

2005-2006 Self-Study Design Plan



Bergen Community College
400 Paramus Rd.
Paramus, New Jersey 07652
www.bergen.edu

TABLE of CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Preliminary Planning	3
III.	Nature and Scope of our Self-Study	4
IV.	Specific Goals and Objectives	5
V.	Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Study Groups	5
VI.	Board of Trustees Self-Study Project	10
VII.	Charges to Study Groups	11
VIII.	Inventory of Support Documents	33
IX.	MSSS Website	42
X.	Timetable	42
XI.	Study Group Reports	42
XII.	Organization of the Self-Study Report	43
XIII.	Profile of the Evaluation Team	44
	Acknowledgement	46
	Appendix: Sample Prototype Study Guide	47

I. Introduction

Bergen Community College was established in 1965 by the Bergen County Board of Chosen Freeholders, and the first classes were offered in 1968. The College was originally accredited by the Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education in 1971. The Mission of the College, substantially revised in 1999, reads

Bergen Community College provides high quality, relevant, and varied educational programs and opportunities for the intellectual, cultural, and personal growth of all members of its community. The College values its role as an educational leader, embracing change and responding to the complex needs of those it serves.

In the Fall 2003 semester, 6,907 students were enrolled full-time, and 7,084 students were enrolled part-time, for a total enrollment of 13,991. Almost 10,000 students registered in noncredit courses in the 2002-2003 academic year. 295 full-time faculty hold master's degrees, doctorates, or both, and 326 adjunct faculty hold master's degrees or higher.

The College offers 21 transfer programs in the Associate in Arts (AA) degree, 18 transfer programs in the Associate in Science (AS) degree, 34 career programs in the Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degree, as well as 19 Certificates and 5 Certificates of Achievement in several areas. The Division of Continuing Education offers a wide range of professional development courses, certificate programs, personal enrichment courses, and specialized training to local business and industry. The Institute for Learning in Retirement offers a wide range of courses for senior residents. The Phillip Ciarco Jr. Learning Center, located in Hackensack, offers workplace literacy, ESL, GED and professional development courses, as well as educational and career counseling.

The College is currently preparing for its fourth reaccreditation evaluation, in 2005-2006, and is submitting this Design Plan for a comprehensive self-study of the College.

II. Preliminary Planning

In late September 2003, President Judith Winn appointed Dr. Peter Dlugos, Associate Professor of Philosophy, to the role of Middle States Self-Study Chair, and authorized the formation of the Middle States Steering Committee (MSSC). President Winn charged MSSC with the design and implementation of the self-study process, and with the task of preparing the final self-study document. Administrative support would come from the office of the Academic Vice President, Dr. David Levinson, and the editing of the final document would be done by the MSSC Chair, Peter Dlugos.

In mid-November, Peter Dlugos and Barbara Erdsneker, Director of Research and Planning, attended the Self-Study Institute in Philadelphia, PA. During the following four weeks some of the general features of the Self-Study began to emerge, and will be discussed in more detail in Section V below. Dr. Dlugos began to recruit MSSC members in December 2003, and an initial core of members was established in January 2004. The committee, though not complete, began to meet at the end of January 2004, and additional MSSC members were added in February and March, as circumstances

and needs dictated. MSSC met seven times between the end of January and mid-April, and accomplished a great deal, including the following major tasks:

- Engaged in a general review of the College's Mission and Goals, and recent history and developments, and identified key issues for study.
- Developed a plan and a mechanism, including "Let's see what makes us tick!" posters, for soliciting from the campus community suggested areas of emphasis, and for generating support and volunteers for the self-study process.
- Constructed charge questions for the Study Groups
- Recruited approximately 115 volunteers to form study groups, and conducted initial meetings of these groups to get feedback and suggestions on the draft charges for each group.
- Constructed this Design Plan.

III. Nature and Scope of our Self-Study

The College has selected the Basic Comprehensive Self-Study model, in which it will review every aspect of its programs and services, governance and support structures, institutional resources, and educational outcomes, all in relation to its Mission and Goals.

We believe that the Comprehensive model will best meet the College's current needs and priorities in light of the following significant changes and developments that have taken place since the '94-95 Self-Study:

- New technology has changed the functioning and the potential of virtually every area of the College, including the way that many courses are delivered.
- The College's administrative and organizational structure has changed significantly, including new positions and offices at various levels.
- Three major construction projects (C-Wing Third Floor, Technology Education Center, and the Parking Deck) have been completed, and a fourth (West Hall) is about to commence, expanding the College's potential in a number of areas.
- Enrollments have continued to increase to close to 14,000 each semester, creating challenges for facilities and human resources.
- An Assessment Plan for Student Learning, along with a set of curriculum-wide Core Competencies, was developed.
- Changes in the student population: the diversity of the student population has continued to increase, with students representing 114 different countries.
- Changes in the faculty population: many of the founding faculty members have retired, creating a large set of new faces and new opportunities for faculty leadership.
- A NJ STARS (Student Tuition Assistance Reward Scholarship) program has been introduced that will allow high school students in the top 20% of their graduating classes to attend two years of community college for free.

