical Standards (7.4.1).

The College Committee for Diversity, Equity, and Affirmative Action was formed in 2003 to ensure a vital and diversified college community and to advise the president on the College's affirmative action, equity and diversity programs and propose changes where appropriate. The goals and objectives of diversity and inclusion are clearly stated in the College Mission (1.1.1), Stockton 2020 Vision (1.1.3), Diversity Statement (7.4.2), as well as in the responsibilities of the College Committee for Diversity, Equity and Affirmative Action (7.4.2).

In response to an open letter in 2007 from the Council of Black Faculty and Staff, President Saatkamp convened a diverse committee of faculty, staff and students to examine the status of respect and fairness in inclusive cultural practices at Stockton. To assess how effectively the diversity goals had been achieved, the College launched a cultural audit in 2008 on diversity and inclusion, which involved an evaluation of the institution's current culture as experienced by a wide range of social identity groups. It was an assessment tool that provided the basis for developing the strategic plans to ensure the best educational achievements of Stockton students, faculty and staff in a multi-cultural community (7.4.3).

While the cultural audit study was exploratory in approach, it revealed both strengths and challenges for the College. The findings suggested that the majority of students and employees found Stockton to be an environment in which people are treated fairly regardless of their racial or ethnic background. The audit report also concluded that the Stockton culture "reflects the removal of many barriers to having a more inclusive culture for females, people of color, and many other identity groups." Based on the study results from surveys and focus groups, the report made a number of recommendations for the College to continue "moving toward culture change based on available resources, motivation, and level of commitment." All of these recommendations have been translated into goals, objectives, and action steps—for instance, relevant objectives and measures were integrated into the Stockton 2020 Vision strategy map. The Stockton 2020 Vision describes how the College engages the campus community in "fostering an interactive environment among students, faculty and staff" and in "developing a globally diverse Stockton community" (7.4.4).

Academic freedom and integrity is clearly articulated in the College's Diversity Statement (7.4.2), "the College promotes an open exchange of ideas in a setting that embodies the values of academic freedom, responsibility, integrity and cooperation." This goal is achieved not only in the form of a Faculty Senate that addresses various academic concerns, but through a Living-Learning community (14.4.2) that its members found rewarding, as concluded in the above-mentioned cultural audit report. This community is one in which students learn more from exposure to unfamiliar topics, issues and perspectives, both in and out of the classroom, than from material that reinforces previously held beliefs. Stockton has achieved a high level of integrity and inclusion based on the survey and focus group data results.

Student Services

The Division of Student Affairs engages in systematic, useful, accurate and effective assessment practices that inform the future planning and development of all the student support programs at the College (7.5.1). There is strong evidence of an ongoing plan for improvement of assessment activities throughout all offerings (7.5.2). Similar to the migration that Academic Affairs plans from manually administered and Web-archived improvement plans, the Division of Student Affairs is also considering the use of SedonaWeb for systematizing these assessment cycles (7.5.3). Furthermore, formal drafts of concept papers for the various Student Life areas have been employed to assess current practices, plan for the future, and improve upon existing services. Student Affairs also refers to Council on the Advancement of Standards (CAS) and peer school benchmarks to provide standards for staffing based on student-to-staff ratios at other public colleges and universities with enrollments of 5,000 to 10,000 students.

The Division of Student Affairs underwent a technological assessment review of all hardware and software utilized by the respective areas with some recommendations for improvement and delivery of services utilizing these new and emerging mediums. External consultant reviews have occurred within several of the Student Affairs' areas (7.5.4 External Consultant Visits). These reviews provide additional insight into how Stockton incorporates continuous improvement data into its ongoing planning and allocations activities.

