



## Results of the 2023-24 Academic Program Assessment Reports

*Prepared by the Office of Educational Effectiveness, July 2025*

---

### Introduction

This report provides a summary of the quantity and quality of academic program assessment reports (APARs) received during the 2023-24 assessment cycle. Reports were collected by the [Office of Educational Effectiveness](#) (OEE) from all active, non-accredited academic programs, in keeping with the [SBU Academic Program Assessment Policy](#). The [SBU Assessment Council](#) reviewed the reports using a standardized rubric to provide qualitative and formative feedback. The OEE then analyzed the Council's rubric results and comments to identify themes and quantify institutional progress on report quality.

### Summary of Findings

A total of 192 APARs were reviewed by the Council. This represents 95% of the reports required to be submitted, supplemented by some optional reports and unsubmitted draft reports. Of the reports reviewed, 99% of reports were considered "Exemplary" (66.2%) or "Acceptable" (32.8%) according to the rubric. Most prevalent APAR strengths based on average component rubric scores included the assessment location, actions/improvements, and program goals. Most prevalent areas for improvement based on average component rubric scores included measurability of program learning objectives (PLOs), alignment of assessment methods to PLOs, and effectiveness of benchmarks. The quality of assessment practices, reports, and review processes are expected to improve with continued professional development, support, and feedback from the Assessment Council and the OEE.

### Methodology

Reports were reviewed by the Assessment Council in small, interdisciplinary groups that attempted to pair a STEM-focused faculty member, a liberal arts-focused faculty member, and an administrative staff member together. Each group reviewed approximately 20 reports using a standardized [qualitative rubric](#), developed collaboratively by the Council.

Eight components of the assessment report were addressed on the rubric: program goals, program learning objectives (PLOs), assessment location, assessment methods, timeline/frequency, benchmarks, results/findings, and actions/improvements. The evaluative criteria of rubric used three categories: Developing, Acceptable, or Exemplary, each worth one, two or three points, respectively. An N/A field was added to address programs that were either not required or unable to provide assessment results due to accredited, low-enrollment, inactive or new program status. This field was point-neutral and was intended to avoid penalizing programs unfairly on the rubric. The rubric also featured standardized feedback statements derived from themes seen across reports and aligned to target levels of the rubric, supplemented with optional, open-ended feedback fields for Council members to provide targeted advice to programs. The complete rubric with feedback statements is included in Appendix A for reference.

Individual group members were encouraged to conduct a preliminary review of all assigned reports independently. Then, groups met to discuss their feedback, norm their ratings, and build group consensus on final scores and feedback statements. Groups entered the results of their rubric review into the OEE Content Management System (CMS).

The OEE collated the results of the Council's review process to provide a total rubric score for each program out of 24 possible points. Overall APAR quality was then categorized as described in Table 2 below, using the terms "Developing" (0-8 points), "Acceptable" (9-16 points), and "Exemplary" (17-24 points). Of note, quantitative rubric scores were used internally for categorization purposes only; qualitative feedback only was shared with programs.

## Results

### *I. Quantity of Reports Received*

In 2023-24, 192 programs submitted reports, representing 95% of all programs that were required to submit a report. Programs with existing discipline-specific accreditation, low enrollment (defined as fewer than 10 students), and those that were considered inactive or phasing out were not required to submit a report. However, some programs in these categories submitted reports voluntarily. Appendix D provides more detailed information on the reports received from each School/College.

### *II. Quality of Assessment Plans Overall*

Results of the Assessment Council's review process demonstrate that, based on the overall scores, 66.2% (n=127) of APARs were considered Exemplary and exceeded the minimum basic standards; 32.8% (n=63) were Acceptable and met the University's minimum basic standards, but with some opportunity for improvement; and 1.6% (n=2) were Developing and did not meet the minimum basic standards, with considerable opportunity for improvement.

