

SELF-STUDY DESIGN

Institutional overview

Queensborough Community College (QCC) is a unit of the City University of New York (CUNY). According to New York State Education Law, CUNY is

Supported as an independent and integrated system of higher education on the assumption that the University will continue to maintain and expand its commitment to academic excellence and to the provision of equal access and opportunity for students, faculty, and staff from all ethnic and racial groups and from both sexes.

The law requires CUNY to “remain responsive to the needs of its urban setting and maintain its close articulation between senior and community college units.” CUNY is the nation’s largest urban university: 11 senior colleges, 7 community colleges, an honors college, and five graduate and professional schools. There are 270,000 students enrolled in degree credit courses, and more than 200,000 enrolled in adult and continuing education courses. A 17-member Board of Trustees is the governing body of the university. CUNY negotiates the collective bargaining agreements, establishes the overall enrollment and revenue targets, and allocates the tax-levy funds for individual campus operating budgets.

Established in 1958, QCC is committed to open access. The college offers associate degrees and certificate programs that prepare students for careers and for transfer to baccalaureate degree programs. The curriculum provides a rich general education core aimed at enhancing students’ critical thinking and decision making skills. Through the Queensborough Academies—Business; Health-related Sciences; Liberal Arts; Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM); and Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA)—the college provides students an integrated undergraduate experience. Faculty in the Academies coordinate and arrange co-curricular activities and events to supplement the classroom experience. Students are advised through a caseload system, with advisers in each academy assigned a caseload of students. QCC also functions as a community resource serving the educational, professional, and cultural needs of the general community, including continuing education, on-and off-campus learning centers, and cultural and recreational events. The college plays a leadership role in providing access to the arts and culture, including a state-of-the-art Art Gallery, the Kupferberg Holocaust Resource Center and Archives, and the Queensborough Performing Arts Center.

The Fall 2016 student enrollment was 15,569 students out of which 13,596 were degree and certificate seeking students. Sixty-seven percent of the degree and certificate seeking students were enrolled full-time. The curricula with the highest enrollments were Liberal Arts and Sciences (A.A.), Business Administration (A.S.), Health Sciences (A.S.), Criminal Justice (A.S.), and Liberal Arts and Sciences (Mathematics & Science) (A.S.).

Some facts about the institution include:

- A total of 1,973 students were non-degree. The majority of this group were high school students who were part of the College Now program, which enrolls high school students in college courses.
- QCC is a very diverse campus with students from 129 countries. The majority live in Queens. Thirty-five percent report speaking a language other than English at home.
- QCC is an open-admissions campus; over seventy percent of the incoming freshmen require at least one remedial course. In the academic year 2015-16, 79 percent of all first-time full-time freshmen and 55 percent of all degree students received some form of financial grant aid.
- The six-year graduation rate for the Fall 2010 cohort was 32.2 percent from QCC with an additional 8.5 percent that graduated elsewhere in CUNY or outside CUNY. This brings the overall six-year graduation rate to 40.7 percent. QCC students usually go on to other CUNY senior colleges like Queens College and Baruch College, but also enroll in non-CUNY colleges (e.g. SUNY Stony Brook, SUNY Binghamton, Adelphi, Long Island University, NYU, and St. John's).
- QCC graduated 2,268 students in the academic year 2015-16, the highest number of graduates in one academic year since the inception of the college. The curricula with the most degrees were Liberal Arts and Sciences (825), Business Administration (342), and Criminal Justice (218).
- Sixty-three percent of the full-time faculty at QCC have earned doctoral degrees. Another 17 percent have terminal degrees in such fields as nursing, engineering, and the visual and performing arts.

The self-study design that follows is the blueprint for the development of the self-study report that the college will undertake over the next two years. The design conceptualizes and organizes the self-study tasks that the working groups will carry out in the development of the individual chapters—one to each working group, each one devoted to one standard and the relevant requirements of affiliation—that will constitute the self-study report.

Specifically, the design will organize and direct efforts regarding:

- Outcomes of the self-study
- Organizational structure of the self-study process
- Charges to the working groups and guidelines for reporting
- Organization of the final self-study report
- Editorial style and format of the self-study
- Timetable for the self-study
- Profile of the evaluation team
- Documentation Roadmap

In each case, the design makes clear what the expectations are that will guide the working groups in their development of the chapter of the self-study to which they have been assigned.

As explained in the corresponding sections of the design below, each chapter of the self-study will be devoted to a Middle States standard and the relevant requirements of affiliation. The accompanying Documentation Roadmap will demonstrate, criterion by criterion of the standard, the ways in which the institution complies with Standards of Accreditation and the relevant Requirements of Affiliation. The initial task of the working groups will be to review and make changes to the documentation in the Roadmap to ensure the best possible examples of documentation to show compliance with the criterion indicated. The review also serves as a gap analysis to identify areas lacking appropriate or sufficient documentation and, through the working group co-chairs, to convey this gap analysis to the executive co-chairs. It is the responsibility of the executive co-chairs to address these analyses and to follow up with the appropriate campus office to obtain appropriate documentation to be added to the roadmap. In the end, the Documentation Roadmap becomes the key to showing how the institution holistically meets the Middle States standards and the relevant requirements of affiliation.

The self-study chapters, however, are intended to demonstrate how the institution meets and fulfills its mission and goals and campus priorities. Given specific examples of evidence and analysis of processes at work, the chapters should demonstrate the ways in which the institution uses data and evidence, at any level, to make informed decisions about the degree to which it is meeting its goals and priorities and, where necessary, to modify its practices to improve institutional effectiveness.

To help shape this kind of examination of the institution, several initiatives that have been the focus of campus-wide efforts over a number of years will be used as guiding themes for the self-study chapters. These initiatives, part of the college's strategic planning for several years, include:

- Faculty and staff development: supporting faculty to tenure and promotion, promoting HIPs and pedagogical innovation, training and supporting administrative professionals for the growing challenges of higher education
- Queensborough Academies: shaping the student experience for success through focused and expanded use of data governance and redoubled efforts on remediation and improving student preparedness

These institutional priorities focus the self-study chapters. In the charge to each working group, however, the initiatives above will be framed in more specific ways through leading questions to help the group to focus and shape the chapter in a way that is appropriate to the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation under review. Each working group will also be charged with developing a chapter narrative that addresses the assessment of the standard.

Intended outcomes of the self-study

The overall goals of the self-study process are reaffirmation of accreditation, institutional self-appraisal, and recommendations for institutional improvement. The self-study design is intended to establish a clear direction for the self-study process and to allow the institution to assess its own progress since the Periodic Review Report, in 2014.

The more specific outcomes below are based on the premise that the institution plans, through self-analysis, to integrate the self-study process with other institutional planning and renewal processes, ensuring that the self-study itself will be as useful and meaningful as possible to the institution.

- Engage in an inclusive and transparent self-appraisal process that actively and deliberately seeks to involve members from all areas of the campus community
- Demonstrate how the institution currently meets Middle States Standards for Accreditation and the Requirements of Affiliation with a focus on continuous improvement in the attainment of the institutional mission and priorities
- Provide a concise and accurate analysis of the institution that can guide institutional planning, growth, and renewal efforts
- Assess the quality and effectiveness of academic programs and administrative services, at all degree levels and in all departments, particularly in relation to the changing needs of the institution's student body and community
- Document current assessment practices to identify challenges and opportunities and areas for improvement in the use of institutional assessment results
- Analyze the quality and effectiveness of the institution's processes for planning and assessment to make necessary adjustments to methods and measurements and to ensure that the use of assessment data will lead to meaningful programmatic and institutional renewal
- Capitalize on the overlapping efforts of strategic planning and the Middle States Self-Study to inform decision-making; to identify specific opportunities and challenges, including budgeting and enrollment; and, if appropriate, to reshape strategic planning
- Make recommendations that are high level, tied to institutional priorities, are mission critical, and are limited in number

As a general guide to the success of the self-study process, some advice is provided below.¹ It is intended to inform the thinking of the executive co-chairs and the self-study steering committee, but also all the members of the working groups.

Pitfall

Viewing the self-study as peripheral to the institution's work

¹ Adapted from *Self-study: Creating a useful Process and Report*, Middle States Commission on Higher Education, for Institutions with Visit in 2018-19, 2016, 44-46.

Helpful advice

The very heart of the self-study process is the intention to use that process for an honest and comprehensive self-appraisal of the institution, articulating strengths and weaknesses and formulating recommendations for institutional improvement. The evaluation team, comprising peers who have experience in similar institutions, helps the institution to use the process for long-term impact on overall effectiveness and student learning.

Pitfall

Describing what the institution does without analyzing the evidence of assessment processes at work

Helpful advice

Rather than focusing on a description of what the institution does, the self-study should analyze how institutional operations affect students and how well operations align with mission and goals. To ensure meaningful analysis, information should come from institutional, unit, and program assessments.

