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Chapter 1: A Student-Centered Mission
Standards 1, 6

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.”

(Characters of Excellence 1)

Overview of Standard 1

Guttman’s mission was derived directly from the College’s founding impulse and continues to inform its culture and provide its students, faculty and staff with the institution’s driving purpose. Leadership brought together all the faculty and staff during the planning phase in 2011 and engaged in a collaborative process of drafting and revising what became Guttman’s vision and mission statements, its initial institutional goals, and its instructional principals. These declarations were revisited during the strategic planning process and in revised form those goals became the centerpiece of the Strategic Plan 2014–2017 (see Document Set 1). The next strategic plan is currently being developed, and the mission statement has once again been reaffirmed as a relevant, articulate, and meaningful statement of our goals and purpose.

Self-study Working Group 1 investigated how well the College’s mission defines the institution and its purpose now and for the future and how clearly the mission, vision, and goals are aligned. It also looked at what evidence exists to show the College is evaluating its mission and goals, whether there are examples demonstrating that the mission and goals are translating to student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness, how effectively the College maintains awareness and commitment to the mission among faculty, staff, and students, and in what ways the academic and administrative decision-making processes are adhering to the mission, vision, and goals.

Findings for Standard 1: Mission and Goals

Guttman’s Mission Statement continues to define the College and its purpose accurately. In many ways, the College’s innovative educational model is the embodiment of a living mission statement. It describes an environment that nurtures student success with the primary objective to increase the number of students who persist in their programs of study and attain a degree in a timely manner, a goal the College has thus far successfully achieved. The mission also points to offering a clearly defined educational pathway: Guttman provides students a clear trajectory from an intentional admissions process through Summer Bridge to matriculated studies focused on city-centric first-year core general education curriculum to five well-defined programs of study. Further, the mission emphasizes a functional community with students at the center of the College, something found to be at the core of all parts of the institution.

There is evidence of community in many of the activities and structures of the College, from an Information Commons (that serves as a learning space for students to collaborate) to the pinning ceremony at fall Convocation (during which first-year students recite the Guttman pledge) and fall and spring Community Days (devoted to civic engagement and service learning). Other College practices
supporting the mission include the multi-step admissions process, the Center for College Effectiveness which fosters collaboration, and the Office of Partnerships and Community Engagement that creates opportunities for applied learning.

The College reflected on the mission during 2012-2013 as part of a year-long self-study on its first-year student experience organized through the Foundations of Excellence (FoE). The community reaffirmed the importance of the mission as part of the FoE dimension on philosophy, agreeing that it serves as the foundation on which the institution is built. This self-study also helped to inform the College’s *Strategic Plan 2014-2017* by revisiting its initial goals and setting a direction for its next phase. The Plan strengthens and reconfigures Guttman’s original goals into four main areas: 1) Refine a New Educational Model; 2) Focus on Student Experience; 3) Create Sustainable Practice; and 4) Improve Communications. These four major goals have strategic initiatives (30 in all, comprised of 9, 9, 9 and 3 objectives for each major goal respectively) with specific benchmarks to mark progress. These goals are aligned with the College’s Middle States Standards and the University’s Performance Management Process major goals.

The mission, vision, and original institutional goals dating to 2011 are clearly defined and closely aligned, and the institutional goals were subsequently reconfigured in the *Strategic Plan 2014 – 2017*. They are linked by the objectives to enhance student success by making students the center of the College, supporting student achievement, and improving student learning, retention, and graduation rates. Working Group 1 found that faculty, staff, and students demonstrate great awareness and commitment to the mission, vision, and goals. The outcomes and decision-making processes of the College thus far demonstrate alignment to the mission, vision, goals, and success.

*Mission and Goals and Awareness of Faculty/Staff*

Faculty become aware of the College’s commitment to student learning and to a new educational model—at the heart of the mission and goals—from the first step of the search process. Human Resources (HR) includes the mission and goals of the institution in every posting and encourages applicants to visit the college’s website. At Guttman, search committees have chosen to include a teaching demonstration lesson, putting teaching at the forefront of the hiring process. New faculty are also recruited and hired in part for their understanding and appreciation of the College’s mission.

Guttman has held new faculty onboarding sessions each year since 2012. The 2012 and 2013 onboarding sessions were one day each, while the sessions held in 2014 occurred in August and September. In 2015 OAA moved the sessions to late June and added follow-up sessions during the fall semester, a model (two days in June and follow-up in the fall) that continued in 2016. At new faculty orientation, faculty learn more about the GCC, including criteria for review, promotion and tenure with regards to the professional triad of teaching, scholarship and service. They receive the Instructional Principals and the President traditionally presents a PowerPoint that references the Mission, History, Values, and Culture. As the Faculty Fellow for Excellence in Teaching explained, while the onboarding workshops may not directly address the mission or goals explicitly, “the mission and goals inform all activities.”

My sense from working with new faculty over the past few years is that Guttman’s mission and goals are what draw faculty to apply to the College in the first place, so I would say I think new faculty have a clear sense of the College’s mission and goals. I think the mission and goals are conveyed throughout the search and hiring processes, as well. One purpose of the onboarding workshops is to help new faculty see what the mission and goals look like in practice.

---

10 For 2016 New Faculty Orientation. See Document Set 10.
Full-time faculty appointed as substitutes after the onboarding do not attend the sessions. For part-time faculty, the hiring and onboarding process is different. As of the 2015-2016 academic year, there is a general onboarding with Human Resources staff, then a more specific follow-up with the Associate Dean in OAA for adjunct faculty as well as a voluntary Guttman Seminar. The Guttman Seminar is a paid, semester-long series of workshops focused on topics of interest to participants. There has been funding for ten participants in each session. The two sessions during academic year 2015-2016 each had 8-9 part-time faculty participating in addition to five full-time faculty facilitators. Both full and part-time faculty are also exposed to the mission, vision, and goals in informal ways during instructional team meetings and informal conversations with program coordinators.

Former Provost Joan Lucariello stated that in her annual faculty evaluations there was always a discussion of teaching and the model and that the CPC evaluates faculty based in part on service and teaching in line with the model. She believed that during her tenure at the College there was a “strict commitment to not a drift away from the model.” The Faculty Handbook includes the mission and vision and was updated and distributed to faculty electronically during the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 academic years. Both statements are also in the College Bulletin distributed to staff and available on the website. At All-College meetings the President usually makes a presentation that includes the history, vision, demographics, and outcomes of the College and serves as a reminder to faculty and staff of the mission and goals of the institution. For example, at the January 2016 All-College Faculty-Staff meeting, President Evenbeck described the college as a “new paradigm” and broke down the vision and values of the College. This retreat provided a forum for faculty and staff to reflect on the College model and make recommendations to maintain or strengthen the model and mission (some of these are reflected in our areas for improvement/recommendations section).

Faculty (including so-called “founding faculty”, appointed before the first students arrived in August 2012) and staff involved in running programs at the College expressed that they still find the mission and vision and goals relevant to the institution. Faculty and staff hold a generally positive view of the College’s mission. In a May 2015 Guttman Faculty and Staff survey about the employee experience, 13 respondents cited the Guttman model as one of the best parts of working at the College. Said one respondent: “I like the fact that the mission is to be centered and responsive to the students. I like the fact that the teaching expectations are that the classroom is inquiry-based and student centered. I like that there is ample opportunity to really impact the students.” According to the Spring 2015 Noel-Levitz Employee Satisfaction Survey (see Document Set 1), the statement “Employees are generally supportive of the mission, purpose, and values of the institution” scored a 3.64 with a satisfaction scale of 5.

Questions do remain about scalability, rigor, and outcomes, but overall faculty and staff feel the goals are relevant and part of the general atmosphere of the College. As one of the founding faculty members expressed when asked about our adherence to the goals and mission:

> Academic achievement to me translates as retention, graduation and transfer; in all those respects, I think we do well, though I have not seen actual transfer data... The other part of this goal—social growth and contribution to the community—anecdotally and based on casual observation would appear to one that we are addressing. All the experiential opportunities, the Community Days activities in particular, are targeting this goal. So in terms of providing the opportunities, I think we are addressing our mission... I believe we are making a strong effort at addressing the 4th goal; when it comes to sharing our knowledge and experiences with stakeholders, I believe we are doing this collectively (in events with the College’s advisors and the CUNY research group) as well as individually, as in College faculty and staff attending conferences where they present their experiences and interact with representatives of other institutions.
Another founding faculty member notes, “I think that the fulfillment of the mission and goals is a work in progress. In some areas (community-building, retention, completion, student-engagement) we’ve done very well. I think that we need to figure out ways to address the issue of academic rigor and be sure that we are holding all who are a part of Guttman (students, faculty and staff) to the same standards of high expectations.”

Mission and Goals and Awareness of Students
Students arrive at Guttman with some exposure to the overarching mission and goals of the institution. Before applying to GCC, students must attend a general information meeting and then an individual meeting; after acceptance they attend an orientation and the mandatory summer or winter Bridge Program prior to beginning the fall or spring semesters. The Bridge Program is built around the mission and goals of the institution. Students participate in curricular and co-curricular activities that are designed according to the College’s mission and goals. The student course pack includes a welcome message that reinforces the mission and goals a section that describes the College’s academic model and GLOs (see Bridge portfolio and student course pack). Sessions of LaBSS1 during Bridge and the academic year are dedicated to discussing the purposes and benefits of the academic model. In addition to the course pack and discussions in class and activities designed according to the mission and goals, students reflect on their Bridge experiences on the last day of the program. The reflection prompt for 2015 relates directly to the “Community” and “College” sections of Guttman’s mission statement. As an example, one student wrote in her reflection:

Two weeks ago, I thought that I will have the same college experiences as my friends have had, with rude and non-caring teachers and staff. But after I came the very first day, I realized that this was going to be a lot different from what friends told me. Professors, faculty and even other students care about us and are there for whatever might be the reason you need them. Also there is a lot of support given to us even for transportation and stipends, which helps us all in some way or another. I think that the Research project has helped me a lot, not just because I’ve never done one, but my professors have taught me how to do it properly and strong enough for college.

Overall, Bridge introduces students to Guttman’s curricular, pedagogical, and student support approaches. It provides learning experiences that help students develop a sense of belonging as part of the Guttman community. As one of the Summer Bridge Coordinators explains, “My sense is that Bridge is ‘transformational’ for some students in that the experience opens their eyes to new ways of thinking about learning and about themselves as learners…. I think encouraging this transformation is central to our ability to fulfill our mission and goals.” The 2016 Bridge Program Coordinator stated, “It definitely starts to give the students an experience where they see themselves as part of the community—which I think is the whole purpose of the new community college—something different to show it’s not just a placeholder until “real” school. We wanted a new type of community and the Bridge experience provides that.” Working Group 1 found evidence that students understand the College’s mission through a familiarity with its educational model. In the Spring 2014 Guttman Survey: Feedback from Students about Their College Experience, students demonstrated a strong awareness and understanding of the College’s educational model and expectations: 76% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they understood graduation requirements; and 57% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they understood Guttman’s five Learning Outcomes (GLOs).

---

1 LaBSS is an acronym for Learning about Being a Successful Student. It is a model for group advisement that is a formal part of Ethnography of Work I and Ethnography of Work II in the first-year core curriculum. It is facilitated by Student Success Advocates during Summer Bridge in anticipation of the model in the fall and spring curriculum. See pp. 116-118 for complete Guttman Glossary.
The Peer Mentoring Program is an integral component of the high touch advising model and the academic and co-curricular student experience at Guttman, and it reflects the mission, vision, and goals in action. Peer Mentors ease entering students’ transition from high school to college, and coach them throughout their educational career at Guttman. Peer Mentors are active participants in the Bridge Program and first-year learning communities, and they plan and facilitate social and educational programs for the entire campus community. The training of all peer mentors includes an iterative process where the mission and goals of the institution are deeply explored and reaffirmed.

Mission and Goals and External Constituencies
Guttman Community College’s Office of Government and External Relations serves as a key representative to external constituents such as community and civic leaders, government officials, and business leaders. The office is responsible for building relationships through strategic outreach to public, private and governmental entities. Through these efforts, the Office seeks to increase awareness of and support for Guttman’s mission and educational programs through such activities as legislative advocacy, community engagement, and participation in local, state and national organizations that promote civic engagement. As one of The City University of New York’s (CUNY) 24 campuses, Guttman also works in collaboration with CUNY’s central administration to obtain support for the university’s legislative agenda specifically and public higher education more generally.

Acting as a bridge between Guttman Community College and New York City, the Office of Partnerships & Community Engagement (OPCE) works with community partners to provide experiential opportunities designed to support an enriched curriculum and career preparation. Helping to provide New York City businesses and organizations with highly motivated and qualified students, the OPCE seeks to establish lasting connections with professionals and businesses in the New York City area. Community partners—individuals and organizations who are part of the civic, cultural and economic life of New York—are involved in a variety of college activities. Some partners collaborate in multiple ways while others target their efforts within a particular area. Current projects include securing external partnerships for academic internships in the Information Technology, Human Services, and Liberal Arts & Sciences programs and the Ethnographies of Work course. Internal partnerships exist with the Office of Student Engagement, Global Guttman, and Community Days. OPCE works directly with Guttman students to provide 1-1 student advising and help with career planning and the job search. Recent accomplishments include securing $150,000 in grant monies for a co-curricular internship initiative and the procurement and implementation of a career and job search database to recruit, manage, and track experiential learning opportunities across the Guttman campus.

Mission and Goals and the Decision-Making Processes
As established by the Interim Governance Plan, the primary decision-making body at the college is the College Council. The Council is composed of the President, the Provost and three appointed administrators, all full-time faculty, all consortial faculty, four staff members and two students. There are three standing committees of the Council that refer proposals to the full Council for review, discussion and approval: Agenda, Curriculum, and Assessment and Professional Development. Each committee embraces Guttman’s mission of “cooperation and collaboration, where students, faculty and staff respect and appreciate each other’s perspectives, commonalities, differences and contributions.” Though the College Council represents a mix of faculty, staff and administration and nearly 80% of the council resolutions deal with academic affairs, faculty do not have the same say on the affairs of other divisions. All meeting agendas and minutes are posted on the Council website.

The development of the SAGE initiative (Systematic Approach for Guttman Effectiveness) has provided a framework for each faculty and staff member to plan, evaluate, and reflect on what they do at the college in order to work more efficiently. SAGE Plans guide efforts by College areas to identify their purposes and practices, to highlight accomplishments, and to determine ways to improve. SAGE
demonstrates commitment to the mission and vision and goals by asking different offices to reflect on how their work aligns with the mission and to make improvements through assessment. (See Chapter 6, standard 7, pp. 107-114 for more information on the SAGE process at Guttman.)

**Mission and Goals and GCC Outcomes**
The College’s student or Guttman learning outcomes (GLOs) encourage students to aim high and provide a framework for their entire educational experience, connecting school, college, work and life. The student outcomes so far demonstrate successful adherence to the mission and goals of the College. Guttman has markedly higher graduation rates than is typical of community colleges. By pursuing these goals, Guttman has demonstrated that the graduation rate for community college students can be significantly improved from the national averages for different populations. The College enrolled its first class of 289 students in fall 2012 with the goal of achieving a three-year graduation rate of 35%. Twenty-eight percent graduated in two years and after three years 49% had graduated, which is significantly higher than the three-year national graduation rate at large city public two-year colleges—14% according to IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey 2013 (see Fig. 4, p. xiii for initial cohorts’ progression to degree).

**Summary of Findings for Standard 1**
1. Guttman Community College has a clearly defined mission and goals that inform its internal (students, faculty/staff) and external constituencies (Foundation Board, CUNY central system office, Board of Trustees, local and state political leaders, foundation grantors, higher education policymakers) about its purpose and guide the College in its decision-making.
2. Guttman’s mission, vision and goals were collaboratively developed and are renewed through multiple reiterations (at faculty and staff onboarding, during human resource searches, at All-College Faculty-Staff meetings).
3. Guttman’s institutional goals and four major strategic planning goals are aligned with its mission and focus on implementing and improving a new educational model; on providing students with opportunities to grow and achieve; on creating an environment that sustains faculty and staff in carrying out the model; and in continuous improvement in communications.

**Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 1**

**Suggestions**
- Consider surveying faculty and staff to determine whether the College should review and possibly revise the Mission and Vision statements now that the institution is four years old.
- Maintain a commitment to continuing to hire faculty and staff who believe in our mission and focus on student success and ensure their understanding of the model through discussion of campus culture during the onboarding process and ongoing professional development.
- Commit to moving forward in ways that intentionally onboard part-time and late-hired substitute line faculty and carefully monitor the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty as the College grows.

**Recommendation**
- As the College grows to scale, it should preserve its commitment to the educational model, especially the First-Year Experience; the structure of instructional teams and house meetings; the role of advisors; and ways to serve all of our diverse students effectively.
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.

Overview of Standard 6

As a new college founded on research and best practices in higher education and committed to its mission and goals, integrity in all practices is crucial to Guttman faculty, staff, and administration. The first objective (2.1) under Guttman’s second major strategic goal (to “provide students with opportunities to achieve academically, grow socially, and contribute to the college and the community”) is to “maintain student learning as the primary driver for all decisions made throughout the institution.” Embodying this deceptively simple statement as an operating imperative creates a high bar for integrity both for fidelity to improving the model and for the resolution of inevitable tensions among competing interests in favor of the student interest. When the College became overly dependent on adjunct faculty teaching first-year courses, it was a straightforward decision by the Interim Provost to recommit full-time faculty as much as possible to that coursework. The transparent use and publication of data and evidence-based decision-making are both aspects of the College’s mission and goals and a function of its integrity in living that mission. Its first strategic plan goal: “improve student learning, retention and graduation rates by implementing and refining a new educational model to serve our students” is the benchmark against which we measure our integrity. The Working Groups for each standard focused on the need to commit with integrity to key aspects of our model as we grow to scale.

Working Group 1 investigated integrity in regard to the dissemination of information to stakeholders, adherence to policies, fair and impartial practices including the handling of student complaints, the commitment to diversity and diverse viewpoints, and the maintenance of effort in scaling the model.

Findings for Standard 6: Integrity

Communication in General

Our research confirmed that the College effectively disseminates data and information in an honest, timely, clear and comprehensive manner to internal and external audiences. The College recently redesigned its website, making current factual Guttman information, including program requirements, financial aid, learning outcomes, the strategic plan and institutional goals, more accessible. The Center for College Effectiveness (CCE—see below Chapter 6, Standard 7) is committed to transparency and the wide dissemination of data. The CCE makes the greater part of the data it reports and studies based on it available publically through the website and its e-Portfolio. The College’s NewsWire, accessible on the website, provides college-related news stories about students, faculty research, and campus events. The President’s e-Newsletter summarizes important college news for external constituents. The College Bulletin, published annually, and available online and in print (both current and archived versions), is a compendium of college policies and procedures. The new weekly online Guttman Gazette offers the College community a summary of activities and events, highlights staff from different departments and their roles, and related information.

The Guttman Portal, an intranet, is available to students, faculty and staff. Students can check their email, learn about upcoming campus events, and access their e-Portfolio and CUNYfirst accounts.

12 CUNYfirst—the University ERP or Enterprise Resource Planning—“stands for Fully Integrated Resources and Services Tool. . . It is the information system that. . . integrates software applications for CUNY. ERP is a core set of reengineered business processes, integrated within a single computing architecture.”
Internal and external audiences are also reached through the College’s numerous social media feeds (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Flickr, You Tube, and Snap Chat) that are continually updated by the Office of Communications. Individual offices, including Peer Mentoring, also maintain their own social media outlets to connect with students.

In 2015 the College launched the Guttman Events Management System (GEMS), an online campus calendar and events announcement platform for campus digital monitors. The calendar, linked to the College’s web homepage, has improved communication across the campus and streamlined event scheduling. Ongoing GEMS development and improvement for strengthened communication continues.

Assuring the Opportunity for Timely Completion of Degree Requirements
The College possesses sufficient structures to provide students with adequate information and resources to fulfill their program requirements within two years or for those who need a little longer within three years. Students are given a solid understanding of program requirements at different points during their time at the College, beginning with the admissions process, Summer Bridge, and the first-year core curriculum (see below Chapter 2).

On occasion the College has not been able to offer some upper level courses at times when students needed them. This may be a factor in students’ ability to graduate on time, although our exceptional graduation rates do not suggest this is a major problem. The Guttman model precludes sending students on permit to other colleges due to the core curriculum in the first-year and the limited number of majors—and courses—in the second year. The model is designed to keep students at Guttman, preferably full-time, to graduate on time. Only those who are candidates for graduation are allowed to take courses on another campus on a permit basis provided the required or substitute course is not being offered at Guttman. Efforts have been made to decrease the number of students utilizing this option. In the fall 2014 semester, 25 students took courses on e-permit. During the spring 2015 semester, there were four students on e-permit and in fall 2015 there were just two (some students took more than one course on e-permit). At this time, allowances have been made to ensure that all students get their requisite courses when needed. Furthermore, the rollout of spring admissions (in spring 2017) will also put pressure on offering timely pathways to degree. Currently, in some majors more adjunct faculty are used to staff courses than ideal.

Another important factor in on-time graduation for Guttman students is the ability to pay for their education. Financial aid awareness for students is strong (Chapter 2, pp. 18-20). The Financial Aid Office trains staff members in policies and best practices to work with students more effectively. Between three and four presentation workshops are held throughout the year for the Advising staff (SSAs and Career Strategists). These workshops provide an overview of the financial aid application process and the relationship between satisfactory academic progress (SAP) and continuing financial aid. To enhance students’ financial understanding, the Office is collaborating with the Office of Student Engagement to select financial literacy software to incorporate within the Bridge Program and the LaBSS sessions for first-year students and to hold similar workshops for continuing students.

Fair and Impartial Practices (Students and Faculty and Staff)
At Guttman, policy implementation and enforcement is ensured by various administrators. As the College has increased in size and complexity, additional operational layers have been created. For example, the Director of Public Safety oversees the following initiatives: Site Access, Bike Storage, Children on Campus, Lost and Found, Student IDs, as well as compliance with the following CUNY policies (see Document Set 6): Sexual Misconduct, Title IX, Discrimination and Sexual Harassment, Drugs and Alcohol, Maintenance of Public Order (Henderson Rules), Tobacco Policy, Violence Against
Students, Violence Prevention, Workplace Violence and CLERY Compliance. The Dean of Student Engagement and Office of Registrar ensure strict adherence to Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) policies. The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs focuses on the CUNYFirst Textbook Module, Certificate of Attendance rosters, COPE Attendance rosters, collective bargaining agreement work-load compliance, State Education Department seat hours and course cancellation protocols.

To ensure integrity in student matters, Guttman follows CUNY protocols for academic integrity, Title IX compliance, and faculty student discipline. Like all CUNY campuses, Guttman established a Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee (FSDC) in 2012. The committee roster includes four Higher Education Officers (HEOs), four faculty members and four students. Representatives are selected from this group on a rotating basis, as each hearing must include one HEO, one faculty member (chair) and at least one student.

