APPENDIX A
APPENDIX A: DEVELOPMENT OF THE SELF STUDY

I. Initial Planning

The planning for the Self Study began under former President Shirley Strum Kenny and Provost John A. Thorpe early in fall 1993. A decision was reached to undertake a Comprehensive Self Study with a focus on student outcomes assessment. The expectation was that development of a comprehensive self study would allow all components of the College community to participate in a thorough and searching reassessment of mission and goals, a description and analysis of what the College does well and where it fails to live up to its own expectations, efforts to integrate outcomes assessment and other measures of institutional effectiveness more fully into the College’s existing review and planning processes, and development of a set of priorities for the future and recommendations for change.

In November 1993, Middle States Association liaison Dr. Arturo Iriarte visited Queens College to discuss preliminary planning for the self study and evaluation team visit. He met with the President, the Provost, the Assistant to the Provost, the Planning Committee, the PSC Collective Bargaining Group, the Executive Committee of the College Personnel and Budget Committee, the Vice Presidents, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, the Deans and the leaders of the Student Governments. In December 1993, Professors Allan L. Ludman and Elizabeth S. Boylan attended the Commission on Higher Education’s workshop for institutions in the pre-design phase.

In September 1994, Dr. Kenny became President of SUNY at Stony Brook, and Dr. Stephen M. Curtis was appointed Acting President of Queens College. A search for a permanent successor to President Kenny concluded in May with the appointment of Dr. Allen L. Sessoms. Acting President Curtis and Provost Thorpe determined that the Self Study should proceed as planned, believing that the proposed timing of the visit--fall 1995, shortly after the arrival of Dr. Sessoms--will serve the College and the new president well. Coincidentally, the last visit by a Middle States Evaluation Team occurred during the first semester of Shirley Kenny’s presidency.

II. Appointment of the Steering Committee and Organization of Task Forces

Planning for appointments to the Steering Committee and its task forces occurred during the spring 1994 semester. Working from the Characteristics of Excellence, nine broad areas for self study were identified. Calls for nominees and volunteers to staff these nine task forces went out in spring 1994 to faculty, staff and students. From the responses, the Provost appointed the members of the Steering Committee and the chairs of the nine task forces. In consultation with the task force chairs, the Provost subsequently appointed almost 100 members to the nine task forces.
For the Planning Task Force, it was decided to use the entire membership of the Planning Committee which had just completed the College’s Five Year Plan for 1994-1999. Its primary role in the current Self Study was to complete an evaluation of the College’s planning process and to make recommendations on how to strengthen the process on the basis of their own recent experience. In other instances, individuals who had served on recent planning sub-committees were asked to continue on task forces working on the same or a related area, in an effort to maintain continuity in the evaluation/planning process and to make best use of expertise already developed and the investigation and analysis already accomplished. This was particularly true for the Task Force on Institutional Effectiveness and Change. The chair and several members of her task force had just completed work on the Outcomes Assessment sub-committee for the 1994-1999 Five Year Plan. They were able to build on their knowledge base, perform an even greater inventory of current practice, and develop a detailed set of recommendations for assessment of student learning and operational effectiveness.

III. Operation of the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee began to meet in March 1994, discussing the staffing of task forces, the need for a detailed charge to each task force, and the outline for a self study design. In September, the Committee completed selection of task force members, agreed upon a time line for submission of documents, reviewed potential sources of information, and discussed the proposed outline and format of the task force reports.

Efforts were begun to keep the entire College community informed about the purpose of the self study process and about the progress being made. Several issues of EXI, the faculty/staff newsletter, featured articles about the self study process and the work of the task forces, and posed questions for members of the College community to consider during this time of reflection and assessment. In October 1994, President Curtis highlighted the self study process in the Faculty Assembly. The Steering Committee chair met with the new editors of the student newspapers, The QUAD and Queens World, to develop regular means of communication with student readers and the local community. Both subsequently published articles on the self study process.

In December 1994, three members of the Steering Committee attended the Commission’s workshop for institutions developing a self study. Later that month, the full Self Study Design was submitted to the Commission, and with minor revisions, approved. Also during December, Dr. Iriarte met with Acting President Curtis, Provost Thorpe, Steering Committee chairperson Boylan and members of the Executive Committee of the Queens College Foundation Board to insure that there was a common understanding about the purpose of the self study and external evaluation, and agreement on time-frame.

From the end of January 1995 to the end of March 1995, the Steering Committee met nine times before approving the release of a draft report. Five campus hearings occurred in early May. Following the hearings, a second draft was prepared for review by
the Steering Committee. Upon further revision in late May, the Steering Committee approved the Self Study.

In late March, Dr. Ruth Leventhal was named chair of the Evaluation Team. Dr. Leventhal visited Queens College on May 1, 1995 to review preparations for the site visit. The date of the site visit was set for October 15-18, 1995.