Pitfall

Making unsupported assertions about student learning and achievement and/or academic programs and their effectiveness

Helpful advice

Demonstrate how the evidence is being considered and used by key institutional stakeholders to achieve mission and key goals and to promote institutional change and improvement.

Pitfall

Using confusing or conflicting data and statistical jargon

Helpful advice

Always confirming data sources and their accuracy, provide clear and concise analyses to explain what is learned about students and their achievements, programs, and their effectiveness and whether the institution's mission and goals are being achieved in classrooms and co-curricular programs.

Pitfall

Developing a self-study that focuses on non-specific aspirations rather than on specific issues that are important to the institution and related to mission, key strategic goals, objectives, or priorities.

Helpful advice

The Middle States Commission expects that the self-study process is framed by mission and the institution's key goals, objectives, and priorities. Institutional plans should reflect alignment of goals, curricula, services, and assessments. Through the evaluation of institutional strengths

and weaknesses, the self-study recommendations should focus on ways that the institution can ensure further continuous improvement.

Pitfall

Assuming that the institution is too “special” to establish and use benchmarks

Helpful advice

Use benchmarks to set specific goals for strategic planning and use those goals for valid and useful assessment. If published and widely available benchmarks do not provide meaningful institutional cohort comparisons, construct more useful cohorts from a variety of sources. If suitable benchmarks for appropriate cohorts are not available, develop other frames of reference like comparisons over time and among relevant sub-populations within an institution.

Pitfall

Allowing a subgroup or individual to stand in the way of the whole

Helpful advice

Establish early in the process how the recommendations of the self-study report will be determined. Constituencies should hold each other accountable for constructive participation in the self-study.

Pitfall

Writing a final self-study report that is lengthy and significantly exceeds the Middle States Commission’s page limit for self-studies and/or providing supporting documentation that is voluminous and generally disorganized

Helpful advice

The final self-study report should not exceed 100 single-spaced pages or 200 double-spaced pages, and supporting documents should be well organized and directly relate to assertions, to specific compliance review requirements, or to the *Standards for Accreditation* and *Requirements of Affiliation*.

Organizational structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

The self-study process will be guided by the Self-study Steering Committee, consisting of the executive co-chairs, the working group co-chairs, and administrative representation from areas like institutional research, marketing and communication, and finance and administration. One of the executive co-chairs, dean for accreditation, assessment, and institutional effectiveness, recruited two seasoned faculty members to serve as executive co-chairs. The executive co-chairs recruited the working group co-chairs, one faculty member and one administrator for each working group. Each working group, consisting of faculty and staff, will be devoted to one Middle States standard and the relevant requirements of affiliation.

The executive co-chairs will meet periodically with the steering committee to address issues as they arise, to monitor the progress of the working groups, and to review drafts of documents as needed.

Working groups will communicate with the executive co-chairs on all matters through their working group co-chairs. Any requests for data to Institutional Research from the working group co-chairs will be sent to the executive co-chairs, who will forward the request to Institutional Research.

The goal of the executive co-chairs is to provide leadership and guidance to a smooth self-study process toward the successful completion of the self-study report.

Self-study Steering Committee

<i>Executive Co-chairs</i>	
Ansani, Antonella	Foreign Languages and Literature
Corradetti, Arthur	Strategic Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Effectiveness
Ford, Kelly	Business
<i>Committee Members</i>	
Beckford, Ian	Strategic Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Effectiveness
Blake-Campbell, Barbara	Nursing
Capozzoli, Gina	Counseling Center
Carpentier, Marc	Budget and Financial Services
Cook, Bonnie	Student Learning Center
Di Dio, Stephen	Marketing and Communications

Faulkner, William	Finance and Administration
Gilleaudeau, John	Social Sciences
Kaur, Simran	Biological Sciences and Geology
Kerr, Brian	Student Development
Lackner, Elisabeth	Institutional Research and Assessment
Landy, Kathleen	Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
Messier, Vartan	English
Lynch, Timothy	Academic Affairs
Pantaleo, Josephine	Affirmative Action, Pluralism, and Diversity Compliance Office
Salis, Andrea	Health, Physical Education, and Dance
Sarno, David	Chemistry
Shi, Lucy	Accounting, Related Entities, Asset and Risk Management

Self-study Working Group Participants

To populate the working groups, a call for volunteers was distributed to the entire campus community by the executive co-chairs. Each volunteer had three choices of working group, in order of preference. Volunteers were assigned to working groups according to their preferences, in some cases being assigned to a second or third choice to ensure that working groups are relatively consistent in size. Based on the meeting times established by each working group, the executive co-chairs will work with Student Activities to assign a small team of Student Government leaders to each group as their schedules permit. The small team of students can rotate in their attendance to ensure better overall attendance. Each working group is assigned to one Middle States standard and the relevant requirements of affiliation and is responsible for developing a draft chapter of the self-study report.

Working group 1: Mission and goals

Standard 1

The institution’s mission defines its purpose within the context of higher education, the students it serves, and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals are clearly linked to its mission and specify how the institution fulfills its mission.

Requirement of affiliation 7

The institution has a statement of mission and goals approved by its governing body that defines its purpose within the context of higher education.

Requirement of affiliation 10

Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.

Sarno, David, Co-chair	Chemistry
Shi, Lucy, Co-chair	Accounting, Related Entities, Asset and Risk Management
Adair, Arthur	Speech Communication and Theatre Arts
Armstrong, Daniel	Health, Physical Education, and Dance
Ballerini, Jeffrey	Center for International Affairs, Immigration, and Study Abroad
Blick, William	Library
Davis, Henry	Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
Galvin, Jeanne	Library
Mader, Bryn	Biological Sciences and Geology
Marchese, Paul	Physics
Martinez, Manuel	English
McAlear, Robert	English
Nelan, Philip	Nursing
Orlofsky, Amos	Biological Sciences and Geology
Rossi Miller, Monica	Foreign Languages and Literature
Ward, Denise	Pre-college, Continuing Education, and Workforce Development
Student representatives	TBD

Working group 2: Ethics and integrity

Standard 2

Ethics and integrity are central, indispensable, and defining hallmarks of effective higher education institutions. In all activities, whether internal or external, an institution must be faithful to its mission, honor its contracts and commitments, adhere to its policies, and represent itself truthfully.

Messier, Vartan, Co-chair	English
Pantaleo, Jo, Co-chair	Affirmative Action, Pluralism, and Diversity Compliance Office

Akpinar, Rezan	Health, Physical Education, and Dance
Billingslea, Shanta	Admissions
Casatelli, Mary	Liberal Arts Academy Advisement
DiGiorgio, Liz	Art and Design
Edlin, Margot	English
Emanuele, Barbara	English
Figel Roliz, Erika	English
Lai, Wei	Foreign Languages and Literature
Lizzul, Isabella	Health, Physical Education, and Dance
Petersen, Joan	Biological Sciences and Geology
Puri, Karan	Mathematics and Computer Science
Reesman, Linda	English
Rosen, Ted	Business
Saadullah, Sabera	Liberal Arts Academy Advisement
Student representatives	TBD

Working group 3: Design and delivery of the student learning experience

Standard 3

An institution provides students with learning experiences that are characterized by rigor and coherence at all program, certificate, and degree levels, regardless of instructional modality. All learning experiences, regardless of modality, program pace/schedule, level, and setting are consistent with higher education expectations.

Requirement of affiliation 8

The institution systematically evaluates its educational and other programs and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes.

Requirement of affiliation 9

The institution's student learning programs and opportunities are characterized by rigor, coherence, and appropriate assessment of student achievement throughout the educational offerings, regardless of certificate or degree level or delivery and instructional modality.

Requirement of affiliation 10

Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.

Requirement of affiliation 15

The institution has a core of faculty full-time or part-time) and/or other appropriate professionals with sufficient responsibility to the institution to assure the continuity and coherence of the institution’s educational programs.

Salis, Andrea, Co-chair	Health, Physical Education, and Dance
Landy, Kathleen, Co-chair	Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
Alexander, Elizabeth	Office of Chief Operating Officer and Senior Vice President
Alves, Kathleen	English
Avens, Indra	Foreign Languages and Literature
Cornick, Jonathan	Mathematics and Computer Science
Dahlke, Steven	Music
Desepoli, Eugene	Health, Physical Education, and Dance
Dolan, Michael	English
Flaherty, Bonnie	CUNY Start
Lago, Susan	English
Mohess, Neera	Library
Srivastava, Anuradha	Biological Sciences and Geology
Tawde, Mangala	Biological Sciences and Geology
Wengler, Susan	Library
Student representatives	TBD

Working group 4: Support of the student experience

Standard 4

Across all educational experiences, settings, levels, and instructional modalities, the institution recruits and admits students whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals are congruent with its mission and educational offerings. The institution commits to student retention, persistence, completion, and success through a coherent and effective support system sustained by qualified professionals, which enhances the quality of the learning environment, contributes to the educational experience, and fosters student success.