In response to the President's transition from episodic personnel reviews to a goals- and responsibility-based performance review, supervisors now review all managers on a yearly basis, systematized with an online Banner Workflow. The first cycle of these performance reviews, coupled with the evidence collected in the Continuous Improvement Inventory (7.5.2), resulted in actions to reallocate staffing talent and resources to better meet the needs of students. The student life areas have recently instituted the process of marketing assessments and Council on the Advancement of Standards reviews for each of their respective areas (7.5.2). These results will be used to provide insight on how to differentiate the College from formidable competitors (7.5.5). This central repository not only makes the assessment activities from all departments more readily available to the Division office for overall analysis, but it also allows managers in each department to look for opportunities to collaborate and/or to apply best practices from one area to another.

There is substantial evidence that the personnel in Student Affairs work diligently to close the loop on the feedback received from various constituent groups to enhance student life. For example, the Campus Hearing Board report from the 2009-2010 academic years reflected a 27 percent increase in the number of cases processed that year (2.1.5). This triggered an administrative response resulting in a reallocation of office space, staff, and fiscal resources dedicated to a pro-active educational approach to campus discipline (rather than a reactive one that had become customary in previous years). This program has been expanded and renamed as the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and is being evaluated this year to assess effectiveness along with the other related service offerings.

Specific reviews of effectiveness measures in Admissions, Financial Aid and Residential Life reveal that each of these areas has a well-integrated, ongoing system of setting goals, allocating resources to support those goals, measuring efforts at achieving the goals and taking action based on those results for each successive cycle of review (7.5.3).

Related Educational Activities

Each manager of related educational activities also uses ongoing, robust assessment practices to set goals, adapt activities, measure effectiveness and use measurement results to plan. Academic Coordinators of these areas formulate annual reports that include both qualitative and quantitative data, augmented with bi-annual NSSE results (7.6.1), and periodic surveys conducted by directors/coordinators of programs that relate to educational activities (e.g., tutoring services, service-learning, the Washington Internship Program, academic internships, continuing/noncredit professional education, etc.). There is evidence to demonstrate that each of these areas uses the results to inform ongoing planning (7.6.2 see reports).

Academic Tutoring Center

The Academic Tutoring Center created an assessment instrument that has been used consistently to measure the effectiveness of tutor training in its core services: writing and mathematics. Program Coordinators have revised programs and services based on internal and external evidence including math and writing lab usage reports for 2009 (7.6.2) and 2010 (7.6.2); five-year trend data (7.6.2); an external reviewer's report in 2008 (7.6.2); and, 2001-2010 data from

NSSE on Tutoring Centers (7.6.2). For example, in response to the growth in demand for tutoring services by students from 2001-2010, Coordinators collaborated with Student Affairs to obtain additional allocations that expanded tutoring to be offered at night in the dorms. Similarly, an earlier response to the demand for professional tutoring to be offered from Academic Affairs resulted in a budget allocation for that service (2.2.1).

Certificate Programs

The College also assesses a series of faculty-directed, credit-bearing, and noncredit Certificate Programs offered on campus and at several additional locations through the School of Graduate and Continuing Studies. The School distributes to participants and maintains articulated learning goals for every program (7.6.3), deploys either the IDEA system (7.6.3) of student ratings or an internally-constructed participant survey of learning goals attainment, and uses the results to prepare instructors for future sessions to plan the content of future programs and to assess the effectiveness of the programs overall (7.6.3). Instructors receive copies of the data for their review and action, and the feedback is discussed with instructors. The data from the surveys also drive the development of new certificate programs for future offerings. For the credit-bearing courses, results of the IDEAs prompt faculty improvements in course delivery and student engagement.

