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Executive Summary
Introduction

Origins
Located in midtown Manhattan at 50 West 40th Street, Stella and Charles Guttman Community College—a Candidate for Accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education—is the City University of New York's newest community college. Guttman’s inaugural class of 289 students began studies in August 2012, and as of fall 2016 the College serves 945 students in total. Guttman CC was established with the goal of significantly improving student learning, retention and graduation, by rethinking community college education and practice. The College is committed to using a range of innovative approaches in order to achieve these goals and to improve student persistence and completion. The centerpiece of Guttman’s educational model is an integrated first-year core curriculum that builds the academic, linguistic, and affective skills necessary for success in college and career. Additional features of the model include a mandatory summer bridge program, learning communities, the use of New York City as a context for learning in and out of the classroom, the integration of academic and student support services, and the use of academic technologies such as Digication ePortfolio, Starfish Early Alert and Starfish Connect.

The establishment of the New Community College (as it was known until June 2013) was approved by the CUNY Board of Trustees on February 28, 2011, by the New York State Board of Regents on June 21, 2011, and by New York State Governor Andrew M. Cuomo on September 20, 2011. The documentation required for the CUNY Board of Trustees and New York State Education Department (NYSED), which consisted of the “Application for Opening a New College” and “Proposal to Establish Initial Programs of Study,” was extensive (767 pages) and in effect constituted the College’s initial five-year plan. Founding President Scott E. Evenbeck assumed leadership on January 3, 2011. GCC established its Institutional Goals in 2011 and in June 2012, the summer it welcomed its first students, it submitted its first Performance Management Process (PMP) targets that aligned its goals with the University’s major goals. It also submitted its first accreditation self-study to the New York State Education Department (NYSED) that summer and hosted an accreditation site visit in August—the day the College opened with its first summer Bridge students. On December 11, 2012, the New York State Board of Regents voted to grant accreditation to Guttman Community College for a period of five years with the condition that the college submit an interim report at the end of three years confirming effective implementation of program plans and student outcomes, including student persistence, graduation rates, and transfers to four-year baccalaureate programs in their fields of study. The College submitted that report dated December 14, 2015, to the State Education Department, and it acknowledged that “the report addresses all Regents’ accreditation requirements and no additional information is requested at this time.”

Guttman currently offers five programs of study leading to associate degrees: Associate in Arts in Business Administration; Associate in Applied Science in Information Technology; Associate in Arts in Human Services; Associate in Arts in Liberal Arts and Sciences; and Associate in Arts in Urban Studies. The College will offer additional programs of study in the future as its enrollments grow and it relocates to a permanent Manhattan campus. Guttman implements a strong civic learning model, with all students involved in community engagement, service learning, or internships. The College strives to create and maintain an inclusive learning environment in which all students feel a sense of “belonging” based on the recognition of students’ diverse cultural backgrounds and identities. Guttman’s student body, primarily

1 CUNY’s major PMP goals: 1) Raise Academic Quality; 2) Improve Student Success; 3) Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness.
recent high school graduates or young adults with equivalency diplomas, includes residents from all five boroughs of New York City, with a majority coming from Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan and Queens.

Why a New Community College?

In an era of diminished funding of public higher education, it is remarkable that Stella and Charles Guttman Community College (hereafter Guttman Community College or GCC²) was inspired by and ultimately founded on the issuance in 2008 of A New Community College Concept Paper. The paper and the initiative it inspired was originally produced with the then Chancellor’s approval under the auspices of the Senior University Dean for Academic Affairs in the Central Office, and the project remained under his direction until Dr. Evenbeck assumed leadership. As noted in the Foreward (p. 5), “Driving this effort [to develop a new college] was the projected growth in student enrollment at CUNY’s six community colleges and the belief that a community college structured differently might better address the persistent challenges of improving graduation rates and preparing students for further study and job readiness.” The Concept Paper clearly defined the problem of low degree attainment (in 2008, the percentage of associate degree students who attained a degree within three years was 11%³) by CUNY’s largely urban students of color and low socioeconomic status and outlined prospective solutions based on research and promising practices. The Concept Paper spelled out the College’s raison d’être and took the position, now largely a consensus view, that degrees matter. For our students attaining a postsecondary credential is often the only path—certainly the surest—out of poverty into a well-paying career and middle class life. In the more than eight years since it was written, more attention than ever before has been given to the so-called “completion agenda” and “equity agenda” and “What Higher Education Can Do to Reverse Our Deepening Divides,” including the “economic gaps [that] persist for Latinos and African Americans.”⁴

From Concept Paper to College

Guttman Community College’s vision and mission statements and goals permeate the College’s culture and provide its students, faculty and staff with the driving purpose of this unique institution. The Concept Paper outlines many of the ideas incorporated into the mission statement, including structured degree pathways, an integrated first-year core curriculum, and an ethos that puts the student and nurturing student success at the heart of all considerations and efforts. A prospective student who reads the three paragraph, 277 word mission statement has a good idea of what she will encounter at Guttman and how her experiences earning her associate degree truly define the meaning and rationale of the College.