Requirement of affiliation 8

The institution systematically evaluates its educational and other programs and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes.

Requirement of affiliation 10

Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.

Capozzoli, Gina, Co-chair	Counseling Center
Cook, Bonnie, Co-chair	Student Learning Center
Bruno, Laura	Enrollment Management, Admissions, and Recruitment
Demas, Jason	Health, Physical Education, and Dance
Friedman, Howard	Business
Huang, Hsiaofang	Business
Lukas, Veronica	Financial Services
Magaldi, Maryann	Nursing
Masterson, Virginia	Business
Nercessian, Elizabeth	Mathematics Learning Center
Nestoras, Alexandra	Student Learning Center
Spezio, Stefan	Campus Writing Center
Sutton, Elizabeth	Nursing
Yarde, Winston	College Discovery Program
Student representatives	TBD

Working group 5: Educational effectiveness

Standard 5

Assessment of student learning and achievement demonstrates that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their program of study, degree level, the institution's mission, and appropriate expectations for institutions of higher education.

Requirement of affiliation 8

The institution systematically evaluates its educational and other programs and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes.

Requirement of affiliation 9

The institution's student learning programs and opportunities are characterized by rigor, coherence, and appropriate assessment of student achievement throughout the educational offerings, regardless of certificate or degree level or delivery and instructional modality.

Requirement of affiliation 10

Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.

Kaur, Simran, Co-chair	Biological Sciences and Geology
Beckford, Ian, Co-chair	Strategic Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Effectiveness
Byfield, Carlene	Nursing
Colalillo, Georgina	Nursing
Fichera, Victor	Institutional Research and Assessment
Ford, Wendy	Business
Lee, Whan Ki	Mathematics and Computer Science
Liriano-Gonzalez, Krystal	ASAP
Mehta, Neeraj	Music
Nichols, James	History
Riekert, Susan	Nursing
Rome, Barbara	Nursing
Tarafdar, Meghmala	English
Yan, Xiyong	Mathematics and Computer Science
Zhelezcheva, Tanya	English
Student representatives	TBD

Working group 6: Planning, resources, and institutional improvement

Standard 6

The institution's planning processes, resources, and structures are aligned with each other and are sufficient to fulfill its mission and goals, to continuously assess and improve its programs and services, and to respond effectively to opportunities and challenges.

Requirement of affiliation 8

The institution systematically evaluates its educational and other programs and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes.

Requirement of affiliation 10

Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.

Requirement of affiliation 11

The institution has documented financial resources, funding base, and plans for financial development, including those from any related entities (including without limitation systems, religious sponsorship, and corporate ownership) adequate to support its educational purposes and programs and to ensure financial stability. The institution demonstrates a record of responsible fiscal management, has a prepared budget for the current year, and undergoes an external financial audit on an annual basis.

Gilleaudeau, John, Co-chair	Social Sciences
Carpentier, Marc, Co-chair	Office of Finance and Administration
Anderst, Leah	English
Conkling, Lori	Pre-college, Continuing Education, and Workforce Development
Ferrari-Bridgers, Franca	Speech Communication and Theatre Arts
Ikwueze, Chukwudi	Social Sciences
Jacob, Frank	History
Lam, Raymond	Engineering Technology
Leary, Christopher	English
Mako, Richard	Library
McLaughlin, Susan	Biological Sciences and Geology
Pham, David	Mathematics and Computer Science
Ryan, William	English
Seo, Dugwon	Engineering Technology
Sporer, Celia	Social Sciences
Student representatives	TBD

Working group 7: Governance, leadership, and administration

Standard 7

The institution is governed and administered in a manner that allows it to realize its stated mission and goals in a way that effectively benefits the institution, its students, and the other

constituencies it serves. Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, religious, educational system, or other unaccredited organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose, and it operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.

Requirement of affiliation 12

The institution fully discloses its legally constituted governance structure(s), including any related entities (including without limitation systems, religious sponsorship, and corporate ownership). The institution’s governing body is responsible for the quality and integrity of the institution and for ensuring that the institution’s mission is being carried out.

Requirement of affiliation 13

A majority of the institution’s governing body’s members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. The governing body adheres to a conflict of interest policy that assures that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution. The institution’s district/system or other chief executive officer shall not serve as the chair of the governing body.

Blake-Campbell, Barbara, Co-chair	Nursing
Kerr, Brian, Co-chair	Student Development
Abramov, Arthur	Health-related Sciences Academy Advisement
Alleyne, Carol	New Student Engagement
Beale, Patricia	Liberal Arts Academy Advisement
Byrnes, Thomas	Admissions and Recruitment
Cupelli, Lorraine	Nursing
Golebiewska, Urszula	Biological Sciences and Geology
Kuszai, Joel	English
Pecorino, Philip	Social Sciences
Ridinger-Dotterman, Angela	English
Saint Laurent, Natacha	Registrar
Schrynemakers, Ilse	English
Student representatives	TBD

Special working group on requirements of affiliation and verification of compliance

In addition to the seven working groups, each assigned to one standard and the relevant requirements of affiliation and responsible for developing one chapter of the self-study, a special working group will be formed to demonstrate institutional compliance with the *Requirements of Affiliation and Verification of Compliance*. All members of the special working group will receive the Middle States publication on the requirements and verification and view the free Middle States webinar to provide background and context to their work. The special group will also use the institutional template provided by Middle States.

Corradetti, Arthur, Chair	Strategic Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Effectiveness
Bruno, Laura	Enrollment Management, Admissions, and Recruitment
Cartolano, Joseph	Buildings and Grounds
Galvin, Jeanne	Library
Larios, Liza	Human Resources and Labor Management
Lukas, Veronica	Financial Services
Moretti, David	Marketing and Communications
Rodriguez, Mel	Environmental Health and Safety
Sherman, George	Information Technology
Canale, Pat	Registrar
Ward, Denise	Pre-college, Continuing Education, and Workforce Development
Wasserman, David	Finance and Administration

Editorial staff

To assist the executive co-chairs with the editing of the full self-study report, an editorial staff will be formed. The purpose of the group will be to ensure a consistent voice throughout the report, lack of redundancy, appropriate cross-references as needed, and an organized and consistent presentation of the material.

Corradetti, Arthur, Chair	Academic Affairs
Reesman, Linda	English
Steele, Karen	Strategic Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Effectiveness, Retired
Science faculty member	TBD
Social science faculty member	TBD

Edits by the editorial staff will be reviewed and approved by the executive co-chairs. It is the executive co-chairs who will make final decisions about changes, additions, and deletions and the final disposition of the self-study document before it is distributed to the campus for review and comment.

Charges to the working groups and guidelines for reporting

The charges to the working groups are the guidelines under which the working groups will operate. They include directives concerning the focus of the individual chapters, the organizational structure of the chapters, and the kinds of documentation that will need to be reviewed to enable the working groups to describe processes and practices, briefly, and, more importantly, to analyze and make evaluations about institutional effectiveness. Communication between the working groups and the steering committee will be channeled through the executive co-chairs.

The self-study process will be guided by the Self-study Steering Committee, led by the executive co-chairs. The executive co-chairs will meet periodically with the steering committee to address issues as they arise, to monitor the progress of the working groups, and to review drafts of documents as needed. All issues at the working group level will be forwarded to the steering committee for appropriate response or action through the co-chairs of the corresponding working group.

Broadly, each working group is tasked with the development of a draft of one self-study chapter. Each self-study chapter is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement through analysis of mission-critical areas relative to the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation under review. Given specific examples of evidence and analysis of processes at work, each chapter should also demonstrate the ways in which the institution uses data and evidence, at any level, to make informed decisions about changing its practices.

Specifically, the draft chapter should include a narrative describing appropriate institutional policies, procedures, and practices, evidence and/or data of the policies etc. at work, findings based on an analysis of the evidence and/or data, and one recommendation, or two, for institutional improvement only if such a recommendation is tied to institutional mission and priorities. The narrative should also examine the institutional assessment efforts relative to the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation under review. To help shape this kind of examination of the institution, each chapter will focus on the two guiding themes below, two areas of extensive campus-wide effort. These areas, part of the college's strategic planning for several years, are:

- Faculty and staff development: supporting faculty to tenure and promotion, promoting HIPs and pedagogical innovation, training and supporting administrative professionals for the growing challenges of higher education
- Queensborough Academies: shaping the student experience for success through focused and expanded use of data governance and refocus on remediation and improving student preparedness

In the charge to each working group below, the themes or areas above will be framed in more specific ways to help the group to focus and shape the chapter that they are preparing.

To help the working group members to collaborate more easily, all working groups will have access to a Sharepoint site to facilitate the development of the draft self-study chapter. Access to the Documentation Roadmap (see below) will be available through this site. All documentation for the self-study will be electronic. All inquiries to Institutional Research should be directed to the executive co-chairs, who will forward those inquiries or, if appropriate, direct the requester to resources already available or to other offices as appropriate. The executive co-chairs will meet periodically with the self-study steering committee, which includes the working group co-chairs, to ensure that progress on the draft self-study chapter is being made; issues will be handled as they arise at that level and then communicated to the working group(s).