Experiential Learning

Experiential learning at the College encompasses service-learning, fieldwork in education, health care, environmental studies, and internships throughout the curricula. Faculty direct and/or supervise students in a field environment for each of these experiences. Each has learning goals identified for the experience that is supervised, monitored and assessed by faculty. Students' work is evaluated by faculty members and site supervisors and, for credit-bearing internships, grades are assigned when the work is completed. Substantive and valid assessment evidence that exists for the various experiential learning models is included within the program coordinators' reports as well as through the graduate and employer surveys conducted by the Career Center (7.6.4), the Washington Internship program reports that include portfolios and both self- as well as supervisor-surveys (7.6.4). The Service-Learning program also conducted annual surveys and informed its plan for ongoing improvement with these, the NSSE 2001-2010 question K data and an external consultant report (7.6.4). For example, ongoing reviews of service-learning have led to an increase in staffing and funding, expansion of service sites, and faculty/student participation as part of the school-community partnership (7.6.4 Fall 2010 Update). Establishment of the Regional Internship Center of Southern New Jersey in 2010 was supported through internal surveys conducted by the Career Center. Findings have also been used to revise the career and internship fairs at the College, develop internship workshops, and enhance internship counseling sessions with students.

Sara & Sam Schoffer Holocaust Resource Center

One aspect of the College's mission is to serve the southern New Jersey region. The Sara & Sam Schoffer Holocaust Resource Center is a joint project of the College and the Jewish Federation of Atlantic and Cape May counties. This coming together of "town and gown" is a symbiotic

relationship and an example of Stockton's mission, and one of its most distinctive facets. The Holocaust Resource Center was established in 1987 and expanded and renamed the Sara & Sam Schoffer Holocaust Resource Center in 2009. Its mission is to honor the victims of the Holocaust and educate people about the potentially horrific results of prejudice and racism, the basis of continuing genocide.

The Center not only serves Stockton undergraduates and graduate students; it serves the region as a unique resource and is recognized as such nationally and internationally. It has a classroom, educator resource area, and library that includes first-person memoirs of local Holocaust survivors. School children and teachers from around the state come to see films, view the Holocaust survivor portraits with life stories, and tour the display cases filled with artifacts from the Holocaust, even the actual rails from Poland on which trains carried victims to the death camps. Students, teachers and community members can conduct academic research using documents that are unique and authentic. The New Jersey Commission on Holocaust Education reported that The Sara & Sam Schoffer Holocaust Resource Center sponsored more programs for educators, Holocaust survivors, and community members than any Holocaust Resource Center in the state from June 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010.

Additional Locations and Other Instructional Sites

The Carnegie Library Center assesses all of its undergraduate and graduate courses, continuing professional education programming, and special events relevant to the needs of Atlantic City and its surrounding region. The Center uses results from facilities and student preference surveys to prepare an annual director's report that focuses on continuous improvement, aimed specifically at increasing enrollments as well as student, faculty and community guests' satisfaction at the site. The Carnegie director has refined successive surveys (7.6.5) to better understand the Carnegie student: who is willing to take a course away from campus, the location of their residence, and their employment status . The Center has made changes that contribute to student satisfaction with the facility and with security, e.g., installing a coffee machine; relocating the parking lot closer to Carnegie, installing additional lighting in the parking lots, and initiating the practice of escorting students to their vehicles (7.6.5 Focus Group).

Stockton-Hammonton is an instructional site under development; a small number of courses were first offered in temporary space during the Fall semester of 2009. At present, four courses are offered at St. Joseph's high school, located near the site while renovations are under way for an education center. The courses offered at the temporary site are subject to the same assessment process as courses delivered at the main campus. Assessment of potential uses for the facility is currently occurring indirectly through the Community Interest Survey. As this site develops, assessment processes will be added and refined. The Web site for Stockton-Hammonton contains information regarding Federal funds awarded to this site and a copy of the Community Interest Survey (7.6.5).

Collectively, the evidence indicates that the distance education (DE) program (7.6.6 DE Web site) has created a structure for ongoing program assessment that informs pedagogy in this particular area as a supplement to all of the course, program and School assessment that already occurs. Analysis of assessment results led to the Distance Education orientation for students

(7.6.6), which was piloted in the Fall semester 2010, and to faculty development opportunities e.g., ASDE summer program, sessions on DE at Technology Bootcamp, and workshops on best practices in DE for new faculty through the Institute for Faculty Development. Evaluations for the latter led to the incorporation of more examples of Distance Education pedagogy in the workshop curriculum. In addition, the DE program piloted a student survey in the summer 2010. The results of this survey led to meaningful changes to the instrument; the revised version of the survey was piloted a second time at the end of the Fall semester 2010. Finally, following the recommendation of the Distributed Education Task Force (7.6.6), the Distance Education Advisory Board was formed in the Fall of 2010. The mission of this group is to improve all aspects of distance teaching and learning at Stockton.