<b>Table 1: Assessment Council APAR Rubric Review - Overall Report Quality (n=192)</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Developing	2	1.6%
Acceptable	63	32.8%
Exemplary	127	66.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>100%</b>

### *III. Quality of Assessment Plan Components*

To obtain more granular information on where programs may strengthen their assessment plans, the individual components of the plans were also reviewed. Programs showed the greatest proficiency in identifying a location or point in the curriculum map where program learning objectives are assessed, identifying strategies to improve assessment outcomes in the future, and articulating program goals. These areas had the highest average component scores on the evaluative rubric.

Programs could use some additional support in refining benchmarks and communicating anticipated assessment timelines. These areas had the lowest average component scores on the evaluative rubric. In some cases, feedback on benchmarks indicated that programs relied too heavily on whole course grades instead of select, aligned methods, or that benchmarks warranted greater specificity in quantitative targets. Feedback on timeline noted that some programs provided incomplete information or conflated program assessment timelines with course-level or enrollment-related milestones. We anticipate that confusion related to timelines will be resolved by more precise selection of the PLOs assessed each year in the OEE Content Management system assessment report module beginning in Fall 2025.

Overall, feedback suggested that assessment reports are in good shape but would benefit from further clarity, completeness, and intentional alignment between assessment plan elements.

Table 2: Assessment Council APAR Rubric Review - Quality of Assessment Plan Components		
Assessment Plan Component	Average Rubric Score per Component	Rubric Score Level
Program Goals	2.38	Acceptable
Program Learning Objectives	2.25	Acceptable
Location/Curriculum Mapping	2.46	Acceptable
Assessment Method	2.24	Acceptable
Timeline/Frequency	2.15	Acceptable
Benchmarks	2.23	Acceptable
Results/Findings	2.38	Acceptable
Actions/Improvements	2.46	Acceptable

#### IV. Most Prevalent Feedback Statements on APAR Strengths and Areas of Improvement

Analysis of the feedback statements provided to programs reveals that the following statements were used most frequently when describing report strengths:

- *“Program goals are effective and impactful statements that describe what the program offers to students.”*
  - 55% of programs received this feedback as a strength in their assessment report.
- *“Assessment locations are clearly identified in a course or other degree requirement and align with the knowledge, skills or abilities described in the PLO.”*
  - 52% of programs received this feedback as a strength in their assessment report.
- *“Results provide clear and meaningful data on student achievement in relation to the stated PLO and benchmarks.”*
  - 42% of programs received this feedback as a strength in their assessment report.

Analysis of the feedback statements provided to programs reveals that the following statements were used most frequently when describing reports' areas of improvement:

- *“Program learning objectives are not measurable as written and would benefit from greater specificity. Reference Bloom’s taxonomy or consult with OEE for assistance creating more action-oriented, measurable statements.”*
  - 20% of programs received this feedback as an area of improvement in their assessment report.
- *“Results provided do not align with the selected assessment method and/or benchmark. Report results so that they can easily be interpreted in comparison to your stated benchmarks. For example, if your benchmark states that “80% of students will score a 75% or greater on the final exam,” then your results should state “X%” of students scored a 75% or greater on the final exam.”*
  - 15% of programs received this feedback as an area of improvement in their assessment report.

- *“Consider refining the assessment method so that it better aligns with the knowledge, skills, or abilities identified in the PLO. For example, a PLO at Bloom’s taxonomic level “identify” or “describe” might be best assessed on a multiple choice exam or low-stakes, formative assignment, while a PLO at Bloom’s taxonomic level “evaluate” or “create” might be best assessed on a term paper, final presentation, or high-stakes, summative assignment.”*
  - 13% of programs received this feedback as an area of improvement in their assessment report.

### **Recommendations**

The OEE will continue to work closely with the Assessment Council to strengthen the APAR reporting, review, and feedback process. Some strategies that have been explored to date include involving Council members in program consultations to a faculty member’s perspective in the discussion, as well as revising the review process so that faculty members can review programs (other than their own) within their discipline in order to provide more substantive and meaningful feedback.