Charge to all working groups

To prepare for the development of a draft self-study chapter, each working group is required to review the Documentation Roadmap that has been provided (in hard copy, by email, and through the Sharepoint site for each group).

The Documentation Roadmap is the institution's guide to compliance with all criteria in the Standards of Accreditation and the relevant Requirements of Affiliation. It comprises an annotated inventory of recent and current documents like accreditation reports, assessment and planning data, enrollment and financial information, policies, procedures, and other resources. Some documentation is fairly straightforward and readily accessible (for example, mission statements, faculty and students handbooks), while other documentation may require the description and analysis of complex, multi-layered institutional processes and procedures (for example, how the budgeting process is linked to strategic planning, how assessment results are utilized to improve educational effectiveness). The roadmap includes as wide a range as possible of documents pertaining to each standard and relevant requirements of affiliation, so that the working groups will have a comprehensive starting point for their research.

The roadmap is organized by standard. For each standard, the accompanying documentation is intended to demonstrate, criterion by criterion of the standard, the ways in which the institution complies with the Standards of Accreditation and the relevant Requirements of Affiliation. The resources included in the Documentation Roadmap may be used in several ways: as primary source material to support the inquiry of the working groups, as appendices to the final self-study report, and for review by the evaluation team. For this reason, while the preliminary Documentation Roadmap includes links that will direct the working groups to the repository of a wide set of documents pertaining to a particular issue, the final Documentation Roadmap should facilitate the work of the evaluation team reviewers by directing them to particular documents, or passage(s) in a document, that most significantly and appropriately demonstrate compliance with the Standards of Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation.

The initial task of each working group is to review the documentation in the roadmap to ensure that the best possible examples of documentation are used to show compliance with the criterion indicated. As the roadmap is a “living” document that will change and develop throughout the self-study process, each group will help to determine which documents, policies, and procedures best demonstrate that the college meets the Standards of Accreditation and relevant Requirements of Affiliation. As a consequence of this analytical review of the Documentation Roadmap, each working group may identify gaps or areas insufficiently documented. Such gaps should be communicated through the working group co-chairs to the executive co-chairs, who will be responsible for following up with the appropriate office on campus to identify or produce documentation that may be added to the roadmap to address the gap. Changes to the Documentation Roadmap will be posted to the Sharepoint site of the corresponding working group to confirm that the gap identified has been addressed.

The final version of the Documentation Roadmap is presented as part of the self-study report to Middle States. It is an integral component of the self-study. Combined with the self-study narrative, it demonstrates how the institution holistically meets the Middle States Standards of Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation.

Charge to working group 1: mission and goals

Following review of the section of the Documentation Roadmap on mission and goals, working group 1 will notify the executive co-chairs, as indicated above, which documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance, which documentation may be problematic and require deletions, additions, or specifications about document excerpts, and which documentation reveals possible gaps in compliance. Though the analytical review and gap analysis will occur primarily in fall 2017, as this process will help to provide background and context to the working group for the development of the self-study chapter, changes to the Documentation Roadmap may occur throughout the year as needed. Actual changes to the roadmap will only be made by the executive co-chairs; an updated roadmap will be distributed to the working groups through their self-study Sharepoint site.

The self-study chapter that working group 1 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement through analysis of mission-critical areas relative to mission and goals. Given specific examples of evidence and analysis of processes at work, the self-study chapter should also demonstrate the ways in which the institution uses data and evidence, at any level, to make informed decisions about changing its practices. In its examination of mission and goals, working group 1 will use the language of the standard and the relevant requirements of affiliation:

Standard 1

The institution’s mission defines its purpose within the context of higher education, the students it serves, and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals are clearly linked to its mission and specify how the institution fulfills its mission.

Requirement of affiliation 7

The institution has a statement of mission and goals approved by its governing body that defines its purpose within the context of higher education.

Requirement of affiliation 10

Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.

The standard and requirements of affiliation will be examined through the “lens” of the two guiding themes below:

- Faculty and staff development: supporting faculty to tenure and promotion, promoting HIPs and pedagogical innovation, training and supporting administrative professionals for the growing challenges of higher education
- Queensborough Academies: shaping the student experience for success through focused and expanded use of data governance and refocus on remediation and improving student preparedness

To tie these themes to mission and goals and to provide a context for analysis, the working group should consider the following questions:

1. How are mission and college goals developed, and what was the process for developing the latest version of the mission and college goals? The working group will need to review the efforts of the College Advisory Planning Committee (CAPC) and the Mission Review Committee formed by the CAPC.
2. What role does governance play in the process? How well do the mission and college goals reflect the college’s values and purpose within the City University of New York and higher education? The working group will need to review CUNY’s mission and past Senate actions.
3. In what ways is the strategic plan aligned with the mission and college goals? How does the organizational structure of the strategic plan reinforce the commitment to the mission and college goals?
4. How are the institutional priorities above incorporated into the strategic plan? What college goals do the institutional priorities support? The working group will need to examine both the previous mission statement and the new version and several years of strategic plans to determine continuity and change.
5. How conceptually do faculty and staff development and the Queensborough Academies support the mission and college goals?
6. What are some examples of strategic objectives that support the institutional priorities? How do subsequent outcomes inform the ways in which the strategic objectives are adjusted and modified over time? The working group should track a number of

examples over several years to determine how the college adjusts and refines its efforts based on outcomes.

As the working group reviews the documentation and the questions above, it may develop other questions relative to the standard, relevant requirements of affiliation, and institutional priorities. This is welcome, of course, even encouraged. As full a discussion of the issues as possible should be entertained by the working group. Questions developed by the working group should be forwarded to the executive co-chairs for its review and possible comment.

As the self-study chapter that working group 1 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, analysis of mission-critical areas is essential. In the context of the self-study chapter, analysis means evaluation of processes and practices through an examination of evidence relative to mission and goals and the institutional priorities above. In its effort to demonstrate compliance and the college's realization of the institutional priorities, working group 1 will need to extract from the evidence—mission statement, college goals, strategic plans—how the institution builds on previous work, modifying its approach as needed, and looking ahead to better outcomes. To provide a context for analysis and evaluation, the self-study chapter should tell a “story,” based on the evidence and using the language of the standard and the two requirements of affiliation above. Based on the evidence from the strategic plans, for example, the “story” should trace, over time, how the institution supports the mission and college goals and responds to change and outcomes to modify and adjust efforts. Using the institutional priorities to focus the narrative, a good self-study chapter will demonstrate college compliance with the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation by telling a compelling story, *citing specific examples from college documents*, that shows how efforts have consistently over time supported institutional priorities and goals. The story is meant to be evaluative, noting strengths and possible weaknesses revealed by the examination of the evidence and periodic assessment of mission and goals. It is the evaluative aspect of the self-study chapter that informs institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, the most important goal of the self-study.

Working group 1 may consider making a recommendation, or two, for consideration in the final self-study based on the analysis of the chapter and *only if* the recommendation is mission-critical and tied to institutional priorities and college goals.

Charge to working group 2: ethics and integrity

Following review of the section of the Documentation Roadmap on ethics and integrity, working group 2 will notify the executive co-chairs, as indicated above, which documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance, which documentation may be problematic and require deletions, additions, or specifications about document excerpts, and which documentation reveals possible gaps in compliance. Though the analytical review and gap analysis will occur primarily in fall 2017, as this process will help to provide background and context to the working group for the development of the self-study chapter, changes to the Documentation

Roadmap may occur throughout the year as needed. Actual changes to the roadmap will only be made by the executive co-chairs; an updated roadmap will be distributed to the working groups through their self-study Sharepoint site.

The self-study chapter that working group 2 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement through analysis of mission-critical areas relative to ethics and integrity. Given specific examples of evidence and analysis of processes at work, the self-study chapter should also demonstrate the ways in which the institution uses data and evidence, at any level, to make informed decisions about changing its practices. In its examination of ethics and integrity, working group 2 will use the language of the standard:

Standard 2

Ethics and integrity are central, indispensable, and defining hallmarks of effective higher education institutions. In all activities, whether internal or external, an institution must be faithful to its mission, honor its contracts and commitments, adhere to its policies, and represent itself truthfully.

