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## Introduction and Contents

Queens College of the City University of New York is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). At ten year intervals, the College prepares a detailed self-study to demonstrate compliance with the Commission’s standards, and to develop recommendations for improvement. The next self-study will be submitted to MSCHE in 2017.

The Commission, in close collaboration with its member institutions, recently issued a revised set of standards. Queens College is privileged to be one of 15 institutions, selected as part of the Collaborative Implementation Project (CIP), to base its self-study on these new standards. CIP participating institutions will work together to develop best practices for the self-study process, and will share their experiences with other institutions as they embark on self-studies.

We present here the Self-Study Design, a guiding document describing how Queens College will prepare and benefit from a self-study. It provides direction to the working groups that will analyze the College’s processes and performance, and it informs the College community as a whole of the importance of the self-study process and the opportunities for participation. The Design is organized according to Chapter 3 of the MSCHE CIP document, [Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B28CAPM6eyUPYVp2RjZqd3B5clE&authuser=0) as follows:

1. [Institutional Overview p](#_2et92p0)age 3
. . . describes the [mission,](#_3dy6vkm) [recent developments,](#_1t3h5sf) and anticipated directions of the College. It outlines the [steps taken to date i](#_2s8eyo1)n preparation for the self-study, as well as the needs and priorities to be addressed.
2. [Model for the Self Study p](#_3rdcrjn)age 8
. . . describes how a comprehensive self-study model aligns with College priorities and supports continuous improvement.
3. [Intended Outcomes p](#_lnxbz9)age 9
. . . describes what Queens College hopes to achieve through self-analysis, and describes desired outcomes that will support the College’s planning and renewal processes.
4. [Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and
Working Groups](#_1ksv4uv) page 11
. . . describes how the committee and working groups will work together within the framework of the College as a whole. Members appointed to date are listed here.
5. [Charges to the Working Groups p](#_2dlolyb)age 15
. . . describes the tasks and responsibilities of each working group, and provides guidance for research activities and report preparation.
6. [Guidelines for Reporting p](#_3cqmetx)age 18
 . . . includes a list of products to be completed by each working group, deadlines for their delivery, and a template for reports.
7. [Organization of the Final Self-Study Report p](#_4bvk7pj)age 20
. . . outlines the structure of the final self-study report.
8. [Editorial Style and Format p](#_1664s55)age 21
. . . describes a uniform editorial style for all reports, and how final editorial changes will be made.
9. [Timetable for the Self-Study p](#_25b2l0r)age 22
 . . . lists dates and deadlines for all major steps and events from inception of the self-study process up to the Commission’s action in 2017.
10. [Profile of the Evaluation Team p](#_34g0dwd)age 24
. . . includes the College’s recommendations for the desired characteristics of the chairperson and team members who will visit Queens College in 2017 and evaluate the self-study.
11. [Documentation Roadmap p](#_1jlao46)age 26
. . . lists documents and resources that will be provided to each working group to facilitate their inquiries. The standards and their associated criteria may also be found in this section.

## Self Study Design

### 1. Institutional Overview

The Middle States Standards for Accreditation describe the characteristics that institutions of higher education should demonstrate. Queens College has established working groups of faculty, students, and staff to analyze the College’s performance for each of the seven standards and their associated criteria. At the same time, MSCHE requires that the self-study process allow these analyses to focus where appropriate on the unique or special characteristics and priorities of the College. In this vein, we present here the characteristics, mission, recent developments, and current priorities of the College that should be at the forefront of considerations as the working groups begin their studies.

#### Characteristics

Queens College is one of 24 institutions in the City University of New York (CUNY), all in close proximity. The University serves over 250,000 degree seeking students, and nearly as many in continuing education or other non-degree programs. Among the 24 institutions are 11 senior colleges (Queens College among them) and 7 community colleges. Roughly 60% of Queens College students are transfers, the large majority from within CUNY. The CUNY Graduate Center in Manhattan awards most doctoral degrees in the University, and many Queens College faculty members teach a course there or mentor doctoral candidates who in turn teach or perform research at the Queens campus. Any examination of governance, planning, assessment, curriculum, or student experience must take into account the structure and benefits of the university system.

Queens College has close to 20,000 students in degree or certificate programs; over 4,000 of these are in graduate programs. The College is located in the borough of Queens, widely considered to be the most diverse county in the United States. This diversity is reflected in the student body, where over 150 nationalities are represented. 34% of students are the first generation in their family to attend college. Though the College is situated in a densely populated urban area, the 80-acre campus features tree-lined grassy areas and playing fields. It is the only institution in CUNY with NCAA Division II athletic programs.

Queens College was recognized in 2011 by the Education Trust as one of only five colleges in the U.S. that do a good job serving low-income students (based on graduation rate and cost). More recently, the Washington Monthly ranked Queens College second among 1,540 U.S. colleges as “best bang for the buck” in 2013 and again in 2014. These accolades reflect a core mission of the College – access to a quality education.