### **Conclusion**

Academic programs are generally on track with their APAR requirements, and we anticipate that the quality and quantity of reports will improve as SBU continues to cultivate a culture of assessment and leverages technology in the OEE CMS to streamline reporting and review processes.

## Appendix A: Assessment Council Rubric for APAR Review 2023-24

Assessment Plan Component	Criteria/Definitions	Developing (1)	Acceptable (2)	Exemplary (3)
		<b><i>"Not provided, unclear, or needs significant revision/improvement"</i></b>	<b><i>"A good start, but would benefit from some revision/improvement"</i></b>	<b><i>"Strong, and require little to no revision."</i></b>
<b>Program Goals</b>	<i>3-6 statements that describe the kind of educational experience that the academic program provides to students. Must be distinct from program learning objectives.</i>	Fewer than three program goals are provided, or they are unclear and need significant revision/improvement.	Program Goals provided are a good start, but would benefit from some revision/improvement.	Program Goals provided are strong and require little to no revision.
<b>Program Learning Objectives</b>	<i>3-6 statements that are measurable and action-oriented describing the knowledge, skills or abilities students should attain by completing the program. Must be distinct from program goals.</i>	Fewer than three PLOs are provided, or they are unclear and need significant revision/improvement.	PLOs provided are a good start, but would benefit from some revision/improvement.	PLOs provided are strong and require little to no revision.
<b>Assessment Location</b>	<i>Concretely links PLOs to a specific course or other degree requirement (dissertation, doctoral exam, internship, etc.) where a sample of student performance can be assessed.</i>	Assessment Location in Curriculum Map are not provided for all PLOs, are unclear, or need significant revision/improvement.	Assessment Location in Curriculum Map provided are a good start, but would benefit from some revision/improvement.	Assessment Location in Curriculum Map provided are strong and require little to no revision.
<b>Assessment Methods</b>	<i>Concretely links PLOs to a specific assessment/assignment that aligns with the knowledge, skills, and abilities described at an appropriate taxonomic level.</i>	Assessment Methods are not provided for all PLOs, are unclear, or need significant revision/improvement.	Assessment Methods provided are a good start, but would benefit from some revision/improvement.	Assessment Methods provided are strong and require little to no revision.
<b>Timeline/Frequency</b>	<i>Concretely identifies the semester, year, and point in SBU's 5-year assessment cycle at which each PLO will be assessed.</i>	Timeline/Frequency is not provided for all PLOs, is unclear, or needs significant revision/improvement.	Timeline/Frequency provided are a good start, but would benefit from some revision/improvement.	Timeline/Frequency provided are strong and require little to no revision.
<b>Benchmarks</b>	<i>Concretely identifies a desired score or grade on the identified assessment method/rubric, as well as a performance target for what percentage or portion of students should achieve it to indicate broad attainment of the PLO.</i>	Benchmarks are not provided for all PLOs, are unclear, or need significant revision/improvement.	Benchmarks provided are a good start, but would benefit from some revision/improvement.	Benchmarks provided are strong and require little to no revision.
<b>Results/Findings</b>	<i>Reported results/findings for at least one PLO in AY 23-24 that are clearly stated in alignment with the identified benchmark.</i>	Results/Findings for at least one PLO assessed during the last academic year are not provided, are unclear, or need significant revision/improvement.	Results/Findings for at least one PLO assessed during the last academic year are a good start, but would benefit from some revision/improvement.	Results/Findings for at least one PLO assessed during the last academic year are strong and require little to no revision.
<b>Actions/Improvements</b>	<i>Reported actions/improvements for at least one PLO in AY 23-24 based on results and findings, or clearly indicated that none are needed due to meeting or exceeding the stated benchmark.</i>	Actions/Improvements for at least one PLO assessed during the last academic year are not provided, are unclear, or need significant revision/improvement.	Actions/Improvements for at least one PLO assessed during the last academic year are a good start, but would benefit from some revision/improvement.	Actions/Improvements for at least one PLO assessed during the last academic year are strong and require little to no revision.