All of the above indicate a need to broadly review and assess the impact and implications of these changes. In addition, two plans for the immediate future warrant a

comprehensive self-study. First, President Winn would like the campus community to come together to articulate a set of core institutional values, focusing on institutional and individual integrity. Second, there is a plan to use the recommendations of our Self-Study to develop the next comprehensive, multi-year strategic plan.

IV. Specific Objectives of the Self-Study

Although we have chosen a comprehensive model of Self-Study, the Steering Committee spent a good deal of time discussing particular issues and areas to emphasize in the reflection and study process. Combined with our expectations about how the self-study will be conducted and used, we have arrived at the following objectives:

1. To lead a thorough, well-organized and comprehensive self-study process in which all sectors of the college community are represented and engaged.
2. To determine the extent to which the College is fulfilling its mission and goals, and in particular the extent to which different offices and units of the College are able to work collaboratively to more effectively and efficiently achieve these common goals.
3. To determine and evaluate the level of support that the College provides for outcomes assessment activities, and to determine the extent to which the College collects assessment data, and is responsive to assessment data, in its planning, budgeting, and renewal processes.
4. To review and evaluate the integrity and commitment to quality reflected in all of the College's policies and practices.
5. To determine the extent to which the College, as an open access institution, maintains high academic standards.
6. To review and assess the extent to which the College has been responsive to continuing student demographic changes in its student services, curriculum, and faculty development efforts.
7. To produce cogent findings and recommendations, based on empirical evidence, to serve as a solid basis for strategic planning.

V. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Study Groups

Steering Committee

Because MSSC is charged with designing the Self-Study, as well as overseeing its implementation and completion, we sought prospective MSSC members who are well-respected, show strong leadership potential, and whose knowledge and skills complement other MSSC members. We also sought to ensure that MSSC has a representative from every major sector of the College.

The following table lists MSSC membership:

MSSC Member	Position at the College
Peter Dlugos, Chair	Assoc. Professor, Philosophy and Religion
Mark Balzarette	Student

Philip J. Ciarco III	Board of Trustees
Joan Cohen	Asst. Professor, Reference and Serials Librarian
Barbara Erdsneker	Director of Research and Planning
John Giaimo	Asst. Professor, Counseling
Alan Kaufman	Faculty Senate Rep; Professor, English
Marybeth Klein	Assoc. Professor, Mathematics/Computer Science
Ilene Kleinman	Interim Director, Continuing Education
Albert Legge	Support Staff, Buildings and Grounds
David Levinson	Academic Vice-President
Maryellen McHale	Assoc. Professor, Nursing
Carol Miele	Professor, American Language Program
Caroline Ofodile	Manager of Financial Operations
Elliot Pruzan	Director of Learning Outcomes Assessment and Testing
Donald Reilly	Asst. Professor, English
Dianne Sarno	Adjunct Faculty Representative
Joan Tscherne	Professor, Chemistry

Study Groups

Study Groups are charged with evaluating the College's performance relative to the Middle States Standards and the issues raised in this Design Plan, and constructing a report containing the group's findings and recommendations. In order to ensure good communication between the Steering Committee and Study Groups, and in order to facilitate communication across Study Groups, Study Group Chairs are members on the Steering Committee. To ease the burden of both being a member of the Steering Committee and the leader of a study group, Study Group Chairs will appoint a Deputy Chair or Chairs from amongst their volunteers to assist with the operations of the group and, if desired, with the preparation of the group's report. Deputy Chairs may also occasionally fill in for the Chair at MSSC and Study Group meetings, but Chairs will bear ultimate responsibility for the administration of the group and the content and quality of group's report. We believe that this arrangement will produce the best outcomes.

Eight study groups were established by clustering the 14 MSA Standards according to their content, and in deciding which Standards to cluster together, considerations were given to the amount of ground each group would have to cover. Relative equity was sought. Also, since Standard 6, Integrity, references every aspect of the College, and since integrity was emerging as a major topic of study, it was decided that each group would study integrity in the areas already assigned to them.

The following table lists study groups by the relevant MSA Standard(s), and lists the Chair or Co-Chairs of each:

Study Group (Standard(s) in parentheses)	Chair or Co-Chairs
Mission/Institutional Renewal (1 & 2)	Marybeth Klein
Institutional Resources (3)	Caroline Ofodile
Leadership, Governance & Administration (4 & 5)	Alan Kaufman
Student Services and Admissions (8 & 9)	John Giaimo

Faculty (10)	Joan Cohen
General Education & Educational Offerings (11 & 12)	Don Reilly Joan Tscherne
Student Learning & Institutional Assessment (7 & 14)	Maryellen McHale
Related Educational Activities (13)	Ilene Kleinman Carol Miele

We currently have approximately 115 volunteers for our study groups, and we would like to recruit 10 to 20 more. Volunteers were assigned to their current groups using two criteria: their stated preferences, and general equity between the groups in terms of size. Because we wanted volunteers to be able to review and provide feedback on charge questions prior to our Middle States Liaison's visit, we thought it prudent to populate the study groups as quickly as possible, with at least nine or ten members per group, and we thought it prudent to try to respect the specific interests of the volunteers, who would be analyzing charge questions on particular subjects. We are happy to report that in this initial assignment, we have been able to give most volunteers their first choice of study group. However, before final assignments are made, more recruiting must take place, and groups will continue to be analyzed to ensure balance and broad representation in each group.

