



Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Self-Study Design in Preparation for Fall 2016 Reaccreditation

***Dr. Rudolph F. Crew, President
Medgar Evers College/CUNY***

***Dr. Ellie A. Fogarty, Vice President
Accreditation Liaison Officer***

Medgar Evers College/ CUNY Self-Study Design Outline Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Mission	1
Description of the Institution	1
Vision and Core Values	2
Strategic Goals	3
Important Recent Developments and Issues	4
Middle States Compliance	5
Strategic Planning and Assessment	7
Assessment of Student Learning	7
Resource Allocation and Institutional Resources	8
Recruitment and Enrollment	9
Retention and Graduation	10
Expectations for the Future	12
Steps Taken to Prepare for the Self-Study	14
Nature and Scope of the Self-Study	16
Model Chosen	16
Key Issues	16
Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study	18
Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Subcommittees	19
Steering Committee Memberships Roster	19
Charges and Guidelines to Steering Committee and Subcommittees	20
Steering Committee Charge	20
Subcommittee Charges	21
Subcommittee Members	23
Subcommittee Charge Questions	27
Inventory of Supporting Documents	43
Table I: MEC Institutional Assessment Measures	45
Organization of the Self-Study Report	47
Editorial Style and Format for Middle States Self-Study Report	49
Self-Study Timeline	51
Profile of Visiting Team	55

Introduction

Mission of the College

Medgar Evers College is a vibrant, vital, and transformative traditionally black institution that was founded as a result of collaborative efforts by community leaders, elected officials, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York. The institution embraces the enduring legacy of Medgar Wiley Evers (1925-1963), the late civil rights leader. Established in 1970, with a mandate to meet the educational and social needs of Central Brooklyn, the College is deeply committed to the fulfillment of this mandate. The College provides educational access and opportunity for all students to become dynamic professionals, scholars, and change agents in their communities and in the diverse and rapidly changing world.

In keeping with the philosophy of The City University of New York (CUNY) and Medgar Evers College, we believe that education has the power to transform the lives of individuals and that it is the right of all individuals to seek a higher education in the pursuit of self-actualization. Consequently, the College's mission is to develop and maintain high quality, professional, career-oriented undergraduate degree programs in the context of liberal education. The College offers programs both at the associate and baccalaureate degree levels, giving close attention to the articulation between the two-year and the four-year programs on campus and for transfer.

The College maintains its commitment to students who desire self-improvement, a sound education, an opportunity to develop a personal value system, and an opportunity to gain maximum benefits from life experience and from their environment. MEC's mission goals encompass service to the community, essential skills and knowledge, liberal education outcomes, leadership development, work environment and institutional effectiveness.

Description of the Institution

Medgar Evers College (MEC) is the youngest of the four-year colleges among the 19 undergraduate institutions that comprise The City University of New York (CUNY), and the only comprehensive, four-year CUNY institution founded as a result of collaborative efforts by community leaders, elected officials, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees. The College houses three academic schools. The School of Business, the School of Science, Health & Technology; and the School of Liberal Arts & Education collectively offer 8 associate degree programs and 18 baccalaureate programs. Additionally, the School of Professional and Community Development offers a wide range of programs for youth and adults aimed at college preparation, career development, and community involvement.

In addition to enlarging its academic programming, over the past 45 years MEC has graduated 14,000 students who have directly contributed to Crown Heights, Brooklyn, to greater New

York City, and the world beyond. Currently MEC enrolls nearly 6,700 undergraduate students, who reflect an increasingly diverse student body. Classified as a comprehensive college within CUNY, MEC admits both associate and baccalaureate students, and admits students regardless of their level of academic preparation. Most students begin in associate degree programs. Nearly 90% of MEC's students are African American, the majority of whom are of Caribbean descent; forty percent are foreign born, and nearly 75% of MEC students are female. Students thus bring a rich cultural capital which includes an enduring belief that education can improve their quality of life. The College provides these students with the academic programming and student support necessary to educate and graduate competent and caring professionals who carry forward Medgar Wiley Evers' legacy of courage, strength, and fortitude.

Vision and Core Values

Growing from the Mission and its educational philosophy, Medgar Evers College believes in the Core Institutional Values of Excellence, Integrity, Access, Scholarship, Innovation, Service, Respect, Honesty and Integrity, Collaboration, Excellence, Student Success, Community Service, Teamwork, Service, Diversity and Accountability.

Remaining true to the College's namesake, our vision of the future is one in which Medgar Evers College honors human dignity and social justice and provides transformative educational, cultural and social experiences to the residents of the Central Brooklyn community and beyond. The College thrives on collaboration among students, faculty, staff and community members from diverse backgrounds. Recognized as the most vibrant, student-centered campus within The City University of New York, the College fosters an intellectual atmosphere based on open-minded inquiry, collegiate discourse, and a passion for learning.

In its commitment to intellectual growth and personal development, the College provides intellectually stimulating academic programs and an engaging array of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities that enable students to meet their academic and career goals. The College offers many outstanding and innovative degree programs, with special focus on baccalaureate degrees that reflect the latest advances in the disciplines. The faculty's scholarly and creative works are recognized nationally and internationally and the research and creative work of the faculty are supported and acknowledged by the College. Faculty also actively involve students in discipline-specific and interdisciplinary research and in the creative arts.

The College attracts faculty who offer innovative curricula and use a variety of instructional modalities, in-class and online. Drawing on the richness of its students' backgrounds, the College's academic programs foster an international outlook and provide opportunities for study abroad. Graduates are fully prepared to enter the professions and graduate studies, become leaders in their chosen fields, and participate in an active alumni network.

The College is a rich educational resource for the community and develops collaborative partnerships with local institutions and organizations committed to the mission of the College. Through these relationships, the College promotes student involvement in service learning and

community service. These strong and reciprocal external relationships contribute to the growth and benefit of both the College and the community.

The commitment to supporting educational pursuits extends to the College's facilities and operations. The College is a welcoming and attractive Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) campus known for its well-maintained and regularly updated spaces for classes, laboratories, arts, athletics, and leisure. The College follows best fiscal and management practices and engages in fundraising for faculty support, research, scholarships, student services, endowments and capital improvement.

Through continuous assessment, improvement and innovation, the College is an excellent and effective institution known for graduating students who entered with diverse academic and social backgrounds and who graduate to be amongst the best prepared to compete and be successful in the 21st Century and who contribute positively to the improvement of their local and global communities.

Strategic Goals

The Medgar Evers College Institutional Strategic Plan (ISP) "Advancing the Spirit of Transformation, Realizing Dreams" outlines five identified goals, around which strategic initiatives have been developed for facilitating confident and efficient progress towards achieving the vision for the future. The goals are:

1. To provide an outstanding and effective student-centered educational experience.
2. To practice assessment, continuous improvement, and advance the culture of accountability.
3. To ensure financial and operational strength and sustainability of the educational enterprise.
4. To provide an expanded environment that inspires teaching, learning, research and support; and
5. To build strong relationships with the College's wide-ranging communities.

Since his appointment as President in 2013, President Rudolph F. Crew has expanded these strategic goals to include the "25s". These "25s" are the following:

- 25% Increase in enrollment;
- 25% Increase in retention;
- 25% Increase in graduation;
- 25% Increase in internships; and
- 25% Increase in fundraising.

Important Recent Developments and Issues

With President Rudolph F. Crew assuming the Presidency in August 2013, strategic planning, ongoing assessment, and implementation of the 25s in recruitment, retention, performance, development, and global initiatives have been at the forefront of his measures to improve institutional effectiveness and student outcomes at MEC. With these goals in mind, the President outlined his goals and vision in a series of presentations with various constituent groups which included the College Council, the Faculty, students, the Community Council, elected officials and faith-based leaders. These presentations were made at the State of the College Address; in Cabinet retreats throughout the academic year; Stated Meetings of the Faculty, Faculty Senate meetings, the Academic Council, and Student Town Hall meetings. A culmination of these meetings was the first annual three-day college-wide Retreat held off-campus in February, 2014. Under the guidance of an external facilitator, 85 members of the college community (administrators, faculty, staff and students) engaged in reviewing nine (9) critical strategic goals informed by the President's vision. A second off-campus college-wide Retreat was held in February 2015 to continue to assess the strategic goals and to begin the planning process for the College's Middle States decennial visit.

The President's new strategic initiatives required hiring new personnel and administrators with a concomitant reorganization and realignment of responsibilities. Major personnel changes included the appointment of an Interim Senior Vice-President and Provost in the Office of Academic Affairs following the former Interim Provost's departure in April 2014; the appointment of a new Acting Vice President for Student Affairs, Enrollment Management Services and Educational Initiatives; the appointment of a new Senior Vice President & Chief Operating Officer with administrative oversight for all strategic planning activities related to the development of a new MEC Facilities Master Plan; the appointment of a Vice President for Finance and Administration; the appointment of Assistant Vice Presidents for Facilities Management, Campus Planning and Operations; Information Technology; and Communications and Public Relations, and the appointment of a CIO for Information Technology.

Additionally, with the appointment of President Crew at Medgar Evers College, in June 2013, The City University of New York repealed the 1992 Governance Plan of the College and adopted a new Governance Plan which took effect in September 2013. CUNY based this adoption of a new Governance Plan on the fact that the current governance plan for Medgar Evers College had been in place for more than 20 years without amendment and that it provided for a very large College Council (108 members) and very complex procedures with respect to the operation of the College Council, the appointment, reappointment and promotion processes and the amendment of the governance plan itself. As a result, for many years, the College Council had difficulty in achieving a quorum or in transacting college business. CUNY believed that revising this plan would ensure that the new President of Medgar Evers College would have an effectively functioning governance for the College.

Shared Governance (Standard Four) is a critical component of the governance structure for Medgar Evers College and for colleges within CUNY. As a result, the College established a new

Governance Committee in 2013 whose first action was to revise the imposed plan and develop a new Governance Plan; the Committee has spent the last two years revising the plan. With the new Plan under review for approval by the college community, it is expected that a new Governance Plan developed by the college constituents will be implemented and in effect before the decennial Self-Study is completed.

Middle States Compliance

The major issue facing the new administrative leadership was to address the compliance issues raised by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education as a result of the Periodic Review Report (PRR) submitted in June 2012, the mid-point report on progress at MEC in addressing the Middle States and College recommendations of the last decennial review. After reviewing the PRR, Middle States determined that both the Self-Study recommendations and those of Middle States had not been fully addressed. The College was placed on warning based on insufficient evidence that the College was in compliance with Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal), Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment), and Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning).

The Periodic Review Report provided an opportunity for the College to assess its progress towards implementation of the recommendations within the College Self-Study Report and the Middle States Commission Report of 2007. The Middle States Commission and its visiting team had given the College high commendations for the quality of the Self-Study and had made recommendations concerning the budget, planning and resource allocation process, the strategic planning process, institutional assessment, assessment of student learning and student support services. In short, the College had had not made use of the Self-Study as a “Living Document” and had neither followed its own recommendations nor the Middle States Team’s recommendations for addressing current and future issues and strengthening the institution’s planning and assessment capabilities.

The Commission subsequently requested a Monitoring Report, due September 1, 2013, documenting that the institution had achieved and could sustain compliance with Standards 2, 7, and 14, and which included but was not limited to demonstrating evidence of (1) the implementation of a comprehensive strategic planning process that incorporates financial and enrollment projections (Standard 2); (2) the development and implementation of a comprehensive, organized, and sustained process for the assessment of institutional effectiveness with evidence that assessment information is used in budgeting and planning (Standard 7); and (3) the development and implementation of a comprehensive, organized, and sustained process for the assessment of student learning at the institution, program, and course levels, including general education (Standard 14).

The College developed and submitted the Monitoring Report to Middle States in October 2013. After the Middle States Team visit, MSCHE accepted the Monitoring Report and affirmed that the College had further implemented and continued to sustain compliance with Standards 2, 7, and 14. More specifically, the report noted that the College provided documentation of

further implementation of the institutional strategic plan with a) evidence that institutional assessment information is used for planning and allocating resources (Standards 2 and 7); b) evidence of the steps to strengthen and support institutional and student learning assessment activities and decision making (Standards 7 and 14); and c) evidence of progress in ensuring that course syllabi consistently include student learning outcomes and that program goals and expected student learning outcomes are published for all programs at all levels (Standard 14).

The Team recommended the College strengthen the strategic plan implementation process by establishing a position of director/coordinator for strategic planning to provide professional support for strategic planning initiatives. This position is currently filled by the COO, as he co-chairs the College's Strategic Planning Committee. The Team also recommended that the College review the charge of the Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness Committee to ensure that assessment of student learning has its own systematic and sustained process for assessing student learning in major fields and General Education. The Commission further recommended that the College ensure that every academic unit clearly articulates and publishes its program mission, goals and expected student learning outcomes; that all academic syllabi are consistent in including course descriptions, objectives and student learning outcomes; that the College strengthen the assessment of student learning by establishing a position of director/coordinator for student learning assessment; and that the College ensure that student learning assessment is clearly operational throughout the College, consistently ongoing, and that its results are shared publicly and used for continuous improvement.

As is customary, MSCHE then asked the College to submit a Monitoring Follow-up Report in November 2014. The Visiting Team of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, after its review, found that the resource allocation process was linked to the strategic plan as evidenced in the CUNY budget process, the performance management plan, and the College's budgeting process, and that there was an analysis and development of action plans. However the Team sought clarity regarding the two strategic plans: the strategic investment plan, and the operational plan. Thus, the Team recommended that the College reconcile the two strategic plans. The Team also noted the commitment, positive energy, excitement, and passion among all members of the College community for the new focus of the institution under the visionary, inclusive and impassioned leadership of the President as expressed through the 25s Initiative. The Team commended the College on the use of the Student Success Progression Model for purposes of increasing retention and ensuring that students receive the requisite knowledge and skills promised by the College. Finally, the Team suggested that the College take steps to streamline and further align the work of the various committees and teams charged with assessment at the institutional and unit levels. This team report was supplemented by the report of the Middle States Team Report in March 2015. The Middle States Team recommended acceptance of the Monitoring Follow-up Report and requested that the College document further implementation of an organized and sustainable process to assess achievement of student learning outcomes in all programs (Standard 14).