As a matter of course, Guttman tries to resolve student issues through intervention instead of after-the-fact discipline. Intervention may include visiting classes to discuss civility and respect in the classroom, mediation sessions, and pre-hearing resolutions. Between January 2105 and August 2016 there were 43 cases that involved a formal investigation, reports and, in some instances, an FSDC hearing. Of the 43 cases, two cases were dismissed, two students withdrew before charges could be filed, three cases were withdrawn by the complainant, four cases were resolved through mediation, five cases were resolved through pre-hearing resolution, one case was referred to John Jay College for resolution through online education and a no-contact order, one case was resolved through a no-contact order, ten cases were referred to Behavior Intervention Team (BIT), and 15 matters proceeded to a FSDC hearing.

Conduct cases are tracked and managed using Excel and stored digitally on a secure, limited access password protected hard drive. Case documents are locked securely in the student conduct officer’s office. The files are organized and managed by trained staff; the information is accessible by authorized individuals and easy to navigate. As College enrollment grows, however, it may be useful to procure a student management behavior record system as suggested by the Association of Student Conduct Administrators and Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.

When a student disputes an academic integrity accusation, if an instructor requests sanctions other than a failing grade or academic misconduct is repeated, the matter is reviewed by the College’s Academic Integrity Committee, formed in 2014. The Academic Integrity Committee has reviewed three such cases; one was forwarded to the school’s FSDC for further action.

In terms of integrity and faculty practices, Guttman observes the obligations, rights and privileges set forth in CUNY Board of Trustee Bylaws and Professional Staff Congress (PSC)/CUNY collective bargaining agreement (CBA). The CBA in some instances refers to constructs not in place at the College. For example, the PSC CBA refers to departments and department chairs in the context of the faculty reappointment, tenure and promotion (RPT) process. Guttman has neither. Accordingly, Guttman is currently participating in a grievance that seeks closer alignment of its RPT practices (approved by the College Council in 2013) with PSC standards of peer review/evaluation. Other grievances relate to language used in letters of reappointment; a failure to promote grievance was resolved on appeal.

As of February 2017, no faculty member had completed the seven year tenure process at Guttman. One faculty member who transferred from another CUNY college was granted tenure after two years; a second faculty member was granted tenure after her third year, as she had tenure at her previous institution. In fall 2016, the first cohort of Guttman faculty were up for tenure during their seventh year of employment with CUNY, and two of them have been recommended for promotion and tenure effective September 2017, with approval pending by the Board of Trustees. Since the RPT process was implemented at Guttman, all faculty members have been reappointed.
Per Guttman protocol and PSC CUNY guidelines, faculty are judged by peer observation of their classroom in addition to student evaluations. Every effort is made for faculty to be observed by someone in his/her discipline but, due to the size of the campus, that is not always possible. Guttman faculty also receive evaluations from the Provost or his/her designee as well as a third year review from a member of the College Personnel Committee (previously the Special Personnel Committee) (RPT pg. 19). Due to requests for information about the RPT process, the Interim Provost has instituted an RPT meeting with each new faculty cohort. In fall 2016, the Interim Provost hosted an RPT panel for the first time, and encouraged the implementation of the First Year Sponsor Program for New Faculty, a network-based faculty success program.

Student Consumer Information, including General Institutional Information can be found under the main Student link, General Policies and Procedures, along with Student Policy Information and CUNY Policies and Procedures on Sexual Misconduct. The web pages devoted to policies and procedures are quite dense and may not be easily understood by students. The College might consider ways that this information could be made more accessible to students.

For findings on handling student complaints or grievances, see Chapter 2, standard 9, pp. 26 – 27.

Policies on Respect and Tolerance for Diversity and Diverse Viewpoints
Guttman must abide by all federal, state, and city regulations. Also, as part of the larger City University of New York, the College must adhere to University-wide policies. The CUNY Bylaws set out in broad strokes the roles and overarching responsibilities of the campus presidents, faculty and instructional staff. The CUNY Manual of General Policy states the rules in specific areas, and for specified topics.

At Guttman, campus-wide policies may be generated by any number of units, worked up through the appropriate channels, considered by Senior Staff, and as appropriate, also by the Cabinet or Council. Policy changes can percolate up from faculty or staff through the formation of a proposal that is approved at the Curriculum Committee and referred to the full Council for a vote, and if necessary approved by the full Board of Trustee under a Chancellor’s University Report. Without an academic or faculty senate under the interim governance plan, there is no other forum than operational units for policy issues to be discussed. (See below Chapter 4, Standard 4).

The Office of Human Resources is careful to ensure compliance with CUNY and GCC policies around hiring and diversity. It follows the CUNY Search Committee Guide from CUNY’s Office of Recruitment and Diversity. This guide is provided to every search committee and spells out the entire search process, roles and responsibilities, confidentiality principles, the encouragement of diversity, the screening and interview process, and the process of concluding a search. Every job posting has the Equal Employment Opportunity statement, which is also listed on the website under “Human Resources.” In accordance with CUNY hiring practices, all full-time positions are advertised on CUNYfirst and, in collaboration with the CDO Office, HR increases recruitment efforts where demographic underutilization is identified. In addition, the HEO Screening Committee has been instituted on campus. HR continuously refers to the CUNY Bylaws and contracts that govern the employee groups that are represented to ensure that minimum qualifications are clearly advertised and met by all hires, and jobs are appropriately classified. For all applicable positions, HR conducts salary benchmark analyses to ensure pay equity within the College and across the University. (See HR Workflows for the part-time and full-time hiring processes at the College, which demonstrate the consistency HR maintains in the process for all hires to ensure equity and fairness.)

The Guttman Community College HEO Screening Committee, whose members are named by the President, was established in September, 2015. The Committee reviews and makes recommendations to the President on personnel actions which may include appointments, merit increases, reclassifications,
reassignments, and other such personnel actions as may be appropriate for the Higher Education Officer (HEO) Series employees. All actions for full-time Classified Staff earning annual salaries of $60,000 or higher are also reviewed by the HEO Screening Committee. To protect the rights of the employees, Committee discussions and votes of members are confidential. The HEO Screening Committee does not establish budgetary priorities. If an action has been approved by the President, it is forwarded by the Human Resources Office to the CUNY Office of Human Resources Management (OHRM) for approval. Action is final upon approval by the President, the OHRM, and the CUNY Board of Trustees. The Committee’s primary goals are to insure the equitable administration of personnel procedures, in conformity with College and University guidelines, and upholding the longstanding commitment of CUNY to equity in compensation as part of its non-discrimination policy.

In accordance with CUNY Human Resource policies, the members of faculty and staff search committees are carefully chosen to assure diversity in terms of race/ethnicity and gender. The membership of each committee is reviewed and approved by the administrative executive, human resources and the Diversity Officer. Guttman search committees include at least three members, and each is charged by the Diversity Officer to ensure that the guidelines are clear regarding EEOC, bias and allowable questions.

The Executive Summary discussed the diversity of our students (see p. xii, Fig. 2). Deputy Director of Student Engagement & Success addressed a question about campus climate by saying “The College fosters, respect and tolerance for diverse view points from students through civility training throughout the campaign for first-year students. However, I don’t think it’s enough from that perspective. Those campaigns need to be ongoing.” Accordingly, in her title and role as the coordinator for student led diversity initiatives, she has advocated and succeeded in repeating the training again for second year students. Civility training occurs during LABSS sessions for all first-year students.

The College’s Diversity Program Manager and AA/EEO Compliance Officer in the Office of Human Resources wants to increase the flow of communication and transparency in different areas at Guttman.

Fig. 5: Full-Time Faculty (N=50)
Overall in 2016, 48% of full-time Guttman faculty; 68% of full-time non-teaching staff at or below the director level; and 38% of administrators above the director level identify as minorities. Employees must do training on behavioral policies and against sexual discrimination and sexual assault training. Implementation plans are also underway for an Internet tool to further the antidiscrimination and sexual harassment training.

The Associate Director of Leadership and Success shares his thoughts on diversity of the Student Government Association: “In terms of ethnicity, well currently I think the student government represents the student body and I think that’s what you want in any democratic process that the governing body is representative of their constituents.” The SGA is representative of the student body in terms of ethnicity, age, and major.

The Director for Mentoring and Student Success who oversees the Peer Mentoring Program (see below p. 17 and pp. 50-52) explains that their commitment to recruiting and retaining a diverse staff and providing ongoing diversity/social justice development is evident in the following ways: peer mentor demographics, the peer mentor recruitment and selection process, peer mentor training and development, diversity and social justice trainings, and their performance management process.
When peer mentors apply, they are evaluated on seven competencies including cultural competency. The description on the application of what will be evaluated reads: “Are you encouraging and supportive toward others’ cultures, identities, and beliefs? Are you able to question or challenge discriminatory or biased attitudes or actions in a respectful manner?” Applicants are also asked to answer the following question, “Please share your experience working with diverse populations (i.e. underrepresented and/or underserved persons).” Upon acceptance into the program, peer mentors participate in intensive training, this training deals with diversity and social justice issues, such as power, privilege, and oppression, and race. Peer mentors are also formally evaluated at least once a year and are assessed on their ability to support students from diverse backgrounds. Given the gender imbalance, the College continues to actively recruit more male peer mentors both for the growth opportunity it affords the mentors and the importance of role models for our students. Targeted marketing is conducted through the United Men of Color organization, the advising team to recruit current Guttman students and those transitioning to senior colleges, and by inviting all current Guttman students that meet the position requirements to apply.

Additionally, the College supports programs that supplement formal educational requirements. The Heritage Awareness Task Force was created to develop programming and to recognize the achievements and contributions of different groups. As examples: In October 2015 the College celebrated Hispanic Heritage Month with a film and lecture series. In February 2016 the African Diaspora Fashion Show, Black to the Future, was held to provide the community with greater insights into the African Diaspora experience.

Our programs of study and the well-honed curriculum of the First-year Experience directly position students to grapple with diversity. Topics range from demographics to socio-economic life course-paths and decision-making (including but not limited to subjects such as immigration, gentrification, inequality, employment exploitation, military service, etc.) to gender and sexuality and to myriad “isms” from able-ism to ageism.

Guttman may be missing an opportunity as a Hispanic Serving Institution to be mindful of diversity both in symbol and practice extending to public events involving parents/guardians and students, at which more bilingual communication could be fostered.

The College Bulletin (in publication since 2012 – 2013) has passages that address the commitment to diversity at the school in the form of policies related to sexual harassment, workplace and domestic violence, and equal opportunity in recruitment, employment, and job retention. Additional University data may be found at CUNY Diversity Statistics. Our handbooks and policies well detail the expectations of participation in the Guttman community and the consequences of not meeting those expectations. Appropriate bodies serve to review conflict and to respond educationally but proactively in the name of committing to tolerance, growth, and safety.

Summary of Findings for Standard 6

1. The College effectively disseminates data and information in an honest, timely, clear and comprehensive manner to internal and external audiences.
2. The College possesses sufficient structures to provide students with adequate information and resources to fulfill their program requirements within two years or for those who need a little longer within three years. On rare occasions a student is directed to an e-permit course at another campus in fulfillment of a graduation requirement.
3. Guttman provides students with information on its website and in the College Bulletin on procedures for appealing grades and filing complaints about faculty or staff behavior. The Dean
of Student Engagement or an advisor is available for assisting students in lodging complaints and resolving them.

4. Guttman follows CUNY protocols for academic integrity, sexual harassment policy, and faculty-student disciplinary practices. The College takes steps to resolve issues with students through interventions such as class visits to discuss civility and respect in the classroom and mediation sessions.

5. The College adheres to the rights granted by the (Professional Staff Congress) PSC-CUNY contract to faculty and staff pertaining to grievances. Guttman is currently participating in a faculty-grievance around the alignment of evaluation practices with the PSC-CUNY contract. Guttman has also received and resolved work-related contract grievances in accordance with established protocols and procedures.

6. The College abides by all federal, state, and city regulations and, as part of the larger City University of New York, adheres to University-wide policies articulated through the Bylaws and the CUNY Manual of General Policy. Administrators, including the Diversity Program Manager and AA/EEO Compliance Officer in the Office of Human Resources, advise on and oversee the implementation of all relevant policies. Efforts to assure civility and respect for diversity occur at many levels in many areas, including Student Leadership, the Student Government Association, and the Peer Mentor program.

Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 6

Suggestions

- If (and when) the College moves to a spring and fall admissions schedule, it should carefully monitor the adequate frequency of course offerings to assure the timely attainment of degrees.
- Guttman should maintain its commitment to diversity as it grows its faculty—full-time and adjunct—and staff extending to the diversity of senior staff as well.
- The College should stay diligent to foster a climate of respect and openness to diverse viewpoints that can be openly explored in community.
- The College should maintain a commitment to rethinking the website and the portal to improve their effectiveness as tools for internal and external communication.
- As a Hispanic Serving Institution, the College should be mindful of diversity both in symbol and practice extending to public events involving parents/guardians and students at which more bilingual communication could be fostered.
- The college should procure and implement a software system for managing student behavior records.

Recommendations

- As the College is still relatively new (with an imbalance of senior faculty and untenured faculty), it is of the utmost importance that the RPT process be clarified and transparent for tenure-track faculty (see recommendation under Standard 10).
Chapter 2: Admissions, Student Support

Standards 8, 9

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.”

Overview of Standard 8

Since its inception Guttman’s singular focus has been to increase the number of students, especially those not effectively served in higher education, who persist in their programs of study and attain a degree in a timely manner. The College was created to address the barriers to degree completion by developing innovative approaches to retaining students and supporting them in earning an associate degree.

Guttman’s design for how students apply, learn about, are accepted, and enter the College infuses intentionality in each step. The Admissions staff, including peer mentors, meet with students who apply online in a “group information session” followed by a separate campus visit for an “individual information session.” Rather than accept community college as simply a default geographical option, these sessions inform students about Guttman’s approach, requirements, and programs of study. They affirm the student as a person with agency and prompt him or her to think about who they are, what their goals are, and what makes Guttman the right choice for them. Students who present a complete application and attend the two sessions are admitted on a first-come, first served basis. In late spring or early summer students are invited to an orientation that provides yet another opportunity to socialize with their peers, meet faculty and staff, and learn about the College. In late August, students attend a required two week Summer Bridge program that places them into the learning community cohort they will persist in for the first year and that affords them a hands-on preview of the City Seminar (the College’s signature core curriculum), including guided field work research in various iconic New York City neighborhoods. Immediately upon completion of the Bridge program, students begin full-time in the first twelve week fall session with their core curriculum (Guttman has two 18 week semesters in the fall and spring, broken into 6 week and 12 week sessions).

With a unique admissions process that greatly enhances the typical community college entry experience, and with direct attention to retention as a focal point of the college’s model, Guttman effectively addresses the standards for accreditation in the areas of Admissions and Retention and Student Support Services. The time and labor-intensive admissions process will challenge the College as it is taken to scale and will require that Guttman be both unwavering in its commitment and creative in the means it employs to provide students with informed choices about Guttman’s guided pathways educational model.

Findings for Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

Recruitment

CUNY has a strong tradition of establishing linkages with New York City high schools, and Guttman has followed suit. Pre-college programs that exist in the high schools are an important venue through which the College recruits prospective students. The Admissions Office staff conducts presentations at high schools and college fairs across the City. When Guttman opened, the Admissions Office gave information sessions to groups of high school guidance counselors at meetings of the Career and
Technical Education Council, New Visions for Public Schools, Urban Assembly, and the College Access Consortium of New York. These presentations not only served as a recruiting tool for the College but also substantiated Guttman’s commitment to helping all high school students make informed decisions about their higher education plans regardless of their ultimate decision to apply. In spring 2016, the Admissions Office started hosting a series of events on campus specifically designed for high school and community based organization counselors. The goal in hosting these events has been to familiarize counselors with the opportunities and resources that Guttman has to offer beyond the admissions process. In addition, Admissions aims to give the counselors a better understanding of the Guttman model in hopes that they will be better able to provide guidance to their students and to answer questions they may have which will ultimately help them during their college decision-making.

With an admissions philosophy that has been in existence since the College opened, Guttman is effective in ensuring its admissions and recruitment practices offer students the opportunity to understand the unique features of the Guttman model. Guttman’s open-access recruitment from the diversity of New York City and its environs “supports and reflects the mission of the College,” requiring the CUNY application for freshman admission and proof of a high school diploma or equivalent. Beyond these requirements, Guttman takes additional steps to ensure students have the information they need to make an informed choice about Guttman and are prepared to thrive, persist and complete their degree.

The Admissions Process

Guttman balances its open access recruitment with an intentional approach designed to ensure a student makes an informed choice when coming to Guttman. Applicants must complete a multi-step process designed to help them determine if the College is the right educational fit for them. A student who applies to CUNY (more than 6,000 in 2014 and 5,000 in 2015) and indicates Guttman as any rank choice out of six will receive an invitation to attend a Group Information Session (GIS). GIS attendance is a requirement to continue the intentional process of admissions, so that students become familiar with the educational model, particularly the required Bridge Program and full-time attendance in the first-year as well as a limited number (5) of structured degree programs. The financial aid and placement testing processes are also reviewed. During the General Information Sessions, the first-year curriculum and requirements of the five majors are reviewed, with students being given information in attendee packets. Following the GIS, those students who are interested in continuing with admissions sign up for and attend a mandatory thirty-minute, individual meeting with an Admissions and Access peer mentor (see below, p. 17) to engage in a deeper conversation about their educational goals as they relate to their commitment to attend Guttman. The goal of this multi-step process is to “assist the prospective student in making informed decisions” and understanding the commitment of enrolling at Guttman, as well as to facilitate applicants’ connections with members of the College community. Within CUNY the process is unique. Students who complete both the Group Information Session and the Individual Information Session are admitted to the College provided they have earned a high school diploma or GED as per the University’s open admissions policy. After acceptance applicants return their Commitment Forms on which they acknowledge their understanding of program requirements (e.g., required Summer Bridge and full-time attendance in the first-year).

Guttman meets the standard of ensuring prospective and current students have “accurate and comprehensive information regarding academic programs and testing.” It keeps its admissions policies up to date on the its web site, and publishes Fast Facts about enrolled students, Student Consumer Information, as well as a thorough explanation of the programs of study. The College also employs Hobsons Connect, a customer relations management software platform, to communicate all admissions matters and procedures to applicants and admitted students. Admissions partners with the Testing Office and Office of AccessABILITY to explain the CUNY placement tests, offer preparatory materials, offer testing accommodations, and schedule testing appointments.
**Peer Mentoring**

The **Peer Mentoring Program** is part of the Office of Student Engagement and is a critical component of students’ academic and co-curricular experience. There are three types of Peer Mentors: Admissions & Access Peer Mentors, Academic Success Peer Mentors, and Leadership & Service Peer Mentors. The role of the Peer Mentor is to help students in their transition from high school to college. Peer Mentors work across campus, from the Admissions Office to the classroom, to provide students with academic as well as extracurricular support. (Mentors who conduct academic support sessions, called Meet-Ups, and offer mentoring in classes such as LaBSS and Studio, are discussed below in chapter 3, pp. 48-50.) According to the Spring 2015 Guttman Faculty and Staff Survey (see Document Set 7), 71% of faculty and staff respondents (including 75% of staff and 70% of faculty) rated their agreement strong or very strong that they understand the purpose of peer mentoring.

The Admissions & Access Peer Mentors (AAPMs) provide prospective students and families with a clear understanding of the Guttman experience and guide them through the admissions process. They consult with students on academic policies and programs, campus life, and curricular and co-curricular activities (see **Position Descriptions**). Approximately 12-15 are hired per year to assist students. AAPMs lead Group Information Sessions for prospective students; in 2014-2015, mentors hosted ten of these sessions for 946 students (Peer Mentoring SAGE plan). Likewise, they host students for individual information sessions, for which 623 students registered that year, as well as campus visits, 31 of which were held in 2014-2015, averaging 25 students each.

**Transfer Credit**

As an **Admissions Policy**, only first-time freshmen have been admitted since Guttman Community College opened. Nevertheless, the registrar and faculty award appropriate **Transfer of Credit** for academic coursework taken while in high school in satisfaction of degree requirements. Students are not exempted from first-year courses (e.g. City Seminar I or II or Ethnographies of Work I or II, for which there are no comparable dual enrollment courses offered). This policy and the procedures for receiving pre-college credit are explained on the Guttman website and emphasized at Orientation, during the Summer Bridge program, and through group advising sessions in the first term, thereby meeting the standard for having “published and implemented policies and procedures regarding transfer credit and credit for extra-institutional college level-learning that state the criteria established by the institution regarding transfer of credit.”

**CUNY Start** (see also Chapter 3, pp. 48-49)

**CUNY Start** is an intensive program for incoming college students, both high school graduates and high school equivalency diploma recipients, who need to increase their proficiency in reading, writing, and mathematics prior to enrollment in college credit courses. The program, offered at a number of CUNY campuses, enrolls prospective CUNY students who have been accepted to college because they have a high school or high school equivalency diploma, but are not ready for college-level work based on their scores on the CUNY Assessment Tests. Guttman offered a summer and fall program in 2015, and attempted to mount a spring 2016 CUNY Start program. Since the Central Office required the College to sustain a year-round program, it was decided in late 2016 to discontinue both CUNY and Summer Start at Guttman until the College has a greater capacity—presumably when it relocates to its permanent campus—to admit students during both fall and spring admissions cycles. The College is now considering supplemental support it might offer, especially in math, to both entering and continuing students in lieu of the full-time immersion experience.

**Orientation**

For students who have completed the GIS and IIS, been accepted and commit by May 1, the Office of Admissions organizes a half-day **Orientation** program. The goal of Orientation is to “increase committed students’ and family members’ awareness of practices and skills needed to be a successful college
During the day, students participate in an activity that introduces the Bridge Program common reading, led by peer mentors, and meet advisors and faculty. A portion of the program is devoted to financial aid education, discussed below in greater detail. Students also set up their email accounts, obtain their ID cards, and discuss any outstanding documentation that needs to be submitted before their first semester. However, space and time constraints have at times limited Orientation programming. Prior to 2016 when students attended an Orientation session offered just before Bridge, the program was reduced, limiting the experience for these students. Challenges reported during the 2015 assessment phase were “streamlining communication between offices and committed students,” and an “inability to host [a good] quality orientation due to time, space and budget.” One change that was suggested was increasing the “periodic exchange of information between Admissions and appropriate offices” (SAGE plan 2014-2015). In 2016 the full orientation session was also offered to all students.

Financial Aid and Registration Processes
Two points in the admissions process offer an opportunity for students to understand how to finance their education and how to apply for financial aid: the General Information Session and the Orientation. Students are made aware, through discussion and print materials, of the need to file their FAFSA applications as early as possible. As students are accepted, the College conducts outreach and offers FAFSA workshops to assist those who are unable to have access to a computer, or have difficulties in completing the application. During the Bridge Program, students’ academic advisors—Student Success Advocates—spend one group advising session reviewing financial aid education and financial literacy issues, in an effort to reinforce what they have learned and understand how best to manage the aid package they will receive. Additionally, the Single Stop Office offers outreach to students regarding information about free financial counselling. (See below Standard 9, p. 25.)