## Appendix B: Feedback Statements Aligned to Rubric Levels for APAR Review 2023-24

Assessment Plan Component	Rubric Score	Feedback Statement Options According to Rubric Score (Option to provide custom feedback is available in OEE CMS for all report components)
<b>Program Goals</b>	Developing (1)	Develop a minimum of three program goal statements that describe that kind of experience your program provides to students.
		Program goals (broad statements about the kind of experience your program provides) are identical to the program learning objectives (measurable statements about what students should know or be able to do). Revise so that the goals and learning objectives are separate and distinct.
	Acceptable (2)	Program goals (broad statements about the kind of experience your program provides) currently read like program learning objectives (measurable statements about what students should know or be able to do). Revise so that goals and learning objectives are separate and distinct.
	Exemplary (3)	Program goals are effective and impactful statements that describe what the program offers to students.
<b>Program Learning Objectives</b>	Developing (1)	Develop a minimum of three program learning objectives that describe what students should know or be able to do as a result of completing your program.
	Acceptable (2)	A maximum of six program learning objectives are recommended. Consider streamlining your PLOs to ensure that the assessment process is manageable and sustainable.
		Program learning objectives are not measurable as written and would benefit from greater specificity. Reference Bloom's taxonomy or consult with OEE for assistance creating more action-oriented, measurable statements.
		Program learning objectives are too complex and include too many variables. Consider streamlining so that each PLO concretely addresses one knowledge domain, skill, or ability that can be linked to a direct assessment method.
	Exemplary (3)	Program learning objectives are effective, action-oriented statements that facilitate measurement of student learning.
<b>Assessment Location</b>	Developing (1)	Identify the assessment location for all PLOs provided by listing the course code and title or other degree requirement, such as the capstone, practicum, thesis, dissertation, etc.
		Current mapping of PLOs to assessment locations is unclear or not aligned with the specified curriculum. Clearly identify the assessment location for all PLOs provided by listing the course code and title or other degree requirement, such as the capstone, practicum, thesis, dissertation, etc.
	Acceptable (2)	Assessing the PLO in multiple locations may be complex and difficult to sustain. Select one course or degree requirement where you will assess each PLO as a sample of student performance.
	Exemplary (3)	Assessment locations are clearly identified in a course or other degree requirement and align with the knowledge, skills or abilities described in the PLO.

<b>Assessment Methods</b>	Developing (1)	Identify the assessment method for all PLOs provided by listing the assignment (exam, case study, term paper, oral presentation, etc.) or other assessment method (survey, focus group, etc.).
	Acceptable (2)	Assessing PLOs using multiple assessment methods may be complex and difficult to sustain. Select one or two assignments to assess each PLO as a sample of student performance.
		Your assessment plan listed multiple assessment locations for one or more PLOs. Identify an assessment method that is specific to each assessment location listed.
		Consider refining the assessment method so that it better aligns with the knowledge, skills, or abilities identified in the PLO. For example, a PLO at Bloom's taxonomic level "identify" or "describe" might be best assessed on a multiple choice exam or low-stakes, formative assignment, while a PLO at Bloom's taxonomic level "evaluate" or "create" might be best assessed on a term paper, final presentation, or high-stakes, summative assignment.
	Exemplary (3)	Assessment methods are effective, appropriate and sustainable measures for evaluating student achievement of the PLOs.
<b>Timeline/Frequency</b>	Developing (1)	Timeline and frequency are not provided for one or more PLOs. Identify the specific term, year, and point in the 5-year assessment cycle for each PLO. (Example: Spring 2025, Year 3 of 5-year cycle). Remember, programs should assess at least one PLO per year, completing an assessment of all PLOs by the end of the current 5-year assessment cycle in AY 26-27.
	Acceptable (2)	Timeline is provided, but frequency is missing for one or more PLOs. Identify the specific term, year, and point in the 5-year assessment cycle for each PLO. (Example: Spring 2025, Year 3 of 5-year cycle). Remember, programs should assess at least one PLO per year, completing an assessment of all PLOs by the end of the current 5-year assessment cycle in AY 26-27.
		Frequency is provided, but timeline is missing for one or more PLOs. Identify the specific term, year, and point in the 5-year assessment cycle for each PLO. (Example: Spring 2025, Year 3 of 5-year cycle). Remember, programs should assess at least one PLO per year, completing an assessment of all PLOs by the end of the current 5-year assessment cycle in AY 26-27.
		The timeline/frequency provided reflect course-level assessment timing rather than a program-level assessment plan. For example, if your selected assessment method like "weekly quizzes," indicate the point at which you will reflect and report out on those results holistically at the program-level by identifying the specific term, year, and point in the 5-year assessment cycle for each PLO. (Example: Spring 2025, Year 3 of 5-year cycle).
	Exemplary (3)	The timeline clearly identifies the term, year, and frequency of the assessment within the 5-year assessment cycle.
<b>Benchmarks</b>	Developing (1)	Benchmarks are not provided or are unclear for one or more PLOs. Identify a target score on the selected assessment method and percentage of students that should meet that target to indicate successful achievement of the PLO. For example: "80% of students will score a 75% or greater on the final exam."
	Acceptable (2)	Benchmarks identify a target score on the selected assessment method, but do not specify what percentage of students should meet that target to indicate successful achievement of the PLO. Refine the benchmark to include both elements. For example: "80% of students will score a 75% or greater on the final exam."