Upon reviewing the outcomes from the College's two annual retreats and the results of the Monitoring and Follow-Up Reports requested by Middle States, the College has developed a

plan for engaging in a self-study that will strengthen the process of continuous institutional improvement. Critical points on this roadmap involve strategic planning, assessment, resource allocation and institutional resources, recruitment, retention and graduation.

Strategic Planning and Assessment (Standards 2, 7 and 14)

The College has addressed strategic planning by establishing a new Strategic Planning Committee whose primary charge is to reconcile the Strategic Plans which have emerged since the last decennial Self-Study. This committee, co-chaired by the Senior Vice President & Chief Operating Officer and a senior faculty member, is charged with drawing from the prior Strategic Plan, *Strategic Institutional Strategic Plan 2012-2017 Advancing the Spirit of Transformation, Realizing the Dream*, the President's *Investment Plan 2014-2018 "Claiming Prosperity"*, the College's Performance Management Process (PMP), the outcomes of the two college-wide retreats and the President's vision in order to create a comprehensive Strategic Plan.

Evidence of the College's sustained commitment to strategic planning and assessment is included in the implementation of the Medgar Evers College Assessment Plan. This plan called for the establishment of an Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee, the requirement of Action Plans for each academic and administrative unit department and unit, the development of a schedule for regular academic program reviews, the development of a General Education Assessment Plan and the coordination of assessment activities by school assessment coordinators and an administrative assessment coordinator.

The college-wide Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee, chaired by the Provost, oversees implementation of the MEC Assessment Plan and integrates assessment activities related to strategic planning, the PMP, general education assessment, and departmental/program assessment. It provides a roadmap for assessment at the institution, department/operational unit, program and course levels. Academic departments and administrative units develop annual Action Plans which are linked both to the Strategic Plan, and to the CUNY-wide Performance Management Plan (PMP). These Action Plans "document the results of the previous year's efforts, and reflect goals, actions and budget priorities for the coming academic year." Further evidence of the institution's commitment to sustaining a culture of assessment is represented by program assessment through academic departments. Professionally accredited degree programs have established program level and course level assessment plans as required by their respective accreditation organizations whereas academic degree programs are formally reviewed every five years on a rotating schedule. All non-accredited programs must complete academic program reviews in compliance with MEC guidelines.

Assessment of Student Learning

The College has taken steps to strengthen assessment of student learning through the following measures:

- i. Creating sub-committees from the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committees (IEAC) to lead assessment activities at various levels;
- ii. Retaining an external Consultant to evaluate the College's current assessment practices and provide recommendations for further development;
- iii. Appointing Academic Assessment Leaders to guide and coordinate assessment for each of the three Academic Schools (School-Level);
- iv. Requesting academic departments to appoint one or two persons to serve as Departmental Assessment Coordinators;
- v. Sponsoring faculty professional development in assessment and supporting faculty attendance at assessment conferences and workshops; and
- vi. Holding review sessions to inform end users of the application of institutional data in reviewing student learning assessment.

The MEC General Education Program was revised in 2012 and retrofitted to align with Pathways, CUNY's general education framework. A plan for assessment of Medgar Evers College's General Education Committee began in 2013. It is ongoing and is based on the rubrics used to assess the Essential Learning Outcomes developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, (AAC & U).

The College understands the need for continuous professional development of faculty to support its culture of ongoing assessment. Thus, the reestablishment of the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE), as suggested by MSCHE, is now a reality. The CTLE opened in the fall 2014 semester with a full slate of activities and is a "hub" for all faculty development needs and interests, including research, grant writing, educational technology, pedagogy, assessment, and more – all in one central location, housed in the newly renovated Charles Evans Inniss Memorial Library.

Resource Allocation and Institutional Resources (Standards 2 and 3)

Evidence that institutional assessment information is used for planning and allocation of resources (Standards 2 and 7) was also a major concern addressed in the Middle States Monitoring Report. The College has instituted a budgeting process which calls for each unit and area head to prepare a budget request for the year. The intent is for this to be a more transparent, collaborative and accountable budget planning process which is tied to resource allocation and planning.

Campus facilities at the College have significantly improved and expanded since the last Middle States Self-Study; a state-of-the-art Academic Building to house the School of Science, Health and Technology was created. The College's Space Reallocation Project resulted in the completion of a state-of-the-art library expansion and renovation which has added 50% more space and a new Welcome Center. The Writing Center and Learning Center are now located in the library. Administrative spaces have been renovated resulting in 170 staff moves; the relocation of Admissions back onto the campus; the consolidation of student services in the Student Services Building; and the relocation of the School of Business. The College now has a

shuttle bus service; a faculty/staff lounge and a Writing Lab in the Carroll Street building. There is a new sound system in Founders Auditorium; three new elevators in the Bedford building; expanded student club space and Wi-Fi upgrades in the Bedford and S-Buildings. Additionally, CUNY has committed to funding a new Master Plan.

With respect to technology, the Office of Information Technology has expanded significantly. A new Chief Information Officer was hired in 2013 and a Director of Infrastructure Services in 2014. The primary focus of IT is on pro-active initiatives that will improve user support and customer service. IT now has oversight to support classroom technology. Internet connection has been increased to 100 mgbs to 1 gbps, a 10 fold increase in all common areas across the campus; data centers have undergone improvement; network topology has been redesigned making the AB1 data center the hub; and the overall maintenance and strengthening of the technology infrastructure have improved immensely. There is a new Technology Lounge in the Carroll Building and a Cyber Café in the Carroll Street Lobby [funded by Student Tech Fees]. IT regularly collaborates with the Office of Academic Affairs, the Office of Communications and Events Management, and the Office of Student Affairs in the development of new systems and data programs.

Recruitment and Enrollment (Standard 8)

A 25% increase in enrollment over the next five years is a major goal of the President. However, a major issue facing the College is that many students who enter Medgar Evers are not prepared for college-level work. Comprehensive data indicate that in fall 2014, over 81% of first-time freshmen required developmental instruction in math, reading and/or writing. Seventy-four percent of the students needed developmental math upon entry; 21% needed developmental writing and 13.6% needed developmental reading. Many of these students who enter MEC requiring developmental skills also face obstacles at other key transition points in their progress toward earning a degree. This is not surprising given Brooklyn's public school performance data where, in 2013, only 20% of 8th graders met the NYS English Language Standards and 17% percent met the Math standards. MEC's entering freshmen, coming forward largely from these schools, need substantial developmental assistance in math, reading and writing. Indeed MEC's founders charged the College to meet exactly this need, providing a college for students who had not been well-served by the public schools.

In response to addressing the need to serve under-prepared students, President Crew's development team created the *Claiming Prosperity Strategic Investment Plan*. This ambitious plan rests on an innovative approach that ties K-12 instruction and parent support to college success at the front end (The Pipeline), and enhanced teaching and learning, student internships and community service to career success at the back end (The Promise). The approach represents a new educational paradigm that activates the symbiotic relationship between key parts of the education spectrum, ultimately connecting them to post-graduation employment and civic participation and allowing graduates to claim prosperity. The College is seeking investments in the amount of \$25 million over five years to support *Claiming Prosperity*.

The Pipeline and Promise initiatives have been supplemented by sustained and focused recruitment measures. These measures have resulted in a 5.2% increase in 2014 freshmen and within this cohort, an increase by 165.9% of baccalaureate degree entering freshmen. These initiatives include a new admissions policy which is in alignment with other CUNY units, an enhanced communications system by the Admissions Office (Hobson), the re-staffing and expansion of enrollment management to include admissions, financial aid, registrar and the pipeline initiative, info sessions for incoming students designed to increase enrollment and registration, test-taking workshops, financial aid and scholarship incentives, and a Baccalaureate Elite Scholars Program. The combination of these initiatives has increased the number and preparedness of entering students.

Retention and Graduation (Standards 8 and 9)

Concomitant with recruitment and enrollment is the retention and graduation of students once they enter the college. Improvement in retention is a major college-wide issue and increasing retention and graduation rates by 25% is one of the President's initiatives. From fall 2013 to fall 2014, the average retention rate for all degree-seeking students was 65.8%. Within this cohort, the retention rate for associate level first-time freshmen was 53.8% and the retention rate for baccalaureate degree students was slightly higher at 65.1%. The four year graduation rate for associate programs was 10.0% and for full-time transfer cohorts was 21.7%. This is a slight improvement for the six year graduation rate for baccalaureate programs: 12.7% and 30.3% for full-time transfer cohorts.

Recognizing that there are multiple factors that impact retention and graduation, the College has designed initiatives that intervene to address the critical variables that cause students to diminish their semester credit loads (e.g., academic, financial, work-related, increased care-giving, scheduling conflicts, etc.). A conceptual framework for identifying these variables is the College's Student Success Progression Model, (SSPM). The SSPM, developed by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment in 2010, provides structure for systematically collecting, analyzing, and reporting institutional effectiveness data. This model focuses on student progress and success and is linked to The City University of New York goals and key Performance Management Process (PMP) indicators, as well as the College's 2012-2017 Institutional Strategic Plan key institutional improvement indicators. Thus, the SSPM functions as an assessment framework that focuses institutional data collection and analysis on key transition points in a student's educational experience from pre-admission to entry, through exit from developmental courses, the first year experience and gateway courses, credit accumulation in the major and general education, associate to baccalaureate program articulation, and progress to degree attainment and post-graduate outcomes.

Specific initiatives to increase student retention and graduation include the MEC Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP), a CUNY program cited nationally for replication and instituted at the College in 2014, a revamping of advisement and counseling, an early alert system to identify students who are in academic jeopardy , financial aid literacy sessions,

student financial aid and scholarship incentives, MEC-Connect, a mentoring program with faculty, staff and administrators, a revamping of the Freshman Year Experience and special freshman year pilot projects, a new writing center, Supplemental Instruction (SI) and expanded internships and study abroad programs.

The MEC Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP) supports students with a range of financial, academic, and personal supports: ASAP advisors; blocked programming and enhanced career development and academic support services. Its retention rate is 88.9% and the College intends to expand the program in 2016. The President also has a retention and graduation initiative fund to ensure that continuing or graduating students who owe 500 dollars or less on their tuition balance so they can continue their education. Additionally, the College has a Petrie Emergency Grant Fund for students who experience emergencies that might interrupt their study and continued matriculation. Since 2011, the retention rate of Petrie grant recipients has been over 80%.

The creation of a Writing Center, the revamping of the Advisement Model and Freshman Year Experience and the relocation of the Advisement Center into the Student Services building with the Admissions, Registrar, Financial Aid, Career Services, Freshman Year Program and Student Government offices have created a student-centered environment that aligns with the College's mission, vision and core values that students and college personnel have entered into a partnership to foster and create success and a better life for the persons who enroll at the College and that students are at the center of what we do.

In the new caseload advisement model, each student is assigned upon entry an advisor who will serve as the student's advocate throughout his/her college career. The Freshman Year Experience (FYE) has been expanded to include a co-curricular and extra-curricular program that engages students in the life of the college and strengthen the experiences of all first-time freshmen. These include summer orientation immersion sessions, bridge programming in developmental courses, common hour programming, and thematic learning community cohorts, among others. In addition, the College has redesigned the Freshman Seminar course to focus on critical thinking, personal, financial, and psychological skills and developed and developed a First Year Experience Redesign (FYE) Project to improve the retention and performance of students in developmental and first year course. The FYE Project provided critical reading and writing professional development workshops to faculty in discipline-based courses, thus increasing the retention and performance rates of students in developmental and first year English, art, music and freshman seminar courses.

Supplemental Instruction (SI), an academic assistance program facilitated by "SI leaders", students who have previously done well in the course and who attend all class lectures, take notes, and act as model students, utilizes peer-assisted study sessions in which students compare notes, discuss readings, develop organizational tools, and predict test items. Data indicate that the program increases performance and retention rates. The success rate for those who participated in SI was 39% compared to those who did not participate. Additionally,

the overall mean course grade for SI participants was 2.85 as compared to 1.79 for non-SI participants

The development of internships and study abroad programs is part of the President's 25s and another initiative to increase student retention and graduation rates. The College has increased the variety of study abroad and international programs for students with a significant increase in the number of students in Study Abroad in the 2012-2013 AY. Students took advantage of programs offered by other CUNY units (non - African diasporic) and 80% of the programs taken by students are in the African diaspora: Jamaica, St. Lucia, Ethiopia, South Africa and Honduras. However, there continues to be an inadequate number of scholarships and grants to pay program fees in study abroad programs.

Expectations for the Future

The Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for providing leadership and oversight of academic programs and planning. This includes support for faculty research, scholarship and creative/artistic activities, teaching, assessment, student advisement, educational technology, and international programs for the personal and professional development of all members of the academic enterprise. Future plans for the Office of Academic Affairs call for fortifying scholarship through increases in full-time faculty; the creation of distinguished professorships; the bolstering of teaching and research; the creation of new academic programs, an academic school, and academic centers; the expansion of internships, nationally and internationally; and the strengthening of technology and educational resources.

The quality and productivity of MEC's faculty is of obvious importance. Great ideas and great teaching galvanize students, engendering important contributions to individual and collective lives. Given the College's projected increases in enrollment coupled with the anticipated retirement of an aging faculty, the College is committed to the aggressive recruitment of emerging young faculty scholars who bring a recognition of the importance of new knowledge, societal commitment, innovative pedagogy and an awareness of the changing student demographics. Furthermore, through its literary and advocacy Centers and its degree programs in English and Public Administration, the College is already well known in two distinct areas: Black Literature and Civil Rights/Social Justice, disciplines associated with the College's name and mission. These Centers and programs represent an important intellectual niche for the College and a selling point to engage new faculty and students. The recruitment of exceptional, internationally recognized faculty who can hold Distinguished Professorships in these areas in association with the Graduate School and/or the Macaulay Honors College will be a formidable asset for the College.