#### Mission Statement

The College’s mission statement was last updated for the 1995 self-study, and contains the guiding principles for planning and assessment:

*“The mission of Queens College is to prepare students to become leading citizens of an increasingly global society. The college seeks to do this by offering its exceptionally diverse student body a rigorous education in the liberal arts and sciences under the guidance of a faculty that is dedicated to the pursuit of excellence and the expansion of the frontiers of knowledge. Its goal is that students learn to think critically, address complex problems, explore various cultures, and use effectively the full array of available technologies and information resources.*

*Within a structured curriculum and in an atmosphere of collegiality and mutual respect, the college fosters an environment in which students learn the underlying principles of the humanities, the arts, and the mathematical, natural, and social sciences. The college also prepares students in a variety of professional and pre-professional programs that build upon and complement the liberal arts and sciences foundation.*

*Recognizing the special needs of a commuting student population, the college strives to create a broad range of intellectual and social communities. The college offers a spectrum of curricular and co-curricular programs that serve individuals and distinctive student constituencies.*

*In support of the need for advanced study in the liberal arts and professions, the college offers a variety of master's degree and certificate programs. In particular, the college recognizes and accepts its historic responsibility for providing high quality programs for the pre-service and in-service education of teachers.*

*As a partner with CUNY's graduate school, the college provides faculty and resources in support of the university's mission in doctoral education and research. The college employs university graduate students and prepares them for careers in higher education and research, and it supports faculty who serve as mentors for doctoral students and engage in related scholarly activities.*

*For its faculty, the college seeks productive scholars, scientists, and artists deeply committed to teaching. It endeavors to enhance the teaching effectiveness of faculty and to encourage their research and creative work. The college recognizes the importance of a diverse faculty responsive to the needs and aspirations of students of all ages and backgrounds.*

*As a public institution, Queens College provides affordable access to higher education and embraces its special obligation to serve the larger community. It is a source of information in the public interest; it is a venue for cultural and educational activities serving the general public. Through its graduates’ contributions to an educated workforce and through the leading roles they assume in their local communities, the college is vested in the economic future and vitality of New York.*

*As one of the most culturally diverse campuses in the country, Queens College faces special challenges and opportunities. By balancing tradition and innovation in the service of this diversity, it represents the future of the nation.”*

#### Recent Developments

The College welcomed new president Félix Matos Rodríguez in September, 2014. President Matos Rodríguez has recently announced that he is recommending to the Board of Trustees that Acting Provost Elizabeth Hendrey be named Queens College’s next Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Chief Financial Officer William Keller assumed his position in September, 2013. All three individuals are CUNY veterans who bring valuable insights to their positions. A new Dean of Social Sciences, Michael Wolfe, will assume duties in July of 2015. A search for a new Dean of Mathematics and Natural Sciences is nearing completion at this time.

The Summit residence hall opened its doors in 2009. It is a modern 505 bed facility that primarily serves degree seeking students, but that has also allowed for special summer programs and other collaborative programs. The 2017 self-study will be the first to assess the impact of the residence hall on the student experience.

CUNY introduced a common “Pathways” general education curriculum to insure smooth transitions between CUNY institutions for its students. At the same time, the university began fostering transferable gateway-to-the-major courses in popular disciplines. Both initiatives have the benefit of reducing time-to-degree as well as tuition costs. The impact of these initiatives will be assessed in the 2017 self-study.

A major new building, formerly the CUNY Law School, was added to the campus. Queens Hall is contiguous to the main campus, and includes over two dozen technology-equipped classrooms as well as several office suites. It will allow for consolidation of the foreign language programs at Queens Hall, creation of a new clinical psychology space, and it will provide some stress relief for class scheduling and space assignments. Space planning processes and outcomes will be examined in the self-study.

Tight State budget allocations were exacerbated by a downward trend in enrollment at Queens College and throughout CUNY, posing major budget challenges. In concert with the College’s Strategic Plan, the College embarked on an enrollment management initiative that yielded strong increases in the number of freshmen and transfer admits in fall 2014.

The Clinical Neuropsychology Program received accreditation from the American Psychological Association in 2015. The Education unit of the College received continued accreditation from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in 2013, and simultaneously received accreditation from the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the successor agency to NCATE. This was the first accreditation awarded by CAEP to any institution. The College is studying the possibility of accreditation for its business-related programs.

#### Priorities

The priorities addressed by the self-study process are embodied in the Queens College Strategic Plan. A new Strategic Plan was announced in December 2013 after campus-wide engagement and effort. During the Spring 2015 semester, the College has been working to refine the Plan by reviewing the measurable outcomes and re-engaging key campus constituents to ensure the success of the Plan. The Strategic Plan enables Queens College to further its mission as well as guide planning and resource allocation. It concentrates in particular on leveraging our global perspective and positioning, focusing on student success, supporting our world class faculty and staff as well as optimizing our operational capacity and effectiveness. Consequently, the College priorities to be addressed by the self-study process are as follows:

1. **Weaving Global Connections** – The Borough of Queens is exceptionally diverse, and is home to immigrants from around the globe. This diversity is reflected in the College, and is one of its greatest assets. The College will draw on these inherent and unique resources to offer an exceptional global perspective in its curriculum and programs. It will provide opportunities for students and faculty to interact with diverse communities and institutions both in the city and throughout the world.
2. **Student Success** – Queens College will provide an outstanding liberal arts education to its students, with emphasis on critical thinking, communication skills, and the adaptability and entrepreneurial spirit needed to insure future success. The College will maintain strong academic support services and will provide learning opportunities including internships, research experiences, study abroad and community service programs, as well as a wide array of cultural events, student clubs, and athletic programs. We will excel while assuring affordability and access, pursuing initiatives to support our students through institutional grants, scholarships, and discretionary funding.
3. **A World Class Faculty** – We will support faculty scholarship and creativity through aggressive recruitment, retention, and mentorship activities. We will foster doctoral education and provide support for students at all levels to participate in faculty research. We will ensure that our diverse faculty have the opportunity to pursue their intellectual passions and build strong scholarly reputations.
4. **Operating Effectively** –The College will seek to maximize the use of its resources to provide the best possible services and environment for all members of the campus community. The College will work to enhance its resources by attracting and retaining talented students, faculty, and staff, and by pursuing opportunities for increased funding.

#### Steps to Date

Shortly after the arrival of President Matos Rodríguez in September, 2014, the president in consultation with the provost appointed three individuals to serve as CIP liaisons and co-chairs of the self-study steering committee: Professor Antonio Gonzalez, Chair of the Department of Art and Art History; Dr. Steven Schwarz, Associate Provost and Professor of Physics; Dr. Christopher Vickery, Director of General Education and Professor of Computer Science. Questions or concerns regarding the self-study process may be directed to any of these individuals.

The president and provost, in consultation with the co-chairs and senior leaders, assembled a representative steering committee, which had its first meeting on February 4, 2015. The structure and membership of the committee is described in section 4. A campus-wide information session was held on February 11, 2015 (standing room only). A second steering committee meeting was held on March 5, 2015, at which working group tasks and an approach to the Self-Study Design were fleshed out. The co-chairs presented a talk on the self-study process at the March 12, 2015 meeting of the Academic Senate. The Steering Committee met again on April 14 to review a draft of the Self-Study Design.

Eight working groups have been formed, as described in sections 2 and 4. Each of the groups have met, and have provided feedback to the steering committee on the documents they will need to perform their inquiries, as reflected in the Documentation Roadmap. For use of the working groups and the college community, we have established a Google Docs repository of resources and working documents. This is fully described in section 4.

### 2. Model for the Self-Study

CIP participants have agreed to use the “comprehensive model” for their self-studies. This model assures that the College is aligned with each of the seven standards for accreditation, and allows for a thorough review of the College’s processes. The seven standards and their associated criteria are listed in the Documentation Roadmap (section 11). They are well aligned with our mission and Strategic Plan, and have a logical flow that has been encapsulated by Dr. David Rehm, Provost of Mount St. Mary's University, as follows:

*“A higher education institution*

* *has a mission (Standard I)*
* *and lives it with integrity (Standard II)*
* *to enhance the student learning experience (Standard III)*
* *and support the overall student experience (Standard IV).*

*That institution*

* *assesses its success in achieving that mission (Standard V)*
* *and engages in planning to strengthen its resources and improve as an institution (Standard VI)*
* *by means of an effective governing process (Standard VII). “*

In the aforementioned presentation to the Academic Senate, several benefits of a comprehensive review were described. First, we aspire to meet and exceed the standards set by MSCHE. The standards present a complete and demanding set of measures that will allow the College to assess how it is serving its students. Our 2007 self-study focused on three of fourteen Middle States standards, so it is appropriate now to conduct a complete review. Second, the self-study provides an opportunity for self-reflection, the value of which has been amply demonstrated by the periodic reviews of each of our academic units. Periodic reviews nurture a sense of community and foster a culture of continuous improvement. Third, the College will be able to enhance its strategic planning process as a result of the focused efforts of the working groups. Fourth, the working groups will assemble, and make public, data and analyses that will have long-term value for the College. Fifth, specific recommendations for improvement will be developed in all areas of inquiry. In the 2007 self-study, the College acted on 40 recommendations, with substantial benefits as described in the 2012 Periodic Review Report. Sixth, participation on Middle States committees will develop our future College leaders. Seventh, the College derives essential and obvious benefits from accreditation. And finally, the Collaborative Implementation Project allows us to benefit from cooperation with other institutions that are embarking on self-studies, and supports MSCHE in its efforts to best represent the interests of its member institutions.

Each of the seven standards will be addressed by a working group, and an eighth working group will address compliance with Federal regulations and the Middle States Requirements of Affiliation. This group will be responsible for preparing the Verification of Compliance document that is submitted at the same time as the final self-study, and addresses compliance in four specific areas – 1) student identity verification in distance education; 2) transfer of credit policies and articulation agreements; 3) Title IV program responsibilities, and 4) assignment of credit hours. The eighth group will also investigate the College’s compliance with government policies and regulations, as dictated in the Requirements of Affiliation. This will include compliance with the Higher Education Opportunity Act (e.g., textbook information requirements), and with Title IX. The latter has been the focus of much attention recently in higher education, and addresses issues of sexual harassment and violence on campuses.