From its inception, planning for Guttman Community College was an inclusive effort, a model for its collaborative structure.⁵ The creation of the College’s mission, vision, and goals was likewise collaborative. A working group composed of a committee of the whole (the College’s new Founding President and faculty, staff, and administrators) met in spring 2011 to develop the mission and vision statements and initial goals, which were finalized in August 2011. Those goals were revisited after the College had opened with students and Guttman’s 2014 – 2017 Strategic Plan’s first major goal—

---

² GCC was originally known as New Community College at City University of New York until its name was changed in June 2013 through the generous endowment of the Stella and Charles Guttman Foundation.

³ From the Introduction to the Concept Paper (p. 7): “Graduation rates in New York City’s public high schools, although improving, remain distressingly low, hovering around fifty-five percent. Equally troubling, only eleven percent of full-time first time freshmen enrolled in CUNY associate degree programs graduate within three years, with about a quarter of the entering cohort still enrolled.”

⁴ See AAC&U Step Up & Lead for Equity, which can be accessed at: https://www.aacu.org/publications/step-up-and-lead

⁵ The reports of the Working Groups that developed the brushstrokes from the Concept Paper into the roadmaps for the establishment of the new college can be found at: http://guttman.cuny.edu/about/strategic-planning-and-institutional-effectiveness/#1440606194111-e8c12d15-bf36
“improve student learning, retention and graduation rates by implementing and refining a new educational model to serve our students”—is the benchmark against which the College measures its integrity. In particular the Working Groups for each standard in the self-study focused on the need to commit with integrity to key aspects of the model as we grow to scale. In many cases realizing those commitments will be crucial challenges for the College and the University, first and foremost identifying and building out a permanent campus sufficient to accommodate the College’s long-term growth from just under 1,000 student FTEs currently to 5,000 student FTEs at full capacity.

In both the Concept Paper and the First Round Working Committee Report on Enrollment and Persistence Management, the early planners strove to rigorously maintain a commitment to open access and to embed intentionality in every aspect of admissions and retention practice. The 2009 charge to the Working Committee on Enrollment Management and Persistence asked the planners to address the ways the New Community College will support the development of informed student choices and actions from initial contact through degree and career attainment. The working group will identify services that foster students’ ability to successfully enter and navigate the college environment, engage with the academic program, and persist through graduation and career entry. The working group will create a plan focused on providing comprehensive services aimed at student success and graduation throughout students’ lifecycles.

Guttman’s design for how students apply, learn about, are accepted, and enter the College infuses intentionality in each step.

The constellation of student support services along with an intentional admissions process and a unique educational model all provide the foundation for student success as measured by persistence and graduation rates. Student support services facilitate student learning by providing an explicit introduction to the mission and the model of the College, and respond to the diverse needs, abilities, and cultures of students throughout their career at Guttman. The Concept Paper emphasized the importance of so-called intrusive or structured advising for all students. It also argued organizationally to combine academic and student support services under the Provost as equally complementary for student success. Another innovation from the Concept Paper in the area of student support services concerned the organization of a one-stop-shop now known as The HUB, which provides services from the Offices of Admissions, Financial Aid, Bursar and Registrar all under the Vice President for Finance and Administration. Students are not run around the building (or a campus) in pursuit of problem-solving but are assisted most efficiently in just one area, with or without the assistance of an advisor. At Guttman, every student is well known by a cadre of professionals including faculty, librarians, advisors, and professionals in the Offices of Wellness and AccessABILITY, Partnerships and Community Engagement, peer mentors, Hub service staff (Admissions, Financial Aid, Bursar, Registrar), and Public Safety.