The College also intends to expand its academic centers. MEC has four academic centers that enrich student's experiences by providing real world engagement in research and advocacy and groundbreaking contributions to knowledge, literature and policy in their respective fields. The College will create two new campus-based Centers: the Entrepreneurship Center and the Interfaith Center. The Entrepreneurship Center will offer students; faculty and the community

an applied counterpart to the academic and theoretical business skills taught in the classroom and the Interfaith Center will provide open, interfaith intellectual discourse, public dialogue, scholarly research, and the development of an appreciation for spiritual and moral values for students, faculty, administration, staff, and the community.

Strong actively engaged faculty and quality faculty research, scholarship and teaching form the heart of an institution. To address these critical areas, the College will redouble its focus on pedagogy, scholarship, and student-faculty interaction through its Center for Teaching and Learning, professional development programs and faculty mentoring. Tenured, published professors will become mentors to tenure-track faculty. Cross-disciplinary research will be supported, and faculty productivity will be recorded, monitored, and celebrated. Student/faculty interactions outside of class will increase via co-curricular and extra-curricular activities including field trips, student research, service learning, and study abroad programs. Teaching and research will also be bolstered through the garnering of start-up funding to attract STEM faculty who will be poised to pursue major governmental and foundation sponsored research activities.

The College will also focus on curriculum renewal with the goal of responding to the global demands of a shifting demography worldwide and making students attractive to the job market in today's dynamic economy. Online courses and degree programs will increase as a result of a revamping of the Technology Platform of the College to further strengthen the infrastructure needed to develop On-line Degree Programs. New degree programs focused on cultivating diversity, appreciation of differences and economic opportunities will respond to the needs of Brooklyn and the larger global society and prepare students for international internships and career opportunities throughout the world.

A unique BFA program will focus on music production, entertainment, and fine arts, a contemporary array based on rapid changes in the arts and entertainment industry and will capitalize on MEC's partnership with the Brooklyn Academy of Music (BAM) and Brooklyn's rise as a center of creative commerce. Additionally, a new degree in financial economics will provide students with strategies for exploring issues related to economics, finance, politics and life in general. Employers seeking students who have business-critical soft skills combined with Brooklyn's high tech employment increase will inform the expansion of majors in the School of Business and create future employment opportunities for Medgar graduates. The establishment of a *Work Learning Cycle Program* will increase internships by linking college study to careers. The program, a four year cycle, will emphasize financial and economic literacy during the freshman year; career awareness and the introduction of a specific career trajectory in the sophomore year; internships, applied learning opportunities and soft job skills training emphasizing written and verbal communication in the junior year; and employment networking, job fairs, and community service opportunities in the senior year.

As part of addressing the President's and College's *Pipeline initiative* (professional development, K-12 and parent support for college success) and *The Promise* (enhanced teaching and learning, student internships and community service), the College plans to create

a School of Education. The School will be an invaluable source for teacher training, preparation and development and will complement the Pipeline Program; it will also address the College's mission to meet the educational and social needs of Central Brooklyn while providing access and opportunity for students to become dynamic professionals, scholars, and change agents in their communities and in the diverse and rapidly changing world.

In addressing the challenges, requirements and demands faced by an educational institution in the 21st century, the College has received support for expanded campus facilities and information technology. This expansion and increase will continue. The College has the following upcoming projects:

- Campus Quad - Design and reconstruction of Crown Street
- Fourth floor Carroll – CUNY CLIP, International Education office, additional classrooms
- New Student Tech Lounge & Cyber café in the Carroll Street and Bedford Buildings
- Renovation of East NY campus
- Redesign of Bedford front and back lobbies

With respect to information technology (IT), the College plans to upgrade 16 classrooms in the Bedford and Carroll Street buildings and to upgrade the Psychology Lab with new technology which includes an interactive projector and a PC with a touch monitor. IT has also conducted an analysis for desktops on the College's network and established a Desktop Replacement Cycle Plan (4 year cycle starting at 25%) which is dependent upon pending funding.

Lastly, Medgar Evers College has a strong tradition of engagement with civil rights and education issues and it will continue to focus on these issues and to strengthen its relationships and partnerships with its alumni and the community by providing students and faculty with opportunities to respond to community requests for contemporary issues research and service. Student internships will be expanded, allowing students to benefit from the community's wisdom and to strengthen the bonds between Brooklyn employers and MEC graduates. This work will include the creation of written research products, public lectures, and on-campus community conferences. In order to reach more of its internal and external constituents, the College will ramp up its public visibility. Community members and area educators will become familiar with MEC's offerings through print, media, and web-based promotions; program specific materials; and banners and visual identifiers on campus buildings, light posts, and area trains.

Steps Taken to Prepare for the Self-Study

While institutional planning and assessment for institutional effectiveness have been an ongoing process at Medgar Evers College, specific planning for the decennial 2016-2017 Self-Study was initiated in Spring Fall 2014, with the announcement by President Crew, that the 2nd Annual College-Wide Planning Retreat, to be held in February 2015, would be organized and led by the Self-Study Chair, Dean Richard Jones; and would focus on the impending Middle States Self-Study Process for the College. During the Retreat Planning process, Dr. David Orenstein, Chief Librarian, was selected as Vice Chair of the Leadership Team. Co-Chairs to lead

subcommittees based upon the Middle States Standards were selected in consultation with the leadership team and the Provost. The leadership team and subcommittee co-chairs constitute the Middle States Steering Committee. These individuals come with significant experience, knowledge, and enthusiasm to lead our College community in the re-accreditation process.

The Chair is the Middle States Liaison and has participated on numerous Middle States Self-Study Accreditation teams for Periodic Review Reports or full evaluation visits by the Middle States Commission and has been a consultant to several colleges, as well as the New York State Education Department. The Vice Chair also comes with significant experience in Middle States Self-Study processes as well as numerous other accrediting experiences that make him eminently qualified to co-lead this institutional effort. From the outset, the Vice-Chair has demonstrated a knowledge and commitment to work closely with academic and administrative areas in preparing the College Self-Study review.

The 2nd Annual College-wide Planning Retreat (Building A Shared Vision), focused on a review of the College's Strategic Plan and progress toward meeting its goals and the preparation for the College's decennial Middle States Review. The Retreat also provided a forum for both a review of the current Strategic Plan, its elements and formation, and through a SWOT analysis, provided an opportunity for participants to provide substantive input that will improve and enhance the current strategic plan.

In order to provide a framework for assessing the academic health of the College, the Provost, utilizing substantive and focused data, delivered a data-driven report that connected the significant benefits of utilizing data in planning and resource allocation. This presentation was followed by Dean Jones' presentation on the Middle States Process, with a specific focus on introducing and describing the expectations for the decennial Self-Study Review. The presentation provided the timeline, framework and structure for the approximately two year review process that would require utilizing the Middle States Standards as guideposts for an assessment of the College's progress in achieving its goals for continuous institutional improvement. The remainder of the Retreat enabled Subcommittee Co-Chairs to delve more deeply into the Self-Study review process. Thus, the planning and the work toward developing the Self-Study Design began in earnest, as the Middle States Standards and its Fundamental Elements of the Characteristics of Excellence were reviewed and discussed in subcommittees groups. These subcommittees utilized sample "Charge" questions as the basis for developing their initial "Charge" questions that will have relevance to the President's vision, the College mission and the proposed strategic plan.

Upon return to the campus, the Leadership Team provided on-site support for Subcommittee Meetings and conducted orientation sessions for Subcommittee Co-Chairs. The Leadership Team covered the following topics:

- Establishing a meaningful workflow for the continued activities (developing "Charge Questions" and identifying issues) for subcommittees;
- Educating committee members on the Standards and their group's charge;
- Establishing regular meeting dates for the group;

- Placing completed committee work online for review by the college community; and
- Updating and providing progress reports to the college community and Steering Committee.

Nature and Scope of the Study

Model Chosen

Medgar Evers College views the Self-Study and reaccreditation process as an opportunity to renew itself and ensure that decision-making focuses on the needs of its students first and foremost, and on its faculty, staff and administration. The process will allow the College to improve and support the academic success of its students and all the constituent communities that the College serves. The Self-Study will also play a major role in future college-wide strategic planning, the development of student learning outcomes, institutional assessment and the resource allocation process. As the College endeavors to become a data-driven institution, the goal in using the information provided for the Self-Study will continue to foster a culture of unbiased and fact-based planning and assessment in all academic and administrative departments at the College, the outcome of which will be rational information-based planning and decision making on the campus.

Since the last decennial Self-Study, the College has undergone many academic and administrative transitions: three presidents, six provosts, and substantial academic and administrative changes, expanded campus facilities and a growth in the number of students. In view of these transitions and substantive changes, we have selected “*The Comprehensive Model*” with an emphasis on *Reordering Standards to Reflect An Institution* to evaluate and provide a full assessment and review of our academic policies, programs, curriculum, student support services, governance, and academic and administrative resources in relation to our mission, goals and educational outcomes. This model will enable us to engage in a deep self-reflective process and appraisal of key areas in our College while also allowing us to evaluate every aspect of the institution since the last decennial Self-Study.

Key Issues

The major issues currently facing the institution include assessment, strategic planning, resource allocation and institutional resources, recruitment and retention, and mission. These issues span the range of standards that will be evaluated through the Self-Study process and represent the issues identified and prioritized by the Middle States Subcommittee Members and the Middle States Steering Committee.

Assessment was cited a significant issue by most of the Middle States Subcommittees. As a result of a failure to address the recommendations from the 2006 Middle States Team Visit, the outcome of the Periodic Review(developed five years after the Middle States Visit), was that the College was mandated to develop a Monitoring Report in 2013 focused on Standards 2, 7 and 14. Thus, the College is concerned with providing continuing evidence of addressing these standards and with sustaining a culture of assessment through a) the integration of assessment into the ongoing operations and planning at the department, school and institutional level, b)

developing a systematic and consistent assessment process for evaluating student data and learning outcomes data and c) the establishment of an information loop for building a culture of assessment.

Related to the College's concern with assessment was its concern with strategic planning, resource allocation and budget. The College has had several Strategic Plans since its last decennial Self-Study. A recommendation resulting from the Middle States Small Team Visit in November 2014 which was required as a Follow-Up Report to the Monitoring Report was to reconcile the varying Strategic Plans. Thus, a goal of the college community is to ensure the alignment between the Strategic Plans, the goals of the 25s, and the College's plans for both the improvement and expansion of facilities and the information technology infrastructure. Additionally, since the College has significantly expanded its institutional resources and developed a more transparent plan for resource allocation, there is optimism that there will be significant funding and resources available to move beyond incremental steps and to implement and support the overall comprehensive changes and improvements essential for a College in the 21st century.

Recruitment and Retention were also major issues identified by subcommittee members and the Middle States Steering Committee. The President's initiatives include increasing the recruitment and retention of students by 25%. In view of this, the College wants to examine the impact of grading and attendance policies on retention and the impact of the Pipeline initiative on recruitment.

The College is also concerned about the vitality of the intellectual life at the College and about the support for new degree programs which reflect varied careers and a changing economy consistent with and relevant to 21st century national trends. Recognizing that extensive curriculum changes require a strong core of full-time faculty and significant resources to incorporate technology, subcommittee members have noted that there is an overreliance on part-time/contingent faculty at the College. The College has expressed the necessity to increase full-time lines and to encourage broad participation and decision making in the allocation of resources and budgeted faculty lines.

Finally, the issue of mission, raised in the last decennial Middle States visit, emerged from the current Middle States Subcommittees and Steering committee. Focus groups and feedback from the college community reveal that there is a lack of clarity and an inability to articulate the College's mission by some college constituents. They note that branding of the College has improved and is visible on campus; however, they suggest that marketing and branding be expanded to highlight the central themes of the mission within and beyond the campus to local, national and international venues. Faculty, staff, students and community stakeholders have identified the need for a systematic information loop that communicates accurate and timely information to end-users, and returns their observations and results to inform future decision-making regarding communication of the mission.

Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

In approaching the Self-Study using the Comprehensive Model, Medgar Evers College recognizes that it must continue to become a data-driven institution, developing a culture of assessment that is fact-based in planning academic and administrative programs and policies. Medgar Evers College has experienced significant institutional change since the appointment (August 2013) of President Crew. Strategic planning and ongoing assessment have become fundamental elements in improving institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes to ensure that MEC fulfills its mission. The College views the Self-Study Reaccreditation process as an opportunity to continue to renew itself and to ensure that decision-making focuses on the needs of its students first and foremost, and fosters an intellectual environment for faculty and staff. The process will provide evidence of strategic planning and planning processes which incorporate financial and enrollment projections and measureable outcomes, as well as evidence of the continued and comprehensive, organized and sustained process for the assessment of institutional effectiveness and student learning at the institutional, program, and course levels and in the general education program.

Thus, the College, through the Self-Study process will:

- Facilitate the involvement of faculty, staff, students, community stakeholders, and the community in general, in a thorough, well organized and comprehensive self-study process;
- Determine and demonstrate the extent to which the College is fulfilling its mission and goals; through assessing the strengths, accomplishments, challenges, resources and opportunities relative to the College mission;
- Demonstrate full compliance with the MSCHE 14 Characteristics of Excellence, through evidence in each Standard.
- Produce and use as a “Living Document”, the completed and accepted document as a primary planning tool which will enable the College to effectively plan for continuous improvement, future growth and development;
- Promote a college-wide awareness of the importance of assessment in quality assurance in order to enhance the effectiveness of its core activities in teaching and learning, student services, administration, and community programs and partnerships;
- Examine the methods of program-level and course-level delivery of educational services offered by the College through its curriculum;
- Create rational and reasonable recommendations that address the challenges found through the Self-Study Document;
- Fully assess the College’s mission, goals and strategic plan as it relates to services, curriculum and operations of the College;
- Enhance and enrich the existing assessment and planning processes through broader understanding of assessment and participation in assessment activities;
- Promote a college policy and procedure that reflects the principles of assessment and rigorous review, as it aims to identify areas of improvement, to foster collaboration and exchange of best practices, and to encourage an ethos of critical self-evaluation;

- Strengthen the alignment between academic and administrative review processes and the linkages between assessment and outcomes;
- Examine and benchmark the delivery of programs, policies and services within CUNY and other peer institutions to facilitate and foster the use of “Best Practices;”
- Further strengthen the College’s Assessment Plan and utilize the 14 Standards identified in the Characteristics of Excellence as pillars for the College’s commitment to continuous institutional improvement; and
- Document that the College meets and adheres to Middle States eligibility requirements, standards, and policies.

Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Subcommittees

The Steering Committee is comprised of the Leadership Team: Middle States Chair and Vice-Chair and the Subcommittee Co-Chairs. Subcommittees have responsibility for addressing one or more Middle States Standards. Each Subcommittee is comprised of three co-chairs drawn from senior and junior faculty, staff, executive leadership, students and community stakeholders. Criteria for their selection were three-fold: institutional memory, commitment to the process and a commitment to consider assuming leadership in future self-study efforts. There are a total of 30 Steering Committee members.

The Subcommittee Members represent all constituent groups at the College and include representation from the Executive Cabinet, the Administrative Cabinet, the Faculty Senate, the Professional Staff Congress (Collective Bargaining Unit), Higher Education Officers (HEO Series), the Offices of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Student Development, Administration, Finance, Facilities, and Student Government, a CUNY representative and Community Stakeholders. Forty-eight percent of the members represent faculty; 37% represent staff in the HEO series, 10% represent the cabinet and executive leadership and five percent represent students. In total, these numbers represent approximately 160 members of the college and university community; 120 of this college number attended the Second Annual Retreat.

Self-Study Steering Committee Membership Roster

Richard Jones Jr.	Dean, Office of Accreditation, Quality Assurance, and Institutional Effectiveness	Chair
David Orenstein	Chief Librarian	Vice-Chair
Brenda Greene	Chair, English Department	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 1
Simone Rodriquez-Dorestant	Dean, SPCD	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 1
Rupam Saran	Associate Professor, Education Department	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 1
Umesh Nagarkatte	Professor, Mathematics	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 2
Jerald Posman	Senior Vice President/Chief Operating Officer	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 2
Wallace Ford, II	Chair, Public Administration	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 2
Sallie Cuffee	Chair, Faculty Senate	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 3
Gary Johnson, Esq.	Legal Counsel	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 3
Jeffrey Sigler	Director/Student Enrollment -Enrollment Management & Student Services	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 3
Tanya Serdiuk	Director, Accreditation and Quality Assurance	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 4

Janice Zummo	Director, Special Programs/ SEEK	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 4
Elaine Reid	Assistant Professor, Social Work	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 4
Nancy Oley	Professor, Psychology Department	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 5
Dereck Skeete	Acting Dean, Enrollment Management & Student Services	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 5
Hollie Jones	Assistant Professor, Psychology	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 5
JoAnn Rolle	Dean, School of Business	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 6
Bart Van Steirteghem	Associate Professor, Mathematics	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 6
Maudry-Beverly Lashley	Assistant Professor, Psychology	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 6
Clinton Crawford	Chair, Mass Communications	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 7
Emmanuel Egbe	Chair, Economics	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 7
Ken Hoyte	Associate Professor, Education	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 7
Owen Brown	Chair, Social & Behavioral Sciences	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 8
Evelyn Castro	Vice President, Student Affairs, Enrollment Management Services and Educational Initiatives	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 8
Mohsin Patwary	Dean, School of Science, Health & Technology	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 8
Sheilah Paul	Associate Dean, School of Liberal Arts & Education	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 9
Chiyedza Small	Assistant Professor, Biology	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 9
Donna Wright	Chair, Education Department	Co-Chair, Subcommittee 9
Katie Davis	President, Community Council	Community Stakeholder
Julius Priester	President, Alumni Association	Community Stakeholder
Dexter Roberts	President, Student Government Association	Member, Subcommittee 3
Amorette Audaine	Student, Social Work Major	Member, Subcommittee 4

Charges and Guidelines to Steering Committee and Subcommittees

Steering Committee Charge

The Steering Committee's charge is to provide leadership to the self-study process. It includes, but is not limited to:

- a) Finalizing the crafting of the key issues for the self-study,
- b) Recommending the self-study model that best reflects the successes, accomplishments, issues and challenges that the College has encountered;
- c) Providing input on the design of the self-study;
- d) Establishing and refining the charges of the subcommittees;
- e) Providing oversight and coordination of the work;
- f) Ensuring that the timetable is implemented, and
- g) Ensuring that consistent, clear and engaging communication with the College is encouraged and planned through hearings, forums and college-wide meetings.

Finally, the Steering Committee will work with and assist the leadership team on the completion of the final Self-Study report and documents relevant to the self-study process and team visit.

Subcommittee Charge

As will be clear in the succeeding sections, the Self-Study Design Report will be organized in common MSCHE order, that is, a consecutive order from one (1) to fourteen (14) of the standards. Each subcommittee is therefore responsible for creating its own research questions which are focused on the charge within their assigned subcommittee. Subcommittees are also charged with answering these questions with evidence from fact-based data and with submitting a written report of their findings for inclusion in the final Self-Study document. It is anticipated that subcommittee recommendations as well as recommendations from the Visiting Team, will provide a “roadmap” for continuous institutional improvement.

All subcommittees to-date have developed between seven and fifteen charge questions. The initial core of these questions was first drafted during the February 2015 Second Annual College-Wide Retreat. Subsequent changes, or the deletion or addition of questions were all developed since the February 2015 Retreat and have continued through the submission of this Self-Study Design.

Through subcommittee research and analysis and through the completion of the College Self-Study Report, each group will ultimately assess the College’s ongoing status related to meeting institutional goals and meeting the MSCHE Standards as detailed in the *Characteristics of Excellence*.

Each Subcommittee is charged to evaluate the College’s compliance with the MSCHE standards assigned to their Subcommittee. Thus, subcommittees will be given the following guidelines:

- Revise the suggested research questions provided by the Steering Committee where appropriate;
- Develop specific relevant institutional goals and objectives for their individual standard, as well as the methods and resources that will guide the work of the subcommittee;
- Identify criteria that measure intended institutional/program outcomes.
- Collect data based upon the criteria and foundational elements of each Standard.
- Assess, analyze, and evaluate the data;
- Indicate how results are used in planning;
- Recommend and coordinate, if necessary, the development of surveys, the hosting of focus groups, and the gathering of data in alternative formats;
- Begin to identify the Inventory of Resources and Evidence to be collected;
- Provide documentation that shows evidence of compliance with a standard;
- Use the approved subcommittee template to draft a report summarizing the Subcommittee’s findings;
- Offer realistic recommendations for improvement;
- Suggest methods and approaches to making the process as transparent as possible; and
- Meet deadlines for assigned tasks and reports that align with the 2015-2017 Self-Study Timeline.

The subcommittee reports will include a brief description of the area assessed, specific ways in which this area is important to the College's mission and goals, and the ways in which this area has been reviewed (for example, examination of documents and what types of data, focus groups, discussion, interviews, etc.). Beyond the description, each self-study team will provide evidence to support their findings. The description and analysis will also specifically address how the effectiveness or strength(s) of the topic area add to the College's mission and goals, and can also include some discussion of how these strengths can be incorporated into other areas of the College. Each self-study team must respond to the specific charge questions of their topic area using appropriate research and obtaining evidence.

Subcommittees will submit periodic and final reports as per the Self-Study timeline. Each Subcommittee report will include: descriptions (fundamental elements) of the Standard and charge; report methodology (interviews, surveys, focus groups, document audits, data analysis, etc.); findings, and recommendations.

Each Self-Study Subcommittee will function as outlined below:

1. Co-Chairs will develop a tentative schedule of meetings, beginning in the fall 2015, which will be included on the College Administrative Calendar.
2. The subcommittee Scribe will keep minutes of all meetings and provide periodic reports on progress to the Steering Committee through its Chairpersons. All interim reports will be available on Share-Point to other subcommittees for review during the process of self-study. The Self-Study SharePoint site provides an on-line storage for committee reports, communication, and college forums.
3. The co-chairs and subcommittee members will be expected to adhere to the timeline and meet submission deadlines.
4. Subcommittee Co-Chairs and members will be expected to participate in college forums and school, department and area meetings, and to report their findings and recommendations regarding the Self-Study.
5. Subcommittees will endeavor to be collegial and open to the ideas, views and concerns of its membership, understanding that unanimity is seldom reached in every instance; hence, members should work toward a collaborative and collegial discourse attempting to reach consensus with the understanding that opposing views may and can exist. The process should be an open one and one that benefits from agreements and disagreements. The process is one that will in some cases not provide a solution, but recommendations for improvement to ensure that compliance of the Standard(s) is assured.

Self-Study Subcommittees – Co-Chairs/Steering Committee Members

Subcommittee I: Mission, Goal, Objectives and Integrity Standards 1 & 6		
Co-Chairs Brenda Greene Chair English Simone Rodriguez-Dorestant* Dean, SPCD Rupam Saran* Associate Professor, Education		
Name	Title	Department
Ann Marie Bemberly	Student	English Major
Dwayne Bynum	Lecturer	Mass Communications
Janice Cousar	Student	Social Work Major
Katie Davis	President	MEC Community Council
Carol Grazette	Adjunct Lecturer	Computer Information Systems (CIS)
Roger Green	Executive Director	Dubois Bunche Center for Public Policy
Kay Lashley	Lecturer	Mathematics
Donna Mossman	Administrative Manager	Liberty Partnerships Program
Syed Mujtaba	Assistant Professor	Biology
Norman Narcisse	Research Analyst/Work Load	Institutional Research & Assessment
Videl Price	Deputy Director	Budget
Tara Regist-Tomlinson	Director	Alumni Affairs
Michael Seelig	Research Analyst	Office of the President
Esmeralda Simmons, Esq.	Executive Director	Center for Law & Social Justice
Victor Stevens	Director	Public Safety & Campus Security
Michelle Williams	Director	Facilities
Rosemary Williams	Chair	Accounting

Subcommittee II: Planning, Resource Allocation, Institutional Renewal and Institutional Resources Standards 2 & 3		
Co-Chairs Wallace Ford* Chair, Public Administration Umesh Nagarkatte* Professor, Mathematics Jerry Posman* Senior Vice President & Chief Operating Officer, Office of the President		
Name	Title	Department
Karen Abel-Bey	Director	Career Management Services
Edward Catapane	Professor	Biology
Jacqueline Clark	Assistant Vice President/Finance	Administration and Finance
Paul Cox	Assistant Professor	Accounting
Marsha Escayg	Recording Secretary	Student Government Association
Adesina Fadairo	Chair	Computer Information Systems (CIS)
John Flateau	Professor	Public Administration
Chi Koon	Director	Research & Sponsored Programs
Lakisha Murray	Special Asst. to the President	Office of the President
Michele Vittadello	Assistant Professor	Physical, Environmental & Computer Sciences

Subcommittee III: Leadership, Governance and Administration Standards 4 & 5		
Co-Chairs Gary Johnson, Esq. General Counsel -Office of the President Jeff Sigler* Director/Student Enrollment - Enrollment Management & Student Services		
Name	Title	Department
Terrence Blackman	Chair	Mathematics
Donnely Castello-Edwards	Vice President (Day)	Student Government Association
Jit Chandan	Professor	Business Administration
Nathaniel Ezuma	Professor	Economics & Finance
Ethan Gologor	Chair	Psychology
David Hatchett	Lecturer	English
Peter Holoman	Executive Director	Student Affairs
Alam Kamal	Professor	Biology
Gregorio Mayers	Assistant Professor	Public Administration
Evelyn Maggio	Chair	Business Administration
Sheron Modeste	Facilities Coordinator	Facilities Management & Campus Planning
Eugene Pursoo	Director/Study Abroad	Office of Academic Affairs
Dexter Roberts	President	Student Government Association
Angel R. Seda	Student	Public Administration Major
Khadiya Smith	CUNY Office Assistant	School of Science, Health & Technology

Subcommittee IV: Institutional Assessment Standard 7		
Co-Chairs Elaine Reid Assistant Professor, Social and Behavioral Sciences Tanya Serdiuk* Director, Quality Assurance- Office of Accreditation & Quality Assurance Janice Zummo* Director, Special Programs/ Seek		
Name	Title	Department
Amorette Aubain	Student	Social Work Major
Mohamed Bangura	Environmental Health & Safety Officer	Environmental Health & Safety
Ray Bartholomew	Academic Advisor	Accelerated Study in Associate Programs
Janice Bloomfield-Alves	Substitute Assistant Professor	Nursing
Cory Brown	Advisor	Freshman Year Program
Eva Chan	Director	Institutional Research and Assessment
Tonya Hegamin	Assistant Professor	English
Lystra Huggins	Advisor	Freshman Year Program
Tanya Isaacs	Director	Office of Human Resources
Sambhavi Lakshminarayanan	Deputy Chair	Business Administration
Tatiana Mejic	Registrar	Office of the Registrar
Tracy Noel	Administrative Coordinator	Social and Behavioral Sciences
Alexei Oulanov	Deputy Chair	Library
Amani Reece	Administrative Assistant	Office of Student Life and Development
Julanne Reid	Director Beta Academy	(SPCD)
Kimberly Wright	Substitute Lecturer	Business Administration

Subcommittee V: Student Admissions and Retention; and Student Support Services Standards 8 & 9		
Co-Chairs Hollie Jones Assistant Professor, Psychology Nancy Oley* Professor, Psychology Dereck Skeete* Dean		
Name	Title	Department
Kevin Adams	Marketing Manager	Communications and External Relations
Ivor Baker	Lecturer	English
William Carr	Assistant Professor	Biology
Michael Chance	Director	The Learning Centre
Shannon Clarke-Anderson	Director	Admissions
Todd Craig	Associate Professor	English
Sharon Earley-Davis	Assistant Director	Public Safety/Campus Security
Norma Goodman	Associate Registrar	Registrar
Eleanor Holder	Substitute Lecturer	Mathematics
Dulcie McPhatter-Clayton	Director	Academic Advising Centre
Herbert Odunukwe	Lecturer	Mathematics
Kathy Phillips-Harding	Director	Health Services
Makeba Pinder	Counselor	Counseling Services
Aisha Williams	Director	The Writing Center
Deborah Young	Director	Career Management Services