The standard will be examined through the “lens” of the two guiding themes below:

- Faculty and staff development: supporting faculty to tenure and promotion, promoting HIPs and pedagogical innovation, training and supporting administrative professionals for the growing challenges of higher education
- Queensborough Academies: shaping the student experience for success through focused and expanded use of data governance and refocus on remediation and improving student preparedness

To tie these themes to ethics and integrity and to provide a context for analysis, the working group should consider the following questions:

1. How is the institution faithful to its mission? The working group should examine the previous and current version of the mission and college goals in the context of the last several years of strategic plans.
2. How are policies and procedures made accessible, are they accurate as posted, and what evidence is there that college practice is faithful to them? The working group should review documents related to grievance policies, conflict of interest, fair and impartial recruiting, hiring, evaluation, and promotion of faculty, disciplinary procedures, and compliance with federal, state, and commission policies, regulations, and requirements.
3. In what ways does faculty and staff development promote and support the values of academic freedom, freedom of expression, respect across campus, the processes toward tenure and promotion, and the pedagogical initiatives of the college?
4. How do the college’s strategic efforts relative to the Queensborough Academies support student preparedness, remediation reform, and enhanced data governance to make better informed decisions?
5. What evidence is there of periodic assessment relative to the standard?

As the working group reviews the documentation and the questions above, it may develop other questions relative to the standard and institutional priorities. This is welcome, of course, even encouraged. As full a discussion of the issues as possible should be entertained by the working group. Questions developed by the working group should be forwarded to the executive co-chairs for its review and possible comment.

As the self-study chapter that working group 2 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, analysis of mission-critical areas is essential. In the context of the self-study chapter, analysis means evaluation of processes and practices through an examination of evidence relative to ethics and integrity and the institutional priorities above. In its effort to demonstrate compliance and the college's realization of the institutional priorities, working group 2 will need to extract from the evidence—mission and college goals, bylaws, governance plan, policies and procedures—how the institution builds on previous work, modifying its approach as needed, and looking ahead to better outcomes. To provide a context for analysis and evaluation, the self-study chapter should tell a “story,” based on the evidence and using the language of the standard. Based on the evidence from the Affirmative Action office, for example, the “story” should trace, over time, how the institution is faithful to CUNY and college policies and procedures for recruiting and hiring and responds to change and outcomes to modify and adjust efforts. Using the institutional priorities to focus the narrative, a good self-study chapter will demonstrate college compliance with the standard by telling a compelling story, *citing specific examples from college documents*, that shows how efforts have consistently over time supported institutional priorities and goals. The story is meant to be evaluative, noting strengths and possible weaknesses revealed by the examination of the evidence and periodic assessment of ethics and integrity. It is the evaluative aspect of the self-study chapter that informs institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, the most important goal of the self-study.

Working group 2 may consider making a recommendation, or two, for consideration in the final self-study based on the analysis of the chapter and *only if* the recommendation is mission-critical and tied to institutional priorities and goals.

Charge to working group 3: design and delivery of the student learning experience

Following review of the section of the Documentation Roadmap on the design and delivery of the student learning experience, working group 3 will notify the executive co-chairs, as indicated above, which documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance, which documentation may be problematic and require deletions, additions, or specifications about document excerpts, and which documentation reveals possible gaps in compliance. Though the analytical review and gap analysis will occur primarily in fall 2017, as this process will help to provide background and context to the working group for the development of the self-study chapter, changes to the Documentation Roadmap may occur throughout the year as needed.

Actual changes to the roadmap will only be made by the executive co-chairs; an updated roadmap will be distributed to the working groups through their self-study Sharepoint site.

The self-study chapter that working group 3 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement through analysis of mission-critical areas relative to the design and delivery of the student learning experience. Given specific examples of evidence and analysis of processes at work, the self-study chapter should also demonstrate the ways in which the institution uses data and evidence, at any level, to make informed decisions about changing its practices. In its examination of the design and delivery of the student learning experience, working group 3 will use the language of the standard and the relevant requirements of affiliation below:

Standard 3

An institution provides students with learning experiences that are characterized by rigor and coherence at all program, certificate, and degree levels, regardless of instructional modality. All learning experiences, regardless of modality, program pace/schedule, level, and setting are consistent with higher education expectations.

Requirement of affiliation 8

The institution systematically evaluates its educational and other programs and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes.

Requirement of affiliation 9

The institution's student learning programs and opportunities are characterized by rigor, coherence, and appropriate assessment of student achievement throughout the educational offerings, regardless of certificate or degree level or delivery and instructional modality.

Requirement of affiliation 10

Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.

Requirement of affiliation 15

The institution has a core of faculty (full-time or part-time) and/or other appropriate professionals with sufficient responsibility to the institution to assure the continuity and coherence of the institution's educational programs.

The standard will be examined through the "lens" of the two guiding themes:

- Faculty and staff development: supporting faculty to tenure and promotion, promoting HIPs and pedagogical innovation, training and supporting administrative professionals for the growing challenges of higher education

- Queensborough Academies: shaping the student experience for success through focused and expanded use of data governance and refocus on remediation and improving student preparedness

To tie these themes to the design and delivery of the student learning experience and to provide a context for analysis, the working group should consider the following questions:

1. How do policies, processes, and practice ensure the rigor and coherence of the academic offerings at the college? The working group should examine the structural design of academic programs in the context of college and state requirements, curriculum committee guidelines, and program accreditations including ABET, ACBSP, ACEN, NASAD, and NAST.
2. How do general education and program outcomes support the intellectual and learning values expressed in the mission and college goals, and how does assessment at multiple levels ensure that students are achieving these outcomes? The working group should review the General Education Task Force's reports on general education assessment and development of new outcomes, program review reports, and course assessment reports.
3. How does faculty development support the professional development of faculty in the context of institution-wide pedagogical priorities, remediation reform and student preparedness, and achievement of student learning outcomes? The working group should review the faculty development offerings of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) in support of high impact practices (HIPs), efforts in the English and Mathematics and Computer Science departments to restructure course offerings to expedite student progress through remediation, and the Assessment Institute website and reports posted.
4. How do the Queensborough Academies contribute to, or enhance, the learning effectiveness of the academic programs? The working group should review the full array of academic and student support services that are intended to improve student persistence, retention, and completion of academic programs. The working group should also examine the ways in which high impact practices (HIPs) support student achievement of general education learning outcomes and the faculty development efforts that support such achievement.
5. In what ways does the institution carry out periodic assessment of program effectiveness and the achievement of student learning outcomes? The working group should review the minutes and annual reports of the Senate Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, the year-end reports of the Assessment Office, and the academic program review process, guidelines, and program review reports.

As the working group reviews the documentation and the questions above, it may develop other questions relative to the standard, relevant requirements of affiliation, and institutional priorities. This is welcome, of course, even encouraged. As full a discussion of the issues as possible should be entertained by the working group. Questions developed by the working group should be forwarded to the executive co-chairs for its review and possible comment.

As the self-study chapter that working group 3 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, analysis of mission-critical areas is essential. In the context of the self-study chapter, analysis means evaluation of processes and practices through an examination of evidence relative to the design and delivery of the student learning experience and the institutional priorities above. In its effort to demonstrate compliance and the college's realization of the institutional priorities, working group 3 will need to extract from the evidence—design and rigor of academic programs, qualifications of faculty commensurate with the positions held, faculty development to support curricular needs and appropriate student learning opportunities, among other evidence—how the institution builds on previous work, modifying its approach as needed, and looking ahead to better outcomes. To provide a context for analysis and evaluation, the self-study chapter should tell a “story,” based on the evidence and using the language of the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation. Based on the evidence from faculty development efforts sponsored by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL), for example, the “story” should trace, over time, how the institution provides sufficient opportunities, resources, and support for the professional development of the faculty and responds to changing demographics and faculty and student need by modifying and adjusting the kinds of pedagogical and other support offered to faculty. Using the institutional priorities to focus the narrative, a good self-study chapter will demonstrate college compliance with the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation by telling a compelling story, *citing specific examples from college documents*, that shows how efforts have consistently over time supported institutional priorities and goals. The story is meant to be evaluative, noting strengths and possible weaknesses revealed by the examination of the evidence and periodic assessment of the design and delivery of the student learning experience. It is the evaluative aspect of the self-study chapter that informs institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, the most important goal of the self-study.

Working group 3 may consider making a recommendation, or two, for consideration in the final self-study based on the analysis of the chapter and *only if* the recommendation is mission-critical and tied to institutional priorities and goals.

Charge to working group 4: support of the student experience

Following review of the section of the Document Roadmap on the support of the student experience, working group 4 will notify the executive co-chairs, as indicated above, which documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance, which documentation may be problematic and require deletions, additions, or specifications about document excerpts, and which documentation reveals possible gaps in compliance. Though the analytical review and gap analysis will occur primarily in fall 2017, as this process will help to provide background and context to the working group for the development of the self-study chapter, changes to the Documentation Roadmap may occur throughout the year as needed. Actual changes to the roadmap will only be made by the executive co-chairs; an updated roadmap will be distributed to the working groups through their self-study Sharepoint site.

The self-study chapter that working group 4 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement through analysis of mission-critical areas relative to the support of the student experience. Given specific examples of evidence and analysis of processes at work, the self-study chapter should also demonstrate the ways in which the institution uses data and evidence, at any level, to make informed decisions about changing its practices. In its examination of the support of the student experience, working group 4 will use the language of the standard and the relevant requirements of affiliation below:

Standard 4

Across all educational experiences, settings, levels, and instructional modalities, the institution recruits and admits students whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals are congruent with its mission and educational offerings. The institution commits to student retention, persistence, completion, and success through a coherent and effective support system sustained by qualified professionals, which enhances the quality of the learning environment, contributes to the educational experience, and fosters student success.