1. Student Admissions and Support Services

John Giaimo, Asst. Professor, Personal Counselor, Study Group Chair
Susanna Lansangan, Assistant Professor, American Language Program
Lynn Gold, Assistant Professor, Learning Disabilities Specialist
Maxine Lisboa, Director, Recruitment and Admissions
Conrad Roncati, Advisory Board Member, Legal Assistant Program
Tracy Rand, Rehab Employment Specialist, Office of Specialized Services
Heidi Flynn, Technical Assistant, Financial Aid/Veterans Affairs
Win Win Kyi, Assistant Professor, Internat'l Students Counselor
Barbara Walcott, Assistant Professor, Library
Lori Alexis, Associate Professor, Surgical Technology
Priscilla Klymenko, Assistant Dir., Registration & Student Information Systems
Lynn Schott, Instructor, Electronic Resources & Reference Services Librarian
Linda Seidman, Instructor, Counseling & Office of Specialized Services
Cristina Haedo, Instructor, Personal Counselor
Lisa Glick, Adjunct Instructor, English Basic Skills
Michael Feder, Assistant Professor, Transfer Counselor
Matthew Santiago, Student
Marcia Wyrzten, Personal Counselor, Office of Specialized Services

2. Mission and Goals/Institutional Renewal

Marybeth Klein, Assoc. Professor, Mathematics/Computer Science, Study Group Chair
Bill McKeon, Instructor, Physical Therapy
Lou Crescitelli, Associate Professor, Division of Science & Health
Marty Lowe, Assistant Professor, Division of Science & Health
Gloria Delfico, Library Staff

Frances Visco, Professional Staff, Payroll
Robert Ewalt, Lecturer, Business
Nancy Haiduck, Director of Public Relations
Mary Yopez, Assistant Professor, American Language Program
Kim Makoe, Scheduling Office
Dorothy Gigiletta, Assistant Professor, Mathematics
Patrick Grosso, Student
Judith Davis, Professor, English

3. Institutional Resources

Caroline Ofodile, Manager of Financial Operations, Study Group Chair
Harold Kahn, Instructor, English
Bill Yakowicz, Director of Grants
Nancy Carr, Director, Office of Specialized Services, Study Group Deputy Chair
Margaret McLaughlin, Assistant Professor, Cooperative Education
Stafford Barton, Assistant Professor, Counseling
Sonia Brown, Assistant Professor, Equal Opportunity Fund
Andrew Tomko, Professor, English
Laurie Francis, Director, Bergen Community College Foundation
Allison D'Alessandro, Alumni Representative
Cathy Flynn, Instructor, Mathematics
Linda Marcel, Associate Professor, Arts and Communication
Doug Short, Instructor, Career Development/Co-op
Sandeep Patel, Student
Barbara Bliss, Secretary, Arts and Communications

4. Leadership, Governance, & Administration

Alan Kaufman, Professor, English, Study Group Chair
Kathleen Bagley, Professional Assistant
Gregg Biermann, Assistant Professor, Art
Milena Christov, Assistant Professor, English
Maria Fressola, Assistant Professor, Nursing
Joshua Guttman, Assistant Professor, Industrial Design Technologies
Robin Harvison, Administrative Secretary
Adreanne Laxamana, Student
Bonnie MacDougall, Professor, English, Study Group Deputy Chair
Mauro Marzocco, Professor, Industrial Design Technologies, Head, Science and
 Technology Department
Ed Mather, Dean, Division of Social Sciences, Math, and Business
Ed Novak, Senior Maintenance Mechanic
Lynne Richardson, Professional Assistant

5. Faculty

Joan Cohen, Assistant Professor, Library; Study Group Chair
Ralph Rojas, Assistant Professor, Criminal Justice
Jane Meehan, Professor, Nursing
Anne Maganzini, Professor, Psychology
Maureen Roller, Secretary, English

Toni Tortorella, Assistant Professor, Nursing
Walter Rothaug, Associate Professor, Mathematics
Cynthia Rockafellow, Assistant Professor, Veterinary Technology
Francis Schmidt, Assistant Professor, Art
Joan Richards, Instructor, Nursing
Carol Chovanec, Instructor, Radiology
Roger Opstbaum, Professor, Physical Science
Marge Galla, Assistant Professor, Radiology
Ron Mazurek, Associate Professor, Music
Susan Klarreich, Professor, Physical Science
Keisha O'Connor, Student
Kaye Demetz, Assistant Professor, Arts and Communication