Subcommittee VI: Faculty Standard 10		
Co-Chairs Maudry-Beverley Lashley Assistant Professor, Psychology Jo-Ann Rolle* Dean, School of Business Bart Van Steirteghem* Associate Professor, Mathematics		
Name	Title	Department
Dawn Adrienne	Adjunct	English Department
Obasegun Awolabi	Faculty	Social & Behavioral Sciences
Kathleen Barker	Professor	Psychology
Carolle Bolnet	Professor	Biology
Chris Castillo	Professor	Computer Information Systems (CIS)
Rosalina Diaz	Director	Center for Teaching & Learning
Benjamin Franz	Librarian/Reference	Library
Adero-Zaire Green	Substitute Lecturer	English
Eda Harris-Hastick	Professor	Social Work
Wilbert Hope	Chair	Physical, Environmental & Computer Sciences
Leon Johnson	Professor	Physical, Environmental & Computer Sciences
Hiroko Karan	Professor	Physical, Environmental & Computer Sciences
Esther Nunez	Lecturer (Adjunct)	Social & Behavioral Sciences
Gina Nurse	Training Specialist	Administrative Computing (Info Tech)
Michael Tucker	Assistant Professor	Accounting

Subcommittee VII: Educational Offerings and General Education Standards 11 & 12		
Co-Chairs Clinton Crawford Chair, Mass Communications Emanuel Egbe* Chair, Economics & Finance Ken Hoyte* Associate Professor, Education		
Name	Title	Department
Shermane Austin	Professor	Physical, Environmental & Computer Sciences
Christopher Boxe	Assistant Professor	Physical, Environmental & Computer Sciences
LeVar Burke	Executive Assistant to the Dean	School of Business
Victoria Chevalier	Associate Professor	English
Verna Green	Assistant Professor	Mass Communications
Linda Jackson	Associate Professor	English
Salika Lawrence	Associate Professor	Education
Sharon Michel	Director	Testing
Eric Neutech	Director	Accelerated Study in Associate Programs
Kareen Odate	Program Administrator	Nursing
Kirt Robinson	Advisor	Academic Advising Center
Oriel Straker	Director	Predominately Black Institution/SI
Iola Thompson	Associate Professor	Mass Communications
Yvette Wall	Director	Immersion & Weekend Programs

Subcommittee VIII: Related Educational Activities Standard 13		
Co-Chairs Owen Brown Associate Professor, Social & Behavioral Sciences Evelyn Castro* Vice President, Enrollment Management & Student Services Mohsin Patwary* Dean, School of Science, Health & Technology		
Name	Title	Department
Norma Brown	Administrative Assistant	Mathematics
Evelyn Claire	Substitute Lecturer	Mass Communications
Tonya Collins	Assistant Director	Communications & External Relations
Heather Grant	Associate Director	Office of Human Resources
Ignatius Greenridge	Student	Social Work Major
Jerry Hoffman	Assistant Director	Campus Security
George Irish	Dean	Liberal Arts & Education
Jennifer James	Director	Government Relations
Vivaldi Jean-Marie	Associate Professor	Philosophy & Religious Studies
Georgia McDuffie	Chair	Nursing
Stanley Mims	Executive Director	Enrollment Management & Student Services
Julius Priester	President	Alumni Association
George Rosales	Director	Adult & Continuing Education
Maria-Luisa Ruiz	Chair	Foreign Languages
Anthony Udeogalanya	Chair	Biology
Xavier Ward	Student	Business Administration Major

Subcommittee IX: Assessment of Student Learning Standard 14		
Co-Chairs Sheilah Paul Associate Dean, School of Liberal Arts & Education Chiyedza Small* Assistant Professor, Biology Donna Wright* Associate Professor, Education		
Name	Title	Department
Valerie Acham	Administrative Executive Associate	Communications & External Relations
Zulema Blair	Assistant Professor	Public Administration
Reynard Doyley	Network Administrator	Administrative Computing (Info Tech)
Avriel Emanuel	Student	Biology Major
Hyo Kim	Assistant Professor	English
Lorraine Kuziw	Assistant Professor	English
Moses Phillips	Lecturer	Mass Communications
Danielle Shallow	CUNY Office Assistant	School of Business

Subcommittee Charge Questions

Subcommittee I (Standard I - Mission, Goals and Objectives; and Standard 6 – Integrity)

Standard I – Mission, Goals and Objectives: The institution’s mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are used to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

Subcommittee Charge Questions

Subcommittee I (Standard I - Mission, Goals and Objectives; and Standard 6 – Integrity)

Standard 1 - Mission and Goals: The institution’s mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its missions. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are used to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

Subcommittee I: Charge for Standard I:

The Subcommittee will examine how clearly the College’s mission is defined, its purposes with the context of higher education, and how well it addresses the population of students and community it serves. The subcommittee will also determine whether the stated goals, objectives and core values are consistent with aspirations and expectations of higher education,

and clearly state how the College will fulfill its mission. It will assess how the mission, goals and objectives are developed and recognized by the institution and its governing bodies, and utilized to develop and shape programs, practices and policy to evaluate its effectiveness.

The Subcommittee will also review significant institutional events as well as local and national trends (policy, demographics, federal, state, and local directives, etc.) to determine whether and how they have impacted on the College mission, goals, objectives, and policies.

Charge Questions:

- 1) What evidence is there that the College has a clearly defined mission and goals related to that guide the faculty, administration, staff and students?
- 2) What evidence do you have that the College has fulfilled its mission?
- 3) What evidence do we have that the College has a niche? If there is a niche, what evidence do we have that the niche reflects the mission of the College?
- 4) How is the mission aligned with the College's new priorities and vision of the president?
- 5) What evidence is there of collaborative participation by the College community with respect to the President's priorities and vision? For example, Pipeline, Enrollment, Retention, Global Initiatives, etc.
- 6) How does the College mission address the changing demographics of Central Brooklyn?
- 7) How does the College's Admission & Recruitment policy and process align with the mission?
- 8) How does the College's hiring process align with the mission?
- 9) What evidence is there that the College promotes and educates its internal and external constituencies about its mission? For example, evidence of orientation practices, pamphlets, and booklets, etc.
- 10) What evidence exists that the mission is periodically evaluated and widely known by various constituents?
- 11) What evidence is there that the mission, goals and objectives reflect a student-centered approach to learning?
- 12) What evidence is there that service learning and internships are integrated into students' educational experiences?
- 13) What strategies and evidence do we have in place to retain and address the needs of entering students who are not prepared for college work?
- 14) How do the mission and goals provide support for faculty scholarship and creative work?
- 15) What evidence exist that Medgar's mission and goals reflect and promote scholarly and creative activities in alignment with the College's purpose?
- 16) What evidence do we have that the mission, goals and objectives are developed and recognized by the institution and its governing bodies, and utilized to develop and shape programs, practices and policy and to evaluate its effectiveness?
- 17) How is the Mission reflective of and responsive to the aspirations and expectations of higher education?
- 18) What evidence demonstrates that the College's mission and vision statements affect the decision-making at the College?

Standard 6 – Integrity: In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.

Subcommittee I: Charge for Standard 6:

The Subcommittee will determine whether in the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the College demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and to its own stated policies, providing support to academic and intellectual freedom.

Charge Questions:

- 1) How does the College access and make available institutional wide assessments related to graduation, retention and certification for enrolled prospective students?
- 2) How does the College create a transparent culture in the following areas; procedures and practices regarding academic policies and regulations; searches and the hiring of faculty, staff and administrators; and solicitation of private, corporate or government funding?
- 3) How does the College ensure that course offerings are scheduled consistently and in ways that ensure the timely graduation of students?
- 4) How does the College provide a culture that supports faculty and staff productivity and morale?
- 5) To what extent do college policies and practices ensure academic freedom and promote a forum for faculty and students to discuss a variety of perspectives?
- 6) How does the College climate foster respect among students, faculty, staff and administration for a range of backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives?
- 7) What evidence is there to ensure the integrity of students' academic performance?
- 8) What process is used to ensure that College publications (print, video, and electronic: including the Catalog, brochures, press releases, publications, schedules, etc.) present accurate, truthful, and up-to-date information and are readily available to College constituencies?
- 9) What evidence exists that the College makes widely available its procedures for addressing student grievances in a prompt, equitable, and appropriate manner?
- 10) What measures are in place and are periodically reviewed to remain responsive to college, university, state, and national policies?
- 11) What evidence exists that the College practices fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation, and dismissal of staff and administrators? What measures are in place to assess that these procedures are followed and reviewed and to ensure that employees and potential employees have access to college procedures and practices?
- 12) What evidence exists that the College practices fair and impartial practices in the recruitment, hiring, retention, evaluation, promotion, tenure and dismissal of faculty?
- 13) What evidence is there that the institution protects intellectual property rights?
- 14) Has the College made available both in paper and/or electronically the college catalog?
- 15) How consistently does the institution accurately report and disseminate information to the public information on College Student Outcomes?

- 16) How consistently does the institution accurately report and disseminate information to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education information on College Student Outcomes?
- 17) What mechanisms are in place to ensure that ethical practices and behaviors are communicated to employees and students? Are these measurable mechanisms?

Subcommittee II (Standard 2 – Planning and Resource Allocation & Standard 3– Institutional Resources)

Standard II – Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal: An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

Subcommittee II: Charge for Standard 2:

The Subcommittee will examine how the institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. It will review the implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation to support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

Standard III– Institutional Resources: The human, financial, technical, physical facilities and other resources necessary to achieve an institution’s mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution’s mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution’s resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

Subcommittee II: Charge for Standard 3:

The subcommittee will determine whether the institution has strategies to measure and assess the level of, and efficient utilization of, institutional resources required to support the institution’s mission and goals; has rational and consistent policies and procedures in place to determine allocation of assets; has a financial budgeting process aligned with the institution’s goals and plans for annual budget and multi-year budget projections; has a comprehensive infrastructure or facilities master plan and facilities/infrastructure life-cycle management plan; has an educational and other equipment acquisition and replacement process and plan, including provision for current and future technology and institutional and external controls to deal with financial, administrative and auxiliary operations; and an annual independent audit confirming financial responsibility, with evidence of follow-up and periodic assessment of the effective and efficient use of institutional resources.

Charge Questions:

NOTE: Numbering established by committee members

STRATEGIC PLAN

2.1 Can the College show evidence that it has reconciled the two strategic plans and the related documents including the MEC revitalization initiative, the MEC operational action plan, and the MEC strategic investment plan, into one comprehensive strategic planning document supported with measureable objectives?

2.2 What steps have been taken to assign a staff person to coordinate strategic planning activities including working with academic departments and operational units to design action plans that are clear, reflect conclusions from assessment results, and demonstrate use of these results in making decisions about resource allocation.

2.3 What evidence does the College have that (1) the implementation of a comprehensive strategic planning process that incorporates financial and enrollment projections exists? (Standard 2)

2.4 Is there documentation that further implementation of the institutional strategic plan with evidence that institutional assessment information is used for planning and allocating resources?

RESOURCE PLANNING/ALLOCATION/EVALUATION (OVERALL)

2.5 What evidence exists showing that resource allocations are made based on data and empirical information? How is the need for empirical information shared with the campus community? What evidence exists to indicate planning is done using data and empirical evidence to support new initiatives, i.e., Pipeline, Enrollment, Internships, etc., maintain and/or redirect resources toward fostering efficient, successful programs and opportunities?

2.6 Have attempts to access external resources proven beneficial (Productive? Have these attempts been successful? What are the results? Evidence?

2.7 What institutional processes are in place to assure effective and efficient decision making for prioritizing and implementing resource allocation, i.e., Budgeting, Procurement, Personnel, Facilities, etc.

3.3 How can Centers of Excellence be identified, developed, and funded?? Are Centers related to College mission appropriately supported, developed and resourced?

3.4 What processes exist to include College Centers in receiving appropriate allocations? How is this planned, implemented and assessed?

3.5 What evidence exists to show the College manages its fiscal resources to achieve the mission and goals of the College?

3.6 What is the process to plan and resource physical plant updates and changes to the Campus

3.7 How does the College manage its technology and other learning resources to achieve its learning outcomes?

RESOURCE PLANNING

2.8 How does the College's planning and assessment processes align with its mission, have attempts to access external resources proven beneficial (Productive? Have these attempts been successful? What are the results? Evidence?

- 2.9 How does the College communicate, encourage broad participation, evaluate and update the planning and assessment processes, i.e. Technology, Facilities, Student Support Services, etc.?
- 2.10 How does the College make decisions pertaining to planning and renewal? How are these decisions assessed and evaluated?
- 2.11 How does the College use, assess, and update the planning processes? What methods does the College use to assign responsibility for and accountability of improvements to planning processes? How does the College track and use the assessment results?
- 3.8 What evidence is available to demonstrate that the College plans and makes appropriate and sufficient budget requests to University in support of current needs, campus renewal and new initiatives?
- 3.9 How is the budget process managed within the campus model of shared governance? How is it assessed, maintained and changed as needed?

RESOURCES ALLOCATION

- 2.7 What institutional processes are in place to assure effective and efficient decision making for prioritizing and implementing resource allocation, i.e., Budgeting, Procurement, Personnel, Facilities, etc.
- 2.12 How does the College assess the allocation and effectiveness of resources related to academic (online instructional services) and administrative technology?
- 3.1 What evidence exists showing that the College implements broad participation into the evaluation and decision making process regarding resource allocation as it relates to strategic priorities of the College, i.e., Pipeline, Assessment, Retention, Technology, etc?
- 3.2 Are resources used (availability and sufficient) for developmental education assessed to ensure non-College ready students obtain skills to become college ready?
- 3.11 How are Academic Support Centers apportioned their resources in support of strategic priorities? What assessments and data are used to support these and other student-based services?
- 3.12 How does the College assess the adequacy and accessibility its resources (financial, physical, technology, equipment, supplies, etc.) and allocate its resources?