The Working Group examined the impact on enrollment and retention of its financial aid and registration policies and processes as part of the self-study (Self-Study Design research questions 8.3 and 8.4), and has determined that these policies and processes meet the standards required by Middle States. The Financial Aid Office provides “accurate and comprehensive information, and advice where appropriate, regarding financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, and refunds.” All Financial Aid Policies are reviewed periodically and the Guttman web site is updated as needed. The College Bulletin is reviewed and updated annually. Once matriculated, the Financial Aid Office offers group workshops and individual sessions to assist with filing the FAFSA (held in March and promoted as “March Madness”). Each student is assigned a dedicated Financial Aid counselor, who is the primary resource for the student during her career. Proactive outreach efforts have resulted in 87 – 90% of students completing the FAFSA each year, and approximately three quarters of students receiving financial aid, as the following graph shows.

Fig. 8
The majority of financial aid recipients receive a book advance one week before classes, to assist with purchasing textbooks. Like other colleges, the allocation of Federal Work Study (FWS) funds is limited, and is determined by the CUNY Central Office. The program is first-come, first-served, as placements are very limited due to space constraints on the campus. Often, the allocation does not meet students’ needs, and their funds run out before the end of a semester. Typically, the Financial Aid Office requests an additional allocation annually to support those students who are already in the program so that they can continue to participate through the end of the academic year, although that in itself does not resolve the issue of there not being enough positions available for all students who wish to work under the program.

To help students stay current on their aid, the Office of Financial Aid repeatedly contacts students selected for verification to submit required documentation in order to finalize and disburse all eligible awards to students. Financial Aid collaborates with the Family Independence Administration of the City of New York Human Resources Administration to provide support to students on public assistance. Through the College Opportunity to Prepare for Employment (COPE) program, the College provides financial aid counseling and tracking to ensure students are receiving all financial aid for which they are eligible and meeting the City’s requirements for retaining benefits. (The Office also collaborates with Single Stop, described above [pp. 25-26], to help students determine their eligibility for public benefits.)

For students who are unable to have their entire cost covered by need-based aid, the Financial Aid Office offers counseling on loans and CUNY payment plans, which can help them continue with their education. More recently, the Financial Aid Office has begun to partner with other areas of the College to ensure a broader outreach and support structure for students who are eligible for scholarships. Since its inception the College has promoted elite scholarships to target groups, such as Phi Theta Kappa, and has regularly sent announcements about select scholarships to the student body, but there was no broad-based coordination of any effort to help students research, apply for, and secure scholarships. In 2015, representatives from a number of units at the College came together to devise a strategy for joint coordination of the process and moving toward tracking students’ progress in completing scholarship applications. The need for technology to assist with both financial education and scholarship searches was noted.

Financial Aid information is disseminated at the admissions sessions and then followed by a separate financial aid presentation during orientation for admitted students. During the winter, the Office holds FAFSA-filing workshops for continuing and entering students. Seven FAFSA-filing workshops were held in 2014 and six workshops were held in 2015. The Office does not produce its own financial aid information materials; instead, it posts on the website the annual Financial Aid Award booklet produced by CUNY’s main financial aid office.

The Hub—Guttman’s one-stop-shop for student services during admissions and including financial aid, registrar, and bursar—enacts the College’s high touch model and provides students a convenient place to receive counselling and assistance for all the issues related to those areas. During 2015 there were 10,379 first-year and continuing student ‘check-ins’ at The Hub; in 2014, there were 7,411. Approximately 55% of these check-ins were financial aid inquiries. Alumni, who returned to Guttman to serve on a panel during the All Campus Meeting in January 2015, cited The Hub as one of the most important and helpful parts of the Guttman experience, but recognized that more development of self-advocacy skills are needed as Guttman students transition to other colleges.

Starfish Connect was launched in March 2016 to help streamline and track communications among faculty, students, advisors and financial aid counselors. It allows students to receive referrals and make appointments with such staff and provides students with the chance to reach out virtually for assistance through a feature called “Raise Your Hand.” With “Raise Your Hand” a student can indicate “I need help
paying for college” and receive an immediate response from her dedicated counselor. In addition to financial literacy support offered in LaBBS, students are also offered this support through the Single Stop Office. Expert financial counsellors provided financial literacy workshops and direct coaching sessions to 70 students in 2014-15 and 49 students in 2016. The main topics covered were: Budgeting; Debit vs. Credit; and Funding Your Future - What to Expect When Transferring. For the latter workshop, participants were provided with additional resources, such as links for websites: College Abacus; Salt: Money Knowledge for College and Beyond as well as scholarship search engines. However, the College also needs a system that can help students find scholarships more systematically.

Assessment
The admissions process is continually assessed through an annual SAGE (Systematic Assessment for Guttman Effectiveness) plan (see Chapter 6, Standard 7, pp. 107-111 for an overview of the Center for College Effectiveness’s SAGE initiative and documentation). As parents and guardians are unique partners in students’ educational success, Guttman strengthened its parent/guardian orientation that began in 2012. In summer 2015, faculty members began to play a larger role at Orientation for students, with faculty joining the student and parent/guardian sessions. These activities require additional attention to ensure they are developed to their fullest potential.

Summer Bridge Program
See below Chapter 3, pp. 31-33 for Description of Summer Bridge Program

Summary of Findings for Standard 8
1. Guttman’s recruitment and admissions process supports and reflects the mission of the College to be both open access, intentional and informative.
2. The admissions process through Group and Individual Information Sessions, and Orientation provides timely, accurate and comprehensive information regarding academic programs, testing, financial aid, and assists prospective students in making informed decisions.
3. The Financial Aid office and student engagement personnel provide accurate and comprehensive information, and advice where appropriate, regarding financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, and refunds.
4. Guttman has published and implemented policies and procedures regarding Transfer of Credit policies.
5. Guttman’s CUNY Start and Summer Start must be discontinued, given the difficulty of sustaining the program year-round due to space constraints and the limited capacity to recruit and admit students in the spring cycle. The College is now considering ways it might offer supplemental support, especially in math, to both entering and continuing students in lieu of the full-time immersion experience.
6. The admissions process is continually assessed and improved through a process of inquiry, data, and reflection in the unit’s SAGE plan.

Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 8
Suggestions
- Carefully monitor Orientation to ensure that all students are as well informed and prepared as possible for the Summer Bridge program and that all iterations of Orientation offer a consistent and high-quality experience.
- The College needs a system that can help students find scholarships more systematically.

Recommendations
None
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.”

Overview of Standard 9

As noted in Advising, Student Support and Academic Achievement, most of Guttman’s services in this area are provided through the Office of Student Engagement, which is explicitly charged and designed to be a support mechanism that aids students in removing internal and external barriers to their success in academia with respect to the diverse needs, abilities, and cultures of our students. The unit is comprised of offices with professional staff who advocate for students and aspire to teach students self-efficacy as they build a foundation of dispositional skills, engagement, and success. The unit’s integration within the division of Academic Affairs under the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost ensures that support services and student needs are at the center of the decision-making process and policy creation. Administration also plays a critical role in supporting student success through The Hub—Guttman’s one-stop-shop that provides services from the Offices of Admissions, Financial Aid, Bursar and Registrar, all of whom report to the Vice President for Finance and Administration. In The Hub students are assisted in just one area through a holistic understanding of the student need, with or without the assistance of his or her advisor.

With the organizational shift away from academic and student affairs’ territoriality, it was natural to see the instructional team (see Chapter 3, pp. 34-35) develop as a collaboration among Student Success Advocates (SSAs), faculty, and librarians. The instructional team concept also provided a strong rationale to maintain a SSA (1) to student (75-90) ratio within the cohort (25) to house (3 x 25 = 75) model as an anchor of student success in the first-year. Maintaining a reasonable ratio of advisor to students in a high touch environment will, like ramping up the admissions process itself, be challenging as the college grows. Guttman encourages collaboration for student success from the unit level to senior management and makes it difficult if not impossible for a student to be invisible or “fall through the cracks.”

Findings for Standard 9: Student Support Services

Advising & Registration
The College’s advising program supports student retention and success and appears to foster resiliency and autonomy as well. Students work closely with assigned advisors starting in the Summer Bridge Program straight through to graduation. Advisors who serve as both academic and career success coaches have the credentials to implement a model that meets the standard for “appropriate student advisement procedures and processes.” In the first-year, students have a Student Success Advocate (SSA), who helps them make a smooth transition to college life. During Bridge and throughout the first-year, students meet with their SSAs weekly in group advising sessions called Learning about Being a Successful Student (or LaBSS; see below (see chapter 3, p. 37). One SSA is assigned to each first-year house, which means the advisor to student ratio is approximately 1:75, extending to as high as 1:90 under certain circumstances. After the first-year, continuing students are assigned to a Career Strategist dedicated to their major, who guides them as they progress toward completing their degree and transition into a baccalaureate program and/or career. Career Strategists' caseloads currently average between 110 and 150 students each. In addition to individual advising, Career Strategists assist students with scholarships, professional skills training, and transfer planning. They collaborate with the Office of Partnerships and Community Engagement as well as CUNY Leads to support students’ career planning. The College enjoys a positive rapport between students and advisors. On student surveys administered annually, students give high ratings to their academic advisors as valuable sources of support. Three items that received the highest satisfaction
ratings, exceeding the national community college average for satisfaction, were: my academic advisor is concerned about my success as an individual; my academic advisor helps me set goals to work toward; my academic advisor is approachable.

The college’s high-touch model is designed to prepare and advise students. The advising philosophy consists of an application of strengths-based, proactive, and appreciative approaches, motivational interviewing techniques, focus on self-efficacy, and holistic student support. Ultimately, students are responsible for their success, but the advisors will help them build and use their strengths, tools, skills, and strategies to stay on track. LaBSS—structured group advising sessions in the first-year that are components of the Ethnographies of Work courses—extend over two semesters. Their objective is to scaffold students’ personal and professional development on a sustained basis through mandatory, so-called intrusive advising. (See a CCE special assessment report, June 2014 Student Engagement: Feedback from First-Year Students about LaBSS I, Meet-Ups, and Studio—Document Set 9).

Like other units and student support programs, the advising program conducts assessment via its SAGE Planning. For instance, student responses to the 2015 Guttman Student Survey, questions 13 and 26 (see Document Set 9) indicated that only 62% agreed or strongly agreed that a major-focused project, “Meet the Majors,” and other activities in the weekly group advising session in the first-year increased understanding of Guttman’s majors, which was a decrease from 82% of students agreeing or strongly agreeing in 2014 (questions 13 and 20). Improving students’ comprehension of and confidence in their major selection became a strategy for achieving the goal of ensuring a smoother transition to second-year advisement in the advising SAGE plan for 2014-2015. The advising team completely revised the project and the advising activities leading up to it for fall 2015. The director also enhanced cross-training among Student Success Advocates and Career Strategists, and the team devised additional opportunities for students to meet with Career Strategists in the group advising session during the first-year.

One area where additional infrastructure is only in its earliest stages is the support system in place for students who do not complete the first-year sequence in its intended manner. All courses in the First-Year Experience (FYE) are required as part of the College’s core Pathways general education curriculum. When students do not pass they must retake them. Roughly 20% of students receive an NC no credit grade on first take (Grade Distribution Dashboard, fall 2015). Often, students in retake courses fall out of sync with their house, cohort, and instructional teams. They may not be enrolled in LaBSS with their SSA and may not be with one or more of the faculty they met in their first term. They may no longer receive the support of integrated instruction and advising. Students in retake are sometimes on probation and are clearly struggling. These students could benefit from increased support but often receive less as they are fall off-track and “outside the model.” If a student retaking first-year classes is readmitted after some time away, she is even further removed from her initial house experience. On the advising end, the assigned SSA continues touchpoints with the student and collaborates with another advisor who may be facilitating LaBSS retake, but this “one anchor” to the FYE is not enough. The Interim Provost has convened a faculty working group in fall 2016 to consider the issues associated with student success and retakes in the first-year.

Regardless of whether they have completed the First-Year Experience, students move after the second semester from the Student Success Advocates to receiving academic advising from Career Strategists. These upper-year advisors guide students as they complete their degree and transition into a baccalaureate program or a career. Each Career Strategist is a specialist in one or more programs of study, and is cross-trained in understanding the nuances of the FYE as well as all majors. Although Strategists typically do not see students weekly, as an SSA would, a large percentage of students report having multiple interactions with their Strategist (for instance, of 42 attendees at a Spring 2014 continuing student feedback roundtable, 88% reported having two or more meetings with their Strategist that semester, and 80% had interacted with their Strategist two or more times via email).
In addition to degree planning, the main focus of the Strategist’s efforts is helping students navigate transfer to a four-year degree. Unlike other CUNY campuses, the college does not have a “Transfer Office,” but rather integrates transfer support into the advising syllabus. The Strategists provide a structured curriculum to prepare students for transfer that is collaborative with the SSA team and reaches back to LaBSS in the first-year. In LaBSS I, students are asked to consider possible four-year institutions as part of the “What’s My Major” project; in LaBSS II, they meet the Strategists and learn about the degree-auditing-tool DegreeWorks and Pathways, the CUNY general education requirements. Seventy-seven percent of student respondents agree or strongly agree that they understand the graduation requirements. Using Starfish data and oral reporting, SSAs formally “pass up” their students to Strategists, so in session 2 of the second semester of college, students are transitioned to the Strategists with an educational plan in mind and an understanding of their advising goals for year two or beyond.

By focusing on preparation for transfer in a scaffolded manner, the advising program fosters resiliency and autonomy in the student body. The College holds an annual transfer fair, like other campuses, but takes a unique approach, encouraging students to attend pre-fair workshops and one-on-one sessions to learn how to prepare for the fair by determining appropriate and meaningful questions of admissions counselors; students visit tables with a clipboard and discussion points. This has had a positive impact on the fair itself, which has attracted more colleges every year (from 35 in September 2014 to 46 in September 2015; attendance by students ranged in those years from 150-180). The same technique is utilized to prepare students for “transfer days,” which bring five to eight campuses for a mini-fair. Further, an expanding series of other events take place throughout the year to support transfer planning, such as “Introduction to Transfer” (2013, now called “Transfer Overview”), “Next Steps” (2014 through the present), Application Studio Hours (2013 through the present), and the like. Career Strategists have developed a handbook, “Making Your Credits Count,” which is a guide to negotiating transfer credit and the transfer process. Alumni panels of students who have transferred to four-year colleges have been popular, demonstrating Guttman students’ interest in networking with transfer students and learning more about how to ensure a successful transfer experience.

The Center for College Effectiveness has published regular reports on our alumni, entitled Life After Guttman (see Document Set 9), tracking them into CUNY’s senior colleges and comparing their cumulative GPAs at Guttman with their first semester and first-year transfer GPAs. Of the spring 2015 graduates who successfully completed fall 2015 semesters at senior CUNY colleges, 36% had GPAs in the range of 3.00 – 3.99 and 41% had GPAs in the range of 2.00 – 2.99. Based on preliminary data, 21% (or 14 of 66 students) did not successfully complete the first transfer semester (Life After Guttman: Spring 2015 Graduates’ Preliminary Fall 2015 Update).

Guttman offers a number of resources to best accommodate a student’s registration needs. Its early registration policy allows students to register for classes well in advance and increases the probability that students will be placed in their required classes especially in the major and stay on track to graduate. In addition to early registration for potential graduates, Guttman offers e-permits that provide for a student to take an equivalent course at another CUNY college. E-permit credits are counted directly towards the student’s degree at Guttman, and the tuition charges for the course are folded into the student’s tuition and fees and financial aid package at Guttman. This reduces the likelihood of potential delays in graduating (see Chapter 1, p.9).

Guttman schedules all first-year student classes at W40th Street. With its limited space, courses for continuing students in their programs of study are usually scheduled to meet at an additional location under arrangements with the CUNY School of Professional Studies (SPS) on 31st Street between Avenue of the Americas and 7th Avenue. Expanding classrooms to SPS and opening additional sections helps ensure that students remain on track to graduate, but at times disconnects them from important support
services located at W40th Street. To address this concern, a SPS support team of Career Strategists has been formed. The team provides in-person support, a reassuring presence and encouragement to continuing Guttman students who are taking classes in the SPS building. During key times in the semester (such as the first week of classes, midterms or the registration period), a Career Strategist is available in between classes at SPS to answer questions, assist students to scheduling appointments with their advisor and troubleshooting any issues that may arise. The aim of the support team is to help students continue to feel connected to Guttman and their advisor while at SPS.

**Men, Women, LGBTQ & Undocumented Students**

The United Men of Color (U-MOC) program at Guttman was founded to provide an inclusive and supportive space where men of color, in particular, can receive academic support, mentoring, and have the opportunity to engage in social-cultural dialogue that will enhance their understanding of self and their relationship to different communities. The program strives to empower students to find their individual voices as they navigate the college environment and overcome the inequalities that lead to poor academic performance and to develop a long lasting bond between scholars, program coordinators, and external program partners.

Women of GRIT (Gratitude, Resilience, Integrity, and Talent) mentorship program is a campus organization founded in 2014 with the mission to provide academic, personal, professional, community and leadership development to young women at Guttman. The program strives to enhance participants’ lives through mentorship, enrichment programs, and workshops that serve to inspire individual advancement.

The need for an LGBTQ Safe Zone has been discussed at Guttman for some time, primarily in the area of Student Engagement. Prompted by events in Orlando this past summer, which had a disproportionate impact on LGBTQ Latinos—well represented among our student body—the College has begun planning in earnest for the creation of a Safe Zone program on campus.

Recent political events have made the plight of our undocumented students even more precarious. There is strong support at both the College and University levels to do everything we can to protect our Dreamers. At its January 30, 2017 meeting, the Trustees approved a statement, including this affirmation:

> CUNY’s Board of Trustees reaffirms its long-standing commitment to welcoming, protecting and supporting our students, faculty and staff who are foreign nationals, immigrants or refugees. We remain committed to diversity, equity and inclusion and will steadfastly continue to offer a welcoming environment for students of all backgrounds. CUNY will take any steps available under the law to protect and support our undocumented students.

**Wellness, AccessABILITY, and Single Stop**

The Wellness Office, Office of AccessABILITY, and Single Stop are all examples of Guttman’s attention to ensuring students’ basic needs are met through direct service, in tandem with providing academic and other support. In fall 2014, Guttman opened a standalone counseling Wellness Office, and retained a full-time licensed counselor to provide short-term, personal counseling services, along with a counseling intern year-round. Wellness Services sponsors workshops and events throughout the academic year to support student growth and well-being. Students rate Guttman counselors’ care more highly than the national average (2015 Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, item 48—see Document Set 9). Wellness reported a total of 411 individual and group therapy sessions from July 2014-June 2015. Average visits per month totaled 34, and the number of individual visits increased by 178% from the previous year; using the Outcome and Session Rating Scales (SRS & ORS), students
indicated that their sessions were directed toward their self-identified goals, with an average rating of 9 on a scale of 1-10 (from SAGE 2014-2015).

The **Office of AccessABILITY** Services ensures equal access to all college programs and services, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, which protects persons from discrimination on the basis of physical or mental impairment. Since the Accreditation Readiness Report in September 2014, the College has reconceptualized the former Office of Wellness and AccessABILITY. Guttman has a higher percentage by far of students with disclosed special needs than any other CUNY college (20% or 161 out of 824 students in fall 2015). After a program review by the University in 2013 and to ensure students have services to which they are entitled, the College recently significantly expanded its Office of AccessABILITY Services, and has responded to the University’s recommendations of alignment of testing capacity with the increasing population of students with disabilities, uncoupling Wellness and AccessABILITY to address the dramatic growth in service demands for each of these key areas and bringing the student-to-disability staff ratio more closely in line with AHEAD (Association of Higher Education and Disabilities) guidelines.

The AccessABILITY office staff grew from one full-time employee to an office of 5 full-time employees and 6 part-time employees, thereby bringing it in line with AHEAD guidelines of maintaining a 12:1 student/staff ratio for students with disabilities. This focus on students with disabilities and the expansion of services shows a positive correlation to student outcomes. For instance, the data from Guttman’s Center for College Effectiveness indicated that the retention rate of students with accommodations who registered with the Office was higher than unregistered students. According to the 2015 Guttman Faculty/Staff Survey, 69% of respondents reported that their understanding of the purpose of the AccessABILITY Office was strong or very strong. This percentage includes 59% of faculty respondents and 72% of staff respondents. According to the 2015 Noel-Levitz Student Survey (see Document Set 9), for the item “Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course,” student rated their satisfaction 6.14 on a 7 point scale (compared to 5.32 for the national comparison group) and for the item “Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students,” students rated their satisfaction 6.32 on a 7 point scale (compared to 5.50 for the national comparison group).

**Single Stop**

The Single Stop Office provides services and resources to help students address barriers that prevent them from attending and completing school. It provides services free in collaboration with both internal and external partners. Referrals for financial coaching, legal counselling for immigration issues or landlord-tenants issues as well as tax assistance are all available. Sixteen percent of students in 2014-2015 reported using Single Stop services often or very often (the office recorded 679 student visits to the Single Stop office (229 unique students). Prior to April 2015, the office was staffed with a full-time coordinator and a part-time social worker. However as the social service needs of the students increased, a full-time social worker was hired. The Single Stop office used the BEN (Benefits Enrollment Network) screening software to assist 93 students in the assessment of benefit eligibility, and 65 students were confirmed to have received benefits. Through March 2015, over 500 visits were made to the Single Stop Office for nutritional assistance, of which 113 were unique visits. After many successful food drives, Guttman partnered with Food Bank NYC to have its own campus pantry in spring 2016. Students are aware of Single Stop due to successful promotion and collaboration with advisors, peer mentors, and faculty. According to the 2015 Guttman Survey: Feedback from Students about their College Experience (see Document Set 9), 50% of students reported having either a strong or a very strong understanding of the mission of the Single Stop office.

Moreover, there was a burgeoning need to align legal counseling with students’ academic and experiential learning. In spring 2014, for instance, Single Stop integrated more meaningful legal services to students by integrating legal workshops in classes with legal modules. Specially, the Legal Aid
provider, contracted by Single Stop, conducted two workshops entitled “Knowing Your Rights” in partnership with an American Government instructor. As these were dedicated class sessions, 40 students reported that they were given detailed information on procedures regarding reasonable searches and seizures, due process, and the right to privacy, and learned about the Bill of Rights and the Fourth and Fifth Amendments. In addition, six students attended a domestic violence workshop conducted by Legal Aid, which was attached to part of their class assignments as an intentional strategy. Faculty also reported that these workshops presented a great space for students to delve more deeply into the material through experienced lawyers who were better able to respond to specific legal questions.

