

Report to the
Faculty, Administration, Trustees, and Students

of

Kean University

Union, NJ

By

A Team Representing the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Prepared After a Visit to
the Campus on
September 13 – 14, 2012

The Members of the Team:

Dr. Stephen Sweeny, MSCHE Commissioner and President Emeritus
College of New Rochelle
New Rochelle, New York

Ms. Patricia McGuire, President
Trinity Washington University
Washington, DC

Dr. Patricia Francis, Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment & Effectiveness
SUNY College at Oneonta
Oneonta, New York

Dr. Kathryn Doherty, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
Morgan State University
Baltimore, Maryland

Working with the Team:

Dr. Elizabeth H. Sibolski, President, Middle States Commission on Higher Education
Dr. Debra G. Klinman, Vice President, Middle States Commission on Higher Education
Dr. Glenn Lang, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of the NJ Secretary of Higher
Education

INTRODUCTION

The team offers its sincere appreciation to Kean University for hosting this follow-up visit. The team notes that considerable effort went into the production of the monitoring report and in responding to Third Party Comment, and we thank the members of the Kean community for their commitment to the processes of self-appraisal and self improvement.

The materials which Kean submitted, the findings of this visiting team, and Kean's formal institutional response will all become part of a multi-level review process by the Commission. Next steps will be deliberated by the Committee on Follow-Up, and the full Commission will take action at its meeting on November 15, 2012.

At the outset of this report, the team recognizes the vital importance of the mission of Kean University to the world of higher education and the society around it. The team was deeply impressed by the degree of passion for the mission expressed by so many members of the community. The team found a serious understanding that the driving force at Kean is the contract that exists between this community and the students who partner with it for their education.

REASONS FOR THE VISIT

Kean University underwent self-study in 2010 - 2011. Peer evaluators visited the institution and submitted a report to Kean, and the institution prepared its institutional response. These materials were considered by the Committee on Evaluation Reports and by the Commission at their June 2011 meetings.

On June 23, 2011, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education warned Kean that its accreditation may be in jeopardy because of insufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment) and Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning). The institution submitted a monitoring report on March 1, 2012 and hosted a small team visit on April 12 – 13, 2012. The small team report and Kean's institutional response were considered by the Committee on Follow-Up and the full Commission, which acted as follows on June 28, 2012:

To accept the monitoring report and to note the visit by the Commission's representatives. To place the institution on probation because of a lack of evidence that it is currently in compliance with Standard 6 (Integrity), Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment), Standard 12 (General Education), and Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning). To note that the institution remains accredited while on probation. To request a monitoring report, due September 1, 2012, providing documented evidence that the institution has achieved and can sustain compliance with Standard 6 (Integrity), Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment), Standard 12 (General Education), and Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning). To request that the monitoring report include, but not be limited to,

evidence of the development and implementation of (1) procedures to ensure that factual information about the institution, including Middle States Commission on Higher Education team reports and Commission actions, are accurately reported and are made available to the institution's community (Standard 6); (2) an organized and sustainable institutional assessment process that (a) includes direct measures that clearly and purposefully relate to the goals they are assessing, (b) is used to evaluate, improve, and gain efficiencies in all programs, services, and processes, and (c) informs decision-making about institutional planning and resource allocation (Standard 7); (3) a coherent program of general education that (a) incorporates the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives in a manner consistent with institutional mission, (b) specifies clearly articulated general education outcomes that are assessed in an organized, systematic, and sustainable manner, consistent with the institution's overall plan for assessing student learning, and (c) provides assessment results that are utilized for curricular improvement (Standard 12); and (4) an organized, systematic, and sustainable process to assess the achievement of student learning goals in all programs that foster student learning and development, and that (a) includes direct measures that are clearly related to the goals they are assessing, (b) provides sufficient, convincing evidence that students are achieving key learning outcomes, (c) uses results to improve teaching and learning, and (d) uses student learning assessment results as part of institutional assessment (Standard 14). To remind the institution that the monitoring report, due September 1, 2012, should also provide evidence of (5) the equitable and consistent treatment of constituencies in the application of academic requirements and policies, administrative review, and institutional governance and management; (6) an institutional climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration; and (7) the periodic assessment of integrity evidenced in institutional policies, processes, practices, and the manner in which these are implemented (Standard 6). A small team visit will follow submission of the monitoring report. To remind the institution of its obligation to inform the Commission about any and all significant developments related to compliance with MSCHE requirements of affiliation and standards of accreditation. The due date for the next Periodic Review Report will be established when accreditation is reaffirmed.