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

- 3.10 Is there evidence to suggest that new information technology systems are used to support institutional renewal? How are systems maintained, managed and assessed?
- 3.13 How does the College project and manage its fiscal resources to achieve the mission and goals of the College? What indicators or measures are used to determine the financial well-being of the College and its programs and services?
- 3.14 Is there a process for planning for and managing the College's physical plant resources?
- 3.15 How does the College manage its technology and learning resources to achieve the learning outcomes of the College?
- 3.16 How does the College manage its auxiliary services and operations to serve its students and community?

- 3.17 How does Medgar's budget-planning management planning processes demonstrate the effective use of resources and alignment with the College's Strategic Plan and goals?
- 3.18 What external processes are in place to evaluate the financial health of the institution?

Subcommittee III – Standard 4 – Leadership and Governance; & Standard 5 Administration

Standard IV– Leadership and Governance: The institution's system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

Subcommittee III: Charge for Standard 4:

The subcommittee will examine the College's system of governance to determine whether it clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. It will determine whether the governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution; whether it has a well-defined collegial governance structure including written policies outlining responsibilities of administration and faculty readily available to college community; written governance documents; appropriate opportunity for student input; community and constituent input; a governing body not chaired by a chief executive officer; a governing body that certifies that the institution is compliant with Requirements for Affiliation, accreditation standards and policies of the Commission; has a conflict of interest policy; and periodic assessment of the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance.

Charge Questions:

- 1) How effectively does information/communication flow in the organization with regard to formal and informal feedback? How effective is the feedback loop for continuous improvement? How do we use effective communication to build a culture of excellence at MEC?
- 2) How effective are administrative structures and services?
- 3) Is there a process that ensures that job titles and job descriptions align with both campus needs and University policies and procedures? How does this relate to administrative officers having appropriate skill-sets and the background to carry out their responsibilities and functions?
- 4) What systems are in place to ensure communication is effectively and efficiently shared throughout the college?
- 5) What evidence exists to ensure appropriate members of the College's leadership team have the skill set appropriate to effectively implement college policy, in regard to professional training, education, and experience, and matching skill sets to job descriptions?
- 6) How is shared governance maintained at the College?
- 7) What evidence exists to show current governance structures are used in the decision-making process? How are they used to ensure clarity and collaboration?

- 8) How is student engagement assessed in the governance process? How is student participation managed and maintained?
- 9) What opportunities do students have for input in decisions that affect them?
- 10) What organizational structures exist, and how are committees composed, in order to ensure effective cooperation and shared governance?

Standard V— Administration: The institution’s administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster improving quality, and support the institution’s organization and governance.

Subcommittee III: Charge for Standard 5:

The subcommittee will determine if the institution has a chief executive whose primary responsibility is to lead the institution toward achieving its goals; one who possesses the combination of academic background, professional training and other qualities appropriate to an institution of higher education and the institution’s mission. The subcommittee will also determine if the institution has adequate information and decision-making systems to support the work of administrative leaders; has clear documentation of the lines of organization and authority, and periodically assesses the effectiveness of administrative structures and services.

Charge Questions:

- 1) Does the President have the necessary authority and responsibilities to lead the institution toward achieving its goals?
- 2) Do administrative leaders have the appropriate skills, degrees and training to carry out their responsibilities and functions?
- 3) Is there qualified staffing appropriate to the goals, type, size, and complexity of the institution?
- 4) Does the College have adequate information and decision-making systems to support the work of administrative leaders?
- 5) Is there clear documentation of the lines of organization and authority?
- 6) How does the College’s administrative structure support classroom and online instruction?
- 7) What are the procedures in place for a periodic, objective assessment of the governance body in meeting stated College goals and objectives?
- 8) What assessments are done to ensure the governing administrative body is helping MEC to meet its goals and objectives? What timeframes are used for this assessment?
- 9) Is there periodic assessment of the effectiveness of administrative structures and services?
- 10) Are there clearly demarcated lines showing organizational authority? How are these established and maintained?

Subcommittee IV – Standard 7 – Institutional Assessment: The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

Subcommittee IV: Charge for Standard 7 – Institutional Assessment:

The subcommittee will examine the institutional assessment plan and the processes that evaluate its overall effectiveness in: achieving its mission and goals; implementing planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes; using institutional resources efficiently; providing leadership and governance; providing administrative structures and services; demonstrating institutional integrity; and assuring that institutional processes and resources support appropriate learning and other outcomes for its students and graduates.

The expectation is that the subcommittee will assess overall effectiveness, with primary attention given to the assessment of student learning outcomes, which are fundamental to the reaffirmation process. Each of the previous six standards builds toward this standard and should demonstrate periodic assessments of effectiveness. The subcommittee should determine whether the approach is useful, cost-effective, reasonably accurate and truthful, carefully planned, and organized, systematic and sustained. Note that the Subcommittee's role is not to assess how well a program or service is working, but rather to determine if effective assessment is taking place. Essential to this determination is an understanding of what comprises effective assessment and whether or not assessment results are utilized to improve services and programs.

Final Charge Questions:

1. What have been the measures taken to address the assessment concerns as stated by MSCHE in their 2012 and 2013 letters in response to MEC's Follow-Up Reports?
2. Can the College demonstrate sufficient evidence that the institution is currently in compliance with Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal), Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment) as they relate to the "Pipeline", enrollment, facility enhancement, retention and graduation outcomes?
3. Has there been a development and implementation of a comprehensive, organized, and sustained process for the assessment of institutional effectiveness with evidence that assessment information is used in budgeting and planning (Standard 7)?
4. How are assessment results used to project costs and allocate resources across academic and administrative units?
5. How does the analysis of the Student Success Progression Model (SSPM) and data related to specific points help us to prioritize institutional interventions?
6. What processes are in place to ensure linkages between the institutional plans and academic and administrative unit plans?
7. What has been the implementation process for a comprehensive strategic planning process that incorporates financial and enrollment projections (Standard 2)? Demonstrate evidence.
8. Does the MEC Assessment Plan and process meet the following MSCHE criteria and provide evidence of:
 - a. An assessment methodology in place and a shared understanding of this assessment methodology?
 - b. A foundation in the institution's mission, goals, and objectives?
 - c. periodic assessment of institutional effectiveness that addresses the total range of educational offerings, services, and processes, including planning, resource

- allocation, and institutional renewal processes; institutional resources; leadership and governance; administration; institutional integrity; and student learning outcomes
 - d. support and collaboration of faculty and administration
 - e. systematic and thorough use of multiple qualitative and/or quantitative measures, which maximize the use of existing data and information
 - f. evaluative approaches that yield results that are useful in institutional planning, resource allocation, and renewal
 - g. realistic goals and a timetable, supported by appropriate investment of institutional resources
 - h. periodic evaluation of the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the institution's assessment plan
9. How is the Student Learning Assessment plan connected to the institutional assessment plan?
 10. How is the College's Assessment Plan used to inform new policies and procedures at the college?
 11. As cited in the 2014 Middle States Small Team Report, what has been the process for reconciling the two strategic plans, the college operational plan, and the assessment plan?
 12. What is the procedure to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the College's assessment plan and process?

Administrative Area Assessment

13. How are the SSPM and other assessment results used to improve and gain efficiencies in administrative services and processes?
14. What evidence exists to indicate that College's HR Recruitment Plan is informed by the results of institutional assessments?

Educational Effectiveness

Subcommittee V – Standard 8 & 9 – Student Admissions and Retention; & Student Support Services

Standard 8: The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students' educational goals.

Subcommittee V: Charge for Standard 8 – Student Admissions and Retention:

The subcommittee will determine whether the College has sought to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission. The Committee will examine the role of admissions in an open enrollment institution. It will evaluate the extent to which the College's admissions procedures and practices are clearly stated, widely communicated, fully understood, consistently implemented, and periodically reviewed for planning. The group will further establish the degree to which these procedures and practices are consistent with—and contribute to—the College's Mission and Goals as part of an overall enrollment strategy.

Charge Questions:

- 1) How does the College assess the attributes of admitted students and match between the institution's mission and program offerings (i.e., majors, professional programs and developmental education)?
- 2) What evidence is available to show the Pipeline and Promise initiatives are supporting campus student growth? How is this evidence obtained and what does the trend data suggest?
- 3) Does data show that the ASAP and Elite Scholars programs attract a more diversified population of students who are retained at greater numbers over one year? What is the evidence?
- 4) Is there evidence to suggest that there is effective assessment of the College's academic and professional programs? How is success measured in areas of developmental education and academic advising? How does the institution monitor retention and persistence?
- 5) What evidence exists that the time frame for processing applications is effective in the enrollment process?
- 6) How effective is the College in reaching out to High School and other K-12 units in Brooklyn and beyond? The Pipeline. How effective has the College been in reaching out to under-served and immigrant communities?
- 7) Are current placement and developmental courses and services effective in preparing students for academic success? Has it had an impact on Retention? Has the College been able to build a coherent case through outreach efforts that K-12 students should consider attending the College? What is the recruitment to Show Rate with this population?
- 8) Is there statistical evidence to suggest that the College's GradesFirst program is helping with retention efforts? Is the program effective for "at-risk" students? Evidence?
- 9) How are students assessed for their readiness to enroll for on-line coursework? What policies and procedures in place to ensure students understand the requirements and tasks required to be successful?
- 10) What retention efforts have been brought to campus to address the high attrition rate? Are they sufficiently resourced? Is there a need for additional resources? Evidence
- 11) How effective is the College in ensuring its students are financially literate about the costs associated with a College education?

Subcommittee V: Charge for Standard 9 - Student Support Services:

Standard 9: The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable student to achieve the institution's goals for students.

The Subcommittee will determine whether the institution provides student services to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students that a well-organized and supported program of student services promotes the comprehensive development of the student, and that these services become a part of the educational process, helping to strengthen learning outcomes. Appropriate student services should support all student learning in the context of the institution's mission and chosen education delivery system. The institution should clearly convey to students their roles and responsibilities as partners in the educational process.

Charge questions:

1. What evidence exists to demonstrate that Medgar identifies and addresses student preparedness, including basic skills? How effective are the support services in assisting students to meet educational goals?
2. How has Medgar used the (NSSE) in regards to benchmarking, diagnosing, and monitoring student engagement? What evidence exist that Medgar students-are engaged and interactive learners?
3. Medgar has a robust tutoring program. How has this program increased student success?
4. How does the advisement process contribute to the success of students on probation?
5. How does the college orientation process contribute to student success?
6. How does Medgar ensure compliance with the regulations of the NCAA? Junior College Athletics Association?
7. How is a student record confidentiality ensured?
8. How does Medgar academic advising assist students in assessing, planning, and implementing their immediate and long-range academic goals?
9. If the institution recruits and admits individuals with self-identified needs that must be addressed to assure the students' likely academic success, how does Medgar apply appropriate mechanisms to address those needs so as to provide reasonable opportunities for that success?
10. How does Medgar measure student success, including rates of retention, graduation, and other measures of success appropriate to the institutional mission? How effective and consistent are the support services in assisting students to succeed in online, hybrid, and traditional courses?
11. Do Medgar's goals for retention and graduation reflect its institutional purposes? Are these results used to inform recruitment? Are these results used to review programs and services?
12. How has student support services changed over the past five years? What evidence exists to support these changes and how effective are these changes that were made? How has the academic warning (Early Alert and GradesFirst) programs at Medgar changed over the past five years? Are these changes effective in their timeliness, student engagement, and offering of student support services at appropriate trigger points? Do these changes increase student likeliness of success and retention?
13. How effectively do student support services positively impact "at risk" subgroups such as black and latino males, student athletes, returning women and men, populations, veterans, and students self- identified with a disability?

Subcommittee VI: Standard 10 – Faculty: The institution’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored and supported by qualified professionals.

Subcommittee VI: Charge for Standard 10 - Faculty:

The Subcommittee will determine whether the faculty and other professionals are appropriately prepared and qualified for the central academic activities and positions they hold in the institution; that they design, maintain, update curricula and that they seek to demonstrate excellence and professional growth; and receive institutional support for the advancement and development of faculty, including teaching, scholarship and service.

1. What is the process for developing/changing/implementing curriculum at the College? How are faculty engaged in this process? How does the process guarantee faculty control over design, implementation, and maintenance of curriculum?
2. How does the administration recognize the linkages between student learning, teaching and research? How does the College encourage and recognize faculty/student research and mentoring? What evidence exists which can show learning, teaching and research address student success?
3. How does the College hiring process ensure that qualified and appropriately prepared faculty are hired for their specific discipline? What factors drive the decision making in the allocation of replacement and/or new faculty lines? Are teaching assignments aligned with specializations of faculty?
4. How does the College and University support and recognize faculty scholarship, research and service at MEC? Is the support effective? Is it equitably distributed? Are faculty involved in the distribution of resources?
5. How does the College assess and recognize excellence in teaching and continued professional growth of its faculty, other professionals and teaching assistants? Are there opportunities that foster collaboration between faculty within departments, the College and the University, including peer mentorship?
6. What are the College's procedures and standards for faculty and other professionals for appointment, tenure, promotion, grievance, discipline and dismissal? Is there clarity among faculty about them? Do faculty consider the procedures and standards to be fair? How accessible are these procedures and standards? How does the College ensure that the process is fair with due regard for the rights of all persons? How do the standards take into account discipline-specific criteria for appointment, tenure and promotion?
7. How does the College evaluate the teaching effectiveness of P/T faculty? Are the criteria for review, supervision and appointment consistent with those for F/T faculty?
8. How effectively does the College adhere to principles of academic freedom within the context of its mission? How does the College educate its community members about the rights and responsibilities of academic freedom?
9. How do the College's policies and procedures ensure that professionals who support the institutions' programs are qualified?
10. What roles do faculty play in the process of designing, maintaining, and updating curriculum and academic standards across all teaching modalities? What policies and procedures are in place to ensure that qualified faculty develop, assess and guide improvements to academic curricula, programs and services across all teaching modalities?
11. How does the institution effectively link student learning outcomes and faculty teaching and service?
12. How effectively does the institution ensure that principles of academic freedom and shared governance are afforded to faculty, especially in the context of fulfilling faculty roles prerequisite to ensuring students the highest quality educational experience?