### 3. Intended Outcomes

In order to address the college priorities defined in section 1, the Steering Committee has developed a list of intended outcomes for the self-study process. Goals 2, 3, and 4 are based on the college’s Strategic Plan priorities:

*1. - Demonstrate that Queens College meets the Middle States standards and has processes in place to assure continuous improvement for each of the standards’ criteria.*

*2. - Examine the academic and business processes encountered by students, faculty, and staff to understand where reorganization, streamlining and simplification might improve student experience and outcomes.*

*3. - Focus on enrollment management with the aim of increasing retention, enhancing diversity, improving student services, building graduate programs, and supporting transfer students.*

*4. - Foster educational innovation to improve student attainment via academic support, faculty development, technology, and other means.*

It is the expectation of the Steering Committee that the working groups will generate specific recommendations addressing the intended outcomes. The individual charges to the working groups in Section V address these outcomes specifically. The ultimate responsibility of the Steering Committee is to insure that accepted recommendations are assigned to proper college units for implementation. Actions on these recommendations will be reported and assessed in the Periodic Review Report to be submitted in 2022.

Finally, a fifth outcome addresses the benefits and responsibilities of participation in the Collaborative Implementation Project:

*5. - Through participation in CIP, the College will develop expertise in effectively addressing and benefitting from the new standards, and will share best practices with its sister CUNY institutions as well as with regional institutions.*

###

### 4. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

The Middle States Steering Committee consists of 13 members appointed by the president. The three Steering Committee co-chairs also serve as liaisons to the Middle States Collaborative Implementation Project (CIP). Eight members of the committee serve as liaisons to each of the eight working groups, and are active members of those groups. Seven working groups address each of the seven Middles States standards for accreditation, while the eighth working group addresses the Middle States requirements of affiliation and compliance with Federal regulations. Each working group is chaired by a faculty member. A co-chair is, in most cases, a member of staff. The chair or co-chair may also serve as liaison. The current lists of members of the steering committee and working groups are [available online](https://docs.google.com/a/qc.cuny.edu/document/d/1ivSbJw3uE9MjTRxKClxOM2o9DXUAP30x4r20yF2ofA8). The lists as of June 25, 2015 are:

#### Steering Committee

##### Co-chairs

Antonio Gonzalez (Chair, Art Department)

Steven Schwarz (Provost’s Office)

Christopher Vickery (Faculty, Computer Science Department)

##### Members

Glenda G. Grace (President’s Office)

Elizabeth F. Hendrey (Provost’s Office)

William Keller (VP Finance)

Richard Maxwell (Chair, Media Studies Department)

William McClure (Dean, Division of Arts and Humanities)

Ashley Prasad (Undergraduate Student)

Adam Rockman (VP Student Affairs)

Manuel Sanudo (Faculty, Library; Chair, Academic Senate)

Laura A. Silverman (Office of Academic Advising)

Mariana Zinni (Faculty, Hispanic Languages & Literatures)

#### I. Mission and Goals

##### Steering Committee Liaison

William McClure (Dean, Division of Arts and Humanities)

##### Academic Chair

Christopher Vickery (Faculty, Computer Science Department)

##### Administrative Co-chair

William McClure (Dean, Division of Arts and Humanities)

##### Members

Eva M. Fernández (Provost’s Office; Center for Teaching and Learning)

Donna Gruber (International Teaching and Learning, English Language Institute)

Steven Schwarz (Provost’s Office)

Daniel C. Weinstein (Faculty, Biology Department)

#### II. Ethics and Integrity

##### Steering Committee Liaison

Antonio Gonzalez (Chair, Art Department)

##### Academic Chair

Stephen Grover (Chair, Philosophy Department)

##### Administrative Co-chair

Richard Bodnar (Dean of Research and Graduate Studies)

##### Members

Erica Davis (Student)

Lizandra Friedland (Graduate Student, Data Analytics)

Glenda G. Grace (President’s Office)

Jennifer Jarvis (Office of Student Affairs)

Charles Lloyd (Office of Curricular Guidance)

Carolyn Pytte (Faculty, Psychology Department)

Cynthia Rountree (Office of Compliance and Diversity Programs)

Fang Sun (Faculty, Department of Accounting and Information Systems)

#### III. Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

##### Steering Committee Liaison

Mariana Zinni (Faculty, Hispanic Languages & Literatures)

##### Academic Chair

Murphy Halliburton (Faculty, Anthropology Department)

##### Administrative Co-chair

Michelle Fraboni (Center for Teaching and Learning)

##### Members

Tesfaye Asfaw (Office of Career Planning & Placement)

Eva M. Fernández (Provost’s Office; Center for Teaching and Learning)

Nancy M. Foasberg (Faculty, Library)

Johanna Pino Grisales (Undergraduate Student)