IV. Operation of Task Forces

A. Mission, Goals and Institutional Integrity

1. Charge to the Task Force

The major job of the Task Force is to develop a forceful statement which accurately and concisely describes the basic mission of the College. To place this statement in historical context, some preliminary study is needed. This study should carefully review the Mission Statement of the 1985; the 1986 Evaluation of the Middle States Association; and the Mission Statement in the Periodic Review Report of 1991. After a thorough discussion of these documents, the Task Force should consider the extent to which the basic mission remains unchanged. In assessing the central elements of the mission, consideration will be given to several factors: the financial crisis of the 1980’s and 1990’s; the changes in student population; and the new initiatives undertaken by the college in curricular development, e.g. world studies, high school-college collaboration, the Business and Liberal Arts program, and the minor in Journalism.

A statement of the mission will be drawn up after a thorough discussion of the above issues as well as any others suggested by members of the Task Force. The final report should include a comparative analysis of the 1994 mission with the description of the 1988 mission. Before writing a final draft, the mission statement will be reviewed by administrators, chairs, faculty, student leaders and alumni. Every attempt will be made to receive input from all interested parties.

2. Process and Procedures

The Task Force met eight times between October and December 1994. Various draft mission statements were prepared and considered by members of the Task Force in order to produce a coherent vision that could then be formulated into a single statement. The discussions were lively, incisive and (many reported) interesting; student representatives made notably valuable contributions to the discussion, in particular in encouraging the Task Force to formulate a general yet distinctive statement on the education offered by Queens College.

The old adage proved true: it is far more difficult to write a short statement than a long one. The Chair had prepared a working document listing three crucial areas of
concern: educational mission, faculty, and community. It quickly became clear from the
discussion that the nature of the liberal arts education offered to the College’s diverse
student body would be difficult to formulate succinctly. Discussion of draft statements on
educational mission made it clear that there was a disagreement of emphasis, if not of
substance, within the Task Force. A substantial portion of the Task Force insisted that any
mission statement should emphasize the distinctive and unique nature of a Queens College
education, that Queens is not simply offering a standard liberal arts education, but a liberal
arts education enriched by a vast array of curricular options tailored especially for our
multi-generational and multi-ethnic student population. Other members, however, were
concerned that an emphasis on the special nature of our offerings would de-emphasize the
importance of the College’s commitment to a liberal arts education. It was ultimately
resolved that these points could be balanced in a mission statement by placing equal
emphasis on both points.

B. Educational Programs

1. Charge to the Task Force

The aim is to produce a documented description and analysis of the college’s
educational programs. “Analysis” here means discussion of problems as well as strengths,
with recommendations for solutions to the problems and timetables for the solutions.
“Educational programs” means all of the college’s instructional efforts, curricular and
extracurricular, undergraduate and graduate, day and evening, on campus and off, credit
and non-credit, together with all the related matters of library, academic support services,
and learning resources.

The Task Force expects to consider: (a) consistency of programs with the
college’s mission; (b) effectiveness of programs and soundness of existing arrangements for
curriculum innovation, program review, quality control, and data collection; (c) adequacy
of both day and evening course offerings, services, enrichment activities, and library
resources; (d) soundness of course requirements, both general requirements and
programmatic ones; (e) prospects for recently inaugurated programs and adequacy of related
library resources; (f) feasibility of further curricular innovations despite budget constraints;
(g) library support of the educational mission and curricula of the college, quality of the
collections and their relevance to the educational mission, availability of the access to
materials on and off campus, efforts concerning college-wide information technology; (h)
adequacy of support services in instructional media, academic advising, academic
computing, students’ English language development, and skills development; (i) extent to
which the college is meeting its responsibilities in respect to nontraditional students; and (j)
scope and quality of the college’s non-credit programs aimed at community needs, and
other community outreach activities.

The Task Force will review: existing college planning documents; polls of
students, faculty, and alumni conducted for recent departmental self-studies and reviews;
students' evaluations of courses and faculty; data on departmental enrollments, majors, and degrees conferred; data pertaining to skills of entering students and to retention and attrition of students; and data on use of the library and of learning resources in general.

Task Force members will confer with faculty and administrators who have expertise in particular areas of importance. The Task Force will interview department chairs, divisional deans, department advisors of MA programs, directors of programs in area and ethnic studies, the Assistant Provost for Interdisciplinary and Special Studies, the Dean for Experimental Programs, the Director of Academic Advising, the chairs of the Academic Senate's committees on curriculum and on scholastic standards (undergraduate and graduate), the Director of the Academic Computer Center, pre-professional advisors in law, medicine, and teaching, the Director of the Cooperative Education Program, the Director of Alumni Affairs, and the Director of the Environmental Teaching and Research Center. Throughout its deliberations, the Task Force will seek to take account of views of all interested parties. Students, faculty, alumni, and administrators will be encouraged, by means both formal and informal, to share with the Task Force their thoughts concerning the educational programs of the college.