Requirement of affiliation 8

The institution systematically evaluates its educational and other programs and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes.

Requirement of affiliation 10

Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.

The standard and requirements of affiliation will be examined through the “lens” of the two guiding themes:

- Faculty and staff development: supporting faculty to tenure and promotion, promoting HIPs and pedagogical innovation, training and supporting administrative professionals for the growing challenges of higher education
- Queensborough Academies: shaping the student experience for success through focused and expanded use of data governance and refocus on remediation and improving student preparedness

To tie these themes to the support of the student experience and to provide a context for analysis, the working group should consider the following questions:

1. How does the onboarding of students support the institution’s mission and college goals and the goals of the Queensborough Academies? The working group should review the full array of activities and events that help students to make the transition to college and to prepare for academic success in the context of mission and goals.

2. How do the organizational structure and intent of the Queensborough Academies support student persistence, retention, program completion, and successful transfer? The working group should examine the array of academic and student support services, from entry to completion, in the context of institutional mission, college goals, and the goals and objectives of the Queensborough Academies.
3. How does the institution use technology and data to help inform processes and practices across the Queensborough Academies in ways that improve student outcomes? The working group should examine recent efforts relative to data governance—for example, how Starfish mobilizes better outreach to students and how data provided by the Starfish system can inform and adjust professional practice for better student outcomes.
4. How does staff development ensure that qualified professionals can carry out Academies' goals and objectives, using clear understanding of goals and objectives and resources appropriate to the situation to improve support of the student experience? The working group should examine the kinds of professional development that is being offered to staff and the alignment between staff development and goals.
5. In what ways does the institution carry out periodic assessment of the Queensborough Academies and the staff development that supports the Academies?

As the working group reviews the documentation and the questions above, it may develop other questions relative to the standard, relevant requirements of affiliation, and institutional priorities. This is welcome, of course, even encouraged. As full a discussion of the issues as possible should be entertained by the working group. Questions developed by the working group should be forwarded to the executive co-chairs for its review and possible comment.

As the self-study chapter that working group 4 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, analysis of mission-critical areas is essential. In the context of the self-study chapter, analysis means evaluation of processes and practices through an examination of evidence relative to the support of the student experience and the institutional priorities above. In its effort to demonstrate compliance and the college's realization of the institutional priorities, working group 4 will need to extract from the evidence—design and delivery of academic advisement, tutorial services, and support programs for different student populations, among other evidence—how the institution builds on previous work, modifying its approach as needed, and looking ahead to better outcomes. To provide a context for analysis and evaluation, the self-study chapter should tell a “story,” based on the evidence and using the language of the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation. Based on the evidence from policies, processes, and practice in the advisement of students in the Queensborough Academies, for example, the “story” should trace, over time, how the institution leverages professional development and technology to align meaningful data with professional practice and student need with appropriate services. Using the institutional priorities to focus the narrative, a good self-study chapter will demonstrate college compliance with the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation by telling a compelling story, *citing specific examples from college documents*, that shows how efforts have consistently over time supported institutional priorities and goals. The story is meant to be

evaluative, noting strengths and possible weaknesses revealed by the examination of the evidence and periodic assessment of the support of the student experience. It is the evaluative aspect of the self-study chapter that informs institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, the most important goal of the self-study.

Working group 4 may consider making a recommendation, or two, for consideration in the final self-study based on the analysis of the chapter and *only if* the recommendation is mission-critical and tied to institutional priorities and goals.

Charge to working group 5: educational effectiveness assessment

Following review of the section of the Document Roadmap on educational effectiveness assessment, working group 5 will notify the executive co-chairs, as indicated above, which documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance, which documentation may be problematic and require deletions, additions, or specifications about document excerpts, and which documentation reveals possible gaps in compliance. Though the analytical review and gap analysis will occur primarily in fall 2017, as this process will help to provide background and context to the working group for the development of the self-study chapter, changes to the Documentation Roadmap may occur throughout the year as needed. Actual changes to the roadmap will only be made by the executive co-chairs; an updated roadmap will be distributed to the working groups through their self-study Sharepoint site.

The self-study chapter that working group 5 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement through analysis of mission-critical areas relative to educational effectiveness assessment. Given specific examples of evidence and analysis of processes at work, the self-study chapter should also demonstrate the ways in which the institution uses data and evidence, at any level, to make informed decisions about changing its practices. In its examination of educational effectiveness assessment, working group 5 will use the language of the standard and the relevant requirements of affiliation below:

Standard 5

Assessment of student learning and achievement demonstrates that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their program of study, degree level, the institution's mission, and appropriate expectations for institutions of higher education.

Requirement of affiliation 8

The institution systematically evaluates its educational and other programs and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes.

Requirement of affiliation 9

The institution's student learning programs and opportunities are characterized by rigor, coherence, and appropriate assessment of student achievement throughout the educational offerings, regardless of certificate or degree level or delivery and instructional modality.

Requirement of affiliation 10

Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.

The standard and requirements of affiliation will be examined through the “lens” of the two guiding themes:

- Faculty and staff development: supporting faculty to tenure and promotion, promoting HIPs and pedagogical innovation, training and supporting administrative professionals for the growing challenges of higher education
- Queensborough Academies: shaping the student experience for success through focused and expanded use of data governance and refocus on remediation and improving student preparedness

To tie these themes to mission and goals and to provide a context for analysis, the working group should consider the following questions:

1. How has the college institutionalized the assessment of educational effectiveness? The working group should examine the multiple levels of assessment that the institution supports—general education assessment, academic program review, course assessment, departmental year-end reporting and planning—and the ways that assessment results are used to change policy, process, or practice. The working group should also examine the work of the Senate Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness.
2. How is the college’s assessment of educational effectiveness congruent with its mission and college goals? The working group should review multiple levels of goals and outcomes, from institution-wide to course specific, to provide context for the institutionalization of assessment efforts.
3. How does the institution support the assessment of educational effectiveness through faculty development efforts? The working group should examine the efforts of the Assessment Institute and those of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) to support the assessment of high impact practices (HIPs).
4. How are assessment efforts shaping and reshaping the design and delivery of the Queensborough Academies experience to students? The working group should examine the Academy Assessment Protocol and its annual reports, the work of the Academies Strategic Planning Team, Starfish functionality and its impact on students, and other technologies and efforts that are improving outreach to and action by students for better outcomes.
5. In what ways does the institution carry out periodic assessment of educational effectiveness assessment? The working group should examine the annual reports of the Senate Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness and the recently completed revision of the mission statement and college goals.

As the working group reviews the documentation and the questions above, it may develop other questions relative to the standard, relevant requirements of affiliation, and institutional priorities. This is welcome, of course, even encouraged. As full a discussion of the issues as possible should be entertained by the working group. Questions developed by the working group should be forwarded to the executive co-chairs for its review and possible comment.

As the self-study chapter that working group 5 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, analysis of mission-critical areas is essential. In the context of the self-study chapter, analysis means evaluation of processes and practices through an examination of evidence relative to educational effectiveness assessment and the institutional priorities above. In its effort to demonstrate compliance and the college's realization of the institutional priorities, working group 5 will need to extract from the evidence—assessment efforts from general education to academic programs to courses, along with assessment of academic and student support services—how the institution builds on previous work, modifying its approach as needed, and looking ahead to better outcomes. To provide a context for analysis and evaluation, the self-study chapter should tell a “story,” based on the evidence and using the language of the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation. Based on the evidence from the assessment “record,” the “story” should trace over time, for example, how the college renews itself and determines institutional effectiveness through the strategic planning process, how the assessment of general education outcomes informs faculty practice, how academic program review helps to drive institutional reappraisal and renewal of programs, or how faculty development supports faculty assessment efforts. Using the institutional priorities to focus the narrative, a good self-study chapter will demonstrate college compliance with the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation by telling a compelling story, *citing specific examples from college documents*, that shows how efforts have consistently over time supported institutional priorities and goals. The story is meant to be evaluative, noting strengths and possible weaknesses revealed by the examination of the evidence and periodic assessment of educational effectiveness assessment. It is the evaluative aspect of the self-study chapter that informs institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, the most important goal of the self-study.

Working group 5 may consider making a recommendation, or two, for consideration in the final self-study based on the analysis of the chapter and *only if* the recommendation is mission-critical and tied to institutional priorities and goals.