Guttman’s educational model is a complex interplay of what George Kuh has called “high-impact practices” threaded across the student-learning trajectory from entry to completion. This model, initially proposed in its basic form in the 2008 Concept Paper, is designed to “meet students where they are and move them along a path that strategically builds their academic confidence and independence, as well as the social and emotional maturity essential to graduate and pursue more advanced studies and/or enter the workforce with the knowledge and skills required to succeed” (16). Guttman’s model combines such high impact practices as learning communities, service learning, culminating course experiences, and

---

ePortfolios (see Fig. 1 below on the impact of educationally purposeful activities and persistence\(^8\)) with a mandatory summer bridge program, full-time attendance in the first year, and a required core curriculum.

**Fig. 1:** George Kuh et al.
Connecting the Dots

Assessment, with a focus on assessment for learning and improvement, is central to the ongoing work of Guttman Community College and relates directly to the fourth Strategic Plan institutional goal:

> The Stella and Charles Guttman Community College will be a model learning organization by effectively communicating its mission and philosophy, being transparent in its operations, and sharing its knowledge widely with both internal and external stakeholders.

The 2010 **Second Round Working Committee Reports** (for Assessment and Portfolios) identified a set of “overarching design principles for assessment practice” that included explicit student expectations, developing student ownership of their learning and the habit of self-assessment. Those design principles remain in practice with the College’s Guttman Learning Outcomes (GLOs) and corresponding rubrics as well as through the use of “student portfolios as the primary tool of assessment of student learning.” The closing sentence of the section on Accountability in the Concept Paper spoke of “build[ing] a community of teachers and learners who are increasingly able to examine and understand the efficacy of their own work, how to improve it, and how to share their insights with peers” (p. 54).

Since its early planning work in 2009 and 2010, Guttman knew that to succeed in developing and delivering a new educational model, the College would need an exceptional faculty—one not only expert in its various curricular areas and in effective pedagogy, but one committed to its social justice mission and doing things differently. From its earliest appointments in September 2010, search committees explored with candidates the vision of the **Concept Paper** (2008) and the implications for what it would take to succeed in this new venture. As part of the CUNY system and its commitment to excellence, job descriptions on which searches were initiated were carefully crafted then reviewed by the Central Office for appropriate terminal degrees, especially when unique hybrid positions were sought. Five-year

---

projections were made in the Application for Opening a New College and Proposal to Establish Initial Programs of Study that were approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2011 and ultimately the New York State Department of Education. Projected budgets were carefully constructed based on University Budget Office formulas for disciplinary coverage and student FTEs. To preserve a full time faculty focus on the first year and to encourage interdisciplinarity, the organization of the new community college was conceived without traditional disciplinary departments. The College was stretched in its early years to fulfill the requirements of multiple search processes, one of the most labor intensive areas of higher education, in order to appoint the necessary new faculty year to year. These efforts more than paid off in the recruitment and appointment of a truly excellent faculty, one exceptionally dedicated to growing the College and the success of its students.

Guttman Community College is committed to continuous improvement through sustained and systematic assessment. High expectations were set for assessment and college effectiveness in the college’s founding documents (A New Community College Concept Paper, First Round Working Committee Reports [2010], and Second Round Working Committee Reports [2010]). The Concept Paper envisioned “reconceptualized institutional structures that [would] ultimately depend on new roles and expectations for all faculty and staff hired to work at the new college” (p. 8). It also endorsed an accountability system with “1) well-defined goals; 2) a transparent, collaborative process by faculty and staff to develop and present clear performance measures and to communicate the goals, measures and results effectively and honestly; 3) continual feedback by faculty, staff and students on the means of assessment and the achievement of goals; and 4) a flexibility that promotes timely, rapid decision-making” (51). Much of this assessment work is facilitated by the 10 college-wide assessment days spread throughout the fall and spring semesters that the Guttman calendar sets aside each academic year. During assessment days, faculty and academic advisors gather to review and assess student work, explore implications of the results of assessment, and engage in professional development opportunities. Staff also take part in some assessment day activities, including time set aside to develop unit-level SAGE (Systematic Assessment for Guttman Effectiveness) plans, the College’s primary tool for this work. While the organizational structure of assessment at Guttman has evolved, as noted in Chapter 6, the College’s comprehensive commitment to and implementation of assessment for both standards 7 and 14 remains unabated.