2. Process and Procedures

The Task Force as a whole usually met once a week during fall 1994. Smaller working groups into which the Task Force was divided for examination of particular issues met many additional times. Many authorities from within the College were interviewed, some by the Task Force as a whole, but most by the working groups. Questionnaires (attached to the Task Force report) were prepared to serve as a basis for discussion in interviews and to generate written responses for consideration by the Task Force. One questionnaire was distributed by deans to departmental chairs and faculty; another was distributed by Task Force working groups to directors and staff of centers and programs collateral to departmental curricula. Reports of interviews, written responses to questionnaires, and working-group assessments of particular matters were prepared by the groups, distributed to the entire Task Force membership, discussed at general meetings, and incorporated by the chair into a draft report. After discussion and revision, it was approved by consensus as the final report of the Task Force.

C. Financial and Physical Resources

1. Charge to the Task Force

The charge of the Task Force on Financial and Physical Resources is to describe the financial and physical facilities of the college, how they have changed since the last Middle State review, to assess the effectiveness of the budgetary and capital planning processes of the College, and to make recommendations based on that assessment. The basic operating premise of the Task Force is that the role of the College's resources is to facilitate its educational programs (as broadly defined by the Task Force on Educational
Programs and Resources), that is, to foster the environment in which teaching, learning, research, and other supportive activities can take place and, ideally, thrive. As noted in *Characteristics of Excellence*, the College’s financial resources should be sufficient “to assure the quality and continuity of . . . programs and services.” Similarly, the physical facilities “should meet the needs of the institution’s programs and functions.”

The report of the Task Force on Resources is directed at understanding the nature of the College’s resource constraints and how they have affected its educational programs. It is to focus not only on outcomes but also on processes. In a period of fiscal constraint, how well do the financial and facilities planning processes work and how do members of the College community feel about the fairness of resource allocations? The Task Force will not estimate the specific budgetary needs of individual departments, programs, or administrative offices in the College; nor will it evaluate the administrative efficiency of budget and facilities staff. Rather the Task Force will attempt to identify the general budgetary constraints and institutional inefficiencies that affect departments and programs in general.

Specifically, the Task Force on Financial and Physical Resources will:

- Describe the composition and allocation of the College’s financial resources and the state of the physical plant, including: current levels and sources of funds; significant additions or deletions over the last ten years; current and projected operating budgets; procedures by which funds are allocated to the College; procedures by which funds are allocated within the College; current inventory of the physical plant, indicating recent changes; inventory of projects in process and those in planning; current maintenance levels and recent trends; the relationship between financial planning and physical facilities planning.

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the budget and the budgetary process.
  - How well do total resources meet the College’s needs based on its mission and goals?
  - How flexible are resources?
  - Do internal budgetary processes promote an efficient and equitable distribution of the College’s resources?
  - What are the categories of unmet budgetary needs and what are the estimated shortfalls in each category?
  - What plans does the College currently have for addressing unmet needs?
  - What plans does the College have for improving resources in light of program plans for the next few years?
  - In what other ways can the College better allocate its existing resources among competing needs (departments and categories of spending)?

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the process of planning and maintaining facilities.
  - How well do the College’s physical facilities meet its needs based on its
mission and goals? What are the College's unmet facilities needs?
- How adequate is the maintenance of facilities? What are the unmet
  maintenance needs?
- What plans does the College have to deal with inadequacies in physical
  facilities and their maintenance?
- What additional recommendations can the Task Force make for
  improving physical facilities and maintenance?

The Task Force will take into consideration the recently completed Report of
the 5-Year Planning Committee on Facilities, but shall be free to form independent
conclusions about the College's needs. With respect to the analysis of both financial and
physical resources, the Task Force's evaluation of allocations and/or needs must take into
account a wide range of perspectives from across the campus community (students, faculty,
departments, programs, support services), and the Task Force's membership will be
broadly constituted with representatives from the administration, all academic divisions, and
the student body.

2. Process and Procedures

This task force was constituted to provide broad representation and particular
experience with the College's finances and facilities. The inclusion of administrators as
Task Force members has strengthened the Task Force's ability to carry out its charge.
Much of the discussion in Task Force meetings involved presentations and "interviewing"
of members who bear administrative responsibilities for finances and facilities. Student
members were selected who had particular interests and experience with the kinds of issues
considered by the Task Force. Three subcommittees were formed: on the tax-levy budget,
non-tax-levy funding sources, and facilities.

In addition to reliance on extant administrative data, the Task Force collected
data by interviewing the Provost, four academic deans, the Vice President for
Administration, the Vice President for College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems,
and a number of other administrators. Department chairs were also surveyed about the
impact of financial and facilities constraints on academic programs and about perceptions of
the effectiveness and fairness of the budgetary process. Students were surveyed concerning
facilities as part of the larger questionnaire developed by the Task Force on Students.