The Distance Education program at Stockton is following best practices in teaching and learning as provided by the Sloan Consortium and Middle States' recommendations. The Distance Education program has made a concerted effort to expand faculty knowledge and adopt best practices. As a result of these efforts, faculty who teach DE courses can receive institutional support for developing or enhancing courses that meet the needs of a growing proportion of Stockton students. Reflection on evaluations of the program has generated increased technology support and program outreach to both students and faculty. From the Faculty Assembly's "A Vision Report" 2007, to its "Need for a Consistent Policy," to its current ASDE program, the evidence illustrates that faculty and administration at Stockton are engaged in continuous improvement in this important type of related educational programming (7.6.6 Faculty Assembly Task Force and Reports on Distance Education).

Contractual Relationships and Affiliated Providers

The Southern Regional Institute and Educational Technology and Training Center (SRI & ETTC) provide and continuously assess nearly 600 workshops and activities each year to pre-K-12 educators from across the state of New Jersey. The Executive Director and faculty use assessment results to determine the effectiveness of instructors; the relevance of the workshop topics and materials for the intended audience; additional support that may be required by the K-12 community; and, future program offerings (7.6.7).

The College offers and assesses noncredit online courses through *JER Online*, provider of accredited.edu and corporate developed online courses and certificates. The courses are assessed through an online program evaluation developed and administered by the educational partner/vendor at the completion of each course. The primary data collected reflects student satisfaction. The documentation/evidence from the surveys is owned by the vendor (7.6.7 Continuing Education Courses with JER).

After incorporating the Study Abroad assessment in the Fall 2010 semester, the Study Abroad program became a formal component of the College's initiative with the American Council on Education's [ACE] internationalization throughout the curriculum project. As part of this ACE Internationalization Laboratory, a committee is working on assessing all aspects of international courses, and the Study Abroad program, offered at Stockton (7.6.7).

Finally, the College has continuously sought ways to better manage auxiliary services such as off-campus housing, the Seaview property, shuttle bus transportation, food services, beverage/vending and bookstore/retail operations. The Stockton Affiliated Services, Incorporated (SASI) 501(c)3 was formed in 2008 to handle these contracts on behalf of the College. SASI has received unqualified clean audits, convenes a public Board of Directors' meeting and regularly assesses its own effectiveness through the feedback it receives from all stakeholders (7.6.7).

Student Learning Outcomes in Academic Programs

Stockton faculty have been actively engaged for more than a decade in an ongoing process of assessment, reflection, and meaningful action tied to the institutional mission that continues to improve in its systematic, useful and cost-effective approach to measuring the effectiveness of student learning outcomes. Moreover, all programs across the campus have gone beyond merely collecting and analyzing assessment data concerning effectiveness, having not only used the results to inform decisions and to improve effectiveness, but also to improve the assessment mechanisms themselves (7.8.2).

Assessment activities occur at all levels – course, program, School, and College. All faculty members participate in course-level assessment. A course syllabus must clearly reflect the learning objectives and direct measures used to evaluate student performance. Syllabi for every course section are filed in the respective school offices. Faculty also identify specific IDEA objectives so that they may weigh indirect evidence from student ratings in accordance with faculty intention to emphasize a particular objective. Both full and part time faculty members in all career stages identify and assess instructional objectives for nearly every course during every semester. Faculty members use these indirect measures alongside the direct in-class assessments of learning outcomes that vary by course: portfolio, exams, final projects, presentations, research papers, etc. Faculty members may meet with their deans, mentors and the Institute for Faculty Development Director to analyze their IDEA results, and generally update their syllabi based on these results. Those on tenure track also use these analyses to update their Professional Development plans. The effectiveness of course-level assessment is also assessed every year through a series of workshops and seminars that the Director of the Institute for Faculty Development organizes, based on data from IDEA, consultations with faculty members and custom reports created for faculty groups who teach related courses. The Institute for Faculty Development informs faculty about best practices for using feedback from students to improve teaching. An example of formative assessment includes a strong recommendation to have faculty engage in midterm evaluations as an avenue to improving end-of-term evaluations.