Christopher Hanusa (Faculty, Mathematics Department)

Elizabeth Ijalba (Faculty, Linguistics and Communication Disorders)

Karran Jainarain (Office of Academic Advising)

Helen L. Johnson (Faculty, Department of Elementary & Early Childhood Education)

James W. Marcum (Faculty, Graduate School of Library and Information Studies)

Amanda L. Williams (Undergraduate Student)

#### IV. Support of the Student Experience

##### Steering Committee Liaison

Adam Rockman (VP Student Affairs)

##### Academic Chair

David A. Leventhal (Faculty, Department of Accounting and Information Systems)

##### Administrative Co-chair

Adam Rockman (VP Student Affairs)

##### Members

Nigel N. Barker (Office of Freshman Year Initiative)

Martin Braun (Faculty, Mathematics Department)

Helen A. Gaudette (Study Abroad Office)

Leslee J. Grey (Faculty, Secondary Education and Youth Services)

Jennifer Jarvis (Office of Student Affairs)

Ivan-Scott Lee (Office of Academic Advising)

Steven Leventhal (Faculty, Economics Department)

Raj Maheshwari (Undergraduate Student)

Kayla Maryles (Office of Student Life)

Wilma A. Saffran (Chair, Department of Chemistry)

Thomas P. Szlezak (Center for Teaching and Learning)

Ross Wheeler (Macaulay Honors College)

#### V. Educational Effectiveness Assessment

##### Steering Committee Liaison

Christopher Vickery (Faculty, Computer Science Department)

##### Academic Chair

Julie George (Faculty, Political Science Department)

##### Administrative Co-chair

Eva M. Fernández (Provost’s Office; Center for Teaching and Learning)

##### Members

Aaron Freundschuh (Faculty, History Department)

Lizandra Friedland (Graduate Student, Data Analytics)

Zhili Liang (President’s Office)

Margaret McAuliffe (Office of Institutional Research)

Dean Savage (Acting Dean, Division of Social Sciences)

Janice Smith (Faculty, Aaron Copland School of Music)

Gillian Stewart (Faculty, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences)

Christopher Vickery (Faculty, Computer Science Department)

Amy Wan (Faculty, English Department)

#### VI. Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

##### Steering Committee Liaison

William Keller (VP Finance)

##### Academic Chair

Michael Toner (Chair, Department of Family, Nutrition and Exercise Sciences)

##### Administrative Co-chair

Claudia Colbert (Office of Information Technology)

##### Members

Selena L. Chu (Office of Professional and Continuing Studies)

Diane L. Coogan-Pushner (Faculty, Graduate Program in Risk Management)

Diane Gahagan (Educational Programs, Professional Development & Corporate Training)

Denese Gordon (Buildings and Grounds)

Dave Gosine (Campus Facilities)

Ernest Jew (Budget Office)

Zeco Krcic (Facilities Planning & Operations)

Reinalda Medina (Office of Human Resources)

Diane Menna (Faculty, Academic Support Center)

Brian Murphy (Budget Office)

Stuart Schaffer (Office of Information Technology)

Nalini Sukhdeo (Accounting and Business Office)

MaryAnn Watch (Provost's Office)

#### VII. Governance, Leadership, and Administration

##### Steering Committee Liaison

Richard Maxwell (Chair, Media Studies Department)

##### Academic Chair

Richard Maxwell (Chair, Media Studies Department)

##### Administrative Co-chair

Elizabeth F. Hendrey (Provost’s Office)

##### Members

Angel Arcelay (Office of Information Technology)

Ann Azzollini (Faculty, Department of Family, Nutrition and Exercise Science)

Arthur B. Chitty (Rosenthal Library)

Jennifer Fernandez (Undergraduate Student)

Brian Hughes (Graduate Student, Media Studies)

David A. Jones (Chair, Department of European Languages and Literatures)

William Keller (VP Finance)

Harriet Li (Faculty, Elementary & Early Childhood Education)

Mandana E. Limbert (Chair, Anthropology Department)

Allan Ludman (Faculty, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences)

Manuel Sanudo (Faculty, Library; Chair, Academic Senate)

#### VIII. Compliance with Requirements of Affiliation and Relevant Standards

##### Steering Committee Liaison

Steven Schwarz (Provost’s Office)

##### Academic Chair

Antonio Gonzalez (Chair, Art Department)

##### Administrative Co-chair

Steven Schwarz (Provost’s Office)

##### Members

Oswald E. Fraser (Office of Human Resources)

William Graffeo (Office of Environmental Health & Safety Operations)

Meryl R. Kaynard (Legal Office)

Patrick O’Connell (Office of International Student Services)

Poline Papoulis (Office of Research and Sponsored Programs)

Cynthia Rountree (Office of Compliance and Diversity Programs)

Barbara Simerka (Faculty, Hispanic Languages and Literatures)

Rena Smith-Kiawu (Office of Financial Aid)

### 5. Charges to the Working Groups

Each working group 1-7 will conduct a thorough investigation of the College’s performance with respect to the assigned standard and all associated criteria, as listed in the attached Document Roadmap. (Working Group 1 is assigned standard 1, etc.)