Subcommittee VII – Standard 11 – Educational Offerings & Standard 12: General Education

Standard 11: The institution's educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

Subcommittee VII: Charge for Standard 11 – Educational Offerings:

The subcommittee will examine whether and how the College's instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals; and whether the College's educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its higher education mission; and how the College identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

Charge questions:

- 1) To what extent do degree, extra-curricular, and co-curricular programs prepare students for the professions and graduate school?
- 2) How does the College determine new degree program offerings?
- 3) What mechanisms are in place to assess degree programs?
- 4) What instruments are used to assess student learning outcomes in individual courses and programs?
- 5) How do the co-curricular and extra-curricular activities support educational offerings?
- 6) What evidence exists that faculty propose new courses and programs?
- 7) How well communicated and how easily accessible are statements of expected student learning outcomes at the institutional, program, certificate, and course levels? Evidence
- 8) What evidence demonstrates that the institution's offerings, including online offerings, have academic content and rigor appropriate to the degree level(s)? How do the program development and assessment processes foster periodic consideration of academic content and rigor? What methods are in place to review and validate courses and their corresponding materials?
- 9) How are the desired Information Literacy learning goals for Medgar students consistent with the College educational programs and goals? How are they stated at the course, program and institutional level?
- 10) What evidence is there that the students are meeting the institution's goals for student information literacy? How are goals assessed? Findings? Actions?
- 11) What evidence exists to demonstrate students experience a coherent, purposeful program of study? What evidence exists that there are clear linkages between courses, programs, and the student's synthesis of learning?
- 12) How do we select and assess present and future educational offerings?
- 13) How does Medgar assess if the library resources adequately support the College's goal to provide a technologically, global and career conscious teaching and learning environment?
- 14) How does the College measure if the library resources and academic computing resources collaborate sufficiently to adequately support a superior teaching and learning environment for its students?

15) What evidence exists that the Library uses its assessment results to improve and strengthen the role of library resources in fulfilling the College's mission, goals and objectives?

Standard 12 – General Education: The institution's curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency.

Subcommittee VII: Charge for Standard 12 – General Education:

The subcommittee charge will determine whether the College curricula are designed to facilitate students acquiring and demonstrating college-level proficiency in general education (Core Curriculum) and essential (basic) skills, including oral, and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy.

Charge Questions

- 1) Given the implementation of Pathways, has the institution been able to provide an adequate Gen Ed program for the students?
- 2) How does the Gen Ed program meet and fulfill the mission of MEC?
- 3) To what extent do faculty assess and revise the Gen Ed program?
- 4) What evidence exists that the core values, goals and objectives of the Gen Ed curriculum are communicated and understood across the College?
- 5) How effectively is the Gen Ed program delivered to students?
- 6) What evidence exists that courses in the Gen Ed program are taught by full-time and senior faculty teach courses in the Gen Ed program? What is the breakdown?
- 7) How well do faculty adhere to and assess the student learning objectives of the Gen Ed curriculum?
- 8) What evidence exists that our faculty are prepared to teach in the Gen Ed Program?
- 9) What evidence exists that faculty understand the Gen Ed curriculum and can convey this understanding to students?
- 10) How effectively are the part-time faculty oriented and developed to teach the Gen Ed curriculum?

Subcommittee VIII – Standard 13 – Related Educational Activities: The institution's programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.

Subcommittee VIII: Charge for Standard 13:

The subcommittee will determine whether College programs and/or activities in basic skills, certificate programs, experiential learning, non-credit offerings, contractual and affiliated relationships are consistent with the mission and meet appropriate standards.

Charge Questions:

- 1) How significant is the institution's commitment to providing programs and services for under-prepared students? Does the assessment of these programs and services demonstrate that the level of institutional investment and commitment is warranted? Do these programs and services achieve their stated student learning and development goals?
- 2) Are the processes for developing, offering and evaluating certificate programs coherent and consistent across the institution?
- 3) How, if at all, do certificate programs relate to existing academic departments, degree programs, existing faculty? Is the level of relationship and connection effective and appropriate?
- 4) How effectively does the institution assure that credit granted for experiential learning is warranted, defensible and consistently applied?
- 5) In what ways and for what reasons have procedures for approving, administering evaluating non-credit offerings changed over the past five years? What has been the impact of these changes?
- 6) How effective is the institutional oversight of programs offered through partnerships with international entities? What is the impact of international programs on the institution's human, fiscal, technological and other resources? What evidence is available to show that the College offers sufficient oversight of academic partnerships with international learning communities and their respective entities?
- 7) How are academically unprepared students evaluated and placed in developmental courses?
- 8) What evidence exists to show a connection between academic success and developmental courses, the learning center and writing center? Do these interventions support retention?
- 9) What process is in place to ensure experiential learning and internship options are offered, assigned and assessed by the academic departments and Office of Academic Affairs? Is there evidence that shows experiential learning and internships opportunities are offered at a level that meet academic program and College-wide goals and objectives? By what processes are these developed, assessed and administered to ensure continuous renewal of coursework?

Subcommittee IX – Standard 14 – Assessment of Student Learning: Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or at appropriate points, the institution's students' have knowledge, skills and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.

Subcommittee IX: Charge for Standard 14 – Assessment of Student Learning:

The Committee is charged to determine whether students through assessment, the gathering and evaluating quantitative and/or qualitative information have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional goals and that such students at graduation have achieved appropriate higher education goals. The committee will also ascertain whether the assessment of students demonstrates that, at appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.

Charge questions

- 1) What are the clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes at all levels (institution, degree/program, and course) that foster student learning and development? To what extent are the expected student learning outcomes appropriately integrated with one another?
- 2) How are the expected student learning outcomes consistent with and supportive of the mission of the college? To what extent are the expected student learning outcomes consistent with standards of higher education and relevant disciplines?
How does the college use documented, organized, cyclical, and sustained assessment processes to evaluate and improve student learning? To what extent is the assessment of student learning systematic, sustained, and thorough? To what extent does the assessment of student learning use multiple qualitative and/or quantitative measures?
- 3) To what extent does the assessment of student learning maximize the use of existing data and information?
- 4) To what extent do the measures of student learning clearly and purposefully relate to the goals being assessed?
- 5) How do the processes for assessment of student learning demonstrate sufficient simplicity, practicality, detail, and ownership to be sustainable?
- 6) How do the faculty and administration of the college collaborate and support each other in the assessment of student learning?
- 7) To what extent do assessment plans provide clear, realistic guidelines and timetables?
- 8) How does the college ensure that assessment results provide sufficient, convincing evidence that students are achieving key institutional and program learning outcomes?

Inventory of Support Documents Identified for the 2016 Self Study

The following list is a preliminary inventory of support documents available to provide information and data for all Middle States Self-Study Subcommittees. This inventory will be expanded as the Subcommittees progress further into their work.

State Level

The Bulletin of the Statewide Plan for Higher Education 2004-2012; 2012 -2016
University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Office of Higher Education,

University Level

The City University of New York Master Plan 2008 – 2012; 2012 - 2016
University wide Reports and Surveys, including but not limited to the biennial *Student Experience Survey*; *Annual University PMP Benchmarking Report*; *Demographic Reports*
CUNY By-laws of the Board of Trustees
CUNY Manual of General Policy
PSC-CUNY Collective Bargaining Unit Contract

College Level

Mission

College Catalogue

Mission Statement: Core Institutional Values; Core Educational Goals; Vision Statement
(July 2004)

Medgar Evers College Mission and Mission Goals

MEC Governance Plan 1992

MEC Governance Plan 2013

Minutes: College Council

Accreditation Reports

Accredited Program Self-Studies and Accreditor Reports – School of Business (ACBSP Self-Study 20013); BSSW Degree Program (CSWE Self-Study 2012); Education Department (NCATE, now CAEN 2012); Department of Nursing (2006 Self-Study submitted to NLNAC (now ACEN) and NYSED Office of the Professions.

Academic Program Reviews: English, Mathematics, Religion & Philosophy

Medgar Evers College Self-Study 2006

Periodic Review Report to the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 2011

Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, Students of City University of New York, Medgar Evers College, Brooklyn, New York 11225 Prepared following analysis of the institution's Periodic Review Report Institutional Response to Reviewers (2011)
Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Eligibility Requirements and Standards for Accreditation

Strategic Planning

MEC Organizational Chart

Medgar Evers College Institutional Strategic Plan 2012-2017

2014-2018 MEC Draft Strategic Plan: *Claiming Prosperity*

Strategic Plan-PMP Alignment

Medgar Evers College Performance Management Plans (PMP) – 2006 – 2015

Comparison of Strategic Plans, PMP, and Operational Plan

Academic Departments – Action Plans (2013-2014; 2014-2015)

Administrative Areas - Action Plans (2013-2014; 2014-2015)

Budget and Finance

Revised Budget Call Memo and Template

Budget and Finance Presentations

Audits and Financial reports

Assessment

MEC 2013-2017 *Institutional Assessment Plan*

MEC *Snapshot*

Departmental Data Set Report

MEC Dashboard Report

MEC Institutional Assessment According to the SSPM

Academic Program Reviews and External Evaluator Reports

Summaries of MEC Coordinators' Reports on Assessment Activities

Departmental Assessment Plans

Administrative Area Assessment Plans: Office of Information Technology (OIT); Student Affairs; Communications; Budget and finance; Facilities

Initiatives

MEC Pipeline Initiative Overview

Coordinated Undergraduate Education (CUE) Reports

Developmental English Redesign Project

Developmental Mathematics Redesign Project

First Year Experience Redesign

General Education Assessment Process and Rubrics

Pathways Resolution and Framework

The table which follows lists and describes the purpose and primary users of typical reports published by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA).

Table 1: MEC Institutional Assessment Measures

Stages of the MEC Student Success Progression Model	Key Institutional Assessment Measures (In Snapshot, PMP, and other IR Reports)	Key Departmental Assessment Measures (in Snapshot and Departmental Data Set)	Sample Key Reports to Inform Strategic Planning (Examples of Use)
Pre-Admissions ↓ Admissions ↓	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Number of high school pipeline activities and participant headcounts- Participants satisfaction surveys	New degree surveys	The Feeder High School Analysis provided information for strategic planning of recruiting potential high achieving first-time freshmen (FTF) for baccalaureate programs. The baccalaureate FTF portrait and academic outcomes analysis provided information for setting admission criteria.
Entering Students (GED recipients, recent high school graduates, adults, transfers) ↓	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Admissions show rate by major and admit type- Average SAT scores; Average CAA scores- CUNY Placement Exams pass rates- Regents Exams scores	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Admission show rates of freshman and transfer;- Internal transfer rates (from associate programs to baccalaureate programs).	The Entering Student Query, First-Time Freshman Trend Portrait and the Outcome Analysis Reports for varies FYP processes served as major information for decision making in the redesign of FYP.

First-Year Experience - Exit from remediation - First-year outcomes ↓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remediation Exit Rate After One Year - Remediation Exit Rate at 30 Credits - Retention Rate - First-Year GPA - First-Year Total Credits Accumulated - High Failure Rate Courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retention Rate - First-Year GPA - First-Year Total Credits Accumulated - High Failure Rate Courses 	The establishment of a Retention/Graduation Task Force in Fall 2013 commenced with the discussion of a Remediation Report provided by OIRA. Members of the Task Force include the chairs of Math and English Departments, and the major participants of the DEV-Math and ENGL redesign. The data report facilitated discussion of issues and challenges while additional data requests were made to inform the eventual program redesign decisions.
Experience in the Major ↓ Continued Progress to Associate Degree Completion or Point of Transfer to Baccalaureate Program ↓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gateway Courses Pass Rates (PMP indicator) - Average one-year credit accumulation - High Failure Rate Courses - Full-Time First-Time Freshmen cohort tracking on Retention and Graduation Rate (ten years) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High Failure Rate Courses - Full-Time First-Time Freshmen cohort Retention and Graduation Rates - Average GPA by major - Average one-year credit accumulation by classification and major - Grade distribution by discipline 	The High Failure Rate Courses Report and the PMP indicators of gateway courses pass rates provided a discussion point in Provost's meeting with the Chairs. Further analysis were charged to Department chairs for course level student learning assessment,
Articulation between Associate and Baccalaureate Degree Programs ↓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Headcount of AA/AS transfers to BA/BS degree programs - Internal Transfer Retention and Graduation Rates from the Point of Transfer - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Headcount internal transfer from associate degree programs - Internal Transfer Retention and Graduation Rates from the Point of Transfer 	Data on the articulation between associate and baccalaureate degree programs are important at the school and program level assessment, to account of the small number of entering first-time freshmen and explain any abrupt increase or decrease in enrollment within programs. SSPM analyses were requested for program review (during 2013-2014, for the departments of Social Work, SBS, and Biology), and the data support for the reaccreditation of the School of Business by ACBSP.)
Continued Progress to Baccalaureate Degree Completion ↓	Retention and Graduation Rate of Baccalaureate Students Reports (Ten Year Trend)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Percentage of graduates taking capstone courses 	The Retention/Graduation Rate Report provided discussion points at the Retention/Graduation Task

		- Capstone courses pass rate	Force to identify where challenges are most evident.
Graduation ↓ Graduate Outcomes and Alumni Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time to Degree Completion - Certification Exam pass rates - Number of Degree Awarded - Graduating student satisfaction measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Graduating Student Survey by program. - Measures from CUNY-conducted Associate degree graduate survey (annual); and the Baccalaureate degree graduate survey (less frequent) <p>The college needs to develop a process utilizing the Career Office and Dean's Office to collect post-graduate outcomes data.</p>	The Retention/Graduation Rate Report provided discussion points at the Retention/Graduation Task Force to identify where challenges are most evident.