		Benchmarks list whole course grades as the measure of student performance, which is not recommended and may make it difficult to isolate areas of improvement in teaching and learning strategies. Refine the benchmark to reflect a target score or grade on the specific assessment method linked to the PLO.
		Benchmark does not align to the PLO and/or assessment method provided. Refine the benchmark so that it provides meaningful data on student performance on the PLO or assessment method.
	Exemplary (3)	Benchmarks clearly identify a target assignment score, target for percentage of students that should meet that score, and are appropriate measures for the stated PLO and assessment method.
<b>Results/Findings</b>	Developing (1)	Results for the assessment of at least one PLO assessed in AY 23-24 are not provided or not clearly identifiable by the reader. Be sure to assess and report results for at least one PLO per academic year.
	Acceptable (2)	Results provided do not align with the selected assessment method and/or benchmark. Report results so that they can easily be interpreted in comparison to your stated benchmarks. For example, if your benchmark states that "80% of students will score a 75% or greater on the final exam," then your results should state "X%" of students scored a 75% or greater on the final exam."
	Exemplary (3)	Results provide clear and meaningful data on student achievement in relation to the stated PLO and benchmarks.
<b>Actions/Improvements</b>	Developing (1)	Actions/Improvements for the assessment of at least one PLO assessed in AY 23-24 are not provided or not clearly identifiable by the reader. Be sure to identify actions/improvements for at least one PLO per academic year. If actions/improvements are omitted purposefully due to meeting or exceeding your benchmark, please explain this in the template so that it is clear that this is intentional.
	Acceptable (2)	Refine actions/improvements to be more specific and better align with your assessment results. This will lead to more targeted and impactful improvements in your student learning outcomes.
	Exemplary (3)	Actions/Improvement provide effective strategies based on the assessment results and demonstrate a clear path to improve student learning in the future.
		Actions/Improvements are not required due to meeting or exceeding the benchmark.
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Developing (Rubric Score 1-8)</b>	Thank you for preparing this assessment plan. Some elements of the plan are either incomplete or unclear to a reader that is unfamiliar with your program, and would benefit from revision or greater specificity. Please contact OEE to set up a consultation at your convenience at EducationalEffectiveness@stonybrook.edu to discuss the Assessment Council's feedback and suggestions.
	<b>Acceptable (Rubric Score 9-16)</b>	Thank you for preparing this assessment plan. Your plan is off to a great start, but would benefit from some revision or greater specificity. Please contact OEE to set up a consultation or to discuss any questions about the Assessment Council's feedback and suggestions at EducationalEffectiveness@stonybrook.edu
	<b>Exemplary (Rubric Score 17-24)</b>	Thank you for preparing this assessment plan. Your plan is in good shape and requires little to no revision. Some recommendations are provided for your consideration. Please contact OEE with any questions about the Assessment Council's feedback and suggestions at EducationalEffectiveness@stonybrook.edu.