Who Are Our Students?
CUNY’s community college first-time freshman come largely from the New York City public school system and are reflective of the City’s diversity: students of color, low social-economic status, often first generation college-going, many recent immigrants. Including its inaugural class in 2012, Guttman has admitted five fall classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Yr</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Annual Av. FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>F 2012</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>F 2013</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>F 2014</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016</td>
<td>F 2015</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2017</td>
<td>F 2016</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of Guttman’s enrollments show that the College has relatively stable demographic baselines for those entering students (Fast Facts). In fall 2016, seventy percent of our students were 19 years of age or younger, and another 27% were ages 20 – 22. Typical of higher education, Guttman serves more
females than males (55% - 45%), in both the starting cohorts and those who persist and graduate. The entering cohorts’ college admission average (of high school college preparatory coursework) ranged from 74.8 to 75.3 (fall 2012 – fall 2015). More than seventy percent of our students have been awarded Pell grants in the last three years, and in 2016 Guttman was formerly recognized as a Hispanic Serving Institution by the U.S. Department of Education, with 60% Hispanic students, 28% African American, 8% white and 4% Asian/Pacific Island students. The following figures reflect the diversity by race/ethnicity and gender of Guttman’s fall 2016 first-time freshman and continuing degree seeking students (n= 945) joined this year by 36 Inwood Early College students.

Fig. 2: Gender and Student Race/Ethnicity (n= 981*) Fall 2016

Guttman’s labor-intensive admission and onboarding process gives students their best chance of success: information, supportive peers and community, and low stakes academic experience that helps them make the transition from high school to college. As important, it gives students, who may have had little sense of their own efficacy as learners heretofore, an opportunity to learn about college and experience it as a place they fit and belong in. As Fig. 4 shows, for African American students, that sense of “fit” is greatly diminished with the experience of high adversity.  

9 As Carissa Romero of the Mindset Scholars Network writes in “What We Know About Belonging from Scientific Research”: “Students with a sense of belonging in school feel socially connected, supported, and respected. They trust their teachers and their peers, and they feel like they fit in at school. They are not worried about being treated as a stereotype and are confident that they are seen as a person of value.” Accessed January 18, 2017 at: http://mindsetscholarsnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/What-We-Know-About-Belonging.pdf.
Fig. 3: African American college students’ rating of their “sense of academic fit on days of low, moderate, and high adversity

Guttman’s fall-to-fall persistence and graduation rates for the first three entering cohorts (fall 2012, 2013 and 2014) demonstrate a successful implementation that addresses Guttman’s first major strategic goal to “improve student learning, retention and graduation rates by implementing and refining a new educational model to serve our students.”

Organization of the Self-Study
Guttman’s Self-Study—a product of two year’s collaborative work involving more than sixty faculty, administrators, staff and students on working committees and the entire college community on a number of occasions—is organized into chapters tracking a students’ experience at the College. It begins with a discussion of the mission and goals, affirms the integrity of the model and its implementation (Chapter
1), moves on to admissions and student supports (Chapter 2), and continues with the educational model—its rationale and evidence of effectiveness (Chapter 3). In terms of the *Characteristics of Excellence*, Chapters 1-3 for the most part pertain to Guttman’s educational effectiveness, while the remaining Chapters 4–6 address the institutional context (faculty, administration, and governance [Chapter 4]; planning and resource management [Chapter 5]; and institutional effectiveness [Chapter 6]). The following overview presents the standards in chronological order.

**Overview of Standards**

**Standard 1: Mission and Goals**
Self-study Working Group 1 found that Guttman’s mission statement was collaboratively developed and continues to accurately define the College’s purpose and goals to its multiple audiences, both internal and external. The mission emphasizes a functional community with students at the center of the College, and there is evidence of this community in many of the activities and structures of the College. Students, faculty and staff, and external constituencies were found to be aware of the mission. Guttman’s institutional assessment through SAGE planning provides an opportunity for each office or unit to align its work with the mission, periodically reflect on its accomplishments and make improvements. The Working Group took note of the challenges to bring Guttman’s model to scale and the diligence required to maintain a commitment to the mission.

**Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal**
Guttman’s 2011 foundational documents for Board of Trustees and NYSED approval in effect constituted its initial five-year strategic plan. Subsequent self-studies for NYSED accreditation and Foundations of Excellence, and its initial Performance Management Process (PMP) goals and reports all informed the development of the Strategic Plan 2014–2017. Working Group 2 found that GCC had developed sound planning practices that align well with its mission and goals, allow for meaningful participation of stakeholders through the Strategic Planning Committee, and meet this Middle State standard. GCC uses results of assessment activities for improvement and renewal at the institutional, unit and programmatic levels.