Program Coordinators work with their faculty teams to document assessment in their annual reports (7.7.5), in their five-year program reviews (7.7.4), in the *Evidence* newsletter (7.7.6), on the Institute for Faculty Development Web site and on the Institutional Effectiveness Web site (7.7.2). The evolution in refining these processes follows a progression that became systematized with the appointment of the first Assessment Coordinator in 2002 and the creation of the Faculty Development Assessment Institute (for full and part time faculty), which has clearly left its mark on the program review process. Prior to the 2007 PRR, program reviews (for those programs not already required to meet external assessment standards that had been

doing so since their founding), began including program-wide assessment plans that include learning objectives, direct and indirect measures of student progress and action plans based on results.

Schools vary in their approaches to planning for improvement based on assessment results. Schools with external licensing (7.7.7) or accreditation standards (e.g., Health Sciences, Social & Behavioral Sciences and Education, whose programs include MACJ, OCTH, NURS, PHTH, SOWK, SPAD, and EDUC) have very robust program and student assessment measures that the Deans review (7.7.8). Additionally, the School of Business is in the process of applying for AACSB accreditation. Deans from Arts & Humanities, General Studies and Natural Sciences have been working in conjunction with the Director of the Institute for Faculty Development, to incorporate learning assessment results from multiple programs into action plans for their respective schools. Most notably, the School of General Studies has brought what began as a sweeping review of its interdisciplinary minors and its "G" core courses (see Chapter Four) to a fully mature, completely cross-informational system of regular student learning outcomes assessment (12.2.3 Assessment). The general studies pilot completed in February 2010 indicated that students' critical thinking skills decline as they progress through their undergraduate degree. This is consistent with national CLA results. Consequently, in Spring 2012 there will be a roll out of a general education assessment pilot that focuses on informal logic/critical thinking and on student capabilities to write about their analysis.

The overall institutional Division of Academic Affairs has translated all of these systematic approaches to ongoing assessment of learning outcomes into two draft templates for use by the academic programs in their annual coordinators' reports (7.7.5) and their five-year review studies (7.7.4). The templates are the basis of standardized electronic, rather than hard copy, documents allowing for easy access, search, and data mining. After the Self-Study team reviewed the archive of program reviews, it was clear that this standardization was very much needed. This is a very positive step forward that illustrates how the institutional level of learning outcomes assessment has matured during this past decade. Similarly, the overall institutional Division of Student Affairs has implemented an ongoing, loop-closing system of publishing all student learning assessment measures, results and action plans using Sedona's Assurance of Learning (7.5.3).

At the institutional level, the College employs a variety of assessment tools and strategies. These include regular, sustained participation in the CLA (Collegiate Learning Assessment), NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement), iSkills (information literacy) and IDEA (Individual Development and Educational Assessment). Having gone well beyond the point of simply participating in these nationally-normed assessment measures, stakeholders throughout every Division of the College make regular and informed use of these results for continuous improvement. For example, IDEA data is analyzed at all levels – course, program, School, and College, integrating results into faculty development plans, program improvement goals and School or Division-wide results on items of general interest such as lab-courses, distance learning courses, freshman courses, courses taught by particular rank/career stage faculty, etc.