Working groups should demonstrate wide representation in their membership, including faculty, staff, and students. Members may be added at any time prior to October 1, 2015. Inform the steering committee promptly of any new members.

In the course of their inquiries, the working groups will likely touch upon one or more of the 15 MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation as indicated in the table below. The 15 requirements of affiliation are listed on pages 2-3 of the [MSCHE Standards Document](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B28CAPM6eyUPdHJ1VGM1ZUpPY2s&authuser=0), and are also listed at the end of the attached Documentation Roadmap. Working Group 8 will draw upon the reports of the other groups when it addresses these requirements. However, where an asterisk appears in the table, the specific requirement is considered to be central to the charge of that working group, and that group is asked to specifically demonstrate how the College meets that requirement of affiliation. For example, requirement 7 states that “the institution has a statement of mission, approved by its governing body, that defines its purpose within the context of higher education.” Quite obviously this falls under the purview of Working Group 1 (Mission and Goals).

| **Working Group** | **Requirements of Affiliation** |
| --- | --- |
| I. Mission and Goals | 7\*, 10 |
| II. Ethics and Integrity | - |
| III. Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience | 8, 9\*, 10, 15\* |
| IV. Support of the Student Experience | 8, 10 |
| V. Educational Effectiveness Assessment | 8\*, 9, 10 |
| VI. Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement | 8, 10\*, 11\* |
| VII. Governance, Leadership, and Administration | 12\*, 13\* |
| VIII. Compliance with Relevant Regulations and Requirements of Affiliation | all |

Working Group 8 will address the remaining requirements of affiliation (1-6 and 14). Among these, requirement 5 calls for adherence to Federal and State regulations, which include for example the Higher Education Opportunity Act as well as Title IX. This working group will examine the College’s compliance with these regulations. It will also collect the information needed for the Verification of Compliance report required by Middle States, which focuses on four areas: student identification in distance learning, transfer credit evaluation, credit hours, and Title IV responsibilities. Finally, this group will assure that all 15 requirements have been fully addressed.

All working groups should address the mission, goals, and intended outcomes, described in sections 2 – 4 of this document, in their evaluations. In particular, groups should check that issues and processes of interest are properly addressed in the college’s Strategic Plan, that appropriate assessments with follow-up are in place, and that responsibilities are assigned to appropriate individuals and offices.

Working groups are free to identify new criteria or topics for research, provided that these are appropriate for the assigned standard. It is important to communicate these new areas of focus to the steering committee, to insure that there are no redundant efforts in other working groups.

Working groups should develop recommendations for improvement applicable to the standard and criteria they are investigating. While there is no minimum or maximum number of recommendations, the total number of recommendations that will appear in the final self-study is expected to be close to twenty, corresponding to about three recommendations per working group.

The group liaison will update the steering committee on the progress of the working group.

Each working group will meet, or already has met, one or more times in the spring of 2015 to discuss their charge, and any areas they believe will merit special focus. They will inform the steering committee of documents to include in the Roadmap, so that these documents can be made available when work begins in earnest in the fall.

The final product of the working group will be a report of approximately 10 pages in length (with no limit on the length of appendices) that is due in March of 2016. An outline of the report is due by December 15, 2015, to allow time for comment by the steering committee. The first draft will be posted in late January 2016 on the campus Middle States website for public comment. A consistent format for reports is described in section 8. Task deadlines for the working group are listed in the timetable of section 9. The format for these tasks is described in section 6.

Working groups should contact the Office of the Provost for logistical support or access to documents that are not readily available. Requests for institutional data may be made directly to Dr. Margaret McAuliffe, Director of the Office of Institutional Research. For analyses of enrollment and grade data that resides in the University’s CUNYfirst databases, Stuart Schaffer in the Office of Information of Technology may be contacted directly.

In the remainder of this section, the Steering Committee poses specific questions or suggestions to each working group for their consideration. These questions can be naturally addressed in the course of the inquiries described above, and are meant to assist the working groups in tying their analyses of the criteria to the intended outcomes:

1. Mission and Goals - Is the college’s Strategic Plan consistent with the 1995 mission statement? The working group may wish to recommend revisions to the mission statement, or a succinct summary.
2. Ethics and Integrity - This working group may wish to consider processes (intended outcome 2) for communicating and overseeing our compliance with this standard, to insure that all constituents are familiar with ethics requirements and can easily seek or provide required information.
3. Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience - It is anticipated that this group will develop specific recommendations in support of intended outcome 4 (educational innovation). This group is also asked to examine the College’s “ACE Internationalization Lab” effort and its potential impact on the learning experience, as well as on diversity (intended outcome 3).
4. Support of the Student Experience - It is anticipated that this group will develop specific recommendations in support of intended outcome 3, focusing in particular on efforts to improve retention. This group may wish to consider intended outcome 2, addressing how bureaucratic hurdles faced by students can be reduced. Complementing the work of Group III, this group may also evaluate the impact of the ACE Internationalization Lab effort on student life for our diverse population.
5. Educational Effectiveness Assessment - The efforts of this group pertain in particular to intended outcome 1 (continuous improvement). Recommendations may address how to better insure that all academic units have assessment processes in place and receive regular guidance and feedback.
6. Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement - Intended outcomes 2 (Strategic Plan, planning), and 3 (effective processes) are of particular significance for this working group. The group may wish to provide recommendations addressing how budget and planning processes can better align.
7. Governance, Leadership, and Administration - Criterion 3 of this standard (“periodic assessment of the effectiveness of governance . . .”) links to intended outcome 1 (continuous improvement). Distinct from the efforts of Group V on educational assessment, Group VII may wish to develop recommendations on assessment of administrative effectiveness.
8. Requirements for Accreditation - In addition to preparing the separate Verification report, this group may wish to address compliance with the HEOA and anticipated revisions to the law, and to recommend how communication of compliance issues to college constituents can be improved.