6. General Education & Educational Offerings

Don Reilly, Asst. Professor, English; Study Group Co-Chair
Joan Tscherne, Professor, Chemistry; Study Group Co-Chair
Jean Goldstein, Professor, Counseling
Tom Jewell, Assistant Professor, English
Mirta Geddo, Assistant Professor, EOF
Kat Kadian, Adjunct Professor, Business
Ellen Zamir, Grants Assistant
Belinda DeFlorio, Senior Library Assistant
James Zorn, Assistant Professor, English
Joan Dalrymple, Instructor, Library
Victoria Marrone, Senior Student Services Assistant, Admissions
Susan Barnard, Assistant Professor, Dental Hygiene
P.J. Ricatto, Assistant Professor, Chemistry
Edith Sirianni, Associate Professor, Library

7. Institutional & Student Assessment

Maryellen McHale, Associate Professor, Nursing; Study Group Chair
Elliot Pruzan, Director of Learning Outcomes Assessment and Testing; Study Group Consultant
Joann Marzocco, Associate Professor, Science and Technology
Sharon Zaucha, Assistant Professor, Nursing
Abigail Santiago, Staff, Bursar's Office
Art Tolve, Associate Professor and Coordinator, Hotel Restaurant Management
Julian Gomez, Counselor, Counseling Center
Tonia McKoy, Research Assistant, Office of Research and Planning
Karen Comai-Fuerher, Assistant Professor, Science and Technology
Kim Smokowski, Assistant Professor, Counseling
Beth Snyder, Assistant Professor, English
Joe Mamatz, Assistant Professor, Allied Health; Radiography Coordinator
Bill Jiang, Associate Professor, American Language Program

8. Related Educational Activities

Ilene Kleinman, Interim Director, Division of Continuing Education and Community Outreach, Study Group Co-Chair
Carol Miele, Department Head, English, Study Group Co-Chair
Ruth Feigenbaum, Professor, Mathematics
Elena Gryczko, Senior Secretary, Center for Business & Industry, Division of Continuing Education and Community Outreach
Marilyn Pongracz, Technical Assistant I, English Language Resource Center
Steve Wightman, Secretary, Admissions
Gail Fernandez, Assistant Professor, American Language Program
Beth Pincus, Senior Resource Accommodation Specialist, Office of Specialized Services
Deborah Cook, Adjunct Instructor
Christina Fitzpatrick, Research Assistant, Office of Research & Planning
Lori Yoselow, Instructor, Ciarco Learning Center
Lucy Caruso-Deane, Department Head, Business Dept, Associate Professor
Michael Orlando, Professor; Coordinator, English Basic Skills/AIMS
Michael Bodek, Assistant Professor, English Basic Skills
Marilyn MacDonnell, Manager of Grants & Projects, Ciarco Learning Center
Khairia Fazal, Tutoring Supervisor

More detailed information about the charge to the Study Groups and the responsibilities of the Chair and Deputy Chairs can be found in the Study Guide for each group. A draft example of these Study Guides is contained in the Appendix.

VI. Board of Trustees Self-Study Project

Recognizing the importance of periodic reflection and self-assessment, and its critical role in the governance of the College, the Board of Trustees will engage in a self-evaluation project that will be a part of the larger Self-Study. Philip J. Ciarco III, Board member and MSSC member, will chair the project. Unlike the other study groups, the form of the resulting report will be left to the discretion of the Board. However, in order to ensure that the project is comprehensive and effective, and in order to have the involvement and input of the entire Board, a survey of questions, based on the following list of issues, will be given to each Board member for completion:

- Whether the orientation process for new Board members is well-structured and effective.
- Whether the composition of the Board reflects the diversity of constituencies served, including the student body.
- Whether the procedures and processes for continuously updating Board members on the current events of the College are effective (i.e., whether Board members have a good grasp of the daily workings of the College).
- Whether the process for selecting and appointing Board members serves the College's interests and needs.
- Whether the policies for replacing inactive or ineffective Board members are appropriate and effective.
- Whether the Board is effective in cultivating appropriate sources of income needed to sustain and improve the College.

- Whether the planning process is effective in guiding and controlling the College's development and allocation of resources.
- Whether the Board's delineation of its governance responsibilities from those of administration and faculty promotes appropriate collegial governance.
- Whether the Board's conflict of interest policy is well understood and adhered to.
- Whether the Board is effective in representing and interpreting the College to the external community.
- Whether the Board conducts its responsibilities free from political interference.
- Whether the Board has current stated objectives, and whether the Board has procedures for periodically assessing the extent to which it meets these objectives.

The resulting report from this project will be integrated with the report from the study group examining the Leadership and Governance Standard.

VII. Charges to Study Groups

For the required format for Study Group reports, see section XI below.

Standard 1

Mission, Goals, and Objectives

Middle States Standard: *The institution's mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and explains whom the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals and objectives, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission, goals, and objectives are developed and recognized by the institution with its members and its governing body and are utilized to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.*

Study Group Purpose: The Mission and Goals/Institutional Renewal Study Group is charged with reviewing the College Mission and Vision Statements. The group will (1) determine how the College measures the extent to which it meets the goals and objectives articulated in these statements, and (2) analyze how the College utilizes the Mission and Vision Statements to develop and shape its programs and practices.