NSSE and CLA results (7.7.3) are published not only by faculty-authored articles in *Evidence* but also discussed and disseminated in Faculty Assembly meetings, program faculty meetings,

Deans' Council meetings and most broadly, through the VSA (Voluntary System of Accountability) Web site. Every stakeholder at all levels of the College invests time and planning into making effective use of these results. Recent projects include participation in the Spencer *Learning to Improve* study that focused on Stockton's slow but steady increases in the NSSE areas of Active and Collaborative Learning, results of which were based completely on solid institutional effective practices (7.7.9). In addition, the comprehensive Writing Program Five-Year Self-Study Review incorporated not only direct measures from the program courses, but also from the four years' worth of CLA results that the Institutional Research Office and the Institute for Faculty Development have been analyzing together (7.7.3).

In 2009, a College-wide student exit survey was created and administered as an indirect measure of student satisfaction and learning. The results were presented in Deans Council for individual schools to reflect on and address. Similarly, the Career Center has been collaborating with Academic Affairs and with the Alumni Office to streamline its annual exit surveys, results of which are published to the Voluntary System of Accountability and shared with all of those offices for ongoing improvement (7.7.3).

As the College continues to assess and identify areas for improvement, the new SedonaWeb system will be a great asset to Schools and Divisions, providing the mechanism for instant feedback and dissemination of best practices. Institutional effectiveness is only achieved when all programs and Schools can assess, share, learn, and implement change efficiently and then pass those data on to other Schools and Divisions. Schools and Divisions must be connected; without data from the Schools, the Divisions are not able to provide students with adequate non-academic resources. Without data from the Divisions, Schools are not able to make the academic student a well-supported student. Easy access to qualitative information at all levels of assessment is crucial for every program, School and Division.

Integrating Planning

From the 2007 PRR to this Self-Study, Stockton's President has led institution-wide divisional planning where annual Program Assessment Reviews precede each institutional allocation cycle. These plans have coincided with the last few years of Vision 2010, the former strategic plan, passed on to President Saatkamp from the late President Vera King Farris. Even as Vision 2010 teams were delivering final projects that included a stronger freshman seminar program, new graduate programs, new technology support programs and increased capacity for growth from both additional personnel and facilities, the President was also responding to suggestions from the 2002 Visiting Team report and the PRR to address critical facilities shortages by commissioning a comprehensive master plan.

Building on this foundation, the College has now aligned all of its planning activities within the central organizing framework of its strategic planning system: the Balanced Scorecard® approach. This approach integrates annual operational plans to Stockton 2020 strategic themes (2.1.3), as well as incorporates planning across all units of the College. Divisional Vice Presidents and Chief Officers collaborate with the President to develop plans that make more efficient use of scarce resources, that leverage the expertise of respective Divisional capacity, and that will impact the College far into the future.

Integrated planning is described in more detail in Chapter Two of this report on Planning, Resource Allocations and Administration. The first of the new Five Year Academic Program Reviews is an excellent example of how the College is beginning to tie cyclical assessment processes into strategic. Women's, Gender, & Sexuality Studies (7.8.3) is an excellent example of the power of these Five Year Academic Reviews. Most importantly, the integrated planning approach relies heavily on the continuous improvement cycle of planning, implementing, measuring results and taking action based on those results. In addition to its integrated annual and strategic planning processes, the College also maintains Dashboard Indicators (7.8.1) and a comprehensive institutional effectiveness Web site that illustrates the continuous improvement efforts on mission-specific, vision-specific and Division-specific objectives (7.8.2).

Looking Forward…

Stockton College is focused on providing an exceptional experience for students. In order to maintain these high standards, every aspect of the institution undergoes regular assessment. From Student Services to Administration & Finance, the College offices allocate time to plan, implement, measure and assess programs and initiatives. The College will continue to implement the Stockton 2020 Vision throughout its daily operations. In the next five to 10 years, the faculty and staff evaluation process will be assessed, the Deans and Provost will continue to be evaluated, and the effectiveness of each office, campus-wide, will be studied. Stockton is committed to bringing traditions of the past 40 years well into the future.