1 The faculty members included a sociologist with strength in survey research and a physicist who has
previously served as the College's director of facilities; these faculty members had also both served as departmental
chairs. The representative of the arts division previously served as division dean for 11 years and, prior to that, as
chair of the Department of Romance Languages. The Task Force Chair is a professor of economics with budgeting
and administrative experience.
D. Students

1. Charge to the Task Force

The Task Force will:

(a) describe the current student population in terms of place of residence, age, gender, economic status, ethnicity, and credit load;

(b) describe each college entity that provides services for the students as to its name, purpose, structure, and program description; the availability and accessibility of the services; information distribution; the use of the service; record keeping and assessment procedures; and planning; and

(c) evaluate the effectiveness of the services by analyzing the relationship between the service provided and the mission and goals of the college; the flexibility of the services to meet changing student needs; the student demand as compared to the availability of services; college plans to equalize the demand and availability; identification of the needed services; and college plans to meet additional needs.

2. Process and Procedures

At an initial meeting of the Task Force, its charge was discussed, sub-committees selected, materials distributed, and future meetings organized. College entities providing services, opportunities, and activities for students were organized into specific groupings that then served as the focal point for each sub-committee. Subsequently, the entire Task Force met to share progress reports and discussed those reports. A questionnaire to sample student opinion was developed and distributed. The data were analyzed by Professor Dean Savage, Sociology, and his student assistants.

E. Faculty

1. Charge to the Task Force

A description and subsequent analysis will be undertaken of the following aspects of faculty life: characteristics of the faculty—their distribution with respect to discipline, rank, age, gender, ethnicity, etc; institutional policies and procedures governing faculty employment, promotion, and retention; faculty service to the institution and to the wider academic community; faculty responsibilities and institutional support for faculty performance; faculty participation in policy and program formation and in governance of the institution; quality of instruction and institutional support for instructional quality; and opportunity for innovation and experimentation in teaching and research and institutional support for such innovation.
The analysis will focus on the extent to which the faculty are meeting the College's expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service, and on the extent to which the College is supporting faculty work and development in these three areas. Progress towards diversifying the faculty and meeting Affirmative Action goals will be documented and analyzed.

2. Process and Procedures

The Task Force on Faculty met for two hours every two weeks during the fall 1994 semester. It discussed the issues of greatest concern to members and distinguished the various aspects of faculty life that would be considered further. Information on each of these aspects was gathered and analyzed, and recommendations formulated. Each member took responsibility for writing one section of the Task Force's final report. The Task Force on Faculty interviewed the Associate Provost, the deans, the Director of Institutional Research, department chairs, program directors, faculty, and students.

F. Governance

1. Charge to the Task Force

The charge to the Task Force on Governance was to: describe the legally constituted bodies that enable the College to fulfill its mission and goals; describe the roles of the Board of Trustees, CUNY Administration and the Chancellor in College Governance; describe the roles of Queens College President, Provost and Deans in College Governance; describe and evaluate the governance roles of faculty, i.e., department personnel and budget committees, department curriculum committees, divisional screening committees, College Personnel and Budget (P & B) Committee, and relevant sub-committees and/or ad hoc committees; describe and evaluate the governance roles of the Academic Senate (Senate membership and representation, Senate committees and their duties, and the role of Search and Review Committees); describe and evaluate the governance roles of the University Faculty Senate as it applies to Queens College; describe and evaluate the roles of bargaining units in governance (bargaining unit for faculty and non-instructional professionals, the Professional Staff Congress, and the bargaining unit for full and part-time administrative staff - District Council 37); describe and evaluate the relationship between governance bodies, i.e., collaboration and cooperation between CUNY administration and campus governance, and collaboration and cooperation between the College P & B, Academic Senate, students, and non-instructional professional staff; describe the current relationship between the CUNY Law School and Queens College; and identify areas in need of improvement.

2. Process and Procedures

The Task Force on Governance held eleven meetings during the fall 1994 semester. The Task Force was divided into sub-committees based upon the different issues...
raised in its charge. Five sessions were devoted to interviewing the Provost and Associate Provost and three other current or former administrators. Three current or former governance leaders were interviewed by sub-committees. The list of questions for the interviews was made available to interviewees before they came before the Task Force. Task Force sub-committees were charged with writing relevant parts of the document.

G. Organization and Administration

1. Charge to the Task Force

The charge to the Task Force on Organization and Administration was to:

(a) review the description of the formal organization and administrative structure of the College and its relationship to the City University of New York;
(b) describe recent documents that affect the relationship between administration and faculty within the College and between the College and the City University of New York, and evaluate their impact on the College;
(c) solicit opinions from administrators, chairs, and faculty members concerning their perceptions about the ways in which the administrative structure functions, and analyze discrepancies among the perceptions; and
(d) develop evaluative statements concerning the extent to which the administrative structure meets the needs of the College, and make recommendations as to how improvements could be made.

To accomplish the solicitation of opinions noted in item (c) above, the Task Force used the following four questions: 1. What has changed in the administration? 2. Why was it changed? 3. Was the change effective? 4. What else needs to be changed?