1. What are the major components of our Mission? How does our Mission Statement guide faculty, staff, administration and governing bodies in the decision making process? How familiar are the various constituents of the College with the Mission Statement?
2. How effective is our Mission Statement? How is our Mission Statement aligned with the major goals and objectives of the College? To what extent are there elements in the Mission Statement that do not pertain to any stated goal or objective? How do we measure the effectiveness of our Mission Statement?

3. The College Vision Statement supports the College Mission and Goals Statement. How effective or useful is our Vision Statement? Our Vision Statement professes the support of an ongoing process of improvement through assessment. Describe this process.
4. To what extent does the Vision or Mission Statement contain a discernable statement of the College's philosophy of education? To what extent is such a statement appropriate, here or elsewhere, especially in light of the many students the College serves who are under-prepared for college-level work?
5. Describe the process whereby the current Mission and Vision statements were constructed. Who was involved, and what processes were used to ensure the approval of campus community? To what extent are the Mission and Vision widely embraced across campus? How is this determined and evaluated?
6. How do the goals and objectives in our Mission Statement flow into all areas and levels of the College? How, and to what extent, is the Mission Statement used as a guide affecting all areas of the College?
7. How does the College use innovative techniques to support and renew its Mission? To what extent are College goals and objectives responsive to new and emerging technologies?
8. In what ways do the College's Mission and Goals support scholarly growth? In what ways, and to what extent, do the creativity and scholarship of the College's constituents fulfill the College's mission?
9. Our Mission and Vision Statements, like all college mission statements, are designed in part to define the College, to convey to our stakeholders who we are and what we do, and not merely what we aspire to. To what extent do our statements accomplish this? To what extent do they transparently characterize our institutional culture and practices?

Standard 2

Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Middle States Standard: *An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and uses the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.*

Study Group Purpose: The Mission and Goals/Institutional Renewal Study Group is charged with examining the nature and quality of planning within the College. The group will (1) analyze the planning processes within the College, (2) determine how these processes are assessed, and (3) determine to the extent to which these processes and their outcomes are used to support the development and change necessary to improve and maintain College quality.

1. To what extent is planning clearly defined? How are planning objectives established? What processes are in place for planning and resource allocation? What groups or individuals are involved in planning?
2. To what extent are all of the goals and objectives of the College supported by current resources? Are appropriate resources devoted to long-term planning? How are the elements of planning and resource allocation prioritized? How is the effectiveness of the College's planning and resource allocation measured?
3. How does each unit or office of the College assess its success in achieving its objectives? How does each unit/office use this assessment to support and improve its efforts? How is each unit/office's assessment incorporated into overall institutional assessment?
4. To what extent do the various units/offices of the College, and the College as a whole, create explicit objectives for improvement? To what extent are these objectives based on the results of specific assessments?
5. How are improvements communicated to the college community? How are improvement efforts measured? Which results of this measurement are incorporated into planning and improvement process? How are these results brought into the planning process?
6. Where does the responsibility for improvements and accountability lie? What groups or individuals hold this responsibility? How and when are these groups or individuals held accountable? How effective has this process been?
7. To what extent are there well-defined processes for decision-making when it comes to planning and renewal? How does the College assess whether planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes are effective and efficient? Do the results of this assessment lead to proactive or reactive efforts?
8. In the mid- and late nineties, the College engaged in various CQI (Continuous Quality Improvement) initiatives, and in 2000, conducted a Trailblazer Self-Study Retreat, which is based on CQI principles. To what extent does the College subscribe to a particular philosophy of change, improvement, and institutional renewal? To what extent is it consistently adhered to, and embraced campus wide? To what extent have the College's planning and resource allocation processes led to institutional renewal?

Standard 3

Institutional Resources

Middle States Standard: *The human, financial, technical, physical facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution's mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution's mission, the effective*

and efficient uses of the institution's resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

Study Group Purpose: Bergen Community College recognizes that human, financial, technical, physical, and other resources are all necessary to achieve its mission and goals. In an environment of rapid growth and change, maintaining successful outcomes requires careful management of resources and effective communication with all members of the college community. The Institutional Resources Study Group will examine and analyze the adequacy and allocation of these resources, and whether effective utilization has been achieved in the context of institutional goals and growth.

1. What are the existing policies and procedures for determining the allocation of resources? To what extent are these applied consistently? Which constituencies are involved in the allocation process, and who makes the final decision? How are resource allocation decisions communicated to the college community?
2. How does the College determine resource trends and needs? In view of the current economic climate, to what extent is the College prepared to deal with possible changes in the external funding environment? To what extent is there a continuous assessment of trends and needs, and to what extent are these assessment processes modified to conform to the College's Mission and Goals?
3. To what extent does the resource allocation process ensure adequate faculty, staff and administration to support the College's Mission and expected outcomes? How does the College determine areas of shortfall, and how are these addressed in planning and budgeting? Who determines that the College has adequate faculty, staff and administrators to effectively and reasonably accomplish its mission?

How effective is the budgeting process? How does it link with the strategic and facilities planning process? To what extent are there contingency plans built into the budget process to compensate for potential changes in funding sources?