### 6. Guidelines for Reporting

The report of the working group should address the following issues, as recommended by MSCHE in [CIP Preparing a Working Group Report](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B28CAPM6eyUPUklGUGItUXdfRVk&authuser=0) (also known as “Template A”):

* An overview of the group’s charge, defining the scope of its tasks and responsibilities in relation to its assigned Standard for Accreditation.
* Discussion of the connection of the group’s charge with those of other groups, and of any collaboration between groups that took place.
* Analytical discussion of the data reviewed and the inquiry undertaken, and the group’s conclusions, including strengths and challenges.
* Explanation of how the group’s conclusions relate to the assigned Standard for Accreditation.
* Recommendations for ongoing institutional improvement.

Specific references to the Intended Outcomes are also recommended.

As the final self-study will be approximately 100 pages in length, exclusive of appendices, the working group report should be approximately 10 pages in length, with no limit on the length of appendices. This is not to imply that the report will be inserted into the final self-study as submitted; some revision and reorganization will be required to maintain uniformity of style. The editorial style and policy is described in section 8. An outline of the report is due to the Steering Committee by December 15, 2015. The committee will provide feedback by December 23, 2015. The first draft of the report is due to the committee by January 20, 2016, and will be posted to the college Middle States website for public comment. The final draft is due to the committee by March 15, 2016.

###

### 7. Organization of the Final Self-Study Report

In accord with MSCHE recommendations, the final self-study report will be approximately 100 pages in length, exclusive of appendices, and will be organized as follows:

*Executive Summary:* Brief (~5 pages) description of the major findings and recommendations of the Self Study.

*Introduction:* A brief overview of the College and description of the Self Study process

*For each Standard for Accreditation:* Seven sections of approximately 10 pages in length each that provide an analytical discussion of the data reviewed and the inquiry undertaken, cross-reference relevant materials in other parts of the report, present conclusions including strengths and challenges with references to appropriate Criteria, and provide recommendations for ongoing institutional improvement.

*Requirements of Affiliation:* A short section describing compliance with the requirements of affiliation, including compliance with Federal and State regulations. This section will note where these requirements are addressed elsewhere in the self-study, and will provide a summary. Recommendations for improvement will also be included.

*Conclusion:* A summary of the major conclusions reached and the institution’s recommendations for self-improvement.

*Appendices:* As numerous appendices will be attached, this section will begin with a guide to the appendices and a short description of their content.

### 8. Editorial Style and Format

It is recommended that working groups make use of the college Middle States website at [middle-states.qc.cuny.edu](http://middle-states.qc.cuny.edu) for working drafts of their reports, and as a document repository. The website is accessible to students, faculty, and staff with a qc.cuny.edu e-mail account, but permissions to view and/or edit specific documents may be easily set by their authors. Documents posted on this site will automatically have appropriate format for inclusion in the self-study. This website will contain most of the documents listed in the Document Roadmap, as well as copies of pertinent College presentations and useful resources culled from resources such as the Middle States compendium of conference presentations. The working group drafts will be posted for public comment at this website as well.

Documents should adhere to the following guidelines:

* 12 point Calibri font with 1 inch margins.
* No heading or footers other than page numbers.
* Avoid use of footnotes.
* References in APA style, with reference list at the end of the report.
* Numbered headings (e.g., 1.2). Avoid using more than two numbers in a heading.
* Write in the third person, to assure uniformity of style in the self-study.
* Figures and tables should be numbered consecutively.
* Figure captions should be in 10 point font and appear directly below the figure.
* Table headings and descriptions should appear above the table in 14 point font.

The self-study will be assembled by the Steering Committee from the working group reports. The Steering Committee has final editorial authority for the self-study.

###

### 9. Timetable for the Self-Study

**2014**

October 7, 2014 CIP Orientation Workshop (Washington, D.C.)

November 12, 2014 CIP Training (Philadelphia)

**2015**

January Selection of Steering Committee members

January 12, 2015 CIP Remote Meeting for Project Participants

February Steering Committee approves outline of Self-Study Design

March/April Working groups being to meet. Self-Study Design is prepared.