In addition, on February 16, 2012 and again on June 30, 2012, MSCHE received and reviewed extensive Third Party Comment about Kean University. Following MSCHE procedure on Third Party Comment, on March 6, 2012 the institution was asked to respond to comments related to Standard 4 (Leadership and Governance), Standard 5 (Administration), Standard 6 (Integrity), and the MSCHE policy on Political Interference. On July 27, 2012 the institution was asked to address further comments about Standard 4 (Leadership and Governance) and Standard 6 (Integrity); in addition, the institution was asked to address comments relevant to Standard 10 (Faculty) and Standard 13 (Related Educational Activities). These comments included multiple references to two additional documents which the University shared with MSCHE: the Report of Special Counsel (February 3, 2012) and the NCAA Infractions Report (April 19, 2012). Included within

the purview of this small team visit is the peer review of all documentation relevant to the institution's written response to the issues raised through Third Party Comment.

The team reminds the institution that, in accordance with federal regulations, Kean's accreditation must be reaffirmed within two calendar years of the date when its warning was first issued (i.e., no later than June 2013). MSCHE sets the dates for reports and institutional visits to accommodate this federal time frame, and to allow time for institutional due process and for the deliberation of peer evaluators, appropriate Committees, and the full Commission.

CONDUCT OF THE VISIT

During their visit, the small team met with a number of individuals and groups, selected by the team either by role and responsibility in the institution or by random selection. The schedule of the visit and names of the participants are appended to this report.

TEAM FINDINGS

Standard 6 (Integrity)

Kean University meets this standard.

Observations:

Kean University is an institution in the midst of dynamic transformation. The team heard significant pride in and support for the institutional mission in meetings with many different leaders and constituents. The care and concern for students, which is the heart of the purpose of accreditation, was clearly evident in the team's discussions and review of materials.

At the same time, the team observed that specific changes resulting from broad institutional transformation have posed conflict and struggles for Kean that are not easy to resolve and will require continuing earnest collaboration across and among all constituencies.

In every meeting, the team heard expressions of appreciation for the Middle States' process that helped Kean University achieve greater clarity of its institutional approach to issues of assessment and integrity.

The team examined the evidence of the institutional response to third party concerns about breaches of institutional integrity. The team was satisfied that the evidence presented addressed the concerns expressed and meets the institutional integrity standard.

The team probed the Board's understanding of its responsibility for establishing a clear tone of the highest commitment to institutional integrity. The team was satisfied the Board understands its responsibility and is able to demonstrate such commitment. In the same way, through interviews and an examination of the evidence, the team probed the understanding and ability of the institution's executive leadership --- president, chief academic officer, executive vice president for operations, faculty senate executive officers --- to establish a clear tone for the highest commitment to institutional integrity. The team was satisfied that the executive leadership has demonstrated such commitment.

The team examined the specific issues that the Commission asked Kean to address.

The Commission asked Kean to present evidence of the "development and implementation of procedures to ensure that factual information about the institution, including MSCHE team reports and Commission actions, are accurately reported and are made available to the institution's community...."

The team found that Kean was responsive to this request. The institution's website now includes comprehensive and accurate information on accreditation and assessment.

The Commission asked Kean to present evidence of "the equitable and consistent treatment of constituencies in the application of academic requirements and policies, administrative review, and institutional governance and management."

Through review of the evidence and interviews, the team is satisfied that Kean meets this fundamental element.

The Commission asked Kean to present evidence of "an institutional climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff and administration."

The team is satisfied that Kean presented this evidence. The team believes that the Board's commitment to a series of meetings with campus constituencies communicates a level of respect for each constituency that helps to build trust and confidence in the campus community and the institution's leadership.

The Commission asked Kean to present evidence of "the periodic assessment of integrity evidenced in institutional policies, processes, practices and the manner in which they are implemented."

The team is satisfied that the board, executive team and faculty senate engage in the routine work of policy review and review of the results of policy applications.

In the course of reviewing documents and evidence for this visit, the team found references to the university's programs at the Raritan Valley campus, but that location does not appear in the university's Middle States institutional profile. Kean has

acknowledged the omission and is poised to contact the Middle States liaison to amend the IP.