4. What are the existing controls for financial and administrative operations? How are these controls reviewed, and which constituencies are involved? What continuing assessments are made to ensure that controls are adequate to meet institutional requirements if there is there an annual financial audit? How does the College follow up on audit concerns as conveyed in the management letter, if there are any?
5. Is there a master plan for facilities/infrastructure appropriate to the Missions and Goals of the College? What are the procedures for determining facilities and infrastructure needs, and how are priorities established? How adequate are the facilities with regards to program needs? More specifically, to what extent does the College have adequate classroom and office facilities? How does the College define adequacy? How are the shortfalls addressed?
6. What is the current IT acquisition and life-cycle replacement plan? How has the College integrated electronic and other technologies to support its educational mission? What is the process for determining technology requirements, and how does the College assess effective and efficient use of technology?

7. How does the College generally assess effective use of its human, physical and fiscal resources? To what extent are there periodic reviews, and how frequent are these? Are the results of these assessments used in future planning and budgeting? How are these results communicated to the college community?

Standard 4

Leadership and Governance

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

Study Group Purpose: The Leadership, Governance and Administration Study Group will examine the governance structure at Bergen Community College. It will analyze the extent to which the roles of the various constituency groups in the governance process are understood, and assess how effectively the traditional system of shared governance in higher education works at the College.

1. Identify and assess changes in organizational and administrative structure at Bergen Community College since the 1994-1995 Self-Study.
2. It is an important tradition in higher education that governance be shared, so that all constituencies become stakeholders with specific responsibilities.
 - To what extent is shared governance an integral part of the philosophy of governance at Bergen Community College?
 - How effective is the shared governance model at mobilizing institutional resources to meet College needs?
 - How effectively is the shared governance process working?
 - To what extent are there assessment processes in place to evaluate the effectiveness of our governance process? Who participates in such assessment processes?
3. Describe how the following constituencies understand their specific governance responsibilities: the Board of Trustees, the administration, the faculty, the staff, and student government.
4. To what extent does the College have written policies that outline the governance responsibilities of the administration and faculty? In what ways are these written policies comprehensive, i.e., inclusive of all essential functions? Do they need to be modified? If so, in what ways? To what extent do they define the roles that each has in policy development and decision-making, thus facilitating the shared governance process? Are these written policies readily available to the campus community?

5. To what extent do the College governance structures foster both accountability and academic freedom?
6. Describe how the College establishes its working priorities. Which governance unit(s) is most responsible for establishing these priorities, and what are its processes for doing so?
7. One of the recommendations of the College's last Self-Study was that the College "institute an organized education program for members of the Board of Trustees" (52, 2001 Periodic Review Report).
 - Describe the program that has been implemented.
 - How effective has this program been at providing the Board with a clearer picture of the daily workings of the College?
8. What mechanisms are in place to enable Board members to receive input from the College's many different constituencies? Are these mechanisms functioning effectively?
9. Describe the process by which the Board resolves potential conflicts of interest. Is there a written policy concerning conflicts of interest, and if so does this policy provide guidance for resolving potential problems?
10. How does the Board evaluate itself and its effectiveness?

Standard 5

Administration

Middle States Standard: *The institution's administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution's organization and governance.*

Study Group Purpose: The Leadership, Governance, and Administration Study Group will examine the administrative structure of the College, and analyze how effectively it facilitates teaching, learning, and professional development among the students and faculty, fosters a positive working environment for all of its constituencies, and supports the College's governance structure. It will also assess the preparedness of the administrative staff to provide leadership and direction for the programs and services offered by the College.

1. What are the primary responsibilities of the President? Are her responsibilities adequately defined? Is enough support made available for the President to carry out all of her responsibilities?
2. Given its mission, how does the College determine the appropriate academic background and professional training for its president? How is the President's performance evaluated?

3. Describe how the job responsibilities of the various administrators are explained to, and understood by, members of the College as a whole. To what extent does the College's administrative model foster and reward teamwork and cooperation?
4. Do the members of the administration, including those on the Management Team, and any faculty members who assume administrative responsibilities, e.g., department heads, have the appropriate credentials and experience to carry out their responsibilities and functions? To what extent are professional development opportunities available, or required, if gaps exist? To what extent is periodic professional renewal encouraged? In what ways?
5. Explain how the lines of administrative organization and responsibility are established and understood to ensure institutional effectiveness.
6. Explain how the organizational structure of the College enables administrators to work with faculty, staff, and students to advance the College's mission.
7. A recommendation of the 1994-1995 Self-Study was, according to the 2001 Periodic Review Report, that the College "develop an administrative model that supports shared governance" (52). To what extent has such a model been developed and adopted?
8. Describe the process that is in place at the College for assessment of the effectiveness of administrative structures and services. To what extent are the College's various constituencies involved in this assessment process?
9. Administrative review and evaluation of the College's different constituencies is a significant aspect of governance. How effectively are these matters pursued by the various governance groups? E.g., in its role as evaluator of the faculty, how well and how consistently does the administration apply fair and consistent criteria?
10. Describe the information systems in place at the College to support administrative decision-making. Are these systems adequate?