Organization of College Self-Study Report

The Self-Study Report will be organized as follows:

Executive Summary and Eligibility Certification Statement

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

- Mission of the College
- Description of the Institution
- Overview of the Self-Study Process and Goals
- Organization of Self-Study Report

Chapter 2: Standards 1 & 6 – Mission; Goals and Objectives

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) being examined
- A description of the topic(s) being examined with the institutional context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Suggestions and recommendations

Chapter 3: Standards 2 & 3 – Planning, Resource Allocation and Renewal; and Institutional Resources

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) being examined
- A description of the topic(s) being examined with the institutional context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Suggestions and recommendations

Chapter 4: Standards 4&5 – Leadership and Governance; and Administration

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) being examined
- A description of the topic(s) being examined with the institutional context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Suggestions and recommendations

Chapter 5: Standard 7 – Institutional Assessment

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) being examined
- A description of the topic(s) being examined with the institutional context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Suggestions and recommendations

Chapter 6: Standard 8&9 – Student Admissions and Retention; and Student Support Services

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) being examined
- A description of the topic(s) being examined with the institutional context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Suggestions and recommendations

Chapter 7: Standard 10 – Faculty

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) being examined
- A description of the topic(s) being examined with the institutional context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Suggestions and recommendations

Chapter 8: Standard 11&12 – Educational Offerings and General Education

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) being examined
- A description of the topic(s) being examined with the institutional context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Suggestions and recommendations

Chapter 9: Standard 13 – Related Educational Activities

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) being examined
- A description of the topic(s) being examined with the institutional context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Suggestions and recommendations

Chapter 10: Standard 14 – Assessment of Student Learning

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) being examined
- A description of the topic(s) being examined with the institutional context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Suggestions and recommendations

Chapter 11: Conclusion

- Summary of significant conclusions and recommendations

Editorial Style and Format for Middle States Subcommittee Reports

Each Self-Study Subcommittee report will contain the following sections:

1. Clear description of the *Standard(s)*, their charge(s) and specific area of focus to be addressed by committee.
2. Analytical and evaluative (quantitative and qualitative) responses to “Charge” questions and areas of focus of the Committee.
3. Identification of Strengths. An assessment of strengths in the context of institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement toward achievement of college mission and goals.
4. Identification of challenges, issues, needs, and/or concerns in the context of college mission and goals and *Standard(s)* being addressed.
5. Recommendations based upon assessment of findings.
6. Provision of supporting evidence, documentation, assessment instruments, assessment outcomes reports and analyses related to study area, and use of report templates where appropriate.

The final report for submission is to be no longer than 100 single spaced pages or 200 double spaced pages. Since the Steering Committee will receive documents from several subcommittees and offices, we request that individuals adhere to this style sheet to facilitate the ongoing writing, editing, and merging of multiple documents into the final self-study document. Note that these suggestions are intended to support the consolidation and editing of the final document, and not to reflect MLA, APA or any other style manuals.

All documents should be saved as a Microsoft Word document.

Font	Calibri
Font size	12-point for body of report, 10-point for tables
Spacing	Single space
Paragraph Style	Block paragraph, no extra white space between paragraphs; two-line return under headings
Margins	Standard – 1 inch
Header and Footer Margins	.5 inch
Bullets	• Black Bullet, Flush left
Chapter Headings	Bolded , flush left
Chapter Sub Headings	Not bolded, <u>underlined</u> , flush left
Headings Under Sub Headings	<i>Italicized</i> , flush left
Person	Third person
Voice	Active voice whenever possible
Tense	Present tense in general; other tenses may be used when appropriate

Acronyms	Acronyms for organizations, offices, etc. May be used in the body of the document. The first time an acronym is introduced; it must accompany the full name and be set off in parentheses. Thereafter, the acronym may stand alone. Ex. Student Success Progression Model (SSPM.)
----------	---

Additional Information for Self Study Standards Documents:

The steering committee and the subcommittees will use the following guidelines to produce their respective chapters for the self-study report. In addition to appointing a report editor, an editorial team has been established comprised of the editor and one member from each of the subcommittees. The editorial team will ensure that subcommittees have ready access to the “style expert.” The Self-study editor will conduct a workshop reviewing editorial guidelines and the use of the college style guide for the editorial team, steering committee and interested members of the subcommittees.

1. Documents should include a Header describing the Subcommittee number, the Standards addressed, draft or final, and date the document was submitted. Sample: Subcommittee 1: Standards 1 & 6 Mission & Integrity Draft Mar 31,2015 (initial or name of last author)
2. Avoid using text boxes. These do not cut and paste easily.
3. If you use bulleted or numbered lists, try to turn off the continuous numbering option.
4. Charts, graphs and figures: Descriptive or analytic text should accompany any charts, tables, or figures. If the section submitted contains multiple tables, etc., please create a table of tables to accompany the submission. Identify the source of data. For example, MEC *Snapshot, 2013* or *CUNY Student Experience Survey 2014*
5. Please do not use shading or highlighting in either the text or in tables. Keep the tables plain.

Figures: Label all types of illustrations (i.e., maps, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc.) as figures (fig. or figure) below the images and number consecutively using Arabic numerals. A title or legend (a brief explanation of a figure) should follow the figure number. Long figure legends can run the width of the figure, and short legends are centered.

Tables : Titles/captions should be: (1) flush left with “Table” heading and Arabic numeral; center the last, shortest line of the title or (2) center “TABLE” heading (in all caps) and Arabic numeral, followed by a double space and the title/caption centered and in all caps.

Note: When cutting and pasting from another document or e-mail body, *select the text, click Clear All under [Styles], then select Calibri 12 font size. Finally, Select [Paragraph], Spacing – Single; 0 pt before and after, and check “Don’t add space between paragraphs.”*

These steps will help avoid importing another document’s formatting or glitches and will expedite the final editing of the document.

Document Delivery

Email documents should be sent as attachments, not as e-mail message text. Note in the e-mail message if a hard copy is to follow.

The Self-Study SharePoint portal will serve as the document repository for each Subcommittee.

The purpose of the aforementioned guidelines is to facilitate the compiling and submitting of subcommittee reports in a consistent style so that the final report reflects a consistent, organized and well written document. While the final report will be submitted to the Middle States Team for review and approval, it is the College community that will utilize the study as a living document to use as a blueprint for continuous institutional improvement. The report will obviously serve as a starting point for the work of the Commission Staff, the site evaluation chair, members of the site team, and the Commission. Consequently, all committees will be expected to submit their findings and recommendations in a timely, coherent, concise, and objective manner. We request that jargon, abbreviations, and ellipses be discouraged, and that you emphasize that Microsoft Word Calibri 12 Font be used.

Subcommittee Co-chairs and members are reminded that the aim of the self-study is to understand, assess, analyze and seek to improve our institution, not simply to describe or defend policies, programs and/or practices. Accordingly, the study should be concerned with introspection and analysis, and the presentation based upon assessment of the findings and the presentation of evidence.

Self-Study Timeline

Date	Week	Deliverables/Action
April 3 , 2015	1st Week in April	Charge Questions Global Issues Action Plan critical dates applicable to SSD
April 10, 2015	2 nd Week in April	Revised charge questions, issues, critical dates submitted to Dean Jones & Steering Committee <i>(NOTE- This is Spring Break Week)</i>
April 17, 2015	3 rd Week in April	
April 24, 2015	4 th Week in April	Subcommittees revise questions per MSCHE VP recommendations IAEC meeting-review of status
May 1,2015	5 th week in April	Continued work on Draft Self Study Design Charge questions, global Issues, Support documents reviewed, revised, confirmed by Subcommittees
May 2015		
May 6, 2015	1 st week in May 2015	Draft of Self Study Design completed Draft posted on website for comments Suggested revisions/additions received from IAEC, Deans, Chairs, Directors ,Academic Council, IAEC meeting MEC College Public Forum and posted on website Draft discussed in School and Department Meetings
May 13, 2015	2 nd week in May 2015	Comments, suggestions reviewed & integrated following discussion at School and Department Meetings Self-Study Design submitted to MSCHE May 13 Preparations complete for VP Fogarty Visit (OAA, OAQA)
MAY 20, 2015		MSCHE VISIT BY VP ELLIE FOGARTY – SELF STUDY DESIGN REVIEW

May 20, 2015	3 rd Week in May 2015	Subcommittee incorporate recommendations made by MSCHE VP Fogarty Identify data, college and CUNY reports needed for next stage of writing Administration determines summer schedule/summer pay
May 27, 2015	4 th Week in May	Comments, edits, recommendations on drafts returned to Subcommittees Update on materials received and needed; Schedule for additional supporting documents established <i>Note: Graduation Week</i>
June, July, August 2015	Summer	Tasks per summer employment contracts completed Update timeline and deliverables as appropriate

Benchmarks met for April, May 2015 Timeline

Self Study Design Completed and Submitted (May)

VP Fogarty comment (informal) received and circulated (June)

Benchmarks in Process (IP) or Status Unknown (SU) for April, May 2015 Timeline

Subcommittee incorporate recommendations made by MSCHE VP Fogarty (IP)

Identify data, college and CUNY reports needed for next stage of writing (IP)

Administration determines summer schedule/summer pay (SU)

June 2015	Summer	Tasks per summer employment contracts identified Update timeline and deliverables as appropriate
July 2015		
July 10, 2015	2 nd week in July 2015	Committee Co-Chair one-on-one meetings with Subcommittee co- chairs
July 10, 2015	2 nd week in July 2015	Identify summer contract tasks/personnel/deadlines
July 10, 2015	2 nd week in July 2015	Subcommittee incorporate recommendations made by MSCHE VP Fogarty (report content)
July 17, 2015	3 rd Week in July 2015	Charge questions revised per VP Fogarty recommendations
July 17, 2015	3 rd Week in July 2015	Revised charge Questions submitted to Steering Committee for review, revision, approval
July 17, 2015	3 rd Week in July 2015	Identify data, college and CUNY reports needed for next stage of writing
July 24 2015	4 th Week in July 2015	Draft list of Support Documents/Evidence for each Subcommittee submitted to SC Co-Chairs

July 31 2015	5 th Week in July 2015	Steering Committee Meeting to review status of challenges met; additional resources TBD
	ongoing	Ongoing upload of documents and data reports to SharePoint portal

September 2015		
September 4, 2015	1 st week in September	Bi-weekly meetings; identification/creation of support materials due
September 11, 2015	2 nd Week in September	Continued work on Subcommittee reports Collection of evidence; documentation; data Orientation of new members
September 18, 2015	3 rd Week in September	Continued work on Subcommittee reports Collection of evidence; documentation; data Initiate writing of Annotated Draft Outline of Subcommittee Reports
September 25, 2015	4 th Week in September	Continued work on Subcommittee reports Collection of evidence; documentation; data Intra-Subcommittee Co-chairs meeting schedules established to ensure overlap in Standards 2, 7, 14 effectively addressed Presentations for each Subcommittee created for October Fora
October 2, 2015	5 th Week in September	Subcommittee meeting schedules established and submitted to SC Co-Chairs Presentations for each Subcommittee created for October Fora Preparation for community presentations

October 2015		
October 9, 2015	1st week in October 2015	Annotated Draft Outline of Subcommittee Standards submitted to Steering Committee Subcommittee presentation drafts submitted to Steering Committee for review, revision, approval prior to public presentations
October 16, 2015	2nd week in October 2015	Subcommittee presentation drafts submitted to Steering Committee for review, revision, approval prior to public presentations (Continued)
October 23, 2015	3rd Week in October 2015	Second Draft of Subcommittee Standards due Second draft submitted to CUNY Office Institutional Effectiveness for review and comments
October 30, 2015	4th Week in October	Public Fora

November 2015		
7	1st week in November 2015	Community comments integrated into Subcommittee Standards Second Draft of Standards reviewed and returned to Subcommittees
14	2nd week in November 2015	Continued refinement of standards and supporting evidence
20	3rd Week in November 2015	Continued refinement of standards and supporting evidence Note: Thanksgiving Break
27	4th Week in November	

December 2015		
December 4, 2015	1st week in December 2015	Continued refinement of standards and supporting evidence Middle States Conference
December 11, 2015	2nd week in December 2015	Continued refinement of standards and supporting evidence
December 18, 2015	3rd Week in December 2015	Continued refinement of standards and supporting evidence
December 27, 2015	4th Week in December	Holiday Break

January 2016		<i>OAQA/ MSCHE Leadership Team one-on-one meetings</i> with Standard Subcommittees scheduled throughout January and February Note: Winter Intersession
February 2016		Continue one-on-one meetings with Subcommittees
		College-Wide Retreat
March 2016		Continued refinement of standards and supporting evidence Third Draft Narrative – March 24th
April 2016		Final Draft Narratives Submitted – April 29th

May 2016		Final Narrative Report revisions and development of final Draft and shared with Steering Committee Subcommittees review, approve, and collate “evidence” and supporting documents
June 2016		Final Draft shared with Subcommittee Co-chairs and Steering Committee Visit of MSCHE Team Chair and Submission of Final Draft For Review MS Leadership Team completes final edits and revisions to Self-Study
July		Steering Committee Review Cabinet Review and Governance
August 2016		Review of Final College Self-Study College Community & Governance Bodies Final Self Study submitted to MSCHE
August /September 2016		Preparations initiated for Site visit Exhibits (August) Exhibit Room set-up (August) Mock visit interviews scheduled (September) Hotel/Travel arrangements completed (September) On site meeting schedule developed and approved by MSCHE team (September)
October 2016		MSCHE Accreditation Site Visit Team Report College Response
November /December 2016		Official Notification of MSCHE Commission action

Profile of Visiting Team

The profile for the visiting team that Medgar Evers College is requesting is one that is composed of individuals from “peer” institutions that have experience at a comprehensive, two and four year institution, serving predominantly non-traditional and first generation students within an urban environment. Medgar Evers College is a College which is committed to access and opportunity for students coming from urban secondary schools in New York. The College serves large numbers of students who enter with basic skills needs and who are challenged to remain because of financial and/or family circumstances. A college whose mission is tied to student

access, community service, and career development seeks individuals from the academy whose background would reflect expertise in the following areas:

- Senior Administration (President)
- Academic Affairs
- Assessment
- Administration and Finance
- Student Services
- Technology
- Retention
- Faculty Development