April 10, 2015 Draft of Self-Study Design provided to Steering Committee.

April 22, 2015 Deadline for submission of Self-Study Design to MSCHE

May 6, 2015 Campus visit of Middle States VP- Dr. Debra Klinman

May Liaison Feedback on Draft Design

June – July Draft Design revised; approval from MSCHE Liaison

June – August Documentation for Working Groups Assembled

September Working Groups begin inquiry

September – November New data collected and analyzed (if necessary)

November 9-10, 2015 Self-Study Institute for 2017-18 cohort

November 11, 2015 CIP face-to-face meeting

December 2-4, 2015 MSCHE Annual Conference, Washington, D.C.

December 15, 2015 Annotated outlines due from working groups

December 23, 2015 Steering Committee provided feedback on outlines

**2016**

January Selection of Evaluation Team Chairperson by MSCHE

January 20, 2015 First drafts due from working groups

February – March Campus Feedback on First Drafts; Open Forum and Senate

 presentation

March 15, 2015 Final draft of working group reports due

May – June Self-study co-chairs prepare first draft of final self-study

August – September Campus Feedback on First Draft of Final Self-Study

September Final Roster of Evaluation Team Members Prepared by MSCHE

October Self-Study Co-chairs Prepare Second Draft of Final Self-Study

October Second Draft of Final Self-Study Submitted to Team Chairperson

November Preliminary visit by team chairperson; feedback on draft of final

 self- study

November Open Forum and Senate presentation

November Self-Study Institute for 2018-19 cohort; final CIP meeting

December 7-9, 2016 Annual Conference, Philadelphia, PA

December – January Preparation of final self-study report based on feedback from Team

 chairperson

December – January Arrangements finalized for hosting all Evaluation Team members

**2017**

March – April Final self-study report sent to all Evaluation Team members

March – April Evaluation Team Visit (no later than 4/15/2017)

May Institutional response to Evaluation Team findings submitted to

 MSCHE

June Commission Meeting; final accreditation action taken

June – August Project Assessment

November Self-Study Institute for 2019-20 Cohort (sharing of experiences)

December 4-8, 2017 Annual Conference (presentations about revised standards and

 lessons learned)

###

### 10. Profile of the Evaluation Team

We recommend that the Evaluation Team have strong representation from large public master’s-level institutions, of which one or more are situated in a large urban area. Representatives from large private institutions, particularly those in an urban setting, are also recommended. Through its affiliation with the CUNY Graduate Center, Queens College supports active and well-recognized research programs that attract over $20M in grant funding annually. Many CUNY Ph.D. candidates conduct research on our campus. It would therefore be appropriate to include at least one institution that has strong doctoral level programs in the liberal arts and sciences.

We have excluded CIP member institutions from this list, but of course would welcome representation from any of the CIP members, if allowed. A representative from at least one New York institution, such as a SUNY institution, is recommended to provide perspective on State regulations and budget. If allowed, a representative from a feeder institution such as Nassau Community College or Suffolk Community College could provide valuable insight on transfer processes. It would be appropriate as well to have a representative from at least one institution that is part of a large integrated system (e.g., SUNY, Rutgers, Inter American).

Programs of note at Queens College include Accounting and Psychology (our two largest majors), the renowned Aaron Copland School of Music, accredited programs in teacher education, library science, speech-language pathology, and nutrition, and MFA programs in Creative Writing/Translation and in Studio Art. This is of course just a partial listing of many dozens of strong undergraduate and graduate programs, but may be of assistance in selecting well-matched institutions. The College does not have engineering programs, as these are exclusive to City College in the CUNY system.

Following is a sample of institutions that we believe meet the recommended criteria:

William Paterson University of New Jersey Wayne NJ

\*Inter American University of Puerto Rico San German PR

University at Buffalo, SUNY Buffalo NY

Binghamton University, SUNY Binghamton NY

Kean University Union NJ

Long Island University Brooklyn NY

Buffalo State SUNY Buffalo NY

Fashion Institute of Technology SUNY New York NY

Rowan University Glassboro NJ

The College of New Jersey Ewing Township NJ

Towson University Towson MD

West Chester University of Pennsylvania West Chester PA

\*Rutgers University Newark NJ

\* We suggest that the chair of the evaluation team come from one of the institutions marked with an asterisk.

Finally, we note in the list above that we have excluded NJCU and SUNY Albany, as the president and provost of these institutions, respectively, were recent highly respected members of the Queens College administration, thus posing a possible conflict of interest or appearance thereof.

### 11. Documentation Roadmap

The Documentation Roadmap is supplied as [a separate file](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B28CAPM6eyUPdS1qdm9iZWZiTU0&authuser=0). It is based on feedback from all eight working groups. Documents are listed on the template provided by MSCHE, with relevant documents adjacent to the Standards and their criteria. In addition, the documents required by the eighth working group, addressing compliance issues, are appended at the end of the Roadmap. The Roadmap will be updated continuously, and can be accessed on the college Middle States website ([**middle-states.qc.cuny.edu**](http://middle-states.qc.cuny.edu)).