**Standard 3: Institutional Resources**
Just as CUNY has one Board of Trustees, it has one overall operating and capital budget under the control of the University, with funds channeled from the City and State of New York. From a very centralized budget process in the early years, Guttman has made progress in developing a more transparent budget process that engages the major operating areas, connects resource allocation to institutional goals and is aligned with strategic planning. Human Resources carefully monitors and justifies the growth of faculty and staff based on student FTE enrollments, and technology management is adequate to the mission. Guttman currently occupies a rental space at 50 West 40th Street whose size and classroom capacity constrain and challenge the community. The College relies on classroom availability at additional locations for its continuing students on W31 Street (CUNY School of Professional Studies) and The Murphy Institute (W43 St). With a clearer destination for relocation to a permanent campus that will allow for enrollment growth, the College will develop discrete plans for facilities and academic programming.

**Standard 4: Leadership and Governance**
As part of the CUNY system, Guttman is governed by the University Board of Trustees which operates under the Board Bylaws. Plenary authority is delegated to the CUNY Chancellor, who in turn delegates authority to the college Presidents to act as the Chief Executive Officers of their respective colleges. The Board approved Guttman’s Interim Governance plan in June 2012, and thereunder a College Council was organized and has had twenty-five meetings over the last five years conducting the College’s business.
Working Group 3 found that the College is in compliance with MSCHE standards with respect to the CUNY governing board, Guttman’s Interim Governance Plan and the College Council. Through consensus, the College is moving to revise its governance plan in consultation with its various constituents and stakeholders and will submit that proposal to the Council and Board soon.

**Standard 5: Administration**

Guttman’s CEO is Dr. Scott E. Evenbeck, who was appointed upon the Chancellor’s recommendation Founding President by the Board of Trustees on July 22, 2010. Dr. Evenbeck is a recognized expert on education assessment and higher education initiatives to boost student success. Guttman’s administrative staff are qualified and are effectively leading the College as it grows. A national search is underway to appoint a new Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost, and the College has made key mid-level administrative appointments in both OAA and Finance and Administration in the last two years. Guttman has professional staff adequate to its size and structure and appropriate to its unique mission. The College Foundation was formed and convened at four meetings in the 2015 - 2016 academic year. Guttman has developed and made public organizational charts for all areas of the college.

**Standard 6: Integrity**

With its founding concept and original mission crucial directives of the College’s day-to-day life, the integrity with which the Guttman community of faculty, staff, administration and students does its work is of paramount importance. Each of the seven self-study working groups commented on the need to commit with integrity to key aspects of the model as we grow to scale. Working Group 1 found that Guttman effectively and accurately disseminates data and information to its stakeholders, adheres to CUNY policies and fair and impartial practices including the handling of student complaints, is committed to diversity and diverse viewpoints, and respects contractual rights and obligations.

**Overview of Standard 7: Institutional Assessment**

The Center for College Effectiveness is a focal point for institutional effectiveness assessment at Guttman CC. The CCE’s primary tool for unit-level planning and assessment is SAGE (Systematic Approach for Guttman Effectiveness). Guttman’s framework for institutional assessment is well-articulated, and evidence shows it has persistent, systematic assessment processes that are aligned with unit goals, the College’s institutional strategic goals, CUNY goals, and Middle States standards. Guttman’s institutional assessment activities routinely involve faculty, staff, and administrators, and occasionally students. Assessment results are regularly shared and discussed with appropriate constituents, including the publication of survey findings, quantitative and qualitative studies, and discussions at assessment days and all-college faculty-staff meetings. As the college has grown and evolved, it has adapted its assessment processes to organizational changes and continues to do so.

**Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention**

Working Group 5 (standards 8 – 9) found that Guttman’s admissions process reflects the mission of the College to be both open access, intentional and informative through its recruitment and applications processes, Group and Individual Information Sessions, and Orientation. It provides timely, accurate and comprehensive information regarding academic programs, testing, financial aid, and assists prospective students in making informed decisions. Guttman has published and implemented policies regarding Transfer of Credit, and assesses and improves its processes through unit-based SAGE planning. For the last two years Guttman has offered CUNY Start and Summer Start full-time skills immersion programs to students who marginally meet Guttman’s admission requirements.

**Standard 9: Student Support Services**

Most of Guttman’s services in this area are provided through the Office of Student Engagement and The Hub. Both are explicitly charged and designed to aid students by removing internal and external barriers to success in academia and recognizing our students’ diverse needs and abilities. Working Group 5 found that
Guttman has implemented an effective model of student advisement and support services that are appropriate to student strengths and needs, reflective of institutional mission, and consistent with student learning expectations. It has widely disseminated and reasonable procedures for equitably addressing student complaints and keeps records of those complaints in accordance with CUNY policy. The College assesses and improves its services based on assessment evidence. Students taking courses at SPS (another nearby location) found it less convenient to access the wide range of services available at W40th Street.