Significant Accomplishments

The team commends the Kean University community for the quality and thoroughness of the Monitoring Report and report on the third party comments.

The Kean Board of Trustees has demonstrated clear understanding of its responsibility to exert leadership to ensure integrity throughout the campus.

The administration and faculty, through collaboration on the UPC and through other processes, have demonstrated the ability to collaborate effectively on planning and assessment.

The enactment of the Academic Integrity policy demonstrates clear understanding of appropriate roles and responsibilities of the board, executive leadership and faculty to protect the integrity of the institution.

Recommendations

Even as the team recognizes the good effects of the Board's engagement with the campus community at the present time, the team recommends that the board review regularly the balance among roles and relationships --- board, president, faculty, staff, students and the structures and processes through which they participate in governance.

Kean's president, board members, administrative and faculty leaders spoke eloquently about the students of Kean and the importance of institutional transformation in sustaining mission. The team recommends that the leaders of each constituency and among constituencies should find ways to articulate the shared vision about mission more frequently and broadly across the institution.

Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment)

Kean University meets this standard.

Kean University uses a process for institutional assessment that begins with the university mission and strategic goals and is based on the assessment of student learning outcomes and the assessment of non-academic programs and administrative units. The institutional assessment process incorporates assessment from the unit level up to the President and Board of Trustees, who review assessment results and reports. The process for assessing student learning outcomes is discussed in this report under Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning).

The 2011-2012 academic year was the first year of Kean University's Institutional Assessment System. The system was developed and implemented through the participation of all administrative and academic units, all school and college deans, and all vice presidents, and was designed in response to Middle States requirements for a systematic and sustainable assessment process using direct measures of assessment to evaluate, improve and gain efficiencies, and to inform decision-making for institutional planning and resource allocation. The University Planning Council, composed of representatives from a broad range of institutional stakeholders, reviews assessment results and reports submitted through each Vice President. The Council, using a pool of money allocated through the President, aligns resource and budget requests submitted through the assessment reporting process with strategic goals and priorities, rates each request based on its relevance to these strategic goals, and send a synthesis of this alignment to the President for recommendation and action, in consultation with the Board.

A review of the evidence for institutional assessment submitted in Kean University's September 1, 2012, Monitoring Report shows 1) a summary of Division assessment results, budget priorities and requests based on those results, 2) the alignment of these results to strategic goals, and 3) the University Planning Council rating of each request. The Council will also be responsible for the University Scorecard, which, although not yet developed or implemented, will use institutional goals and priorities and a series of indicators measuring the accomplishment of those goals to track University progress on key initiatives. Goals and indicators developed as part of the new Strategic Plan for the University (2013-2020) will be linked to this Scorecard and data/results used in institutional assessment and planning/resource allocation decisions.

To sustain the Institutional Assessment process and demonstrate University commitment to assessment, a new Director for Assessment and Accreditation, with strong assessment and evaluation skills and experience, was hired in June 2012, to direct and supervise the University's assessment plan and process. A new Associate Vice President was also recently hired to oversee academic assessment and collaborate closely with the Accreditation and Assessment Director/staff. The use of CampusLabs, an assessment data collection and tracking system, by the Division of Student Affairs is identified as further supporting the sustainability of institutional assessment by providing an

infrastructure for standardized collection of assessment data and results for the Division. The Office of Accreditation and Assessment oversees the institutional assessment process.

As of June 2012, 49 administrative units at the University had submitted an Assessment Report, and, with the addition of four new units, 53 are scheduled to submit in the coming academic year. A selection of examples in the Monitoring Report from the 2011-2012 administrative unit reports shows a listing of goals and a timeline for assessing those goals, identification of measures, summary of results, and notes on actions taken in response to those results. A more complete listing is available on the university website. Data and results seem largely limited to counts of transactions and activities, numbers of participants, student/staff satisfaction data, and item/service costs. Results look at increases in percent participating or served, percent satisfied or not, increase/decrease in costs, increase/decrease in incident reports, and comparison among these results across multiple semesters or years, in some cases. Actions taken seem closely linked to results in most cases and relate, for the most part, to increases in services provided, or increase in staff or program funding. Only one case presented (Premiere Stages) seeks to assess something other than increase/decrease in numbers/participants, funding, or activities and, instead, looks at assessing the impact of the project on the campus, the quality of the production, and the benefit of the collaborations and partnerships developed. However, again, the unit provides no discussion of the tools used to assess this impact, although results and action steps are provided.