Registration and financial aid are but two components of the College’s student support services. Integrated, proactive advising, embedded peer mentoring, and a network of other campus-based support services (Wellness, AccessABILITY, and Single Stop) are cornerstones of the Guttman educational model, designed to improve student learning, retention, and graduation. Guttman has implemented “a program of student support services appropriate to student strengths and needs, reflective of institutional mission, consistent with student learning expectations, and available regardless of place or method of delivery.”

On Handling Student Complaints or Grievances and Record-keeping

The self-study found that Guttman has “reasonable procedures, widely disseminated, for equitably addressing student complaints or grievances,” and it “keeps records of student complaints or grievances.” Although a new institution, Guttman is expected to implement CUNY-wide procedures, protocols, and policies to address student grievances and complaints (CUNY Student Policies and Procedures). The College has tailored the University’s student complaint procedures to make its Student Policies & Procedures widely available online and in the College Bulletins. Similarly, there is an expectation for students to understand their roles and responsibilities as partners in the educational process (Bylaws: Article XV Students, CUNY Policy on Sexual Misconduct, CUNY’s Students’ Bill of Rights). The University and its Colleges have a variety of Academic Policies for dealing with student-related issues, including grade appeals, academic integrity violations, and disclosure of student records. The University provides students with a path for addressing their complaints about faculty treatment in an academic space in a way that does not encumber academic freedom.

All policies relating to student rights are posted and updated online and are accessible in the College Bulletin 2016-2017 and Student Consumer Information. In addition, hard copies of the College Bulletin are available in the Office of Communications. During the mandatory Bridge Program, students are presented with the Guttman Guide with an embedded QR code that takes them to the Guttman web site and a comprehensive overview of the policies that govern their college life. The policies include formal procedures and guidelines for specific academic and non-academic complaints. Which are reviewed by the CUNY Office of General Counsel. Similarly, faculty and staff are also introduced to their rights and responsibilities as they relate to students in the Faculty Handbook and Faculty and Staff Conduct presentation at orientation. (Faculty and staff are also informed of how to manage complaints about student conduct; there is online information about the Behavior Intervention Team (BIT) and an online form for faculty and staff to send a report about urgent conduct matters to BIT. Students are encouraged during Bridge to read and internalize these rights and expectations. In more formal settings, first-year students are trained about sexual misconduct and harassment concerns and are introduced to CUNY Sexual Misconduct Policy in their LaBBS courses as well as University rules and codes. These trainings occur in the fall and spring semesters and are facilitated by the Office of Conduct in collaboration with advisors and the Title IX Officer. The website features CUNY videos with speakers explaining various aspects of the policies in this area.

Students who are educated about the College’s grievance policies on faculty and staff conduct are more empowered to take corrective action to resolve issues, but not necessarily formal action. In a short survey
distributed from January 20 to 30, 2016, “Conduct in Academic Settings” (response rate of N=50), of students who indicated they were familiar with Guttman’s complaint procedures, 62% were more likely to have informal discussions with a faculty or staff member about his or her conduct. Of those who were not familiar with Guttman’s procedures, only 3% reported that they would take the same course of action. These results are clearly aligned with focus group and on-the-spot surveys conducted by the Office of Student Conduct, which indicate that most respondents would not file a formal report for these grievances. It is suggested that as the College grows, and in the spirit of equity and consistency, students should be continually educated about formal grievance procedures and a clear, consistent reporting structure as well as secured record maintenance should be developed.

Academic freedom is of paramount importance to Guttman Community College, its faculty and students. Guttman respects the right of its faculty to teach course content in a variety of different ways and expects that its staff will act professionally at all times. At the same time, Guttman has established procedures for appealing grades and for filing complaints about faculty or staff behavior which is not protected by academic freedom or administrative necessity, and is not covered by other procedures. Examples might include incompetent or inefficient service, neglect of duty, physical or mental incapacity or conduct unbecoming the staff.

In addition, Guttman has a variety of procedures for dealing with other issues that can arise in the academic setting, including violations of the college’s code of academic integrity, behavioral misconduct, gender harassment, accommodation or discrimination concerns, and questions about the accuracy of student financial or academic records.

Among the links available under Students from the main navigation bar on the Guttman website splash page are Student Policy Information, including policies on Academics, Student Conduct, and Title IX. Students with questions, complaints or grievances are guided to Student Policies & Procedures or encouraged to consult with the Program Coordinator or Guttman’s Dean of Student Engagement or designee, who will advise which procedure applies to the type of issue raised. Most situations will fall into one of the following areas:

- Grade Disputes
- Academic Integrity (e.g. dishonesty associated with an assignment that results in academic sanction)
- Student Conduct / Discipline (e.g. behavior or academic misconduct that results in disciplinary sanction)
- Faculty or Staff Conduct (e.g. treatment or behavior unjustified by academic freedom)
- Harassment / Discrimination (e.g. violation of civil rights, education law or CUNY policy)
- Student Records

Like other student records at Guttman, student grievance records are stored and retained per the established CUNY protocols. The College has “policies and procedures, developed and implemented, for safe and secure maintenance of student records.” Most records at Guttman are electronic, but like all CUNY campuses, the College adheres to the CUNY Records Retention and Disposition Schedule. The Registrar follows University procedures for designating individual access to the electronic student records system, CUNYfirst, utilizing request forms that require several levels of signature and are processed by the University’s Central Office to ensure compliance with policy. When employees leave the College their access is removed. CUNYfirst contains records from admissions through degree completion. Student advising records are electronic as well, and as of fall 2015 they are stored in the Starfish by Hobsons system (prior to acquiring that system they were kept in spreadsheets on the College’s secured network). The system is password-protected and a limited number of individuals on the
campus have access. All members of the community who have access are required to undergo training as to the security and maintenance of these records.

The College also maintains the records of students who have taken the CUNY Assessment Tests in reading, writing, and mathematics. Initially, the College did not have a Testing Office, and the testing records were kept off-site at another CUNY campus. Once a Testing Office was established in 2013, all testing and record-keeping was conducted on site in accordance with University policy on testing records. Assigned, locked cabinets contain stored essays, Scantron sheets, attendance records, test result printouts, and shipping records. Online files are kept of student scores for reading, writing, initial math, CUNY Elementary Algebra Final Exam (CEAFE), and the Ability-to-Benefit (ATB) results. Records of the essays must be kept for 6 years beyond the date of graduation or last date of attendance; each essay booklet is checked individually to ensure that the student has graduated or last attended CUNY more than 6 years ago before discarding. Until July 2016, the Testing Office provided testing services for students with accommodations on course tests as well as the CUNY Assessment Tests, CEAFE and ATB tests. The Testing Office maintained a shared file on the secured network with the Office of Accessibility to keep records of students requiring testing accommodations, and in spring 2016 moved these records to Starfish. Effective July 2016, responsibility for the coordination of course-level testing for students with accommodations was transferred to the Office of AccessABILITY.

With regard to student records and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the College Registrar disseminates policy and procedure through the College Catalog, the Guttman website, and at the Registrar’s Office. FERPA affords students certain rights with respect to their education records, and Guttman informs students of these rights with regard to their records. This annual notice informs students of procedures whereby they may make a formal request for non-disclosure of directory information, exercise the right to inspect and review their education records, request an amendment of education records, and obtain a copy of the College’s education records policy. In accordance with FERPA, Guttman Community College will disclose academic and financial records of a student to a third party provided the College has written consent from the student on file. Without this form, parents or legal guardians cannot conduct College business on the student’s behalf at any office. Students are notified of their right to control the disclosure of "Directory Information" in the Annual Notification of Rights under FERPA, which is published in the online bulletin. They are required to complete a Request to Prevent Disclosure of Directory Information and submit the form in person to the Registrar's Office with a photo ID. If a student elects to control disclosure, no information will be disclosed on the student, nor will verification of enrollment be given to any callers.

All student support programs at the College have established “procedures to address the varied spectrum of student academic and other needs, in a manner that is equitable, supportive, and sensitive, through direct service or referral.” In an attempt to facilitate the holistic development of students and support the academic, professional, and personal success of the student body, the program of student support addresses the many obstacles and challenges the students may encounter. However, as would be expected as the College has grown, some student support services are more fledgling, while others were developed in the Concept Paper and have been well-integrated over time into the educational model. In the 2013 Noel-Levitz Student Survey (Document Set 9), academic advising received the highest satisfaction ratings (6.00). Other areas receiving high satisfaction ranking included concern for the individual (5.96), and student centeredness (5.78). Academic advising as well as concern for the individual also received highest importance ratings (6.45 and 6.38, respectively). On the other hand, campus support services (5.21 and 5.77, respectively) received low satisfaction and importance ratings on the 2013 Noel Levitz survey, although the mean scores for campus support services were skewed by lower ratings for support services unavailable to Guttman students (e.g., child care facilities, Veterans’ Services program, a college nurse, or displaced homemakers services). Nonetheless, the College has begun to address additional student needs identified over the last two years. For example, the Single Stop Office, which offers
counseling to help students obtain government benefits, food stamps, housing, and other basic needs, opened a Food Bank and began to offer free tax preparation in spring 2016. The College also has greatly expanded AccessABILITY services to meet the needs of students who require accommodations.

Further, according to the 2014-15 Performance Management Process College Targets Report, Guttman measures student satisfaction levels with regard to student support services. Based on these assessments, the College seeks to improve student satisfaction with academic support and student support services, meeting the fundamental element of “conducting assessments of student advising and service programs, with recommendations for improvements and evidence of action based on recommendations.” During even years, the College reports on policies, practices, and activities intended to increase student satisfaction with academic and student support services. During odd years, student satisfaction with academic advising effectiveness and campus support services are measured by the Noel Levitz Survey or CCSSE.

**Summary of Findings for Standard 9**

1. Guttman has implemented an innovative and effective model of appropriate student advisement procedures and processes.
2. Guttman has implemented a program of student support services including Wellness, AccessABILITY and Single Stop that are appropriate to student strengths and needs, reflective of institutional mission, and consistent with student learning expectations.
3. Guttman has reasonable procedures, widely disseminated, for equitably addressing student complaints or grievances, and keeps records of student complaints or grievances in accordance with CUNY record retention policies.
4. Guttman has established procedures to address the varied spectrum of student academic and other needs, in a manner that is equitable, supportive, and sensitive, through direct service or referral, and it assesses and improves its advisement and service programs based on the evidence of those assessments.
5. It is less convenient for students taking courses at SPS to access the wide range of student support services available at West 40th Street, and so the College has initiated an SPS Career Strategist team to buttress that support.

**Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 9**

**Suggestions**

- Expand the College’s Federal Work Study (FWS) program to the extent possible.
- Examine the needs of freshmen who have not been successful in first-year courses, and take measures to ensure that students who are no longer taking all their classes within their FYE learning community understand their educational pathway in the context of the Guttman model, and have dedicated support and attention from faculty, staff, and other support providers.
- Consider conducting a longitudinal ethnographic study of a sample of Guttman students to track their success in senior colleges and workplaces relative to fostering resiliency.

**Recommendations**

None
Chapter 3: Educational Offerings and Assessment of Student Learning

Standards 11-13: Educational Offerings & General Education

“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.”

“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.”

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

Overview of Standards 11-13

This chapter analyzes Characteristics of Excellence 11 (Educational Offerings), 12 (General Education), 13 (Related Educational Offerings), and 14 (Assessment of Student Learning). It focuses on (1) the extent to which we are achieving our institutional mission and goals relevant to these standards, (2) how effective Guttman’s educational model is in helping students persist and complete their degree, and (3) the potential for Guttman to maintain the effective components of our educational model as we scale. The issues discussed in this chapter relate directly to Guttman’s educational model.

Three co-chairs led the working group for this chapter—one from academic affairs, one from student engagement, and one from OAA administration. Working group members included: faculty; student engagement staff, including advisors and peer mentoring leadership; and a staff person from the Office of Partnerships and Community Engagement. These members were chosen for their in-depth knowledge of various components of the educational model and assessment. Working group co-chairs met and communicated regularly. Each co-chair worked with a sub-group of committee members to discuss the research questions posed in the self-study design document, along with each standard and its corresponding fundamental elements.

Guttman’s educational model is a complex interplay of what George Kuh calls “high-impact practices” (see fn. 7, p. ix) threaded across the student-learning trajectory from entry to completion. Since the model is unique in the ways it connects developmental and credit-bearing coursework, academics and student advising, curricular learning and co-curricular experiences, as well as the centrality of student learning assessment, the self-study examines the elements of these four Middle States Standards together. We present our analysis and findings beginning with three sections that follow the guided pathway of the student experience at Guttman (see Figure 9) – The Guttman Bridge Program, the First-year Experience: A New General Education, and the Programs of Study. These are followed by sections on Related Educational Offerings, Information Commons and Academic Support, Academic Technology, and Testing. Standard 14 on the Assessment of Student Learning has its own section, which details the Guttman Learning Outcomes (GLOs) assessment process. In each section, we analyze the College’s effectiveness in the implementation and delivery of our educational model and our assessment practices to date. We highlight successes, identify challenges, and make suggestions as warranted from our analysis.
Findings for Standards 11 – 13: Educational Offerings and General Education

**Guttman’s Guided Pathways**

The idea for structured pathways originated in *A New Community College Concept Paper* (2008), and informed the development of a first-year core curriculum with a limited number of majors. *Redesigning America’s Community Colleges* (2015) lays out the theory and rationale for guided pathways and cites Guttman Community College as an exemplar of this approach, which the authors contrast to the plethora of confusing options and choices they denote as the traditional cafeteria model. Fig. 1 gives the major routes of Guttman’s pathways and what follows provides the details of Guttman’s unique educational model.

![Fig.9: Guttman’s Guided Learning Pathway for Students: Key Elements](image)

**Guttman Bridge Program**

Grounded within the existing literature, the college’s concept paper envisioned a Summer Bridge Program that would benefit first generation and traditionally underrepresented students. The purpose of the program is four-fold: (1) to begin to develop the reading, writing and research skills necessary for success in the first-year City Seminar course; (2) to familiarize students with the college’s statistics and quantitative reasoning program and begin its intensive work; (3) to acquaint students with the resources available at the college and help them develop a sense of comfort and familiarity with the college through a student success course; and (4) engage in formative assessment of students’ abilities. Starting with Guttman’s 2012 inaugural class, the 10-12 day Guttman Bridge Program (GBP), a required component of Guttman’s student experience, has operated within this framework to introduce all students to Guttman’s educational model. Student attendance and participation in GBP is required and to date attendance has been supported via stipends provided by a grant from the Robin Hood Foundation.

---

Curriculum

The overarching theoretical framework for the Guttman Bridge Program was derived from several successful programs throughout the nation, but work at the granular level has been guided by both GBP’s aforementioned purposes, program goals, and learning outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge Program Goals</th>
<th>Bridge Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Becoming a Community</td>
<td>As a result of your participation in Summer Bridge, you will be able to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduction to FYE Coursework</td>
<td>1. Apply basic critical thinking and research practices through completion of an inquiry-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based, integrative group project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Use an ePortfolio to share work and reflect on learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Read, analyze, and discuss texts with an understanding of how details and structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contribute to meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Use quantitative reasoning skills to support an argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Identify and reflect on personal strengths and growth as a new college student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Demonstrate what it means to belong and contribute to Guttman’s academic community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each year, the learning outcomes are evaluated if needed, by the Bridge Steering Committee in response to program assessment data, implementation of new college-wide programs or due to logistical constraints. Guided by the established learning outcomes and GLOs (see Table 3) the GBP curriculum, is reviewed and revised annually by an interdisciplinary committee. A faculty or staff person with appropriate disciplinary expertise leads the development of each curricular component (see 2016 GBP Faculty-Staff Guide in Document Set 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Broad, Integrative Knowledge</th>
<th>Applied Learning</th>
<th>Intellectual Skills</th>
<th>Civic Learning</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Integrated Group Project and Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Individual ePortfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Personal SWOT Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Individual reflection composed at conclusion of Bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An assessment is conducted after each Bridge program to identify strengths and areas of improvement related to the learning outcomes and student experience. As described below under Standard 14, Guttman’s faculty and staff participate in the program evaluation process by reviewing and scoring student work during Assessment Days. The program is achieving its goals, as evidenced by quantitative and qualitative data from student surveys (see Table 4).
### Table 4. Bridge Student Survey Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge Program Goal</th>
<th>Bridge Student Survey Question (3-part Likert)</th>
<th>2015 % Agree (n=41)</th>
<th>2016 % Agree (n=340)</th>
<th>Summer Bridge helped me the most by...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a community</td>
<td>Summer Bridge helped me get to know my peers. If I have a question or problem, I feel comfortable asking someone at the college.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Working with peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge made me more confident in my ability to...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Getting to know professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to FYE Coursework</td>
<td>apply basic critical thinking and research practices to investigate an iconic New York City neighborhood.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Understanding college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read, analyze, and discuss texts with an understanding of how details and structure contribute to meaning.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Preparing for college work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluating findings each year, the Bridge program committee makes improvements to the program as evidenced by data (see Table 5).

### Table 5: Bridge Assessment and Closing The Loop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Data</th>
<th>Closing The Loop</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012: 33% of students correctly uploaded their ePortfolio to Digication’s assessment management system.</td>
<td>Modified curriculum to build in dedicated time for ePortfolio submission</td>
<td>2015: ~85% submission rate 2016: ~93% submission rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014: 64% of students agree that they are confident in their ability to use an ePortfolio to create and share work</td>
<td>Modified curriculum to include a required group research project ePortfolio</td>
<td>2015: 80% of students agree that they are confident in their ability to use an ePortfolio to create and share work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to the addition of CUNY Start to Guttman, a Winter Bridge program was introduced in February 2016. This Bridge provided a similar experience for incoming spring 2016 freshman during an abbreviated 5-day experience. Based on the success of that curriculum, revisions were made to the most recent Summer Bridge Program, including the use of the theme of “The American Dream,” the book *Drown* by Junot Diaz, and the creation of integrated research project ePortfolios by all students in the program.

As Guttman enrollment grows to 5,000 students, we will need to consider ways to effectively scale the Guttman Bridge Program. The Bridge Steering Committee must address issues such as the sustainability of student stipends and the cost and length of the program. Guttman will be well served to use these next few years of our “steady state” enrollment to experiment with some of these variables to determine how to most effectively scale this program and create a sustainable structure while not compromising the purpose or effectiveness of the program.
The First-year Experience: A New General Education

The First-year Experience (FYE) is the heart of the Guttman model. Indeed, a student's first-year at Guttman Community College is different from any other community college in the country. Aware of low community college completion rates across the country and within CUNY, the NCC planning team in 2008 sought to create, “one tightly designed and highly structured associate degree pathway (Concept Paper, p. 7),” in order to improve student success. The College was imagined and built on research and best practices, including the innovative practices gleaned from CUNY’s six other community colleges—in particular, models of learning communities. At Guttman, the learning community model was conceived and implemented as a highly structured, high-touch environment.

Academic Semester Structure

Guttman follows a 12 - 6 semester structure, with fall and spring semesters comprised of two sessions each: a 12 week fall I session followed by a 6 week fall II session; and a 12 week spring I session followed by a 6 week spring II session. The fall semester runs from September through February and the spring semester runs from March through early August. This structure, which is also used at CUNY’s LaGuardia and Kingsborough Communities Colleges, has several benefits. First, it keeps students enrolled in classes almost continuously throughout the year, reducing winter and summer melt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Percent of Entering Cohort Enrolled in Summer Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Semester</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Enrollment counts may include students who received withdrawal grades.
CCE September 27, 2016

Second, students can take additional courses during the fall II and spring II semesters, helping them earn additional credits or repeat course work they didn’t quite master in the 12 week session, thus keeping them on track toward a timely degree completion. Third, from a financial perspective, since fall II and spring II are part of the fall and spring semesters, there is no additional tuition charge for courses taken in those semesters, which is a significant cost benefit for students. Lastly, for students who may struggle academically, they can spread courses out over two sessions and still be considered full-time for financial aid purposes. It is evident From Table 6 that very high percentages of students take advantage of this semester structure.

House and Cohort Structure

In order to build a wrap-around support system for first generation college-students often underprepared for college level work, students attend a structured set of general education requirements. When students enter Guttman, they are assigned to a House of approximately 75-90 students. Each house is then divided into three cohorts of 20-30 students, with whom the students travel as a learning community through their first-year. The cohort nourishes students with a community experience: one student’s lapsed attendance, for example, is often met with a sea of texts from peers urging the student to return to coursework. Full-time attendance is required of every first-year Guttman student.
House Instructional Teams provide essential leadership and support to faculty and staff as they, in turn, support student learning and social-emotional experience of entering and persisting in a community college. Each Instructional Team consists of the full-time faculty teaching in the house, a Student Success Advocate, a Graduate Coordinator, and a college Librarian. Full-time faculty are compensated with 1.5 hours reassigned time from classroom teaching each semester for a 90-minute weekly meeting, to collaborate, plan integrated activities and assignments, and discuss student challenges and successes. An Instructional Team leader coordinates the scheduling of and agenda for the meetings and serves as the primary point of contact for the team. Team leaders receive an additional .5 (total = 2.0) reassigned time each semester for serving in this role.

From 2014-2016 two faculty members served as First-year Experience Program Co-Coordinators. These faculty supported FYE faculty and worked to maintain the fidelity of the student experience across the 7 houses. In 2015-2016, the coordinators began the First-year Experience program review process and wrote a successful CUNY Strategic Initiative Grant Proposal to obtain funding to support FYE professional development and the development of an FYE manual (see Document Set 11) to guide the work of instructional teams in the delivery of the FYE curriculum. Beginning in 2016, the FYE Program coordinators were replaced with Course Coordinators who oversee the implementation of specific courses in the FYE and Area Coordinators for mathematics and reading/writing who oversee the implementation of and articulation between different courses in these areas. (See p. 41 for further information about these roles.)

The General Education/FYE Curriculum

The FYE curriculum consists of a broad set of interdisciplinary general education courses. Twenty-four credits in total, there are 7 required FYE courses that all Guttman students complete: City Seminar I and II, Ethnographies of Work I and II, Statistics, Composition, and Arts in New York City. Most students also take Biology: Life in NYC in their first-year.

All FYE courses fully align with CUNY’s Pathways Common Core (see Guttman Required and Flexible Pathways Common Core). “In Fall 2013, CUNY implemented the Pathways initiative across its undergraduate colleges. Pathways has established a new system of general education requirements and new transfer guidelines across the University, and by doing so it has reinforced CUNY’s educational excellence while easing student transfer between CUNY colleges. The centerpiece of this initiative is a 30-credit general education Common Core.” In addition to the FYE courses listed above, students also complete Composition II and an additional science course to complete the full Common Core alignment (see Guttman website). This Common Core seamlessly transfers to senior colleges across CUNY.

Guttman does not offer remedial courses for underprepared students. Basic skills development is embedded in City Seminar I and II and Statistics through additional weekly contact hours; students are placed immediately into credit-bearing coursework regardless of their scores on CUNY placement tests. The additional embedded contact hours allow for extended time-on-task, providing an opportunity for faculty to support students’ developmental needs while students earn college credit beginning in their first semester.