## Appendix C: Sample Feedback Cover Letter for APAR Review 2023-24

### Academic Program Assessment Report 2023-24 Feedback for [Academic Program Name] May 15, 2025

---

#### Summary

Thank you for submitting your academic program assessment report (APAR) for 2023-24. The Office of Educational Effectiveness (OEE) received a total of 192 reports last year, representing a 95% submission rate among the non-accredited programs that were required to submit an annual report. Of these reports, 99% were complete and included all assessment plan components. In general, assessment reports were most effective in identifying where in the curriculum PLO assessment takes place and reporting results and findings. In addition, reports demonstrated some potential for improvement in articulating measurable program learning objectives that reflect the desired knowledge, skills and abilities graduates should attain and setting clear benchmarks with specific performance targets for students.

---

#### APAR Review Process & Rubric

Reports were reviewed by the SBU Assessment Council in interdisciplinary groups that included a STEM-focused faculty member, liberal arts-focused faculty member, and an administrative staff member. Review was guided by a [rubric](#) developed by the Council, and supplemented with qualitative feedback specific to each program's assessment plan.

---

#### Overall Feedback for Your Program

The Assessment Council provided the following overall recommendation on your report:

- [Overall Feedback Recommendation]

For more detailed feedback on each component of your assessment plan, see the attached report for your program.

---

#### Contact OEE to Review & Discuss Feedback

If you have any questions about the Assessment Council's feedback, we strongly encourage you to [set up a consultation](#) with OEE at your convenience. Our staff is available to meet one-on-one, in small groups, in-person, or via Zoom. These can be quick, clarifying chats or in-depth discussions to support you with assessment plan revisions. Let us know how we can help!

---

#### Next Steps for 2024-25 Reports

Through a series of focus groups, feedback surveys, and discussions with Assessment Council members and Assessment Coordinators, OEE is implementing a few adjustments to the assessment process for 2024-25 in order to make it more manageable and meaningful to programs.

##### I. Reports due September 30 annually for the prior academic year.

As a reminder, assessment reports for 2024-25 are due on September 30, 2025. September 30 is the new annual deadline, implemented in response to assessment coordinator feedback so that programs can collect and report data on the complete academic year.

## II. Revised report template with more detailed instructions.

The revised report template features more detailed instructional prompts and links to resources to support assessment coordinators as they are completing the form. It also includes space to track other assessment results (such as student feedback, career placement, or graduation rates) that are meaningful to you.

## III. Streamlined reporting process using the OEE Content Management System.

Rather than using Google docs, OEE has developed a similar, user-friendly module in its homegrown Content Management System (CMS). Assessment Coordinators will be able to login to the CMS, enter assessment plan information for their program(s), and submit their report all in one place through their web browser. Assessment plan information from prior years will be pre-loaded into the CMS, and you will have the option to add, delete, revise, or update components as needed.

Stay tuned for more information on how to login to the CMS coming this Summer. OEE will host a series of CMS training opportunities, open office hours/data entry events to help troubleshoot questions, and is available to provide one-on-one data entry support to assessment coordinators.

## IV. Focus on PLOs & collaboration between Assessment Coordinators & faculty members.

As the Spring comes to a close, take a moment to review the feedback from the Assessment Council on last year's report, with a focus on ensuring that your Program Learning Objectives accurately reflect the knowledge, skills, and abilities graduates from your program will attain. Regroup with your faculty and staff to review, revise, and strengthen your PLOs to be measurable statements that will guide your assessment plan.

## V. When in doubt, reach out!

Contact OEE with any questions at [EducationalEffectiveness@stonybrook.edu](mailto:EducationalEffectiveness@stonybrook.edu). We are available to answer your questions, engage in consultations, or come to your next department/program meeting to facilitate a discussion or workshop on assessment topics.