It is clear from the Monitoring Report, and from interviews and discussions during the small team visit, that Kean University has developed a systematic and potentially sustainable process for institutional assessment. There is a plan in place to continue the system next year, as well as an organizational structure in place to oversee this process. However, the team has some concern with the depth of the assessment measures and the extent to which these measures rely on simply counting participants and activities, rather than looking at overall programmatic goals and impact using multiple methods of direct and indirect assessment. The very newness of this process leads to additional concern over its sustainability across time.

Significant Accomplishments

The visiting team commends Kean University for the incorporation of its University Planning Council into the institutional assessment system and for the charge to the Council to review and utilize assessment data for program improvement, decision making and resource allocation. The Council serves as an excellent two way conduit between the divisions and the university leadership.

The team commends the work of the Office of Accreditation and Assessment for its herculean efforts to jump start the institutional assessment process across campus in the short turnaround time required by the submission of a September 1, 2012, monitoring report.

Suggestions

The team suggests that Kean University ensure that each non-academic unit identifies an assessment coordinator within the existing staff to be responsible for the coordinated assessment of institutional effectiveness.

Recommendations

The team recommends that administrative units develop and assess broader programmatic outcomes than a simple increase in participants, services provided/offered, and/or funding, and—in conjunction with the University Planning Council, the Office of Accreditation and Assessment, the leadership team, and faculty/staff—identify, assess, and analyze administrative unit outcomes using substantive and direct measures to assess the broader outcomes of these units in terms of impact, shared learning outcomes, and overarching goals related to mission and vision.

The team recommends that the University Planning Council develop and implement a written procedure and set of guidelines structuring its review of assessment data to prioritize and allocate resources into a systematic and sustainable process embedded in the strategic plan of the institution.

Standard 12 (General Education)

Kean University meets this standard.

Since Spring 2011, Kean University has revised its General Education program in a number of ways, including the integration of the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives in 100% of its course offerings; inclusion of student learning outcomes (SLOs) in all general education courses; development of a schedule for assessing general education SLOs at multiple points in a student's academic career; and generating assessment data that demonstrate student achievement of SLOs and that are used to improve teaching and learning.

Positive actions taken by the institution toward strengthening its General Education curriculum (GE) are hiring an Executive Director to lead GE efforts, officially housing General Education in the School of General Studies, hiring eight full-time lecturers to teach in the program, and assigning responsibility for the GE curriculum to the faculty-led GE Committee. Efforts to strengthen its assessment of general education include linking the School of General Studies to the Office of Accreditation and Assessment, completing the work on the General Education SLOs on the institutional level, and training adjunct and full-time faculty to conduct assessments (e.g., AACU rubric training).

General Education student learning outcomes at Kean University are assessed on a three-year cycle that involves development of general education program student learning outcomes, assessing those outcomes at the course level in all degree programs, documenting results, and using results to improve and sustain student learning. A full-time General Education Director coordinates this assessment process through the School of General Education (created in 2009) and across disciplines and majors. A faculty-led General Education committee (composed of elected voting representatives from all areas that involved General Education) oversees the general education program and is charged with ensuring a quality education experience for Kean students. Eight full-time lecturers work with thirty general education mentors to develop and administer assessment tools in general education courses, and an ongoing adjunct and full-time faculty development program provides training on assessment and rubric norming.

The School of General Studies partners with student support services and academic areas to assess both academic and non-academic outcomes related to retention and student success. External instruments and benchmarks have been used as part of this assessment process, including the Civic Engagement Benchmark Survey, the VALUE rubric for Civic Engagement (AAC&U), AlcoholEdu.com, and an A-TEAM model of mandatory academic support. In 2010, the School of General Studies, the Office of Accreditation and Assessment, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and representatives from faculty and student affairs worked together to develop a specific mission and 14 student learning outcomes for the General Education program that were aligned with the University's student learning outcomes. Direct and indirect measures of assessment have been used, and action/assessment plans were developed for each general education student learning outcome. In addition, the General Education Committee focuses on teaching, learning, and assessment when reviewing general education courses for approval.