Guttman’s FYE curriculum challenges students to grow their academic skills while allowing them to access a subject of study from a varied set of disciplinary approaches. Taken together, the FYE courses blend experiential learning with practice-based quantitative, reading and writing work that engages critical thinking for a powerfully cohesive first-year experience. Students attend a total of twenty hours of class time in the two twelve week semester sessions of the spring and fall. Successful students without remedial math needs earn a total of 9 and 12 credits during the two 12 week sessions respectively. Those with remedial math needs earn a total of 7.5 and 10.5 credits, respectively. Students enroll in Arts in New
York City and/or Biology: Life in NYC during the 6-week semesters, accumulating an additional 3 or 6 credits towards their degree and rounding out the CUNY Pathways Common Core.

Table 7: General Education Pathways and GLO Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>General Education Pathways Common Core (F – Flexible Core, R – Required Core)</th>
<th>GLOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Seminar I</td>
<td>World Culture and Global Issues (F)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Seminar II</td>
<td>U.S. Experience in Its Diversity (F)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographies of Work I</td>
<td>Individual and Society(F)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographies of Work II</td>
<td>Individual and Society (F)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Biology: Life in New York City</td>
<td>Life and Physical Sciences (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition I</td>
<td>English Composition (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition II</td>
<td>English Composition (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning (R)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts in New York City</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Chemistry or Introduction to Urban Community Health</td>
<td>Scientific World (F)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who fail to complete or pass one of the three core courses of the First-year Experience—City Seminar, Ethnographies of Work, or Statistics—receive a grade of NC, or No Credit, and are allowed to retake the course. The NC grade does not impact the students GPA or academic standing.

Guttman’s unique model embeds basic skills development across the First-year Experience, but students still must pass a CUNY-wide test assessing their skills in reading and writing. Those students do not demonstrate proficiency by the end of fall I, are enrolled in a 6 week skill-building Practicum in the interim sessions (Fall 2 and Spring 2) until they attain proficient levels in reading and writing.

Each of the general education/first year experience courses are described in the sections below.

City Seminar I & II

Students in City Seminar I explore a wide range of topics—from gentrification, to public health, to urban sustainability—in three separate but interconnected course components and a fourth academic support component: Critical Issue, Quantitative Reasoning, Reading and Writing, and Studio. Each core component meets for 3 hours per week and Studio meets for 90 minutes; a total of 10.5 hours/week. In City Seminar II, the embedded Reading/Writing component drops out—the course meets for 7.5 hours/week—and students take a separate 3-credit Composition course. City Seminar is taught by faculty members with expertise in a quantitative discipline, English, and social sciences and the urban experience. A Graduate Coordinator facilitates the Studio component of City Seminar I and II.

Remedial coursework is integrated into the two City Seminar Courses. Each course component has a skill spine that is shared with faculty to help scaffold reading/writing and quantitative skills across the course. Embedded remedial work is a challenge for many faculty, who do not have this expertise as evidenced by repeated requests by faculty at Assessment Days and All-College meetings. It is suggested, based on this need, that professional development opportunities be made available for all faculty to address this challenge.

Students who are not successful in City Seminar I and II receive a grade of NC, or No Credit, and are allowed to retake the course. That has always taken place in the subsequent 12-week semester; students
are partially removed from their cohort and retake the course with other students in a similar situation. Success rates in retake City Seminar courses are not as high as we would like. For example in City Seminar I, failure rates in Spring 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 were 51%, 51%, 23%, and 42% respectively. Based on this evidence, in spring 2016, the Interim Provost charged a task force to convene in the fall to reconceive the structure of City Seminar, refocus on the importance of full-time faculty teaching the course, and make recommendations to the Curriculum Committee. Based on the work of the taskforce, a “retake pilot” course is running during the January/February 2017 Fall II 6-week semester as a first step in identifying ways to improve student success in City Seminar retake courses.

Ethnographies of Work I & II

Ethnographies of Work I and II (EOW) are two three credit courses that span and anchor students’ First-Year Experience. Ethnographies of Work introduce sociological and anthropological research methods by engaging students in an investigation of work perspectives and culture while exploring career possibilities. For students from working-class backgrounds, the course serves as an opportunity to both expand their knowledge of career choices and to understand the forces of social stratification that have limited American mobility ladders. Using ethnographic and sociological methods to conduct interviews, participant observation, and surveying, students choose a worker and an industry as their point of focus for the semester. The students’ ethnographic observations and insights serve as the foundation for descriptive and analytical essays and research projects about the workplace as a site of cultural production and social hierarchy. In the course, students may debate minimum wage laws, describe how working conditions might vary based on a person’s citizenship status, or investigate how a union may or may not be able to mitigate gender discrimination at a workplace. The combination of difficult theoretical readings, from Karl Marx and Arlie Hochschild to anthropologist Ruth Gomberg Munoz, with real life ethnographic data has proved to be a successful entry point for students into the world of social science and the world of work.14

Learning about Being a Successful Student or LaBSS is associated with EOW and provides first-year group advising sessions facilitated by a Student Success Advocate, in which students are introduced to the sequence of the first-year curriculum and the five majors. At the Major Celebration, held in the second semester as first-year students prepare to select a major, the degree requirements are reviewed. At each touch point with first-year students, advisors revisit the course sequencing. The Career Strategists have created Academic Planning Checklists for each major explaining which courses are required and in which semesters they are typically offered to help students plan. In spring 2017, with a grant from EDUCAUSE, the College will refine this approach by adding Educational Plan ePortfolio (eP²) (see Document Set 11) modules to students’ ePortfolios to help them record their course choices for future semesters and reflect on their academic progress. DegreeWorks, CUNY’s degree audit tool that students are trained in, also has an option for students to plan and record their course options for their entire Guttman career. In the 2015 Guttman Survey: Feedback from Students about Their College Experience (Document Set 9), 66% of all student respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their first-year at Guttman prepared them to make an informed decision about which major to select.

Statistics

A gateway course in Statistics fulfills the Pathways Mathematical and Quantitative reasoning Required Common Core course for all students. The Statistics course provides students with an in-depth

14 For a September 22, 2016 online publication about the Ethnographies of Work courses by Advisory and Research Council member Nancy Hoffman titled “Guttman Puts ‘Work’ at the Center of Learning”, see http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00091383.2016.1198167?scroll=top&needAccess=true&
understanding of the fundamental concepts and computational methods of statistics. Students learn the fundamentals of both descriptive and inferential statistics and each semester apply that knowledge to a project that is completed over the course of the semester. The work that students are doing in reading and writing is reinforced by the requirement that all projects conclude with a written report of the findings. Technology is integrated throughout the course with students making use of Excel, StatCrunch, and in some cases, calculators. Homework is completed online using MyStatLab.

Guttman is innovative in its implementation of Basic Statistics in the first-year in that it is required of all students, regardless of their prior mathematical achievement. Statistics was chosen as the first mathematics course for all students because it is easily made relevant to the students’ lives and connected to events occurring in the City and to their other courses. For many students this also interrupts the cycle of failure or underachievement that they experienced in Algebra during high school.

For students who enter Guttman having demonstrated basic algebra proficiency, the course (Math 103) is a 12-week course that meets five hours a week. For students who have not yet demonstrated basic algebra proficiency, Guttman spreads the same content over two courses (Math 103A and Math 103B) scheduled during the two 12-week fall and spring sessions. Students meet for five hours each week during fall and spring. This slower pace allows for the development of necessary basic skills on a just-in-time basis during the course. For example, prior to beginning the unit on linear regression, time is spent graphing points and lines and also writing the equation of a line when given two points (all topics that are part of a basic algebra course). For many underprepared community college students passing the required quantitative course is a major hurdle for graduation. For those students enrolled in Math 103, approximately 77% passed the course the first time they took it. The graph below shows the percentage of students who entered with remedial math needs and the number of semesters they took to complete the Math 103A/103B sequence of courses (and thus the Pathways mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning requirement). This data demonstrates that Guttman has been successful in helping the majority of Guttman students complete their math requirement during their first-year of study and that for most students at Guttman the quantitative requirement is not a barrier to graduation.

![Fig. 10: Guttman Community College Percentage of Students with Remedial Math needs who Completed Pathways Quantitative Requirement (by entering cohort)](image)

- Fall 2014: 66.0% by end of two semesters, 2.92% by end of three semesters, 29.07% by end of four semesters
- Fall 2013: 53.4% by end of two semesters, 7.7% by end of three semesters, 35.04% by end of four semesters
- Fall 2012: 45.8% by end of two semesters, 17.4% by end of three semesters, 34.32% by end of four semesters
Arts in New York City

In this 6-week 3-credit course, students are exposed to visual and performing arts as well as public, private, and community-based arts institutions in New York City. Students explore a broad range of art forms through texts, images, and experiential components. Students develop artistic literacy skills by closely and carefully examining works of art and performance, discussing their observations, and supporting their views using evidence from the works and from class readings. Students learn vocabulary to describe the particular art form, are introduced to ideas and theories about the art, and engage experientially by visiting museums, attending performances, or participating in workshops. A major component of this course is that students learn from the creative process of visiting artists and guest speakers and also study the lived experience of New York City artists. Each guest artist works with students for a week offering students different modes of learning and communication and a space where they can creatively improvise.

Introduction to Biology: Life in NYC

Introduction to Biology is the primary non-science major biology option for Guttman students. First-year students may take the course as early as fall II of their first-year, so enrollment in the course includes both first-year and continuing students. Although this course is based on an exploration of the basic laws of living organisms, it has a focus on critical thinking and building research and writing skills to support students in their non-science programs of study. The course is non-traditional in so far as it is primarily lab-based with nearly 75% of the course content covered through hands-on discovery as opposed to lecture. The hallmark of the course is its focus on experiential learning.

Composition I & II

Following the Pathways university-wide general education plan promulgated by CUNY Central, Guttman requires students to complete two college writing courses—Composition I & II. Composition I is designed to enrich students’ writing skills. A major goal of this course is to build the ability to write in order to convey a well-developed point of view and demonstrate students’ personal writing voice. The course often focuses on the theme of immigration, thus allowing for cross pollination with readings and experiential projects from City Seminar courses. Composition II focuses on writing for research. Some faculty have built courses around the unique resources available from our Bryant Park neighbor, the New York Public Library.

Information Literacy

Guttman’s approach to information literacy (IL) instruction is among its many distinctions as a new community college. Because of traditional structures and silos, information literacy instruction at most institutions is often an afterthought and therefore difficult to integrate meaningfully into students’ learning. But Guttman’s founders explicitly identified IL as a priority, stating, “We . . . recommend that the required courses in the majors and the liberal arts . . . build advanced reading, writing, quantitative reasoning and information literacy skills in the context of all of these courses” (p. 22). In this way, we have laid the foundation for a truly embedded information literacy program, and it is the reason that instruction librarians are members of the FYE Instructional Teams. It is also why the librarians’ work stations are situated with their fellow faculty members rather than isolated in the Information Commons.

Still, even with the founders’ thoughtful and intentional design, the project remains ambitious. A truly embedded program requires faculty members to co-own IL instruction with the librarians, and for librarians to support faculty’s professional development in IL. Faculty in turn must be willing to collaborate with the librarians on their course curriculum and assignment design. To this end, the 2015 - 2016 academic year was significant in terms of the development of Guttman’s Information Literacy
Program. With the arrival of an additional librarian faculty and additional support, Guttman’s IL program finally began to take shape. First, the librarians mapped IL-focused student learning outcomes to the FYE curriculum to ensure that those IL outcomes were well aligned with FYE course outcomes to enhance student learning. Then, the librarians built the curriculum itself. They created lesson plans, activities, assignments, and assessment tools, related to all different aspects of IL, that Guttman faculty could use and adapt in the classroom. By the end of the spring 2016 semester, the librarians had completed a full draft of the IL curriculum. The next step is to pilot this curriculum, which is underway in fall 2016 following the course coordination by the librarians with the FYE coordinators. All of these steps have laid the groundwork for embedding IL across the curriculum, not only in the FYE, and have moved the College closer to the vision of IL as outlined in the Concept Paper. We will need to continue this work, moving from pilot to full implementation.

Assessing General Education and the First-Year Experience

Guttman’s General Education and FYE assessment is multi-faceted. Specific Guttman Learning Outcomes (GLOS) are mapped to each course in the FYE and are assessed as part of the GLO assessment process which is detailed on pages 64-68. While the GLO assessment is critical to assessment of the first year, we also recognize that the FYE is a pseudo-program and as such, is also completing a Periodic Program Review (PPR) process, as described in the May 2016 Institutional Assessment Plan. The PPR team, led by a designated faculty member, is in the process of developing a mission statement for the program, identifying strengths and weaknesses, and refining the curriculum map. In the upcoming year, they will gather and examine data and make recommendations for curricular and co-curricular improvements.

In addition to the GLO and PPR process, we continually examine success rates in the FYE courses and make improvements as warranted by evidence. During the last two years, the pass (grades A - D) rates for our First-year Experience Courses range between 68% and 88% and are shown in the table below. (Rates for all years can be found in Document Set 11.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Seminar I</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Seminar II</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOW I</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOW II</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics A</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics B</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These rates are good, but below where we aim to be. And, though we’ve come close, we have yet to consistently achieve our target fall-to-fall retention rate of 75%. While we do believe these rates demonstrate a level of academic rigor, we are also aware that there is a population of students that we are not serving as well as we might. The Office of Academic Affairs, with assistance from the CCE has begun to look more closely at demographic and proficiency data to see if we can identify specific populations that are not successful in the First-year Experience. While nothing significant has emerged from this initial analysis, we will continue to examine these data and relevant data from Starfish moving forward. Our goal is to begin using analytics to proactively identify students who could benefit from academic support interventions and connect them to those services early, helping to improve their success. (See below pp. 48 – 54 for various academic supports provided Guttman students.)
We also examine the model of remediation to ensure that our embedded developmental coursework and practica are effective. The CCE examined Guttman students’ proficiency progress in reading, writing, and math and during their first-year of study in 2015. The data for the fall 2014 cohort of students is provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>On Entry</th>
<th>After Fall semester</th>
<th>After Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, in the fall 2014 cohort, 15% of students were proficient in all three subject areas (math, reading, and writing) on entry and 68% were proficient in all three areas after the spring semester. (For complete data on progress to proficiency see the Document: Progress to Proficiency: Student Proficiency Status during the First-Year created by the CCE.) While there are, of course, areas upon which we can improve, this data does show that overall, our embedded remediation and practica model is serving our students with developmental needs well.

Structural Support for the FYE

Since the opening of the college, the Guttman leadership has been committed to supporting and maintaining the FYE in various ways. An instructional team was sent to the Atlantic Center for Learning Communities Retreat in 2014. Under a recent reorganization of the Office of Academic Affairs, responsibility for overseeing the First-year Experience program has been given to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. And, the College sent a team of 9 faculty, staff, and administrators to the National Summer Institute for Learning Communities (Washington Center for Excellence in Undergraduate Education) in July 2016. Their work focused on developing two plans, one short-term and one long-term, both focusing on populations of concern (e.g., English Language Learners, young men of color, those with lower placement testing outcomes, neurodiversity and students with disabilities). The short-term plan centers on enhancing currently-used high impact practices in the FYE, while in the long-term plan the team looks to conduct qualitative research to find out more about these students’ outcomes.

Given the complex nature of the First-year Experience and its importance to the success of Guttman students, a decision was made by OAA to shift from an FYE Program Coordinator model to a Course Coordinator model for courses in the FYE beginning in 2016 - 2017. Course coordinators are able to work more closely with faculty to ensure that the curriculum is being delivered with intentionality and fidelity to the model. Coordinators identify and share best practices and make recommendations for improvement. Coordinators have been identified for City Seminar, Ethnographies of Work, and Arts in New York City. A Mathematics Coordinator supports Statistics and Quantitative Reasoning and a Writing Coordinator supports Reading/Writing, Composition I, and Composition II. Course coordinators work closely with both full-time and adjunct faculty to ensure the fidelity of each of our FYE courses is maintained both at our current enrollment levels and as we grow.

As the college grows maintaining the current structural support for the FYE will be a challenge. Maintaining the house/cohort structure and the current success of the FYE courses as the college grows will require ongoing, careful attention to faculty and SSA professional development, assessment of the curriculum and instructional team model, identification of “best practices,” and
communication/coordination among instructional teams to ensure that that each house delivers a first-year experience that aligns with Guttman’s goals and expectations. The College must continue to provide the necessary resources to support this work.

Programs of Study
A discussed in the Concept Paper (2008), “another defining feature of the new community college will be its focus on offering students a limited number of programs of study and pathways that have well-defined steps to degree, transfer and/or employment” (p. 8). The College has five programs of study: four leading to A.A. degrees in Liberal Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Human Services, and Urban Studies; and one leading to an A.A.S. degree in Information Technology.

While all students must select a major on their CUNY application, Guttman students “re-declare” their program of study on a designated “Major Declaration Day” in March of their first-year, having completed educational planning and goal setting along with a “What’s My Major?” research project in LaBSS. This has led to students making more informed major selections and reducing “majors’ swirl,” where students change from one major to another, often losing time, relevant credits, and sometimes loss of needed financial aid to complete the degree. Overall enrollment in each of the programs of study is strong as are the relative graduation rates. Approximately 23.7% (71 out of 299) of the retained Fall 2014 cohort changed their major after the first year. After implementing the new curriculum in LABSS described above this number fell to 12.6% (39 out of 310) students for the retained Fall 2015 cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10</th>
<th>Continuing Student Enrollment by Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business - AA</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services -AA</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology -AAS</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Sciences -AA</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Studies -AA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum
As described in the College planning documents, each program of study has a clearly defined set of required courses with a limited number of electives which are communicated to students in the College Catalog and on the website. These guided programs of study pathways are designed to foster a coherent student learning experience, scaffold discipline-specific knowledge, and build on the general education skills acquired in the first-year curriculum, providing students the opportunity to synthesize and apply their knowledge in a holistic learning experience.

While the five programs of study each had a clearly defined pathway and set of required and elective courses in 2013 when they were first offered, there were no program outcomes. In the spring 2014 semester, key faculty members teaching in each program worked during Assessment Days to develop a mission statement for their program as well as program learning outcomes. The Curriculum Committee followed by the College Council during that same semester approved these missions and learning outcomes for each program. Program faculty also began developing draft curriculum maps, aligning both the program learning outcomes and Guttman Learning outcomes with courses in the program of study. All
programs of study courses also have course-level learning outcomes defined. Those outcomes are included on course syllabi and assessed by faculty at the course-level.

There is sufficient access to learning resources and technology in the building on W. 40th St. as described below, Standard 14. The one challenge Guttman currently faces and will continue to face for some time is classroom space. Since the College is trying to keep first-year students at the 50 W 40th Street location, many of the programs of study courses are held at the CUNY School for Professional Studies (SPS), which is nine blocks away (31st Street just west of 6th Avenue). As guests at that facility, we are not able to use laptop carts there, and so the classrooms are not as technologically supportive as our classrooms at W 40th Street. Neither do our faculty or career strategists have office space at SPS.

Initially, oversight of programs was handled via committees. Realizing that, given the faculty workload and the number of committees in existence, this was not a sustainable or effective practice, the Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost created the role of program coordinator in 2014. Depending on the size of the program, one or two faculty were given reassigned time and appointed coordinator for each of the five programs of study. Each program coordinator serves a three-year term and is responsible for curriculum development, hiring of adjuncts, and program reviews. Program coordinators meet 2-3 times a semester with the Provost and academic affairs deans to discuss program-related issues, such as adjunct hiring processes and Community Days and service learning. Some, but not all, program coordinators meet regularly with faculty who teach in the program.

The program coordinator, working in conjunction with other full-time faculty in the discipline, typically makes curricular additions and revisions. Guttman’s curriculum committee and college council, as well as CUNY’s Board of Trustees must approve all curricular changes before they are effective. Curriculum changes have included revision of course pre-requisites, addition of new courses and electives, and changes in program requirements. Full detail about curricular changes can be found in the Curriculum Committee minutes and the website publication of approved Council resolutions. Program coordinators also lead the Periodic Program Review process (see pp.44-45; 76).

Hybrid Courses

The University has made increasing online instruction a priority since 2009, when the Chancellor instituted the Hybrid Initiative that called for the expansion of hybrid (partially online, partially in-class) instruction. Aligned with that goal, Guttman added the use of technology to enrich courses and improve teaching to its PMP 2013 – 2014 College Goals and Targets. Although, at this time Guttman does not offer fully online, the number of hybrid course offerings has increased slowly and intentionally from 3 in 2013 to 7 during the 2015-2016 academic year.

Working with the Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology, the faculty with Academic Technology Expertise oversees the hybrid course development initiative, including its professional development plan. Aligned with the Concept Paper Executive Summary’s description of academic technology (p. 5), “our hybrid course vision, and corresponding collaborative hybrid training, highlight the high-contact, interactive learning environment integral to our model and focus on the student as co-producer of content and technology as a way to connect this productive learning out of the classroom back to the classroom space, professor, and peers.” Hybrid courses are developed using New York City as an extension of the classroom, broadening the opportunities available to students for conducting research and to facilitate students making meaningful connections between real world experience and course
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content. Hybrid courses also support students with different learning styles since they benefit from instruction occurring through a variety of modalities.

We have intentionally kept our hybrid course development and offerings to a small number (see Document Set 11 for a full list of hybrid course offerings, by semester), and no formal evaluation of the hybrid courses has yet been conducted. Evaluating the hybrid offerings will help us identify ways to best develop and offer and support student success in these courses as we scale.

Articulation Agreements

At the opening of the College in 2012, each program of study had at least one articulation agreement with a senior college. Additional Articulation Agreements have been created in the ensuing years, with CUNY institutions such as Baruch and Hunter as well as with non-CUNY schools such as Pace University and Metropolitan College. Under the guidance of the Dean of Academic Affairs, each program coordinator continues to develop articulation agreements with appropriate transfer institutions.

Assessment of Programs of Study

CUNY Manual of General Policy requires that all degree programs complete a Periodic Program Review (PPR). The College’s initial assessment plan, developed in 2013, includes a description and timeline for each Program of Study to complete a PPR. Modeled after LaGuardia Community College’s PPR process, the Guttman PPR takes place over three years, with an inquiry year, a reflection year, and an integration year (see Guttman’s 2016 Institutional Assessment Plan). The Plan identified that two programs would begin the process each year. While not a degree program, we do consider the First-year Experience a program and it is included in the PPR timeline.

Completing a Periodic Program Review necessitates having graduates of the program. The PPR process, therefore, was launched in the fall 2014 semester. In May 2014 the Council approved the Guttman Learning Outcomes (GLO) & Periodic Program Review (PPR) Timelines and a template for the periodic program review report. Program Coordinators (PC) lead the PPR process for their program of study, and each PC puts together a team of faculty and advisors to assist in the process. Time is allocated during each of the College’s Assessment Days for PPR teams to meet and conduct their work (see Document Set 13 for Assessment Days agendas).