Charge to working group 6: planning, resources, and institutional improvement

Following review of the section of the Document Roadmap on planning, resources, and institutional improvement, working group 6 will notify the executive co-chairs, as indicated above, which documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance, which documentation may be problematic and require deletions, additions, or specifications about document excerpts, and which documentation reveals possible gaps in compliance. Though the analytical

review and gap analysis will occur primarily in fall 2017, as this process will help to provide background and context to the working group for the development of the self-study chapter, changes to the Documentation Roadmap may occur throughout the year as needed. Actual changes to the roadmap will only be made by the executive co-chairs; an updated roadmap will be distributed to the working groups through their self-study Sharepoint site.

The self-study chapter that working group 6 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement through analysis of mission-critical areas relative to planning, resources, and institutional improvement. Given specific examples of evidence and analysis of processes at work, the self-study chapter should also demonstrate the ways in which the institution uses data and evidence, at any level, to make informed decisions about changing its practices. In its examination of planning, resources, and institutional improvement, working group 6 will use the language of the standard and the relevant requirements of affiliation below:

Standard 6

The institution's planning processes, resources, and structures are aligned with each other and are sufficient to fulfill its mission and goals, to continuously assess and improve its programs and services, and to respond effectively to opportunities and challenges.

Requirement of affiliation 8

The institution systematically evaluates its educational and other programs and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes.

Requirement of affiliation 10

Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.

Requirement of affiliation 11

The institution has documented financial resources, funding base, and plans for financial development, including those from any related entities (including without limitation systems, religious sponsorship, and corporate ownership) adequate to support its educational purposes and programs and to ensure financial stability. The institution demonstrates a record of responsible fiscal management, has a prepared budget for the current year, and undergoes an external financial audit on an annual basis.

The standard and requirements of affiliation will be examined through the “lens” of the two guiding themes:

- Faculty and staff development: supporting faculty to tenure and promotion, promoting HIPs and pedagogical innovation, training and supporting administrative professionals for the growing challenges of higher education

- Queensborough Academies: shaping the student experience for success through focused and expanded use of data governance and refocus on remediation and improving student preparedness

To tie these themes to planning, resources, and institutional improvement and to provide a context for analysis, the working group should consider the following questions:

1. How does the resource allocation process align with mission, college goals, and strategic planning to ensure institutional health and sustainability? The working group should examine the strategic planning and budget allocation process.
2. How do other college planning processes align with mission and college goals? The working group should examine other college-wide plans like the Technology Plan.
3. How does the college ensure that faculty and staff development are appropriately funded to ensure individual support and broader support of college goals and institutional priorities? The working group should examine the full range of faculty and staff development efforts in the context of yearly strategic planning goals and objectives and the resource allocations that are based on them.
4. How does the college ensure that the Queensborough Academies are appropriately funded to support the institutional priorities relative to improving the student experience, progress through remediation, and student preparedness for college work? The working group should examine efforts, in the context of strategic planning and resource allocation, in support of New Student Engagement, Academies advisement, and departmental efforts to improve student progress through remediation and address issues of student preparedness for credit-bearing courses.
5. How are data governance and technology projects that support it aligned with mission, college goals, and institutional priorities? The working group should examine the kinds of funding—for example, in recent years, the Strategic Investment Initiative—that are supporting the ways in which the institution is managing and using data to inform and improve process and practice across the campus.

As the working group reviews the documentation and the questions above, it may develop other questions relative to the standard, relevant requirements of affiliation, and institutional priorities. This is welcome, of course, even encouraged. As full a discussion of the issues as possible should be entertained by the working group. Questions developed by the working group should be forwarded to the executive co-chairs for its review and possible comment.

As the self-study chapter that working group 6 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, analysis of mission-critical areas is essential. In the context of the self-study chapter, analysis means evaluation of processes and practices through an examination of evidence relative to planning, resources, and institutional improvement and the institutional priorities above. In its effort to demonstrate compliance and the college's realization of the institutional priorities, working group 6 will need to extract from the evidence—planning and budget allocation processes—how the institution builds on previous work, modifying its approach as needed, and looking ahead to better outcomes. To provide a

context for analysis and evaluation, the self-study chapter should tell a “story,” based on the evidence and using the language of the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation. Based on the evidence from the resource and budget allocation process and documentation, the “story” should trace over time, for example, the ways in which resources are allocated according to mission, college goals, and strategic goals and objectives. Using the institutional priorities to focus the narrative, a good self-study chapter will demonstrate college compliance with the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation by telling a compelling story, *citing specific examples from college documents*, that shows how efforts have consistently over time supported institutional priorities and goals. The story is meant to be evaluative, noting strengths and possible weaknesses revealed by the examination of the evidence and periodic assessment of planning, resources, and institutional improvement. It is the evaluative aspect of the self-study chapter that informs institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, the most important goal of the self-study.

Working group 6 may consider making a recommendation, or two, for consideration in the final self-study based on the analysis of the chapter and *only if* the recommendation is mission-critical and tied to institutional priorities and goals.

Charge to working group 7: governance, leadership, and administration

Following review of the section of the Document Roadmap on governance, leadership, and administration, working group 7 will notify the executive co-chairs, as indicated above, which documentation is sufficient to demonstrate compliance, which documentation may be problematic and require deletions, additions, or specifications about document excerpts, and which documentation reveals possible gaps in compliance. Though the analytical review and gap analysis will occur primarily in fall 2017, as this process will help to provide background and context to the working group for the development of the self-study chapter, changes to the Documentation Roadmap may occur throughout the year as needed. Actual changes to the roadmap will only be made by the executive co-chairs; an updated roadmap will be distributed to the working groups through their self-study Sharepoint site.

The self-study chapter that working group 7 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement through analysis of mission-critical areas relative to governance, leadership, and administration. Given specific examples of evidence and analysis of processes at work, the self-study chapter should also demonstrate the ways in which the institution uses data and evidence, at any level, to make informed decisions about changing its practices. In its examination of governance, leadership, and administration, working group 7 will use the language of the standard and the relevant requirements of affiliation below:

Standard 7

The institution is governed and administered in a manner that allows it to realize its stated mission and goals in a way that effectively benefits the institution, its students, and the other constituencies it serves. Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate,

religious, educational system, or other unaccredited organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose, and it operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.

Requirement of affiliation 12

The institution fully discloses its legally constituted governance structure(s), including any related entities (including without limitation systems, religious sponsorship, and corporate ownership). The institution's governing body is responsible for the quality and integrity of the institution and for ensuring that the institution's mission is being carried out.

Requirement of affiliation 13

A majority of the institution's governing body's members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. The governing body adheres to a conflict of interest policy that assures that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution. The institution's district/system or other chief executive officer shall not serve as the chair of the governing body.

The standard and requirements of affiliation will be examined through the "lens" of the two guiding themes:

- Faculty and staff development: supporting faculty to tenure and promotion, promoting HIPs and pedagogical innovation, training and supporting administrative professionals for the growing challenges of higher education
- Queensborough Academies: shaping the student experience for success through focused and expanded use of data governance and refocus on remediation and improving student preparedness

To tie these themes to governance, leadership, and administration and to provide a context for analysis, the working group should consider the following questions:

1. How do policies and governing processes and practices support the college's mission and college goals and institutional priorities?
2. How do CUNY and college policies, processes, and procedures ensure that the values of academic freedom and other freedoms are upheld, that a written policy on conflict of interest is transparent and promotes impartiality, and that grievances are recognized and processed equitably and fairly?
3. How do policies, processes, and procedures ensure that the chief executive officer and administration have the credentials and professional experience sufficient to their roles and responsibilities and are organized in such a way that is appropriate and sufficient to carrying out the college's mission and goals?
4. How do the leadership and administration support faculty and staff development to ensure that both individual growth and institution-wide fulfillment of goals and priorities are achieved?

5. How is the administration providing leadership in the implementation of the Queensborough Academies, the refocus on remediation, and the improvement of college preparedness of incoming students?

As the working group reviews the documentation and the questions above, it may develop other questions relative to the standard, relevant requirements of affiliation, and institutional priorities. This is welcome, of course, even encouraged. As full a discussion of the issues as possible should be entertained by the working group. Questions developed by the working group should be forwarded to the executive co-chairs for its review and possible comment.

As the self-study chapter that working group 7 develops is intended to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, analysis of mission-critical areas is essential. In the context of the self-study chapter, analysis means evaluation of processes and practices through an examination of evidence relative to governance, leadership, and administration and the institutional priorities above. In its effort to demonstrate compliance and the college's realization of the institutional priorities, working group 7 will need to extract from the evidence—college governance plan and bylaws, college policies and procedures, among other evidence—how the institution builds on previous work, modifying its approach as needed, and looking ahead to better outcomes. To provide a context for analysis and evaluation, the self-study chapter should tell a “story,” based on the evidence and using the language of the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation. Based on the evidence from the interplay of policy and practice, the “story” should trace over time, for example, the ways in which college practices are congruent with policies and procedures and are handled in an equitable manner. Using the institutional priorities to focus the narrative, a good self-study chapter will demonstrate college compliance with the standard and relevant requirements of affiliation by telling a compelling story, *citing specific examples from college documents*, that shows how efforts have consistently over time supported institutional priorities and goals. The story is meant to be evaluative, noting strengths and possible weaknesses revealed by the examination of the evidence and periodic assessment of governance, leadership, and administration. It is the evaluative aspect of the self-study chapter that informs institutional self-understanding and self-improvement, the most important goal of the self-study.