Standard 6

Integrity

Middle States Standard: *In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support to academic and intellectual freedom.*

Questions concerning the Integrity Standard are distributed throughout the other charge sets.

Standard 7

Institutional Assessment

Middle States Standard: *The institution has developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in: achieving its mission and goals; implementing planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes; using institutional resources efficiently; providing leadership and governance; providing administrative structures and services; demonstrating institutional integrity; and assuring that institutional processes and resources support appropriate learning and other outcomes for its students and graduates.*

Study Group Purpose: Bergen Community College recognizes the importance of outcomes assessment as a means to seek improvement. The Institutional and Student Assessment Study Group will examine how well the college community accomplishes its goals and objectives and how effectively it re-evaluates teaching and learning processes. The process will include reviewing the College's Strategic Plan to determine if it is relevant in determining institutional effectiveness. The study group will also examine the extent to which outcome assessment findings are utilized in resource allocation and planning. Further, activities undertaken by the College to develop faculty and staff in creating an optimal atmosphere for student learning will be assessed for effectiveness. Finally, the study group will examine the methods by which the College maintains appropriate accountability for its assessment to external forces, including the public.

1. To what extent can the College demonstrate that it has engendered a culture of assessment and evidence on its campus?
2. What is the College's strategic planning process, and how is it informed by outcomes assessment? How well does the College adhere to this process?
3. What are the methodologies developed by the College for institutional assessment? Have they proven to be effective?
4. What are the various reports generated by the College in conducting and documenting institutional assessment studies and research? Who reads them, how are they used, and with what results? For example, how well has the College used its Five-Year Plan, Assessment Plan for Student Learning, and Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Surveys in assessing and improving learning within the College?
5. To what extent does the College engage in the effective and systematic review and evaluation of its various approaches to institutional assessment?
6. What is the College's plan for evaluating overall institutional effectiveness? To what extent does the College adhere to its plan and sufficiently engage all appropriate stakeholders (faculty, students, and staff) in its institutional assessment and strategic planning processes as they specifically pertain to: the

- review of institutional mission; resource allocation; governance; administration; and, the maintenance of institutional integrity?
7. How well does the College periodically assess the integrity of its assessment processes as evinced in its policies and practices and their various modes of implementation?
 8. To what extent does the College systematically and continuously review and assess student outcomes assessment data? How well does the College use these findings in budget formulation and resource allocation?
 9. To what extent are the data collected appropriate to the assessment of student outcomes?
 10. To what extent are the data collected utilized effectively in academic decision making?
 11. What are the College's procedures and protocols for program and faculty evaluation, and how are they used to determine their effectiveness and use in College decision making and planning?
 12. How does the College determine the effectiveness of plans for faculty and staff development, and what mechanisms for the assessment of faculty and staff development are in place? How are the plans' adequacy evaluated over time?
 13. How well are the College's assessment processes and results communicated to both internal and external constituencies? Is the level and quality of communication appropriate?
 14. Are all College constituencies effectively and systematically involved in planning assessment processes? If so, how, and with what results?
 15. To what extent do members of the College community accept responsibility for institutional renewal and improvement based on data collection and outcomes assessment?

Standard 8

Student Admissions

Middle States Standard: *The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission.*

Study Group Purpose: The Student Admissions and Support Services Study Group will examine the role of admissions in an open enrollment institution. It will evaluate the extent to which the College's admissions procedures and practices are clearly stated, widely communicated, fully understood, consistently implemented, and periodically reviewed for planning. The group will further establish the degree to which these

procedures and practices are consistent with—and contribute to—the College’s Mission and Goals as part of an overall enrollment strategy.

1. To what extent are “best practice” models used in the admissions process? What opportunities exist for collaboration across the College related to admissions, such as for marketing materials, student recruitment and outreach, and, if so, are they effectively utilized?
2. Given that the college has an open enrollment policy, what is the specific purpose of Admissions? How does Admissions know whether its purpose is being accomplished? How does it evaluate and assess whether its purpose is being achieved, and whether the kind and levels of effort are appropriate and sufficient?
3. What are the processes and procedures for ensuring integrity of operations?
4. What standards exist—both internal and external—for ethical and responsible relationships? Do publications, brochures, and advertising accurately describe the College's programs?
5. Given that programs in Nursing and Allied Health are selective, how do admissions staff members work with the academic departments to ensure that: a) prospective students are given accurate information about program requirements and b) admissions decisions are made in a fair and consistent manner?
6. To what extent is information on student learning outcomes utilized as a recruitment tool, and how is its effectiveness determined?
7. To what extent is financial aid information and scholarship material current, accurate, and readily available to students?
8. Describe the review process for maintaining accuracy in the College’s catalogue. To what extent is this a collaborative effort across the College?