In 2014-2015, the two programs with the largest number of students, Liberal Arts and Sciences and Business Administration, began the Periodic Program Review process. At the end of year one, each team submitted their deliverables, which included the program curriculum map, identified strengths and weaknesses, and a data collection and assessment plan. These programs are currently in the third year of their PPR process and are preparing for an external review and site visit. In 2015-2016, the Human Services and First-year Experience programs launched their PPR process. They identified perceived strengths and weaknesses of their programs, and developed research questions and a data collection and analysis plan. The Associate Dean of Assessment and Technology works with the program coordinators throughout the Periodic Program Review process, providing support and guidance, and she also works with the Director of the Center for College Effectiveness to make sure PPR teams have access to graduate and other student outcomes data as appropriate. The dean and director are in the process of creating a standard data set that can be prepared annually for each PPR team.

The LAS and Business Administration programs have submitted their PPR reports to OAA for review and feedback. We are currently in the process of scheduling a site visit for March 2017 where an external reviewer will provide feedback and recommendations to each program. While we will not begin implementing recommendations until after the MSCHE site visit, we have already seen examples of
closing the loop, or evidence-based curricular changes that have taken place throughout the PPR process. For example, in the Liberal Arts and Sciences, improvements were made based on concerns around course offerings that were addressed during the first year of its PPR. One key finding was that Guttman course names, course outlines, and learning outcomes were not being readily transferred at the other CUNY colleges. PPR review also identified overlapping learning outcomes for Introduction to Sociology and Foundations in Social Sciences. Foundations in Social Sciences was eliminated as a course offering / program requirement and replaced with the requirement of Introduction to Sociology. In addition to this change Introduction to Psychology and American Government and Politics were also changed to required courses in the major. Several courses were added to broaden the number of available electives. LASC 201 Environmental Ethics and ECON 223 Economics of Social Issues were removed as program requirements to allow for Introduction to Psychology and Introduction to Sociology to become program requirements.

Given that Guttman is only in its fifth year and the PPR process was designed to stagger program assessment over time, it will be two more years before all programs complete a PPR cycle. It is recommended that the completion of all PPRs according to the assessment timeline be a priority for the Office of Academic Affairs.

Evaluating Guttman’s Guided Pathway: From Entry to Graduation to Transfer

If timely graduation may be seen as the paramount marker of student success, Guttman is far exceeding expectations of success. Our two-year graduation rates for the first three entering cohorts were 28%, 30%, and 28% respectively, and our three-year graduation rates were 49% and 44%. Further supporting these numbers is recent data showing that Guttman graduates who go on to baccalaureate programs in CUNY are achieving similar success rates and GPAs as their peers from other CUNY community colleges. From our 2012 cohort of entering students, 56 graduates enrolled in CUNY senior colleges and 63% of that group successfully completed their first semester and met CUNY academic standards. From the 2013 cohort, 83% of the 58 graduates who enrolled in CUNY senior colleges completed their first semester with grade point averages of C or better. While these data are laudable, we need to conduct further investigation of our students who are not succeeding in order to learn about their challenges and roadblocks. By identifying obstacles to success, we can find ways to proactively intervene to help better support and keep our students maintaining the momentum they need to also earn their degrees.

Guttman’s guided pathways are central to the mission and vision of the College. Careful attention to these pathways as Guttman grows will be critical to demonstrating the effectiveness of such a model. Everyone at the College must remain focused on and committed to this goal, which will be achieved by continuing to support ongoing assessment and professional development efforts and providing appropriate levels of financial and other institutional resources.

Related Educational Offerings

Inwood Early College

In 2013, Guttman Community College partnered with CUNY’s Early College Initiative (ECI) and the New York City Department of Education to open Inwood Early College, a new Early College High School whose students transition into college course-taking at Guttman in their 10th grade year and go on to complete an AAS program, in either IT or Business Administration, at no cost to students and their families. This model is ECI’s newest initiative, the “9-14 model,” through which a high school is partnered with a CUNY college and an industry stakeholder, enabling high school students to earn a high school diploma, an associate degree, and gain relevant industry work experience within a six year time period; students are dually enrolled in high school and college. Inwood’s industry partners are Microsoft and New York-Presbyterian.
On September 14, 2014, Inwood Early College opened its doors to its inaugural class of 87 students. One hundred six new students enrolled in 2015, and 85 in 2016. Some students have left the school and other entered mid-year in 2014 and 2015, to bring the current student enrollment to 283 students. In January, 2015, 44 tenth grade students enrolled in their first Guttman Community College course, Ethnographies of Work I. Thirty-six of those students moved on to their second course, Ethnographies of Work II during Fall 2016. These courses are delivered by Guttman professors in the high school building. In 2017 this first cohort of students will begin taking a full-time First-Year Experience schedule at Guttman. Like pathways forward to transfer colleges, Guttman is interested in growing guided pathways back to high schools, and Inwood Early College is its first and most prominent example of such a path.

Experiential Learning

Experiential Learning is central to the mission at Guttman Community College and shapes its student learning outcomes. Our curricular and co-curricular experiences are intentionally and experientially New York City-centric, encompassing the first-year experience and subsequently threaded throughout the programs of study. Indeed, it is helpful to think of our curriculum as literally bookended by experiential learning, beginning with the student projects conducted under faculty supervision in neighborhoods around the city during the Guttman Bridge Program and ending with an experiential capstone in the program of study. Experiential Learning outcomes have been included in Guttman's College Area Focus Goals, a section of the Performance Management Plan (see Document Set 2) that is reported on annually to the CUNY Chancellor.

The Office of Partnerships and Community Engagement OPCE (see above p. 5) serves as a bridge among Guttman’s curriculum, the City of New York, and local organizations to generate experiential learning opportunities for students. Internally, OPCE partners with the Faculty with Experiential Learning Expertise, the Global Guttman faculty coordinator, and the program coordinators in each program of study. The designated Experiential Learning faculty member works closely with her peers to support experiential pedagogy and curriculum. The Guttman Endowment provides student funding for experiential learning to support field trips, cultural experiences, student-led research, and Community Days.

Global Guttman is a key focal point for experiential learning at the College. Global education encourages deep learning beyond borders, both geographic and the borders of one's self-awareness. Global Guttman is an equity-based faculty-directed global learning initiative that offers faculty-led global travel programs to Guttman students. Since 2014, 62 students have traveled on 7 trips to Nicaragua, Germany, Ecuador, Alaska and Jamaica. These trips have allowed students to foster a deeper understanding of themselves in a global context and examine their own perspectives on the world, while cultivating a deeper sense of social responsibility, as exemplified in the results of the 3-part, pre- and post-travel Global Guttman Assessment. When asked to agree or disagree with the statement “I have a clear sense of myself and my place in the world”, prior to travel 67% reported Strongly Agree or Agree, while after travel 96% reported Strongly Agree or Agree. When asked to what extent they feel a responsibility to give back to their community, prior to travel 59% reported to a Moderate or Large Extent, while after travel 85% reported to a Moderate or Large Extent. Written and video reflections posted on e-Portfolio often captured the development in perspective that occurred in many students, for example, one student’s pre-trip written reflection noted that he “would be interested in exploring a cultural heritage that is very different from mine to get a better understanding of how others live and think….(and) help me develop more as a person, a student”, while upon return he explained that “apart from developing patience I learned how open I have become to other people, to new things and new environments.”

Our curricular and co-curricular offerings are structured such that each student who graduates from Guttman engages in multiple experiential learning opportunities intentionally included in the pedagogical design of the courses in their first-year experience and throughout their programs of study. At Guttman, the
City is used as a living text for student learning. Two of our five academic programs (Human Services and Information Technology) require majors to do an internship, and a third program (Liberal Arts and Sciences) recently launched an elective internship seminar for majors. The Human Services program requires a fieldwork placement or internship over the course of two 12-week semesters (total of 250 hours). The Information Technology program requires an internship to be fulfilled by the student over one of the 6 week sessions (total of 90-120 hours). The Liberal Arts & Sciences internship seminar requires a total of 100 internship hours and an additional 20 hours of leadership and career development (total of 120 hours). Two of the five GLOs (Guttman Learning Outcomes)—“Applied Learning” and “Civic Learning, Engagement and Social Responsibility”—deliberately foreground the centrality of experiential learning.

During the two-day periods called ‘Community Days’ in the twelve week fall I and spring I sessions, students are encouraged to engage in service, community-based research or advocacy activities. We are currently piloting a badging project where continuing students who participate in community-based service activities can earn a Civic Engagement Digital Badge upon completion of a reflection module in their Guttman ePortfolio. In addition to making a student’s civic engagement learning visible to the student himself, the ePortfolio provides Guttman authentic evidence of student learning that aligns with our Civic Learning, Engagement and Social Responsibility GLO.

Since 2013, Guttman has participated in the Roosevelt Institute Campus Network to offer our students civic leadership opportunities. Our most recent partnership in the area of experiential learning is with the Do School / Innovate NYC, which will provide 2-3 Guttman students with stipends and training via weekly entrepreneurship workshops and an intensive 3-week summer entrepreneurship challenge institute, applying the insights of the sharing economy model to address non-profit space needs.

Our intentional focus on experiential learning leads to high levels of student service and engagement. Guttman students are nominated annually for CUNY-wide service awards (e.g., Annual Service to Women Recognition Award, Guttman Global Ambassadors, Campus Compact Newman Civic Fellows, and New York City Department of Transportation/CUNY Sidewalk Inspection Management Internship Award). In 2012 GCC co-hosted a New York State-wide workshop on civic engagement with NY Campus Compact. Two GCC students have received Campus Compact's Newman Award.

Guttman’s experiential learning efforts must also be situated in the broader CUNY context. In fall 2015, a NY State Budget provision to develop a plan to make experiential/applied learning activities available to enrolled students starting in fall 2016 and to assess the feasibility of making experiential learning a graduation requirement. CUNY's Board of Trustees passed a resolution to develop a plan to assess the university’s current practices regarding experiential learning with a goal of increasing the quality and availability of such opportunities for CUNY students.

As a first step in developing a CUNY-wide experiential learning plan, Chancellor Milliken created an experiential learning task force with representatives from each institution. The task force asked each campus to complete a 2014-2015 experiential learning inventory to describe the breadth and depth of students’ experiential learning opportunities. Guttman representatives on the task force were both active participants and leaders on this task force, sharing our expertise and best practices. CUNY’s A Plan for Experiential Learning, compiled by the task force highlights Guttman’s experiential learning efforts. And using Strategic Investment grant funding in May 2016, Guttman held the first CUNY Experiential Learning Symposium—Breaking Boundaries: Experiential Learning Opportunities in the 21st C Classroom—which was attended by over 100 participants.

The 2015-16 experiential learning inventory (Document Set 3) is a significant start towards identifying the breadth and depth of experiential pedagogy and practices across the institution. Our most immediate goal is to develop strategies to track the various experiential practices and measure the impact on student
learning. Because experiential learning is seemingly everywhere at once, developing a strategic approach to effectively track and assess its impact is a complex undertaking and will unfold over time. OPCE recently purchased the Simplicity Career Manager and Job Search Database to track experiential learning activities developed by the office. Once implemented, OPCE will determine if the database has the capacity to track experiential learning opportunities across the entire institution.

Current assessment efforts are most visible with Community Days, an institutional community service initiative that integrates curricular and co-curricular experiential learning. Student feedback on Community Days data was concerning; in the spring 2015 Guttman Student Survey (see Document Set 9), only 41% of students agreed / strongly agreed that Community Days motivate me to volunteer in non-Guttman events. In addition, attendance at Community Days activities by continuing students was startlingly low. Based on this data, changes were made to Community Days for 2015-2016; early signs of improvement are emerging. During the fall 2015 Community Days, Guttman invited the Roosevelt Institute to campus to train students on public policy the day after students completed their community service. Out of a total population of 809 students, 59% of our first-year students and 41% of our second year students completed a Community Days reflection assignment. The assignment solicited reflection on both the community service and the policy workshops facilitated by the Roosevelt Institute.

Examples that demonstrate student learning and the potential for future impact:

- 59% gained new insights from the community experience;
- 39% encountered at least one civic issue during their community experience;
- 44% can now define “policy” to someone who did not know its meaning;
- 59% are likely to take action on issues discussed during the Roosevelt Institute workshops.

The stories students share in their ePortfolios further strengthen the learning that emerges. The student responses collectively reveal awareness, understanding and voice. A pledge to action is visible in many of the responses. Here is one such response: “Today's workshop helped me open my own perspectives on what I want to do when I get older. I wanted to major in something that was just for the money. But after listening, I want to help other people and understand why this world is the way it is.”

To continue this positive trend, a task force has been convened to recommend improvements to Community Days. As part of this work, a team attended the Campus Compact in September 2016.

_CUNY Start and Summer Start_ (see above p. 17)

_CUNY Start_ is an intensive program for incoming college students, both high school graduates and high school equivalency diploma recipients, who are best served in a sustained skills development immersion program to help increase their proficiency in reading, writing, and/or mathematics prior to enrollment in college credit courses. The program, offered at a number of CUNY campuses, enrolls CUNY students who have been accepted to college, but who decide after a review of their scores on the CUNY Assessment Tests and meeting with a counselor to defer their matriculation one semester to work on their developmental skills in math, reading and writing. Students who have enrolled in CUNY Start re-take the required CUNY Assessment Tests at the end of the program. The program provides an innovative approach to developmental education with carefully designed curriculum and pedagogy, ongoing professional development for faculty, a supportive teacher approach, and well-integrated advisement services.

The Guttman CUNY Start program works closely with Guttman’s Admissions staff to identify and enroll eligible students. Launched in fall 2015, CUNY Start invited over 80 eligible students; 48 students were officially enrolled. Forty-two students completed the program, meaning they retested during the first phase of CUNY Assessment Tests. Students are invited to continue with the program for a second
opportunity to retest if needed, but whether they test or not in the second phase, they are considered as completing the program. The student pass rates by subject were: 31 students (73.8%) passed writing, 28 (66.7%) passed reading, and 24 (57.1%) passed math. Pass rates by remedial need show that 15 students (35.7%) eliminated all three remedial needs, 13 students (30.9%) eliminated two remedial needs, 12 students (28.6%) eliminated one remedial need, and 2 students (4.8%) remained triple remedial. Of the 42 students that completed CUNY Start, 41 of them enrolled at Guttman; all completed the Winter Bridge program and matriculated as Guttman students in spring 2016. A much smaller second cohort of CUNY Start students began the program in March 2016.

Similar to CUNY Start, Guttman added the Summer Start program in 2015. This intense 8-week program provides incoming Guttman students an opportunity to increase their math proficiency before starting credit classes in the fall. The program, which provides pre-college math instruction, enrolls students who have been accepted to Guttman, but have not passed the math sections of the CUNY Assessment Tests; specifically students must have received non-passing scores in both Math 1 (arithmetic/pre-algebra) and Math 2 (elementary algebra), and received passing scores on the reading and writing proficiency tests. In addition, students attend a weekly college success seminar to help develop their academic identity and learn about college structures and campus resources. In summer 2015 roughly 200 students were eligible for the program; 56 students enrolled and were accepted into the program. Fifty-two students completed the program with 50 students (96.2%) eliminating their math remedial need. Forty-nine of those students began at Guttman in fall 2015 with 2 students deferring their enrollment to spring 2016.

To continue a CUNY Start program, Guttman understood from its inception that it would be necessary to have a full year-round program that enrolls students each fall and spring. It has been a greater challenge than anticipated to recruit a population of students for CUNY Start in the spring semester. In 2016 Guttman began a limited spring admission, in part to accommodate CUNY Start. With only one House of up to 75 students target enrollment, only limited recruitment efforts were possible resulting in a smaller pool of students from which to identify potentially eligible CUNY Start students. In spring 2016, Guttman took students that were unable to enroll in programs at their preferred institution into its CUNY Start program; this was not a successful model to be replicated. In late 2016, it became evident that the College could not sustain a viable year-round program; the students in fall 2016 CUNY Start are the last to be served in this program at Guttman, until the College has a greater capacity—presumably when it relocates to its permanent campus—to admit students during both fall and spring admissions cycles. The discontinuation of CUNY Start includes the Summer Start program. The College is now considering supplemental supports it might offer, especially in math, to both entering and continuing students in lieu of the full-time immersion experience.

Information Commons and Academic Support
Information Commons

The Information Commons (IC) acts not only as a library (offering traditional reference and circulation services) but as a student union, classroom, community gathering and auditorium space, a place for laptop loans, WiFi access, printing/copying/scanning, access to assistive technology, and a space for collaboration and production of multimedia presentations and projects. A non-traditional setting, the IC from its inception was designed to serve students and their faculty in partnership. The idea was to create an innovative space built on the philosophy and pedagogy of the College. Intended as a departure from prescriptive college libraries, the IC was designed as a fun, relaxed place for collaboration and social learning with the overarching goal to enhance student academic achievement and the timely attainment of degrees. As students make progress through their programs of study, integrated information literacy and research-related assignments are the focus of support offered in the IC and of the collections cultivated. Furnishings support group work and flexible spontaneous interactions. Adjacency of services allows students to avail themselves of the support they need from one comprehensive location without having to
continuously relocate or seek out remote offices. Budgetary spending for textbooks held on Reserve is a priority expense. A minimum of one copy is acquired and made available for loan of every required title of any resource used in every course. Students also have access to all of the CUNY-wide centralized full text databases. While the emphasis is on information literacy rather than on print collections and access over ownership, the IC has over 2,200 print books in its collection and 1,344 instance of print books circulated (2016). There are 155,000 entrances to the IC annually, and 120 information literacy sessions per academic year (of 55 - 90 minutes each). Considered as a part of the CUNY system, there are 456,859 E books and 102,517 electronic journal issues held in our collection, with 10,871 electronic articles accessed. Additionally, the NYPL Stephen A. Schwarzman Research Library and the Mid-Manhattan Public Library, are both located down the street from the College, and provide easy access to vast print resources, in addition to the 24 CUNY campus libraries Guttman students have access to.

The IC itself provides a physical space for students to work independently or collaboratively on assignments; at 5,554 square feet it has sufficient space and access to computers and printers to accommodate our student population. During Fall I and Spring I, the IC is open on weekdays from 7am until 10pm and from noon until 5pm on weekends to accommodate student-learning needs. During Fall II and Spring II, the IC is not open on weekends, and on weekdays when no classes are scheduled the hours are reduced. Research librarians are available to provide one-on-one support to students who need assistance with assignments and projects. Through the Research Assistance Service on Starfish, faculty can refer students to a librarian and students can make an appointment to meet with a librarian during their published “office hours.”

The SAGE plan for the Information Commons includes goals to strengthen operations leadership and increase academic messaging in the space where learning support is the priority goal. A future goal includes attracting a greater number of faculty to frequent the IC during hours when students typically are actively working on assignments in order to strengthen informal intellectual exchange and shared curiosity. While the college increasingly builds dynamic programs to complement courses and space is a forever competitive reality, we creatively work with facilities to keep the space accessible to students while also supporting the myriad of purposes constantly rotating through the space. The IC, as the center of learning activity outside the classroom, will continue to be rich with technology and teeming with resources alongside human academic support. Satisfaction surveys will continue to be issued and feedback incorporated to the best of our ability given the space constraints.

The Learning Lab

In 2015, the Office of Academic Affairs began an effort to more intentionally focus on the wrap-around academic support structure offered to students from Bridge through Commencement. While there were several programs in place—such as peer mentoring and tutoring—those services were operating independently. An academic support committee was convened to address this issue. From this work, it was decided to house several of our academic support services in one physical location at the college. The rear portion of the Information Commons has been designated as “The Learning Lab.” This Lab houses the peer mentors, tutors, and eTerns and is a place for students to receive academic support as well as for quiet study and research.

Peer Mentoring Program

Guttman's Peer Mentoring Program began in fall 2012. Since then the program has grown to offer intentional academic support for Guttman students. The Peer Mentor role is a paid student leadership position that is open to all CUNY students who have completed one full academic year. The selection process includes an application, group interview, and an individual interview with 3 current Mentors, Faculty, or Staff. Currently, there are four types of mentors; Admissions and Access Peer Mentors (AAPM), Leadership and Service Peer Mentors (LSPM), Academic Success Meet-Up Peer Mentors, and
Academic Success Studio Peer Mentors. Academic Success Peer Mentors must have a cumulative GPA of a 3.0 or above and other mentors must have a GPA of 2.75 or above. All Mentors participate in over 150 hours of training and coaching each year.

The initial focus of the 28 mentors in Guttman’s inaugural year (2012 – 2013) was the Admissions process, Group Work Space (which became Studio), and some student programming. In spring 2013 the program worked with faculty to develop the first ever Math Meet-Ups—a place where students could meet with peers and faculty to discuss math, study, and work on statistics homework. In 2013-2014 in addition to working in Studio, Academic Success Peer Mentors began to lead Meet-Ups. Meet-Up sessions, collaborative group study sessions facilitated by the mentor, focused initially on Math and Reading/Writing with a few mentors working with Chemistry courses. The Peer Mentoring Program continues to evolve each year.

In 2015-2016 there were 54 Peer Mentors across the four roles; Admissions and Access, Leadership and Service, and Academic Success Peer Mentors for Meet-Ups and Studio. There were 15 Meet-Up Mentors working with faculty in the following courses: College Algebra, Biology, Composition, Chemistry, Precalculus, and Statistics. Each mentor observed the appropriate class once a week and hosted two drop-in Meet-Up sessions that were open to all students. Meet-Up attendees were tracked and this information was shared with subject faculty. Presentations were also made to faculty about the use of mentors in the classroom and individual meetings were held with faculty that would be hosting a mentor in their classrooms. Meet-Up mentors also built a robust ePortfolio so Guttman students could find their contact information and study guides. This all led to greater effectiveness of the Meet-Up mentor. From fall 2014 to fall 2015 the program saw a 142% increase in student usage. Additionally, all of the Academic Success Peer Mentors (Studio and Meet-Ups) offered Direct Connect coaching sessions, which provide additional one-on-one support to students upon request.

Since 2015-2016, the number of mentors remains steady and we continue to support a variety of courses. (See Document Set 11 for Fall 1 2016 Meet-up schedule.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Number of Meet-Up Mentors</th>
<th>Number of Meet-Ups Held</th>
<th>Total Number of Attendees</th>
<th>Average Attendees per Meet-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall I 2015</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall I 2016</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We continue to track Meet-Up attendance while at the same time beginning to evaluate the content of sessions. In spring 2016, mentors were trained on Starfish Connect and are now more visible via the platform to students, faculty and staff. Moving forward, the Peer Mentoring Program intends to focus on first-year courses such as Composition and Statistics, along with supporting all Studio sections. Additionally, we will continue to support Practicum courses, Chemistry, Biology, and higher level Math courses when possible. To accomplish this as we grow, the number of mentors hired will need to increase to support our student population. We also hope to develop and offer regular academic support workshops as well as sessions targeted to specific faculty requests. We will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and respond accordingly.