**Standard 10: Faculty**

Guttman has consistently recruited an excellent faculty in all the necessary disciplinary areas with effective pedagogical skills to support student learning and success. From 7 faculty in 2010, Guttman has grown to 49 full-time faculty in 2017, and its faculty have demonstrated a consistent record of scholarly work. The College is committed to academic freedom at both the local and University levels. Guttman strives to balance the triad of faculty teaching, service and scholarship with both its commitment to a new educational model and its place within a traditional university and contract. The College is developing ongoing mentoring and professional development opportunities for all faculty. Faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) guidelines have been problematic and a point of significant concern for faculty and OAA. The College is in negotiation with the PSC regarding needed revisions and has already taken steps to better articulate expectations in this area. Creating a working schedule and assigning faculty teaching loads for each semester needs to be better structured so that both are available in a timely manner.

**Standard 11: Educational Offerings**

Guttman’s educational offerings, comprised of its first-year experience core curriculum and programs of study are coherent and rigorous with carefully mapped student learning outcomes. Guttman’s programs of study have been approved and registered with the New York State Department of Education, and Guttman has articulation agreements with a number of senior colleges assuring alignment of coursework at the associate and baccalaureate levels. The guided pathways structure effectively helps students stay on track to graduate within three years. The Working Group found that the Periodic Program Review process in the Liberal Arts and Sciences major led to changes in the major that added flexibility and addressed credit recognition concerns. The College’s hybrid courses effectively support the high touch / high tech model. Guttman’s Information Commons implements an open, collaborative learning approach with its primarily digitally-based collections. The Learning Lab, comprised of peer mentors, tutors, and eTerns is increasing in size and impact.

**Standard 12: General Education**

Guttman’s general education coursework is comprised of its first-year experience (FYE) core curriculum. These courses are approved for CUNY’s Pathways required and flexible common core and establish both Guttman and CUNY student learning outcomes for rigor and content. The Working Group found that the FYE is effective, as evidenced by retention and course success rates, and that Guttman’s unique house and cohort structure of the FYE is an important part of students’ experience. Guttman Learning Outcomes (GLO), adapted from the Degree Qualifications Profile and assessed with rubrics informed by the AAC&U VALUE project are a critical feature of the curriculum. Guttman is committed to the ongoing examination of student success data and Starfish data as it continues to monitor and refine the model to better serve students who are struggling to be successful.

**Standard 13: Related Education Activities**

The Guttman Bridge Program effectively introduces students to the college and helps with their transition in terms of both academic and dispositional expectations. 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. Guttman’s CUNY Start and Summer Start must be discontinued, given the difficulty of sustaining the program year-round.
with the College’s 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.

**Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning**
Guttman Institutional Assessment Plan May 2016 endorsed by the College Council establishes sustainable timelines for assessment work. The College has implemented a comprehensive system of 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. The College’s approach to assessment has evolved organizationally with a growing clarity of purpose and buy in from stakeholders, especially the Council’s Sanding Committee on Assessment and Professional Development. Evidence of student learning assessment information is shared and discussed with constituents especially during assessment days and is used to improve teaching and learning. ePortfolio is essential to the GLO assessment process. The College continues to improve its assessment work using assessment evidence and closing the loop, and is especially focused on better integrating ePortfolio with capstone coursework and the programs of study.
Recommendations

Standard

1
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.

3
Guttman should continue to connect budgeting and planning cycles for greater transparency on the reallocation of resources.

3
With a clearer destination for relocation to a permanent campus that will allow for enrollment growth, the College should develop discrete plans for facilities and academic programming.

4
After consultation with all involved constituents, and approval by the College Council, Guttman should propose to the CUNY Board of Trustees a successor governance plan to the 2012 Interim Governance Plan now in effect, including explicit provision for the periodic assessment of the Guttman Council.

6
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).

10
Guttman should conclude negotiations with the Professional Staff Congress concerning elements of the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure guidelines, consistent with the new governance plan.

10
Guttman should establish and commit to an annual time line for the review of the schedule of classes, the assignment of instructors to their classes, and the notification of faculty of their teaching assignments.

11
Guttman should complete the PPR process for all programs of Study according to the Institutional Assessment Plan timeline.

12 & 14
Guttman should complete the cycles of assessment for all GLOs according to the Institutional Plan timeline.

13
Guttman should develop a strategic approach to effectively track and assess the impact of experiential learning.