2. Process and Procedures

The Task Force was composed of six faculty members, one of whom serves as the Dean of Education, and one administrator, the Senior Registrar. Among the six faculty members, there were representatives of all four major academic divisions of the College and the Library. At initial meetings, basic information about the Middle States self study process, a draft of the Task Force's charge and the College's organizational chart and statistical profile were distributed. The Task Force then began discussions about how to solicit opinions from the campus community, and settled on four questions (cited above in the charge) which were to guide its data gathering and analyses.

---

2Two of the six currently serve as chairs of departments, and two others have served as chairs within the past ten years. One present chair has also previously served as Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. One former chair presently chairs the Academic Senate and has served as Dean of Mathematics and Natural Sciences. Among the chairs and former chairs, several have been members of important subcommittees of the College Personnel and Budget Committee—the Executive Committee and the Committee of Six, the latter responsible for recommendations on tenure and promotion.
Questionnaires were sent to all administrators listed on the College’s organizational charts in 1986, 1990, and 1994 and to all departmental chairs who served in other than an acting capacity from 1986 to 1994. Of the 122 surveys sent, only 32 were returned. The responses were evaluated and members agreed upon which issues to highlight in the Task Force Report. In the course of the Task Force’s deliberations, certain issues additional to those stated in questionnaire responses were also raised. It was decided that these issues should be included in the Report given the extensive experience that Task Force members had had in the administration of the College; such issues are labeled accordingly.

H. Institutional Effectiveness and Change

1. Charge to the Task Force

The Task Force on Institutional Effectiveness and Change is charged with describing and analyzing procedures used by Queens College for evaluation of its educational effectiveness, the assignment of responsibility for this evaluation of educational effectiveness, the use to which its findings are put, and the need for additional procedures for collection of outcomes information. In accordance with this general charge, the Task Force will collect and analyze information on current College procedures and processes to assess:

(a) the quality of the student academic experience during college, that is, the extent to which students have mastered the knowledge, skills and abilities that are incorporated in the mission statement;
(b) student ethical and personal development during college, that is, the extent to which students have an understanding of themselves, other individuals and their environment and participate in activities related to those concerns;
(c) students after college, that is, the extent to which graduates have been prepared to perform as intelligent citizens after they leave the institution;
(d) faculty achievement in teaching, scholarship, creative activity and service, that is, the extent to which faculty participation enhances the intellectual and psychological climate of the college;
(e) administration and staff contribution to the College, that is, the extent to which the administration provides leadership, and the administration and staff facilitate the effective operation of the College; and
(f) the quality of campus life, that is, the extent to which there is a climate conducive to student learning and socialization and hospitable to the multicultural, multiethnic and multilingual community of the college.

---

3 Questionnaires were not sent to administrators or department chairs who were no longer employed by the College.
The information collected in these six areas will answer the following questions: What procedures and processes are used by the institution and who is responsible for instituting them? What procedures and processes are used by departments and who is responsible for instituting them? What procedures and processes are used in the classroom and who is responsible for instituting them? To what use are evaluative findings put? On the basis of the evaluation of existing assessment processes, the Task Force will develop recommendations as to what additional procedures and processes are still needed to assess student academic experience; student ethical and personal development; graduate performance; faculty achievement in teaching, scholarship, creative activity and service; administration and staff contribution; and the quality of campus life. It will develop recommendations concerning who should be responsible for instituting additional procedures and processes evaluating institutional effectiveness, and describe and analyze the projected use of these additional evaluative procedures.

2. Process and Procedures

The task force members held weekly meetings throughout the fall 1994 semester. Numerous documents and materials were distributed to task force members and a variety of people were interviewed. A systematic review of each of the six areas identified in the charge was undertaken to determine what procedures/processes of outcomes assessment were currently in place and who was responsible for them. Each member of the task force selected one of the six areas in the charge and investigated the following: what is the College now doing in this area, who is doing it, and what else needs to be done? The student academic experience was addressed first and required the greatest amount of time. Attention was paid to both quantitative and qualitative assessment methods as is suggested in Characteristics of Excellence. Information needed from departments was listed as each area was reviewed; these data were collected through a questionnaire compiled in late November and distributed to department chairs (see Appendix A of Task Force report). Each task force member was asked to follow-up with department chairs to insure a good response rate. Numerous sources of information were used to gather data including books, articles, reports, and surveys. A faculty member made a presentation to the Task Force on the National Educational Longitudinal Survey 1988. A complete listing of resources can be found in Appendix A of the Task Force report.

I. Planning

1. Charge to the Task Force

The Task Force on Planning established the following aims:

1. To present a coherent and comprehensive plan for the College, to be implemented over the course of the next five years (1994-99). This plan should particularly address the following issues, recognized in previous planning work as of special urgency for the College: student advisement; outcomes assessment; curricular development; faculty
hiring, retention, tenure, promotion, and development; the place of graduate education at
the College; implementation of new computer and communications technologies; library
services; and renovation and maintenance of the physical plant.