Currently the Peer Mentoring Program uses a SAGE plan and works with Guttman’s Center for College Effectiveness (CCE) to assess various aspects of the program. Midway through and at the end of each semester, the program evaluates the effectiveness of all of our classroom mentors. Faculty provide feedback that is used in the further development of skills needed for the mentors. The program monitors the usage of Meet-Ups quantitatively by reporting mid- and end-of-semester to the faculty and advising
team a list of all the student attendees. The numbers are further analyzed to show the percentage of repeat
users. Multiple subject attendees, and multiple time attendees. Qualitative data is gathered about the
mentor’s experiences through bi-weekly reflections that ask mentors to write about experiences where
they have supported Guttman students, how they have experienced personal growth, and specific
questions about their experiences in the classroom working with their faculty partner. Since information
about Meet-Up sessions, individual appointments and referrals is in Starfish by Hobsons, we have an
additional repository of data from which we can learn. Working with the CCE, we intend to host focus
groups with students who have attended Meet-Ups and those who have not, with the intent of looking into
student’s motivation and desire to attend these specific learning opportunities. We also will measure the
Mentor effectiveness via surveys, or another similar tool, with Meet-Up attendees.

As Guttman continues to grow, our goal is to increase the numbers, and hours, that Mentors are available
to support the first-year experience and Practicum courses. With more Mentors, we will be able to partner
with additional faculty and better support students. In addition to increasing the in-classroom support,
Academic Success Mentors are planning on developing a more in-depth offering of 1-on-1 coaching
sessions to support student development both in and out of the classroom. Additionally, Academic
Success Mentors intend to offer standing academic skill building workshops for students.

As new houses are added with the growth of students, the Peer Mentoring Program will also need to grow
so that the program remains an integral part of the First-year Experience supporting both the academic
and social integration of Guttman students. Mentors will be needed to support the academic classes,
LaBBS and Studio. We will target Guttman alumni to return as Peer Mentors and will develop a stronger
leadership program with lead mentors taking on a larger role in the scheduling and supervision of their
peers, enabling full-time professional staff to allocate more time to training and development.

Tutoring Services

Tutoring Services began in fall 2014 when the Office of Academic Affairs realized that, given student
success data in the programs of study and the percentage of students on academic probation, discipline-
specific academic support was needed to augment the Peer Mentor Meet-ups. OAA hired a lecturer with
Academic Support expertise to oversee the development and implementation of Tutoring Services at
Guttman. Tutors—subject matter experts—are located in the Learning Lab and provide one-on-one
academic support to students. Tutoring Services has grown from its inception, as more tutoring hours
became available and more students take advantage of this support each semester. In Fall 2016 there were
69 tutoring hours available each week. Tutors are available to assist in writing, ESL, mathematics,
biology and chemistry, information technology and business. Table 11 below shows the number of unique
students served each semester as well as the total number of tutoring visits.

| Table 12  
| Tutoring Sessions and Number of Students Served Each Semester |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fall I 2014 | Fall II 2014 | Spring I 2015 | Spring II 2015 | Fall I 2015 | Fall II 2015 |
| Sessions | 102 | 49 | 259 | 33 | 283 | 99 |
| Unique Students | 48 | 25 | 106 | 34 | 105 | 38 |
| Unique students per subject | 60 | 42 | 142 | 25 | 144 | 42 |
Students are encouraged to sign-up in advance for a tutoring session but can also drop-by as needed for assistance. Students are made aware of Tutoring Services via handouts, Starfish (Guttman Tutoring Lab), word-of-mouth, and faculty and advisor recommendations and referrals. Students on academic probation are encouraged to attend two hours of tutoring or Meet-Ups per week. Starting in spring 2016, Tutoring Services began using Starfish Connect to receive tutoring referrals from faculty and advisors and for an online appointment schedule. Connect also allows tutors to “close the loop” and provide feedback to faculty about tutoring sessions, as well as collect data to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of tutoring on student learning.

As Tutoring Services is relatively new to Guttman, there are several anticipated areas of growth. First, it is likely additional subject matter expert tutors will be hired to provide additional expertise and service hours each semester. Second, tutoring will expand its online presence so students can access resources, submit questions, receive quick responses, and submit papers for feedback. Third, the service hopes to offer classroom support, where tutors can provide assistance with group work and projects for a particular class. These additional supports will benefit all students at Guttman as the college’s enrollment grows.

We recognize the centrality of Tutoring to student success as we scale. It was apparent that maintaining an effective tutoring program requires more time and attention than a faculty member with dedicated reassigned time can dedicate to this effort. As such, in fall 2016, the responsibility for the Tutoring Service was shifted to an Associate Director of Peer Mentoring and Student Success. The Associate Director is in the process of developing measurable goals, defining practice, and gathering evidence as part of an initial SAGE plan. Over the next few years the Associate Director will work under the guidance of the Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology to continue to grow the program as well as evaluate the impact of tutoring on student success.

eTerns

As described below, all Guttman students use ePortfolio as a space for learning and construction of knowledge as well as for assessment. Guttman faculty also use ePortfolio for delivery of course content. In order to provide technical and pedagogical support for both students and faculty, the student eTern program was launched in 2014. eTerns are current or former Guttman students who provide ePortfolio support via appointments, drop-in hours, and classroom visits. They are also supporting our pilot badging initiative.

eTerns provide approximately 50 hours of technical assistance availability per week. eTerns are introduced to students in the Bridge program, and they are present in the Studio sessions when students create their ePortfolio. New faculty are introduced to the eTerns each year as part of an ePortfolio workshop that takes place during new faculty orientation.

Students can be referred to an eTern via Starfish or they can drop-in on an eTern in the Learning Lab. Faculty and advisors can request one-on-one assistance with setting up an ePortfolio for a course or with specific assignments/activities. eTerns can also assist in a class session, if appropriate. The College is still gathering benchmark data on eTern visits and will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in the upcoming years.

Testing

Guttman’s Office of Testing Services provides information and services pertaining to the CUNY Assessment Tests (CAT) and the Ability to Benefit (ATB) tests. Until June, 2016, the Office also organized and administered course exams for students eligible for special accommodations, but those course-level accommodations for students with special needs are now managed through the Office of AccessABILITY. The CUNY Assessment Tests (CAT) evaluate competencies in the areas of reading,
writing and mathematics. Students take these tests when they are first admitted to college unless they have demonstrated proficiency in these subject areas by other standards (SAT or Regents test scores). The Reading Test (or CATR) is designed to measure reading comprehension; the Writing Test (or CATW) is designed to measure the ability to do college-level writing in English based on critical reading, thinking, and writing skills; and the Math Test (CATM) measures skills in four areas: numerical skills; pre-algebra, elementary algebra, college algebra, and trigonometry. The Office of Testing administers the CUNY Elementary Algebra Final Exam (CEAFE) to students as well. For students who do not demonstrate proficiency on entry to Guttman, there are opportunities to do so through re-testing over the course of the first-year. The Testing Office coordinates these opportunities with faculty in relevant subject areas. During the 2014 - 2015 academic year the Testing Office provided weekly updates about testing for incoming students through June 2015, as well as bi-monthly eligibility reports for CUNY Start/Summer Start. Between March 13 and May 11, 2015 the Testing Office registered 857 students for CUNY Assessment Tests (including 77 students with accommodations) and 538 of those students were tested.

Until June 2016, the Testing Office coordinated all course-level exam accommodations for students with special needs. After a student had first registered with AccessABILITY Services, to schedule an exam with accommodations a student and faculty to fill out and pass along to the Testing Office a Testing Arrangement Form (TAF) 10 days prior to each scheduled classroom exam. With the rollout of Starfish in the spring 2016, a new Starfish protocol was put in place whereby a student signals his or her intention to request and receive accommodations for a course exam, and the AccessABILITY Office works with the faculty to schedule the exam and provide the appropriate accommodations. Students now request accommodations testing through Starfish with a “Raise my hand – I need testing” flag that triggers a fillable-form (the TAF) sent to the course professor. The Director of Accessability receives the form, schedule the test accommodations, and logs the outcome through Starfish. Students’ designated accommodations can be viewed through Starfish by AccessABILITY counselors, providing a seamless and secure transfer of information.

Guttman has a disproportionate number of students with special needs compared to the other CUNY colleges (see Document Set 11). In fall 2015, 18% of Guttman’s students disclosed their need for accommodations. As the College grows, the number of students registered with the AccessABILITY Services to receive testing accommodations will continue to grow as well. A related challenge faced by the Testing Office and now AccessABILITY is locating and reserving limited space at W 40th Street to conduct testing. Some improvement followed the creation of an additional conference room (207Q) on the mezzanine in spring 2015, but this ongoing challenge remains. The number of accommodations testing sessions offered per semester was 150 for fall 2014, serving 80 students, and 84 in spring 2015, serving 66 students. In total the amount of time provided for accommodations testing was 315 hours in fall 2014 and 201 hours in spring 2015. The implementation of Starfish and the transfer of course-level accommodations to AccessABILITY were important steps in improving services to our students with special needs.

**Academic Technology**

Guttman is a high-touch, high tech institution. And, while Guttman’s technology infrastructure is strong, with laptops in all classrooms along with smart boards and projectors, our definition of “high tech” extends far beyond equipment. The Concept Paper states that “technology will not be a replacement mechanism [just an alternative means of delivering classroom instruction or library research], but an enhancement of what we know is most important: access, feedback, interaction, connection. Technology will not replace contact with faculty, student peers, advisors; it will extend it” (54). Guttman faculty and staff have worked to put that high tech vision into practice, in a way that is well positioned to scale to our target enrollment. Supporting faculty and staff in carrying out this vision has been a priority for the institution. Just before the inaugural Guttman Bridge Program (August 2012) was launched, a faculty with assessment and ePortfolio expertise was hired, and in 2015 she became an Associate Dean for
Assessment and Technology. An Academic Technology committee, comprised of faculty and staff, has been in place since 2012, working to ensure that we use technology to effectively support student learning and success, and in 2014 Guttman appointed a faculty with academic technology expertise. Working together, each of these stakeholders, along with the Chief Information Officer, continue to develop and carry out a strategic long-term plan for the use of academic technology at Guttman.

Guttman is able to provide students multiple access points to academic technology. Wi-Fi is available throughout the campus. Faculty and staff use a wide range of software applications to support student learning. There are two platforms used “at scale” and integrated across the student learning experience: Digication’s ePortfolio software and Starfish by Hobsons. Each classroom is equipped with a laptop cart containing approximately 30 laptops. The Information Commons and Learning Lab have desktop computers for student use, and they can also checkout a laptop for use in the IC. If students need long-term access to a laptop, they can check out a laptop for the semester, through the IT Help Desk. The college now has over 100 iPads for student use, and iPad checkout is also available. The IT office at the college is open during normal business hours and provides excellent support to students experiencing technical difficulty. On the 2015 Guttman Employee survey, 94% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the IT department provided timely/appropriate support and 78% of respondents responded that they had access to the technology/software necessary to do their job. Students registered with the Office of AccessABILITY are also encouraged to work with this office if they require adaptive technology to successfully complete their coursework.

ePortfolio

As discussed below in Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning, ePortfolio is the primary vehicle for assessment at the college. But, its use extends beyond assessment. ePortfolio pedagogy is widely used across the curriculum. Faculty and staff are integrating ePortfolio into their assignments and activities and see it as a space for learning and collaboration. Students are introduced to ePortfolio in their Bridge program when they create their personal ePortfolio; they use that portfolio throughout their time at the College for learning and reflection. Students are asked to reflect at specific milestones in their academic journey, helping them make meaning of their learning experience and to see their growth and development over time.

An ePortfolio Task Force (see Document Set 14), which met from 2013-2015, developed a vision to define Guttman’s ePortfolio practice. An ePortfolio subcommittee of the Academic Technology committee meets periodically each year to ensure that that vision and philosophy are being carried out.

Vision: As an institution focused on learning and improvement, ePortfolio is an integral and integrating component at the center of Guttman Community College. The use of ePortfolio spans the breadth of our work and organization from students, faculty and staff to programs; from academic and curricula to administrative and institutional functions. ePortfolio is a space to showcase our work, articulate and reflect on our learning, assess our outcomes, document improvements and change, and communicate to each other and the larger communities we are a part of.

ePortfolio is well integrated into our culture. Every student uses ePortfolio as a place to showcase and reflect on his or her learning experiences. Faculty use ePortfolio for delivery of course content as well as for their own professional portfolios. Programs and units across the college, include Peer Mentoring, Tutoring, and the Center for College Effectiveness, use ePortfolio to share their work with the community.
While ePortfolio is used at scale, our attention now focuses on using it most effectively. Our aim is for all Guttman students to have a “high-impact” ePortfolio experience, one in which scaffolded, recursive ePortfolio practice helps students develop as learners and scholars. Recognizing that “high impact” ePortfolio use begins with faculty, the College regularly offers ePortfolio professional development opportunities for full-time and adjunct faculty as well as staff. Despite these regular offerings, participation has been uneven and meaningful ePortfolio practice is still sporadic, particularly in the programs of study. Findings from early assessment data revealed that student use of ePortfolio was inconsistent (see Assessment of Student Learning). Work was difficult to find, or not present at all. Only a limited number of students in the programs of study have submitted capstone portfolios for assessment. Guttman student survey data supports these findings. In the 2014-2015 Guttman Student Experience Survey, only 54% of students agreed / strongly agreed that “Using ePortfolio allows me to be more aware of my growth and development as a learner.”

Based on these findings, several steps were taken to improve ePortfolio practice at the college: 1) Students’ introduction to ePortfolio in Bridge programs was redesigned in 2015 to create a better introduction to and understanding of ePortfolio, 2) A series of educational planning ePortfolio modules (eP2) were developed and are integrated across the LaBSS I and LaBSS II curricula, 3) The Bridge, FYE, and Milestone reflection prompts were revised to better align with GLOs and to help students become more aware of their learning and growth, and 4) ePortfolio is integrated into the New Faculty Orientation Seminar, helping faculty better understand ePortfolio practice.

Early formative evidence shows this new introduction appears to be working with students and in the FYE. Our most recent assessment data showed only 7% of “no evidence” scores as compared to 41% in Dec 2014. And, during an assessment day’s group reflection, faculty agreed that students have a better understanding of ePortfolio. It is suggested that professional development and support be provided to programs of study faculty to integrate ePortfolio practice and the curation of a capstone ePortfolio into the second-year curricula.

Starfish

One of the four major strategic planning goals for Guttman Community College is to “improve student learning, retention and graduation rates by implementing and refining a new educational model to serve our students.” Despite our early graduation rate success, our fall-to-fall retention rates remain below our initial 75% target, and declined from 74% for the first 2012-entering cohort to 69%, 73%, and 69% for the 2013, 2014 and 2015 cohorts respectively. The leaves our lowest performing, under prepared students most at risk of not making degree progress or earning their degrees. As the College scales up to its target size of 5,000 students, one of its greatest challenges will be to maintain the effectiveness of its wrap-around and proactive student advising and academic support. To address this challenge, Guttman is implementing an Integrated Planning and Advising for Student Success (iPASS) initiative that uses Starfish by Hobsons along with ePortfolio to more effectively identify and monitor students in need of academic and other supports and to more proactively connect them to appropriate Guttman services.

Guttman was deliberative in its decision to implement Starfish. The committee that selected Starfish, comprised of faculty, advisors, administrators, and institutional research analysts, recognized the need for and value of a system that will help our at-risk students succeed. There is buy-in … from all key stakeholders: faculty, advisors and administrators. Guttman also secured funding from two separate grants to support this major iPASS initiative: Project STARS: Student Achievement and Retention Support a College Completion Innovation Fund grant and Project GAPP: Guttman’s Advising and Planning Project an EDUCAUSE iPASS grant.
Over the course of the 2015-2016 academic year, Starfish Early Alert and Connect were implemented “at scale.” Starfish allows the College to:

- analyze the effectiveness of academic support interventions and to build a more sustainable support process into our programs of study;
- strengthen our advising model through centralizing advising data;
- provide a tool for faculty and staff to identify academically at-risk students and student in need of personal support or referrals; and
- connect those students to resources as quickly as possible.

Formative assessment of the Starfish implementation indicates that we are making significant progress towards integrating this technology as part of effective and sustainable advising and student support practices. Initial findings show:

- strong participation in professional development sessions. There was attendance by 100% of full-time teaching faculty (n=42); 100% of advisors (n=10); and all but one graduate coordinator (7 out of 8);
- strong use of the system. 13,108 items (flags, kudos, referrals) were raised in 2015-2016, and 99% percent of our student population received kudos and/or flags;
- strong support from students. Over 75% of student survey respondents agreed / strongly agreed with each of the following items: I find it helpful to use Starfish to schedule office hours / appointments; Receiving kudos in Starfish Early Alert makes me feel that my hard work is recognized; Receiving kudos in Starfish Early Alert increases my motivation to success. Almost 70% agreed or strongly agreed that receiving flags in Starfish Early Alert helps me improve my performance.

Formative data also revealed two areas for improvement:

- Enhance the use of Early Alert by instructional teams. 29% of faculty/advisor survey respondents agreed / strongly agreed: Starfish Early Alert supports the work of my instructional team. The Starfish Implementation team is working with Instructional Teams to enhance the use of Early Alert by the teams. We recently showed team leaders and SSAs how to filter flags and kudos to look at recent activity during their team meetings. We also gave advisors and team leaders the ability to download flag, kudos, and referral data as team leaders believe it will be helpful to have Excel files to distribute for discussion during team meetings.
- Increase frequency of Early Alert use by faculty/advisors. Student survey respondents commented: “Maybe some improvements would be if more professors use Starfish more”; “It should be used more frequently!”; “ALL professors to update students more often, maybe weekly or biweekly.”

These data were shared with faculty and staff during subsequent professional development sessions, and Guttman continues to seek suggestions and feedback from faculty and staff on ways to improve the system. For example, this year two new kudos were added that faculty suggested for the Bridge Program. Starfish by Hobsons is, in itself, a response to building sustainable and scalable advising and student support practices. iPASS grant funding allowed us to recently hire a project coordinator to help manage the software itself and to support faculty and staff usage. The College will continue to provide meaningful professional development for all faculty and staff with the aim to develop an online professional development workshop to supplement face-to-face work—a strategy we hope will be especially helpful to adjunct faculty. As our work evolves, Starfish’s analytics capability will provide an opportunity to
identify effective student behaviors and interventions, or combinations of interventions, and proactively apply them to high-need students.

**Summary of Findings for Standard 11**
1. Findings from the PPR process in the Liberal Arts and Sciences major, led to changes in the major that added flexibility and addressed credit recognition concerns raised as students began to transfer to four-year colleges.
2. The guided pathways structure effectively helps students stay on track to graduate within three years.
3. Guttman’s hybrid courses support the high touch / high tech model and integrate the use of technology in ways that promote student-to-student and student-to-faculty interaction.
4. The Information Commons implements an approach suggested in the Concept Paper for open, collaborative learning and digitally-based collections.
5. The Learning Lab, comprised of peer mentors, tutors, and eTerns has been increasing in size and impact as it gets better established at the College.
6. Academic technology—because of its procurement, provision and support by IT—is pervasively used throughout Guttman and is readily available to both students and faculty.
7. Initial findings indicate that the implementation of Starfish by Hobsons has strong support from both faculty and students.

**Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 11**

**Suggestions**
- Examine success data and Starfish retention data and look for insights into how we might better serve students who are struggling to be successful in the FYE and in the Programs of Study.
- Develop ways to assess the impact of the various types of academic support: peer mentoring, tutoring, and eTerns and consider the best ways to expand these programs as the college grows.
- Provide professional development to City Seminar faculty to improve developmental skills instruction.

**Recommendations**
- Complete the PPR process for all programs according to the Institutional Assessment Plan timeline.

**Summary of Findings for Standard 12**
1. The House and cohort structure of the FYE is an important part of students’ first-year experience at Guttman. It is important to maintain.
2. The FYE is effective, as evidenced by retention and course success rates.

**Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 12**

**Suggestions**
- Examine success data and Starfish retention data and look for insights into how we might better serve students who are struggling to be successful in the FYE and in the Programs of Study.

**Recommendations**
- Complete the cycles of assessment for all GLOs according to the Institutional Plan timeline.

**Summary of Findings for Standard 13**
1. The Guttman Bridge Program effectively introduces students to the college and helps with their transition in terms of both academic and dispositional expectations.
2. Guttman has a broad array of experiential learning opportunities available to its students, and it should continue to refine and assess which opportunities work best and lead to high levels of student service and engagement.

3. Guttman’s CUNY Start and Summer Start must be discontinued, given the difficulty of sustaining the program year-round due to space constraints and the limited capacity to recruit and admit students in the spring cycle. The College is now considering ways it might offer supplemental support, especially in math, to both entering and continuing students in lieu of the full-time immersion experience.

Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 13

Suggestions
- Consider ways to effectively scale the Guttman Bridge Program, with particular attention to student stipends, and cost and length of the program.

Recommendations
- Guttman should develop a strategic approach to effectively track and assess the impact of experiential learning.
Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

“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.”

Overview of Standard 14

As noted in the Introduction (p. x), assessment, with a focus on assessment for learning and improvement, is central to the ongoing work of Guttman Community College and related directly to its fourth institutional goal.

There has and continues to be strong institutional support for and recognition of the importance of ongoing student learning assessment that focuses on assessment for learning where improvement is a key step in the process. The importance and centrality of assessment has been recognized since the earliest planning, as reflected in Guttman’s Interim Governance Plan, in which the Assessment and Professional Development Committee is established as a standing committee of the College Council. In August 2012, Guttman hired a faculty with assessment expertise. In this hybrid role, the assessment faculty worked as part of the Center for College Effectiveness to help guide and facilitate the College’s ePortfolio and assessment initiatives. In June 2013, Guttman sent a team of administrators, faculty, and staff to AAC&U’s Institute for General Education and Assessment, where the College’s first Assessment Plan was developed. In 2015 a designated Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology position was created. Guttman is fortunate to have a nationally recognized ePortfolio and assessment leader currently serving in that position. The college is also committed to having ten Assessment Days built into the academic calendar each year, another unique practice at Guttman since 2012. As discussed in Chapter 6, the organizational structure of assessment at Guttman has evolved but the College’s comprehensive commitment to and implementation of assessment for both standards 7 and 14 remains unabated.

Findings for Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Guttman’s assessment of student learning process puts student, faculty, and institutional learning at the forefront. There are multiple components to this process including:

- Guttman Learning Outcomes – clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes at the institutional level;
- The Assessment and Professional Development Committee – comprised of faculty, staff, and administration to oversee the assessment of student learning and to respond to assessment results;
- Guttman’s Institutional Assessment Plan – a document which details Guttman’s organized and sustained assessment process;
- Assessment Days – used for both conducting assessment and for sharing and discussing evidence with faculty and staff; professional development provides faculty and staff the opportunity to then “close the loop” and improve teaching and learning practices;
- Assessment activities yield results that provide both evidence of student achievement and identify areas in need of improvement.