Working group 7 may consider making a recommendation, or two, for consideration in the final self-study based on the analysis of the chapter and *only if* the recommendation is mission-critical and tied to institutional priorities and goals.

Organization of the self-study report

Certification

Table of Contents

Overview

Chapter 1 – mission and goals

Standard 1

Requirements of Affiliation 7 and 10

Chapter 2 – ethics and integrity

Standard 2

Chapter 3 – design and delivery of student learning experience

Standard 3

Requirements of Affiliation 8, 9, 10, and 15

Chapter 4 – support of the student experience

Standard 4

Requirements of Affiliation 8 and 10

Chapter 5 – education effectiveness

Standard 5

Requirements of Affiliation 8, 9, and 10

Chapter 6 – planning, resources, and institutional improvement

Standard 6

Requirements of Affiliation 8, 10, and 11

Chapter 7 – governance, leadership, and administration

Standard 7

Requirements of Affiliation 12 and 13

Conclusion – summary of recommendations

Documentation Roadmap

Format of the chapters, including guides to content and editorial style

Each draft self-study chapter should include:

- Narrative (brief description of background, processes, procedures, as appropriate)
- Evidence (best practice that illustrates the spirit of the standard and/or relevant requirement of affiliation)
- Analysis and findings
- Recommendations

Each working group is limited to one recommendation, or two. A recommendation should be high level and tied to mission and institutional priorities. For the full self-study report, when compiled, it will be the responsibility of the executive co-chairs to decide on the recommendations that are included in the report based on a comprehensive look at the document as a whole, concerns about redundancy, and an overall sense of the full document's integrity.

In terms of editorial style, chapters should refrain from using personal pronouns, as follows:

Don't write:

In 2013, *we* launched the Queensborough Academies.

Write:

In 2013, *the college* launched the Queensborough Academies.

Likewise, refer generically to offices and departments rather than to individuals.

Chapters may have footnotes as appropriate, which can stand alone or refer to material that is intended to be included in an appendix. Material that is intended for an appendix has no limits. Whatever is intended for an appendix must be submitted electronically, along with the chapter, to the executive co-chairs and in the form in which it is intended to be presented.

Chapters may include tables or graphs, as appropriate to clinch a point, with more expanded data in an appendix. Such tables or graphs should be inserted in the text of the chapter without using any embedded textboxes.

Chapters may also use links from the Documentation Roadmap or other web links as appropriate. It is suggested that the latter be limited, as websites tend to change and links may become inactive.

To facilitate the consolidation of chapters into one self-study report, each chapter should be in a Word document using single spacing, one inch margins on all sides, and Calibri 12-point font.

Special formatting with bold, italic, underling, fonts in different colors should be avoided. The chapter should not include any embedded textboxes or special formatting devices. Bulleted items are fine.

The full self-study report, once compiled by the executive co-chairs, will be edited by an editorial staff formed expressly for this purpose. The staff will work directly with, and under the guidance of, the executive co-chairs.

Timetable for the self-study and evaluation

2016	
November	Attend Self-study Institute
November to December	Begin draft of self-study design; confirm executive co-chairs for project; reach out to prospective working group co-chairs
December	Attend Middle States annual conference with large contingent
2017	
January	Confirm working group co-chairs; assemble steering committee
January to April	Complete draft of self-study design, including documentation roadmap; distribute for comment and revision; finalize document
March	Call for volunteers sent out to campus community to serve on working groups
April	Submit draft of self-study design to MSCHE VP liaison
April	Working group membership confirmed and distributed to campus
May 4	MSCHE VP liaison visits campus to provide feedback on self-study design
May	Executive co-chairs host kick-off meetings with all working groups
July	Documentation Roadmap (in draft form) distributed to all working group participants
June to August	Self-study design revisions completed; final document submitted for approval to MSCHE
September	Special working group formed by executive co-chairs; work begins on compliance review report
September	Executive co-chairs conduct orientation sessions with each working group
September to November	Working groups review Documentation Roadmap and conduct gap analysis; conduct interviews as needed, meet with steering committee, and begin drafting a chapter outline; faculty, staff, and student surveys developed by the steering committee with assistance from Institutional Research

November	Survey conducted through Survey Monkey; survey results developed with assistance from Institutional Research and shared with working groups
December	Working groups submit an outline of chapter to executive co-chairs, who provide feedback to working group; first draft of Compliance Review reviewed and revised
2018	
January	Progress update due from working group co-chairs to executive co-chairs; discussion of progress toward first draft due in March
January to May	Site team chair selected and confirmed
March	First drafts of chapters from working groups; feedback provided by executive co-chairs to working groups
April to May	Based on edits and comment provided on chapter draft, working groups complete final draft of chapter
June	Working group co-chairs submit final draft chapter to executive co-chairs; final draft of Compliance Review submitted for review to executive co-chairs; Compliance Review also shared with steering committee for review and comment
July to August	Executive co-chairs, working in consultation with steering committee, assemble and edit self-study report; final review by cabinet of Compliance Review report (verification of compliance)
August to September	Self-study draft submitted to editorial staff for revision; newly edited draft submitted to steering committee for review and comment; additional edits completed
October	Final draft of self-study report and Compliance Review report distributed for comment to cabinet and CAPC; edits incorporated; newly edited self-study draft sent to CUNY review team for input and feedback; site team chair review of draft self-study and campus visit may be scheduled in October (see November below)
October to November	Compliance Review finalized and submitted to Middle States; draft self-study reviewed by campus in focus groups, open hearings etc.
November	Self-study draft sent to site team chair in advance of preliminary visit; preliminary visit by site team chair; feedback on self-study draft; revisions to Compliance Review report as needed

December	Compliance Review report submitted to MSCHE; edits and revisions to self-study report, based on feedback from site team chair, by executive co-chairs and editorial staff
2019	
January	Revisions to self-study report continue
February	Final version of self-study report completed and sent to site visit team (six weeks prior to visit)
March/April	Site visit team comes to campus (arrives on Sunday, leaves mid-day on Wednesday); the team visit may be scheduled no later than April 15
June	MSCHE commission meets to determine accreditation action and reports decision to campus

Profile of the visiting evaluation team

The team chair should be a college or university president, preferably with experience in a large public urban institution.

At least one team member should have experience with community colleges.

It is preferable that the team member dealing with financial matters should be experienced with a large public integrated university, as this will help to understand CUNY operations.

It is suggested only that a team member have faculty experience dealing with issues of remediation, including experience with developing and/or implementing instructional models that are successfully accelerating students through remediation.

Documentation Roadmap

The Documentation Roadmap, a separate document provided to all working group members, is a repository of college documentation that demonstrates compliance with the Standards of Accreditation and the Requirements of Affiliation.

As indicated under the charges to the working groups, the Documentation Roadmap is a work in progress when first distributed to the working group members. The section of the roadmap specific to the working group will be accessible through the self-study Sharepoint site by working group. Any changes or additions to the roadmap should be made through the working group co-chairs to the executive co-chairs. As changes come in, an updated roadmap by working group will be posted to the Sharepoint site.

When the self-study process has been concluded, a finalized version of the complete Documentation Roadmap will accompany the self-study report in the college's submission to the Middle States Commission.

Communication plan

Effective communication will be a hallmark of the self-study process, promoting the self-study as a major campus-wide project.

Led by the executive co-chairs, the unfolding self-study process will be shared with the campus community. Email announcements will mark important dates in the process and milestones that have been achieved (for example, the team chair site visit or a forum for discussing a final draft of the self-study report). A college website devoted to the self-study will explain its importance and feature the achievement of certain milestones, including the culminating event of the process, the site visit in spring 2019. The self-study website will include a timeline for the entire project, lifted from the self-study design.

Critical milestones in the self-study process will also be featured on the college calendar, available to the entire campus community.

Periodic campus conversations and open forums will be held to provide updated information on the progress of the self-study and to elicit input as appropriate. Event invitations will be addressed to faculty, staff, and students. There may also be more targeted focus groups hosted to obtain more specialized information or input.

The principal forum for communication among the working group participants will be a Sharepoint site hosted by the college. Each working group will have a site that includes their section of the Documentation Roadmap, electronic resources that will inform their work, and space for sharing documents in progress. All working group participants will have read-only access to all other working group Sharepoint sites to expedite the sharing of information. The executive co-chairs will have access (with edit capability) to all working group Sharepoint sites. The Sharepoint site will also expedite communication by email among working group participants. Issues at the working group level that need to be addressed at the steering committee level will be communicated through the working group co-chairs. Responses from the steering committee to the working groups will be communicated through the executive co-chairs.