2. To assess the College's current planning mechanisms, examining how
effective the establishment and realization of planning objectives has been. In this
assessment, the Task Force should be particularly concerned to evaluate how the planning
process at the College is linked to resource allocation—that is, how an ideal sense of where
the College should move in the future is tempered by an awareness of the necessary
limitations to planning imposed by budgetary considerations.

2. Process and Procedures

The Planning Task Force met weekly during the spring 1994 semester, as it
drafted the College's Five-Year Plan for 1994-1999, presented to former President Kenny
in June 1994. During the spring meetings, even as it did the actual work of planning for
the next five years, the Task Force began to assess the College's overall process of
institutional planning, discussing, for instance, the relative merits of a five-year plan that
would try to address all the College's needs and a plan, more limited in scope, that would
instead target the College's most urgent problems.

During the fall 1994 semester, the Task Force met less frequently, primarily
to gather response from the larger College community to the "Recommendations,"
distributed across the campus at the start of the 1994-1995 academic year. Two extensive
public hearings were held on October 12 and 13, at which time the Task Force heard
responses—objections, agreements, further recommendations—to its Plan and answered
questions provoked by that Plan. The Task Force met again several times late in the fall
semester to draft and revise its final report.

The Task Force included student representatives, from both graduate and
undergraduate programs and from both day and evening sessions (one student is also an
elected member of the student government); faculty from the College's three divisions, the
School of Education, and the Library; representatives of the College Deans and of the
Executive Committees of the College-wide Personnel and Budget Committee and Academic
Senate; and several of those administrators (Vice Presidents and the Provost) responsible for
implementing most of the Planning Committee's recommendations. Meetings in December
1994 gave Task Force members the opportunity to respond to the draft report, and a fully
revised version was then prepared based upon suggestions for revision. The revised report
was approved by the full Task Force in December 1994.
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GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

The Planning Committee on Academic Program and Support Services Review was appointed by President Shirley Strum Kenny in 1987, in response to concerns expressed by the 1986 Middle States Association visiting team over the lack of formal academic program review. The Planning Committee proposed a review program consisting of an intensive departmental review and a review by a selected external panel. The recommendations of this Planning Committee, endorsed by the College Planning Committee, formed the basis of the process which was initiated by the Office of the Provost in the 1989-90 academic year. Some of the procedures have been modified for the reviews initiated in 1992 and beyond in response to new policies being promulgated by the University.

The self-study is designed to encourage members of a department to analyze its curriculum in relation to the goals of the department, the College and the University; to investigate the effectiveness of its curriculum in relation to the desired outcomes (as perceived by students, alumni, and faculty members); to review various procedures to determine strengths and weaknesses; to consider needed changes; to evaluate the effects of current levels of resources on the ongoing programs; and to suggest needed changes in program, department organization, and resources. A self-study that is exclusively laudatory or damning is likely to be less useful to the department and the College, than one which tries to describe as accurately as possible the current status and needs of specific units. Following the department's self-study, a panel of external reviewers (two or three depending on the program's size and structure), will visit the campus for two days to meet with members of the department, administrators and students.

The model of internal self-study, followed by external review, parallels the accreditation process used by the Middle States Association. They describe the purposes of the two elements as follows:

The self-study allows an institution to analyze "its functions, appraise its educational effectiveness, review its on-going planning procedures, and discover means by which its work can be strengthened." The primary function of an evaluation visit by a team of experienced academic colleagues from other institutions "is to study an institution's analysis of its own work and to give the institution the views of competent outsiders on the validity of that self-analysis...It is a healthy sign when their work can be predominantly corroboration of an institution's own findings, a cause for serious concern when they identify major problems undetected by the institution."

The departmental review should be conducted in a manner consistent with these stated purposes.
A. THE INTERNAL DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW AND REPORT

It is recommended that the department chairperson appoint a departmental review committee to prepare the self-study report. Reports from other institutions and accrediting agencies indicate that the generation of the report will be facilitated if a small core of full-time, tenured, senior faculty are involved in the data gathering and writing of the report. Obviously, as broad a representation of the faculty, students, staff, and alumni as possible should be included in the data pool.

The Provost's Office and the Office of Institutional Research are prepared to meet with department P&B's and review committees to assist them in any way needed. The Office of Institutional Research will provide a historical record of FTE's produced, students graduating with degrees from the department; the number of full-time faculty, instructional staff, and support staff assigned to a department. Department's requiring additional information should request it from the Office's Director, Dr. Margaret McAuliffe, 997-5788. Representatives from the department will meet with the Provost, Associate Provost and Dean prior to initiating the review process to review the guidelines, expectations and timetable.

The Self-Study is a report developed by the department's faculty. The major purpose of the internal review is to provide a an analysis of the current status of the department and a projection of where the department aspires to be in the next five years or so. As such, the review should project needed changes, the resources necessary to make the changes, and the plans to obtain needed resources.