Taken together, these components provide evidence that student learning assessment information is part of Guttman’s ongoing institutional focus on assessment for learning, thereby demonstrating that the College meets the fundamental elements of Standard 14. Each component of the process is detailed in the sections below.
The Guttman Learning Outcomes

In addition to having course and program learning outcomes (described above) Guttman, through the collaborative work of multiple stakeholders, developed a set of clear and effective institutional student learning outcomes, the Guttman Learning Outcomes (GLOs), with corresponding rubrics that are widely understood by faculty, staff, and students.

Prior to the opening of the New Community College, faculty and staff identified five institutional student learning outcomes, based on the Degree Qualifications Profile v.1. Multiple criteria for each outcome and rubrics were developed using AAC&U’s LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes and the VALUE Rubrics. In 2013, with the re-naming of the College and following an AAC&U Summer Institute on Assessment and General Education, the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes were re-branded as the Guttman Learning Outcomes, or GLOs.

In 2013, faculty and staff spent time during Assessment Days reviewing and revising the outcomes criteria and rubrics to make sure that expectations were appropriate for students in their first two years of college. Faculty and staff also worked to create curriculum maps, mapping each GLO criteria to courses across the first-year experience and programs of study. All programs have a completed curriculum map which is reviewed and revised as part of the PPR process described above.

We continually find new ways to make the GLOs accessible and transparent to students. In 2015, one of the findings from our earliest assessment work was that the language of the GLOs was not easily accessible to students. As a result, faculty and staff created a set of “student-friendly” GLO rubrics. Signs with each of the GLOs are mounted on the stairwell walls with the question, “How Do You GLO?” Bookmarks are distributed to students with their Bridge common read book and their program of study common read. The Guttman Learning Outcomes are now explicitly introduced to and discussed with students in Studio during the Bridge program. As the Studio curriculum is being refined, we are also more intentionally integrating time to discuss the GLOs with students. As a step towards greater transparency for students, the GLOs aligned with each course should be included on course syllabi.

In the 2015 Guttman Faculty and Staff Survey (see Document Set 14), 63% of all respondents (56% of staff respondents and 73% of faculty respondents) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I can explain the purpose of GLO (Guttman Learning Outcomes)” (17-19), demonstrating that faculty have a better understanding of the GLOs than staff, which makes sense given that GLO is integrated primarily with faculty members’ scope of work. Furthermore, among faculty who reported a clear understanding of the GLOs, there was still uncertainty about how to incorporate the GLOs into their classroom assignments. To address these two concerns, assignment/activity design charrettes have become a recurring activity at Assessment Days. The charrette is a structured, collaborative design workshop developed by the National Institute for Learning Outcomes, where faculty and staff, working in small groups, use a set of guided prompts to give and receive feedback on assignments and activities. During these charrettes both faculty and staff work on integrating GLOs into assignments and activities. These charrettes have been positively received by Guttman faculty and staff, as evidenced by this comment from the February 2015 Assessment Days feedback survey:

- “I was really impressed with the faculty buy-in for the assignment charrette. As far as I could see a good number of people had submitted assignments in advance and came with questions for their colleagues. We had a very constructive, productive discussion at my table.”

---

The Assessment & Professional Development Committee
The Assessment and Professional Development Committee guides the student learning outcomes assessment process across the entire assessment cycle – from data collection and analysis to recommendations to closing the loop. The committee is comprised of faculty, staff, and the Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology.

Recognizing the centrality of assessment to the success of Guttman’s educational model, the Working Committee on Governance created the Assessment & Professional Development (A&PD) Committee as a standing committee of the College Council in the Interim Governance Plan. The committee is composed of five elected faculty and 2 elected staff, serving staggered terms. The President appoints a designee to work with the Committee.

Identifying the purpose and role of the A&PD Committee in relation to the other key assessment stakeholders—the faculty with assessment expertise, the CCE director, and the Associate Dean—has been a challenge. The College’s Assessment Days began prior to the formation of the Committee and the assessment faculty and CCE Director created the agendas and activities for those first assessment days. Initially, both the assessment faculty and CCE director were elected members of the committee. But mixed messages from senior leadership about expectations for leading Assessment Days left a limited role for the A&PD Committee. Furthermore, the College’s initial assessment plan did not outline a clear purpose or place for Committee members in the assessment process. In 2014 - 2015, after the Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology was appointed, the A&PD Committee chose not to include her in committee meetings, creating a further divide. There was also a general question as to the need for and purpose of the Assessment & Professional Development Committee as a policymaking body in relation to the operational responsibility and authority for assessment work in the Office of Academic Affairs and the Center for College Effectiveness.

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the Associate Dean and the A&PD committee forged a new working relationship and created a clearer sense of role and purpose for committee members. The Associate Dean attended and participated in all committee meetings as the President’s designee, and Committee members took a more active and visible role in planning and leading Assessment Days’ activities. Together, they developed a more comprehensive Assessment Plan, that clearly defined the role and purpose of the committee as Guttman’s assessment work continues to evolve and deepen. Guttman’s Institutional Assessment Plan (endorsed at Council June 9, 2016) details the GLO, PPR, and SAGE assessment processes and timelines. It describes the expectations for the range of stakeholders at the institution involved in assessment. It clearly identifies that, for faculty, assessment is service to the college, and will be recognized as such moving forward.

Moving ahead, the Governance Task Force is charged with making recommendations for a revised governance structure. It will review the purpose of the Assessment & Professional Development Committee and whether it should remain as a standing committee under a new governance plan. Even if not part of governance, it will be critically important to have a faculty and staff body in some form to work closely with both the associate dean and the broader faculty and staff as part of the GLO Assessment process, which is central to Guttman’s mission and goals.

Assessment Days
Assessment Days provide the necessary time and space for faculty and staff to engage in student learning outcomes assessment and professional development activities. Learning and improvement are at the center of all Assessment Days activities.

On July 26, 2011, at a NEW Committee Meeting (a prototype of a College Council), the College decided to schedule “several days to a week during the Fall I and Spring I semesters (or at their ends) during which
no classes would meet that could be used to conduct assessment” [New, 3]. Guttman institutionalized the practice scheduling 10-12 Assessment Days throughout each academic year. The President and Provost remain fully committed now to scheduling ten Assessment Days each academic calendar—a notable feature of the model. There are two Assessment Days in October, December, February, April, and June of each academic year. It is expected that all faculty participate in assessment days. That participation is recognized as service to the College. Student engagement staff also participate, albeit more sporadically.

A variety of assessment and professional development activities take place during the college’s Assessment Days. Agendas and activities for assessment days are shared with the Guttman community via an Assessment Days ePortfolio (see Document Set 14). An analysis of agendas shows that these days are a mix of assessment and professional development activities. Initially, the Director of the CCE and the faculty with assessment expertise put agendas together. Other faculty and staff facilitated activities as well. Currently faculty have opportunities to propose Assessment Day activities to the Assessment & Professional Development Committee, and the Associate Dean works with the A&PD committee to set the agenda for these days. Topics have included:

- Summer Bridge Assessment
- Assessment of Bridge, FYE, and Capstone ePortfolios
- GLO Team meetings
- PPR Team meetings
- Assignment Design Workshops
- Rubric design Workshops
- Reflections on survey data (i.e. SENSE, Noel-Levitz Employee Satisfaction Survey)

Feedback was collected about Assessment Days after sessions in October 2013, December 2013, April 2014, December 2014, and February 2015. The most recently collected feedback in February 2015 indicated the percentage of respondents who were satisfied or very satisfied with the planned activities: Civic Learning GLO Team discussion (89%), Broad Integrative Knowledge GLO Team discussion (80%), the assignment design activity (80%), the rubric construction activity (73%), and the ePortfolio Reflecting & Recommending Improvements Small Group Activity (60%). Respondents provided comments about what worked well:

- “These assessment days were excellent. I really appreciated getting to learn from other faculty and work together on activities that will benefit our classes. I loved that the activities were helping us prepare for the semester and felt very meaningful during a busy time...”

In addition, respondents indicated concerns and offered suggestions for improvement:

- “I think we should continue working on improving our practice in hands-on ways and learning from one another. I would love more opportunities to share best practices and assess them. The other faculty are an amazing but underutilized resource.”

The 2015 Guttman Faculty and Staff Survey reported that 61% of all respondents (69% of staff respondents and 48% of faculty respondents) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I recognize the value of Assessment Days” (17-19).

Assessment Days are a necessary component of Guttman’s Institutional Assessment processes; it is suggested that the college maintain these days in its academic calendar.
**GLO Assessment Process**

The GLO Assessment Process engages students, faculty, and staff in the assessment of authentic student work using the GLOs and their corresponding rubrics. The use of ePortfolio across the entire student learning experience makes learning visible to the students themselves as well as to faculty and staff. It also provides the opportunity to examine student learning longitudinally from entry to graduation.

The root of the word assess comes from the Latin, meaning “to sit beside.” While students do not literally “sit beside” faculty and staff, Guttman’s GLO assessment process is grounded in the assessment of authentic student work and reflections; ePortfolio, therefore, is central to the GLO assessment process and providing faculty and staff the opportunity to virtually “sit beside” the student as they review his/her ePortfolio. As discussed in the section above on academic technology, students use ePortfolio across their first-year experience and program of study for the creation of signature assignment work, such as the Bridge Integrated Group Research project portfolio, the City Seminar final project, and the EOW Research paper/ePortfolio. Our current assessment process has evolved over time and based on formative findings and recommendations from our Assessment Days activities.

The assessment process begins when students create and use their ePortfolio in Bridge. Students respond to a reflective prompt at the end of Bridge; their ePortfolio is then submitted to Digitation’s Assessment Management System (AMS). These portfolios provide baseline data as to where students are in relation to the GLOs on entry to the College. At the end of the First Year Experience, students in Studio respond to a second set of reflective prompts. They also curate a “How Do I GLO?” page in their ePortfolio where they select an artifact (curricular or co-curricular) they feel best demonstrates their achievement of a particular GLO and explain, through a guided prompt, why they chose that artifact. The ePortfolio is submitted to the AMS for FYE assessment. A similar curation process should take place at the end of a student’s program of study on a “How Do I GLO Revisited?” page in their ePortfolio. The ePortfolio is then submitted to the AMS for capstone assessment. The use of ePortfolio and these milestone reflections allows the student to be an active agent in the assessment process. Collection of ePortfolios at three milestones will also allow us to examine student learning longitudinally to see if there is improvement, according to the rubrics, from entry to graduation.

Digitation’s AMS provides the ability to store snapshots of students’ ePortfolios at these 3 different points in their learning trajectory. We can then assemble a set of ePortfolios and distribute them to participants. Guttman’s Learning Outcomes rubrics are also stored in the AMS. During assessment activities, faculty and staff participate in a norming process using a particular GLO rubric. They then work in pairs with an assigned set of ePortfolios. Using the rubric they evaluate the student work and enter their scores into the AMS. Those scores can then be aggregated and downloaded for analysis.

This assessment process provides opportunities for students to self-assess and reflect on their learning and growth and for faculty to a) design high-impact ePortfolio practices/activities that align to the GLOs and b) to “sit-beside” the student as they review artifacts and reflections. The challenge with this process has been integrating time and space into the curriculum for students to curate their “How Do I GLO?” pages. That has been successfully done in Bridge. We are working with Graduate Coordinators to integrate this into Studio for the FYE assessment. The A&PD committee is currently working with program coordinators to determine the best way to do that for capstone assessment.

**GLO Assessment Activities Fall 2012-Spring 2016**

Initial GLO assessment activities involved examining student learning as well as Guttman’s initial assessment processes and structures. Much learning and improvement took place during this formative period.
Assessment activities were initially guided by Guttman’s original 2013 Assessment Plan, which outlined a three-year cycle for assessment of each Guttman Learning Outcome. Assessment of each outcome was led by a GLO Team, composed of faculty and staff from different disciplines and areas of the college. A different GLO team began work each year. In order to jumpstart the GLO Assessment process in 2013-2014, two GLO Teams were launched: Intellectual Skills and Civic Learning, Engagement, and Social Responsibility, which was “fast-tracked” on a two-year timeline. Each team developed research questions and engaged the broader faculty and staff in ePortfolio assessment during Assessment Days. In the fall of 2014, the Broad, Integrative Knowledge GLO team began its work.

During the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 academic years, the Civic Learning GLO team met during each of the Assessment Days, gathering and analyzing data. They compiled their analysis as well as a set of findings and recommendations into a final report. In April 2015, the Civic Learning, Engagement, and Social Responsibility GLO team shared their GLO Assessment Report, which outlined findings and recommendations for curricular and co-curricular improvements related to this outcome. The report was widely shared with all stakeholders at the college; various groups began implementing changes and integrating new practices into their work based on the report recommendations. The table below shows one example of evidence-based improvements that were made as a result of the Assessment Report (see full Civic Learning, Engagement and Social Responsibility Final Report).

| Table 13: Civic Learning, Engagement, and Social Responsibility GLO: Closing the Loop Example |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Assessment Data                | Findings                        | Correlating Recommendation      | Results                        |
| **Civic Learning Criteria D.**  | Students should be encouraged to | *Create a badging certification system with criteria for certification. Provide resources for faculty to explore the design of civic engagement/social responsibility activities in each course to include assignments that 1.) capture student’s learning; 2.) ask students to reflect on learning using prompts 3.) can be measured against the Civic Engagement GLO rubric. *Create student-friendly rubrics, including definitions and examples where needed, that could be distributed in Summer Bridge, LABSS, Studio and parts of which could be integrated into courses, via syllabi, or as scoring rubrics for assignments (e.g., flashy images, interesting and larger font, altering the language somewhat, condensing one outcome into one concise handout). | *Civic Engagement Badge created and offered to students in Fall 2016. *Student-friendly GLO rubrics created in Spring 2015. |
| Takes an active role in a community context, such as work, service, or co-curricular activities, and examines the civic issues encountered with the insights gained from the community experience 42% benchmark or milestone (n=37) 47% below benchmark or no evidence (n=42) | *These recommendation s aim to help faculty plan for these experiences and help students recognize them. | |

Despite this early success, there were challenges with the overall GLO team structure and timeline. The disconnect from the A&PD committee, turnover of team members, difficulty recruiting new members, developing appropriate research questions, and the extended timeline led to a lack of forward momentum and energy. The Broad Integrative Knowledge GLO team compiled formative data from a December 2014 survey it administered that was completed by 22 faculty members. The data illustrate some of the challenges related to GLO practices and an interest in making improvements:
• With respect to formulating course assignments, 96% of respondents took course learning outcomes into consideration; 56% took program outcomes into consideration; and 41% took GLOs into consideration.
• 38% of respondents agreed / strongly agreed: “I incorporate the GLOs into my class assignments.”
• 50% of respondents agreed / strongly agreed: “I have a clear knowledge of the Broad Integrative Knowledge GLOs that are met in my class.”
• 59% of respondents agreed / strongly agreed: “I would like to incorporate the GLOs into a class assignment.”
• 67% of respondents agreed / strongly agreed: “It would be helpful to have specific instructional planning time to incorporate GLOs into assignments” [Bro, 2].

During the 2015-2016 year, the A&PD committee and the associate dean put the GLO assessment plan on hold as they evaluated the current situation. A proposal prepared by the Associate Dean and distributed at the A&PD Committee Meeting on September 21, 2015 listed several challenges of GLO Teams: “[it’s] getting more difficult to solicit GLO Team members”; “[GLO is a] completely separate process from A&PD Committee”; “because the timeline is so extended [three years], there is a lack of momentum for the work.” The proposal suggested a two-year cycle facilitated by the A&PD Committee rather than by separately appointed GLO Teams.

Working collaboratively, the associate dean and A&PD committee, along with the CCE Director, revised the Assessment Plan to one that is comprehensive, sustainable and scalable. As a result of this effort, Guttman’s 2016 Institutional Assessment Plan outlines a two-year GLO assessment process. Implementation of this new plan began during the 2016-2017 academic year.

GLO Assessment Activities Fall 2016-Present
The current GLO Assessment plan, which includes a clear set of timelines and activities for GLO assessment is practical, sustainable, and scale-able. Table X details the activities that will take place during each set of Assessment Days across the 2-year timeline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
<th>GLO Assessment Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Assess student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from the Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Assess student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from FYE portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Assess student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Begin analyzing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including ePortfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>needed for PPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>A&amp;PD shares findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with faculty for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>input and steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(draft report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In accordance with the new Institutional Assessment plan, the A&PD committee put together a new Intellectual Skills GLO team; co-chaired by 2 members of the A&PD committee. During the October and December Assessment Days, Bridge and FYE ePortfolios were assessed (see Figure x), capstone portfolios will be assessed Feb 27 and 28. The GLO team is already reviewing data and identifying potential improvements, including revising the GLO rubric language.
Closing the Loop & Integrating Change
Guttman has been closing the loop – assessing student work, identifying areas of improvement and integrating those improvements into practice since we opened.

For any institution, the most daunting assessment step is closing the loop – integrating changes based on assessment findings. Guttman is no exception; and, as a new institution, faces additional challenges. Doing assessment work takes time; our unique circumstance in founding a new college required extraordinary time to both accumulate student data and to identify processes and practices that would work within our assessment framework. The First Round Working Committee Reports (2010) recognized that “While we should strive to have as much in place as possible before the college opens, we should also see the assessment system as something that will take time to develop” (p. 70). Guttman’s GLO and PPR assessment plans have reinforced the importance of having time, patience, and senior administrative support and commitment when transitioning from concept to implementation to improvement. The GLO and PPR assessment plans rely on a complex assessment infrastructure and process. To achieve the goal of assessing student work in relation to general education and program of study outcomes, many pieces need to be in place. The Civic Learning GLO Team faced the challenge of conducting an assessment, while components—assignments, rubrics, curriculum maps, ePortfolio templates—were still taking shape. Their recommendations provided crucial insight into how to refine the GLO and PPR assessment plans going forward.

Despite these challenges, there are many examples of ways faculty and staff have “closed the loop” and used findings from our assessment work to make improvements to both our educational offerings and assessment practice. The table below lists 4 such examples:
Table 15
Closing the Loop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action/Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 Summer Bridge: 38% of students submitted an ePortfolio for assessment</td>
<td>The presence of ePortfolio needs to be more pervasive in the curriculum.</td>
<td>Revised curriculum results in an annual increase in the % of submitted Bridge ePortfolios. In 2016, 93% of students submitted ePortfolios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Assessment Days Faculty Group Reflection identified issues with rubric language and levels</td>
<td>Faculty recommended revising rubrics</td>
<td>In April 2013, faculty and staff reviewed and revised all GLO rubrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Civic Engagement faculty feedback identified the challenge of finding student work in their ePortfolio</td>
<td>The students’ ePortfolio template could be revised to more clearly connect to the Guttman Learning Outcomes in general, and not just the Civic Engagement GLO by changing the tabs in the student ePortfolio to reflect the “BASIC” order of the GLOs or, alternately, by leaving the current student ePortfolio template intact and adding an additional tab, possibly entitled “How I GLO,” in which students compile evidence on a single page that connects to each GLO.</td>
<td>Fall 2014: Developed How Do I GLO? Sections in ePortfolio template.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement Assessment of Student work reveals very small percentages of students moving beyond benchmark or milestone (1)</td>
<td>Need better integration of civic learning into assignments</td>
<td>Summer 2015: Mini-grants to instructional teams, POS faculty. Faculty designed/re-designed assignments to integrate a civic learning component.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking Forward
It should be no surprise that developing a strong, engaging culture of assessment for learning is just as challenging at Guttman as it is at other institutions. We are well-positioned to use what we’ve learned from our initial successes in “closing the loop” and from our overall findings to date, to build on our current momentum and successfully implement our GLO assessment plan. While we are in the earliest stages of this plan, we are off to a strong start and will continue to strengthen our assessment for learning culture.

We will continue to work together to implement Guttman’s Assessment Plan to be both more comprehensive and practical. Having the A&PD Committee play a more central role in GLO Assessment is an essential component of that plan. Assessment work must be recognized as an essential service to the college for tenure-track faculty. Recognizing that student learning takes place not just in courses but across the entire student learning experience, we will continue to work with student engagement staff to connect co-curricular activities at the College with the Guttman Learning Outcomes. Badging, as described above (45; 51), will be one way to build this connection and make co-curricular learning visible for assessment. Activities that more regularly engage staff in the Office of Student Engagement must also be planned.
Table 16
GLO Assessment Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1: Intellectual Skills</th>
<th>Year 2: Intellectual Skills</th>
<th>Year 2: Broad Integrative Knowledge</th>
<th>Year 1: Applied Learning</th>
<th>Year 2: Applied Learning</th>
<th>Year 2: Specialized Knowledge</th>
<th>Year 1: Civic Learning</th>
<th>Year 2: Civic Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We recognize that we must complete the assessment cycle for each of the remaining GLOs. By 2020 we will complete the assessment of all five GLOs, begin integrating improvements for Specialized Knowledge, and begin our second cycle of assessment for the Civic Learning GLO.

Using the benchmark, first-year and capstone assessment ePortfolios will allow faculty and staff to more easily assess student work in relation to each GLO and for the A&PD committee and GLO teams to evaluate the data and make recommendations for improvement. Relevant college stakeholders must then provide the necessary resources (professional development, etc.) for improvements to be implemented in order to sustain a culture of assessment for learning.

**Summary of Findings for Standard 14**

1. Guttman has developed, refined with practice, revised and sought endorsement of two Institutional Assessment Plans, the most recent on June 9, 2016, that lays out sustainable timelines for assessment work. The College has implemented a comprehensive system of clearly aligned, integrated, and articulated GLOs (Guttman Student Learning Outcomes) informed by the Degree Qualifications Profile and VALUE rubrics and communicated to faculty, staff and students.

2. Guttman’s approach to assessment has evolved organically with a growing clarity of purpose and buy in from stakeholders, especially the Assessment and Professional Development Committee.

3. Evidence of student learning assessment information is shared and discussed with constituents and used to improve teaching and learning.

4. ePortfolio is essential to the GLO assessment process and the College continues to refine and improve its assessment work using assessment evidence and closing the loop.

**Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 14**

**Suggestions**

- Better integrate the use of ePortfolio, including the capstone assessment ePortfolio into the programs of study.

- Assessment Days should continue to be included in the academic calendar each year. Time during Assessment Days should continue to be dedicated to professional development activities focused on needed curricular and co-curricular improvements as revealed through the assessment process.
Curriculum maps should be reviewed and updated regularly; faculty should be encouraged to work with the program coordinators and curriculum committee to include GLOs on all course syllabi as well as use the GLO rubrics in their course-based grading and assessment processes.

Recommendations

- Guttman should complete the GLO assessment process for each learning outcome according to the timeline in the Guttman Institutional assessment plan.