---

## Appendix D: Quantity of Reports Received by School/College 2023-24

SBU School/College	# Required Reports Received	# Required Reports	% Completion	# Additional Voluntary Reports Received
College of Arts & Sciences	88	94	92%	3 <sup>a</sup>
College of Business	1	1	100%	N/A
College of Engineering & Applied Sciences	34	36	94%	8 <sup>b</sup>
Lichtenstein Center (Southampton Arts)	4	4	100%	2 <sup>b</sup>
Other HSC (Program in Public Health)	3	3	100%	N/A
Renaissance School of Medicine	8	9	89%	N/A
School of Communication & Journalism	5	5	100%	N/A
School of Dental Medicine	1	1	100%	N/A
School of Health Professions	4	4	100%	1 <sup>d</sup>
School of Marine & Atmospheric Sciences	11	11	100%	N/A
School of Nursing	1	1	100%	N/A
School of Professional Development	8	8	100%	N/A
School of Social Welfare	N/A	0	N/A	N/A
SUNY Korea	10	10	100%	N/A
<b>Totals<sup>e</sup></b>	<b>178</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>95%</b>	
<sup>a</sup> Received three supplemental/track-specific reports from: Music M.A., Music Ph.D., Earth Science B.A.				
<sup>b</sup> Received eight reports from accredited CEAS programs, which were collected but not reviewed at the request of the CEAS Dean.				
<sup>c</sup> Received two reports from inactive programs: Children's Literature Adv Cert, Creative Writing Adv Cert.				
<sup>d</sup> Received report from accredited program: Speech-Language Pathology M.S.				
<sup>e</sup> The Council reviewed and provided feedback on the 178 required reports, 6 voluntary reports, and 9 unsubmitted draft reports.				

## Appendix E: Assessment Council Charge and Membership 2024-25

### Charge of the Assessment Council

The Assessment Council is constituted by the Provost in consultation with the University Senate to focus on the development of campus-wide policies and procedures for academic assessment and to ensure rigorous assessment across our programs. It fosters a culture of assessment enabling us to understand the impact of our instruction on our students and to celebrate the success of our SBU programs through the accomplishments of our students.

### 2024-25 Assessment Council Membership\*

We are grateful for the support and contributions of the SBU Assessment Council members, including:

- Bini K. John, School of Nursing
- Debbie Zelizer (Chair, 2024-25), School of Health Professions
- Dolores Cannella, School of Dental Medicine
- David Black, School of Marine & Atmospheric Sciences
- David McKinnon, College of Arts & Sciences\*\*
- David Rubenstein, College of Engineering & Applied Sciences
- Gabrielle Russo, College of Arts & Sciences
- Jacobus Verbaarschot, College of Arts & Sciences
- Johnathan Anzalone, School of Communication & Journalism
- Kelly Walker, School of Nursing\*\*
- Leah Holbrook, Renaissance School of Medicine
- Michael Nugent, College of Business
- Margaret Schedel, College of Arts & Sciences
- Mashal Salehi, Renaissance School of Medicine
- Paul Bingham, College of Arts & Sciences
- Richard Morgan, School of Social Welfare
- Ross Nehm, College of Arts & Sciences
- Stefan Judex, College of Engineering & Applied Sciences
- Susan Ryan, School of Professional Development
- Amie Cohen, Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning\*\*
- Catherine Scott, Office of Educational Effectiveness
- Kimberly Hachmann, Office of Educational Effectiveness
- Diana Jernigan-Breedy, Office of Educational Effectiveness
- Krista Emma, Office of Educational Effectiveness
- Ling Zhai, Office of Educational Effectiveness
- Rose Tirota-Esposito, Center for Excellence in Learning & Teaching\*\*\*

*\*Group responsible for reviewing 2023-24 reports.*

*\*\*On leave or ended appointment term early.*

*\*\*\* Serving in an interim capacity.*