A recommended format and topics to be covered are indicated below and are designed to assist the department in developing a comprehensive self-study report. While departments are free to organize the information as appropriate for their discipline, it is expected that the major elements will be covered in the self-study report. Departments should check with the Provost's Office if they wish to deviate significantly from this format.

The Self-Study Report will be presented to the Dean, the Provost and the President, and to members of the external review panel. New CUNY guidelines require that a copy be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Self-Study Report is considered a privileged document, that is, the College administration will not release it to others; the department is free to share the report as it chooses.
Self-Study Topics

Mission

- A statement of the department's sense of itself and its relation to the mission of the College and the University.

Resources

- A statement of the current state of the resources (human, physical and fiscal) which are available to carry out the department's goals and objectives, and an evaluation of prospects for the future.

- An analysis of the department's sources of funding, both tax-levy and non tax-levy support, including grants awarded to individual faculty members. Means for encouraging faculty to obtain external support for instructional and research purposes should be described.

- An analysis of the scope and adequacy of centralized facilities such as the library, film library, computer hardware and software, and learning resource centers to support the instructional and research needs of the department's programs.

Faculty

- A description of the current faculty:
  their number,
  teaching and research specializations,
  publications,
  extra-departmental teaching in the College and Graduate Center,
  participation in College committees.

- The composition and quality of the faculty should be analyzed with respect to:
  breadth of preparation,
  range of graduate schools attended,
  affirmative action goals,
  age distribution,
  participation in the governance of the College.

Tabular presentation of this information is encouraged. Appendices should contain current
curriculum vitae of all faculty and any evaluations of the department by professionals which are on public record.

- A description of recent faculty recruitment activities, including the search process and selection criteria.

- A description of departmental procedures for the evaluation of faculty (and staff, as appropriate) for re-appointment, tenure and promotion.

- A description of the department's efforts to facilitate faculty development, both in teaching and research.

- A description of the means by which adjunct faculty are recruited, selected, supervised and evaluated.

The Curriculum and Enrollments

- A presentation and analysis of the history of enrollments for the past ten years, based on data provided by the Office of Institutional Research. This should include data both on the number of majors (plus minors if applicable) and graduates, and on FTE student enrollments.

- An outline of the contribution of the department to the liberal arts and sciences goals of the Division and the College, both generally, as well as specifically for those courses qualifying as LASAR requirements. Include a description of how LASAR courses are reviewed in order to insure that the goals of LASAR are being met.

- An outline of the majors program with course descriptions appended, including a description of the typical path(s) of majors, gathered from transcripts as well as from current students. Comparisons should be drawn between the College's major and those offered by other reference colleges, both within and outside of CUNY. The requirements for the major should be analyzed with respect to the expectation that students should study more advanced and cumulatively integrated subject matter as they progress toward graduation, and with respect to the diversity of talents and ways of learning in the student body.

- The quality of advisement of majors and the frequency of student-faculty contact outside of class should be evaluated.

- Projections for the growth (or reduction) in the number of majors, and for new or revised direction in the major field, should be presented.

- An analysis of the relationship between specialized and pre-professional programs and the department's major, particularly those subject to certification by external agencies.
- A description of the role and relationship of the department to the College's School of General Studies and Summer Session, including a review of the process by which SGS and summer offerings are monitored.

- An analysis of the participation of non-majors in the department's courses, including a description of the typical paths of non-majors as they use the department's offerings.

- A description of the contribution of the department to other majors, interdisciplinary courses and programs, MA programs, Ph.D. programs, etc. The administrative, financial and academic roles played by departmental faculty in the programs of the CUNY Graduate School should be explained.

- A description of the range of "special programs" offered to matriculants, non-matriculants, and students with "special" needs. This includes, but is not limited to, remedial and developmental programs for academically disadvantaged students, and to programs for the physically challenged.

- A description of the means by which the department applies assessment mechanisms which assure the quality and viability of its programs and courses.

**Students**

- A summary and analysis of the career choices and perceptions of a random sample of recent graduates from the major, derived from the ETS standardized questionnaire and supplemented, as the department sees fit, by additional mail or telephone interviews.

- A summary and analysis of perceptions of current undergraduate majors based on the ETS standardized questionnaire, with additional discussions/focus groups as desired.

**Critical Analysis and Priorities for the Future**

- A description and analysis of the department's strengths and problems, proposed changes, and unsolved problems on which an external review panel might provide counsel, as viewed by the department's staff. Special attention should be given to issues regarding faculty recruitment and retention, especially with regard to women and minorities.

- A plan for the future direction of the department, consistent with the mission and future direction of the College. See the attached document for the statement of the mission of the College.
B. THE SELECTION OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

Given the multiple purposes of Queens College academic programs, the external review personnel must be recruited from several pools of expertise. Visitors based in the discipline under review should have relevant experience in at least one of the following areas:

a) liberal arts and sciences programs at the highest levels of quality;
b) academic research at the highest levels of quality;
c) large scale (preferably public) college education at the highest levels of quality.