Assessment methods for general education student learning outcomes at Kean are a mix of indirect measures (surveys and grade distributions) and direct measures (competency-based rubrics, embedded exam questions, portfolio review, standardized testing, and pre/post testing). The General Education assessment plan includes the annual assessment of general education foundation courses and the periodic assessment of general education distribution and capstone courses in conjunction with Kean's program review process.

According to the assessment schedule, all programs will undergo program review by 2014, after which time the School of General Studies plans to undertake a revision of the General Education program following the University Faculty Senate guidelines. There is initial evidence that assessment results are reviewed and utilized by the University Planning Council during its budget allocation process. Examples of the use of assessment data for budget and resource allocation include the hiring of a Writing Center director based on standardized testing results in written communication skills; and the creation of a common online platform for teaching, learning and assessment for General Education math courses integrated with the Accuplacer Diagnostic Test.

The Monitoring Report makes reference to a number of assessments of General Education SLOs that utilize both direct and indirect measures. Examples of assessments described in the report's narrative include:

- The Civic Engagement Benchmark survey to be administered in Fall 2012, “using the VALUE rubric for Civic Engagement from AACU”
- Completion of the AlcoholEdu.com program to assess personal responsibility
- The use of clickers by students for formative and summative assessment
- Use of VALUE rubrics to assess Values, Ethics, and Diversity SLOs
- Use of the College Success Factors Index to assess personal responsibility
- Administration of the AACU Civic Engagement and Life-long Learning rubrics and the Defining Issues Test in Fall 2012
- Survey results indicating that Kean students rank above the national average for personal responsibility
- 15,000 hours of community service
- Student reports that they increased their understanding of Western Literature using Likert scale surveys

Most of these examples do not represent direct measures of student learning. Further, information in the Monitoring Report suggests that there may be some confusion about what constitutes appropriate assessment of student learning of General Education outcomes. For instance, the September 2012 Monitoring Report makes references to using pre- and post-class student and faculty surveys and grade distributions “since 2002” in assessing GE foundation courses. In addition, the example above regarding students increased understanding of Western Literature using self-report is cited as an example of “assessments of knowledge.”

Appendix 12-4 provides a summary of all GE SLO assessments during 2011-12 and indicates that many courses did rely on direct assessments of SLOs during that time. It is notable, however, that frequently the description of the measures and criteria reported in Appendix 12-4 are vague. While it is acceptable to state that multiple choice questions are being used to assess a particular SLO, it is important for the reader to know the mechanisms through which those questions were mapped to the SLO, especially for more complex outcomes (e.g., “applying the scientific method to understand natural concepts and processes”). Similarly for many courses assessment results are not described in sufficient detail to determine whether or not the actions taken were appropriate (i.e., data based).

On a related point, many of the actions taken do not relate to revisions made to courses or teaching, but rather to changes that will be made to the assessment strategies themselves. Or, there were a number of references to assessment data indicating the need for change in the Writing Center or Speech Lab, but minimal discussion linking assessment results to courses or instruction. The most valuable information yielded by effective assessment is that which identifies areas of student performance that require improvement and that points to specific curriculum or pedagogical changes that are enacted to enhance that

performance. There is very little evidence of this kind of “closing the loop” in either the Monitoring Report or Appendix 12-4.

There are pockets of more meaningful assessment activity reflected in Appendix 12-4, including:

- Examination questions in science courses indicating students could articulate examples of observations but were less able to clarify between hypotheses and theory
- Assessments of student writing indicating need for greater historical analysis and more chronological comparison, using portfolios
- Assessment for quantitative reasoning are better at Arithmetic than Algebra, leading to redesign of math courses
- Using AACU rubrics to assess Critical Thinking and the use of SAILS to assess Information Literacy

In particular, the assessment data produced for Writing and Oral Communication appear to yield relatively more useful information, in large part because the assessment approach relies on more specific, discrete SLOs, making it possible to discern patterns of strength and weakness in student performance. The institution would benefit by highlighting these examples of better assessment practice and using them as prototypes for other areas.

Significant Accomplishments

The visiting team commends Kean University for involving adjunct faculty so extensively in its efforts to revise and assess its General Education program and for providing high levels of training and support in its implementation of the program.

Suggestion

The visiting team suggests that Kean University publicize examples of good General Education assessment practice and encourage other areas to adopt those strategies and approaches.