The department will furnish the Dean with names of those individuals who fulfill the various expertise functions listed above, along with pertinent biographical information about the potential reviewers (e.g. current position, area of specialization, relevant administrative experience, where and when the Ph.D. was granted, other distinguishing academic credentials). Additional names will be sought by the Dean from other knowledgeable persons. The Dean will obtain approval from the President and Provost regarding persons to make up the pool of reviewers. The Dean will formalize all arrangements with members of the review panel. Appropriate honoraria will be offered to the chairperson and members of the review panel.

C. GUIDELINES FOR THE SITE VISIT

The departmental Self-Study Report will be sent to the review panel members by the Dean at least two weeks in advance of the visit. The site visit will typically involve two full days on campus, consisting of interviews and the drafting of the final report. The Dean, in consultation with members of the Department, will establish a schedule for the visit. Minimally, it will include:

- a charge to the reviewers by the President and meeting with the Dean and Provost;
- a tour of facilities;
- examination of additional material, e.g. course syllabi, sample examinations and student work, scholarly or creative works of the faculty, etc.;
- meeting with the Chairperson and P&B Committee;
- individual meetings with all full time faculty;
- meetings with adjunct personnel, graduate students and staff;
- meetings with students, and if possible, recent graduates;
- attending classes;
- an exit interview with the President, Provost and Dean.
The focus of the panel during the site visit should be on rounding out their information about the department under review; evaluating the department's performance relative to teaching, research and support; identifying problems and issues for discussion in the curriculum, teaching or research efforts of the department; and making suggestions wherever appropriate. The Dean will make arrangements with the review team concerning submission of their final report. It is expected that it will be submitted within two weeks of the site visit.

D. DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWER'S REPORT

As soon as the Dean receives the Report, he/she will distribute it to the department, the President and Provost. The department will then examine the report for accuracy, and analyze its recommendations. It is expected that it will serve as a basis for broad discussion within the department. The department will develop a written response to the Report, correcting factual errors or misperceptions if any, and offering a plan to incorporate the suggestions made by the reviewers into the department's action agenda for the next 5-7 years. The goals articulated by the department for itself should be as explicit as possible. The department's written response should be developed as quickly as possible, no later than one month after receiving the reviewer's report.

E. MEETING WITH THE COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

When the department's response is complete, the Dean will set up a meeting of the department's P&B with the President, Provost and Dean attending. The focus of the meeting will be the reviewer's report and the department's response. The goal of the meeting is to establish a set of goals for the department for the next 5-7 years, and to work out a timetable to effect agreed upon change. The Provost will summarize the goals and timetable in a document called an Academic Plan, which will be given to the department, and which will accompany the department's Self-Study Report, the reviewers' report and the department's response to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.
QUEENS COLLEGE OF CUNY
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
TIMETABLE AND ADMINISTRATIVE CHECKLIST

Late spring -
Selection of departments for review during next academic year.

Late spring - September
Organizational meetings with departments, Divisional Dean, Provost, Associate Provost and Director of Institutional Research to go over objectives and to outline the process.

September - December
Writing of Self-Study by departments.

September - October
Survey of faculty, student and alumni perceptions.

December 1
Deans develop list of potential external reviewers with department, and submit list to Provost for final selection by President. Each name should be accompanied by brief statement of qualifications and affiliation.

December 15
Department submits Self-Study to Dean and Provost for review. Dean works with Department on editing as needed, and checks that Self-Study contains current statistical information on department's FTE's, graduates, etc. When approved by Dean and Provost, site visit is scheduled. Self-Study is mailed to reviewers by Dean. If incomplete, Self-Study returned to the department for further work.

December - January
President and Provost approve list of potential external reviewers and identify reviewers to chair site visit team. Dean begins scheduling of site visits for departments whose Self-Studies were approved.

Late February - late March
Site visits coordinated by Dean. Dean responsible for travel plans, hotel accommodations and other local arrangements. Schedule of meetings to be arranged by Dean and to include:
---President's charge to reviewers, attended by Provost, Associate Provost and Dean;
---tour of appropriate physical facilities;
---meetings with chairman and P&G; with individual faculty; with support staff; with students (graduate and undergraduate) with alumni;
---auditing of selected classes;
---time for reviewers' discussion and writing;
---exit interview with President, Provost, Associate Provost, and Dean.

Prior to site visit
Dean is responsible for ensuring that President, Provost and Associate Provost have complete, final versions of the Self-Study including all appendices, a site visit schedule and brief biographies on the reviewers.

Within two weeks of site visit and no later than April 15th
Report of site visit team due in Dean's Office. Dean to distribute report to Department, President, Provost and Associate Provost. Department (all full time faculty) reviews report and develops brief response statement, to be forwarded to President, Provost, Associate Provost and Dean within one month of receipt of the reviewers' report.

No later than mid-May
Meeting of department's Personnel and Budget Committee with President, Provost, Associate Provost and Dean to discuss Self-Study, site visit report, department's response statement, and future directions of the department.