Recommendation

The visiting team recommends that Kean University place priority on the development of direct assessment measures for all of its General Education SLOs, and systematically align this assessment with the overall assessment of Student Learning Outcomes as addressed in the Standard 14 section of this report.

Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning)

Kean University meets this standard.

Kean University is currently completing its first full cycle of the assessment of student learning using a systematic and potentially sustainable process that links student learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional level to curriculum mapping, improvement, and resource allocation. At the graduate level, student learning outcomes are linked to University outcomes and, at the undergraduate level, also to general education outcomes. Each department and/or program is required to collect, analyze and use for improvement data and information about student achievement on identified student learning outcomes related to the major and the degree. Academic program review is also a part of Kean's new assessment of student learning process and academic year 2011-2012 was the pilot year for program review. A Faculty Senate task force was charged with reviewing the pilot process and provided recommendations to both the overall Senate and then to the Board of Trustees, from whom action on the process is awaited. There is a separate process for the assessment of general education outcomes (see discussion under "Standard 12"), which is also used to assess student learning outcomes at the institutional level.

A review of information and evidence provided in the Monitoring Report point to the University's meeting the requirements of Middle States Standard 14 Assessment of Student Learning. The majority of academic departments and programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels have developed and implemented standardized assessment of student learning using both direct and indirect measures of assessment and making a good faith effort at utilizing these data and results for resource allocation, decision making, and improvement of student learning. A comprehensive curriculum mapping project was undertaken in developing and implementing the assessment process at Kean and syllabi review and oversight to align course outcomes with program outcomes and to include that information on each syllabus. Faculty and staff interviewed during the small team visit used a common language of assessment that spoke to a fundamental understanding of the assessment of student learning outcomes and the use of assessment results to improve teaching and learning.

Evidence of direct measures in assessing student learning outcomes at the course and program level at Kean University include the use of capstone courses and projects, evaluation rubrics, embedded exam questions, portfolio review with rubric, and oral presentation assessment with rubric. The Monitoring Report and Assessment webpage both contain assessment results summarizing evidence of student achievement of learning outcomes. Selected programs are presented in the 9/1 report; however, results from all programs are available electronically for review. A survey of faculty to collect feedback on the assessment process found 98% of faculty responding to the survey strongly agreed or agreed that assessment is an important part of their work, while 80% said that they understood the University's system for assessment of student learning and 70% said that they played an important role in completing the department assessment report. Extensive faculty development (workshops, assessment days, and one-on-one trainings) has

supported the integration of assessment throughout the institution and the development of a strong foundation for a sustainable culture of assessment.

At the point of the team visit, there is clear evidence that a structure for the new assessment process has been completed and evidence that the University has committed resources to sustaining this system through commitment of staff and resources. Organizationally, the hire of a new, permanent Director for the Office of Accreditation and Assessment, who brings significant experience and expertise in assessment and evaluation to the position, suggests a new commitment to continuity and best practice in the assessment of student learning, as does the hire of an equally experienced Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs charged with leading the assessment of student learning outcomes. Additionally, the requirement that all academic departments and programs report on and utilize assessment data to inform decision-making and justify resource allocation also provides evidence of the University's commitment to the process. The use of rubrics and performance based projects to assess student learning point to a new understanding of direct measures and evidence of student learning compared with past reports that present grades and survey data as the only evidence of student learning provided.

Significant Accomplishments

The visiting team recognizes the significant accomplishment of Kean University to develop and implement, within a very short timeframe, a systematic, and potentially sustainable, process for assessing student learning outcomes at the course, department and institutional levels that engages faculty, provides institutional support and review, and supports decision making and resource allocation at each level of the university.

Suggestions

The visiting team suggests that Kean University develop and maintain an ongoing system for faculty development on key topics in assessment of student learning outcomes to support faculty work in this area and to more effectively build and sustain a culture of assessment across the campus.

CONCLUSION

The visiting team encountered in the course of our visit an acknowledgment from all constituencies that the Middle States reporting process has had some salutary, albeit painful, effects for the institution. The team appreciates the sentiment and finds it to be an important foundation for the work already achieved and for the results yet to be realized.

The team expresses a profound interest in the sustainability of the work that we have verified on this visit. We look forward to the continued expansion and development of these successful directions for Kean.