Standard 9

Student Support Services

Middle States Standard: *The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution’s goals for students.*

Study Group Purpose: The Student Admissions and Support Services Study Group will examine the extent to which student support services at Bergen Community College: (1) comply with their purpose of enhancing the student’s quality of life; (2) contribute to student development and learning; and (3) are congruent with the College’s Mission and Goals. In addition, the group will examine to the effectiveness of Student Service programs and how outcomes are utilized in planning.

1. What kinds of support services are particularly important given our student population? How well is the College able to serve our increasingly diverse students? What changes have been made in response to this increase? Have they been effective?
2. To what extent are the providers of Student Services qualified for the positions they hold and the services they offer? How are staff members (including student aides) who work on the “front lines” trained to communicate with students and prospective students with respect and sensitivity? Are professional development opportunities available? How are they oriented to the College so they can make appropriate referrals when necessary?
3. What services and programs does the College provide to enhance the academic, career, cultural, social, emotional, civic, and moral development of its students? How are these organized and promoted?
4. How consistent are the goals of Student Services with the needs of our students and the Mission of the College? To what degree do administration, faculty, and staff coordinate their efforts to meet these goals? How seamless is the delivery of student services?
5. What instructional support does the Counseling Center provide to meet discipline-specific needs? How are the results of the Noel-Levitz survey being utilized to improve support?
6. Does the College have an overarching plan for assessing the outcomes of Student Services, including a feedback loop for utilizing assessment results? How are these assessment results used for improvement? Does the College anticipate and provide for changing needs in a systematic way? What methodologies exist to assess student needs and evaluate the outcomes of Student Services programs?
7. How are athletic programs administered? What goals exist for them and how are they assessed for effectiveness?
8. Does the College have published and appropriate policies concerning the release of student information? What evidence exists that these policies are implemented?
9. To what extent does the College have in place a process for addressing student complaints or grievances? How does the College assure that these processes are fair and impartial? To what extent are these processes published and widely available? Can the College demonstrate that student grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably? Does it maintain records of student complaints?
10. Can the College demonstrate equitable and appropriately consistent treatment in matters of student discipline?
11. What kinds of technology are used in our student support services, and how effective are they?

Standard 10

Faculty

Middle States Standard: *The institution's instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.*

Study Group Purpose: The Faculty Study Group will research and analyze the extent to which the faculty of Bergen Community College is responsible for devising and developing academic, professional, research and service programs within the framework of the College's educational mission and vision. It will analyze the adequacy of faculty and other professional staff to support the programs offered by the College, including a review of the faculty selection processes, for their consistency with the College's Mission and Vision and the diversity of our student population. The group will also examine the consistency of processes for appointment, promotion, tenure, and evaluation, as well as the College's commitment to standards for professional growth and academic freedom for full-time and part-time faculty. Further, the group will analyze faculty participation in institutional planning, curriculum review, and the determination of technology needs.

Size, Composition, and Qualifications of the Faculty

1. How does the College determine what qualifications are appropriate for faculty in general? To what extent are the size and professional qualifications of the faculty appropriate to the Vision and Mission of the College? Describe the process in which it is determined that faculty members are appropriately qualified for the specific courses that they teach. Is sufficient oversight and review given to this process?
2. Who determines the number of faculty needed at each level, and in each area, to support a comprehensive array of degrees and degree options, and how well is this done? To what extent is the hiring of faculty tied to planning and budgeting in a meaningful way? Who is responsible for linking hiring to planning and budgeting, and how strong are these links?
3. At the start of each semester, it is common for there to be classes without an instructor, and staffing shortages seem to be a chronic problem in a number of departments and disciplines. How do such shortages affect decisions about (a) how many sections to offer in that area, (b) whether adjunct salaries are competitive with other local colleges, or at least reasonably high enough to attract prospective adjunct faculty, (c) whether prospective adjunct faculty possess the appropriate qualifications for the courses they are being asked to teach, and (d) whether and how such situations compromise overall educational quality?
4. To what extent is our faculty diverse in terms of composition by race, gender and ethnicity, in light of the long term demographic trends in Bergen County, and how successful are our efforts at achieving diversity? How does the faculty's diversity, or lack of it, enrich or fail to enrich the curricula?

Faculty Role in Curriculum Development and Facilities

5. How is the curriculum designed, maintained and updated by faculty? Is there appropriate cooperation and support across academic fields?
6. What is the involvement of faculty in the selection of equipment and facilities that are designed to support the instructional programs?

Teaching, Research, and Professional Growth

7. How is teaching excellence defined and measured? Is the approach to measuring teaching excellence valid, reliable and fairly applied? To what extent do student learning outcomes factor into judgments about teaching excellence?
8. How does the College work to enhance teaching and research skills? Is there a plan for this? To what extent is it done systematically? Who is responsible for making sure that such enhancement occurs? Who oversees these processes?
9. How does the College define "professional growth?" What expectations exist for continued professional growth and renewal? In light of the College's mission, is there a clear expectation about the faculty's role in teaching, scholarship, and service? How is this communicated to both new faculty and senior faculty, and is it adequate? Are faculty roles and responsibilities defined in such a way that insures overall equity and fairness? How does the College appropriately and adequately support each of these three activities? Is the support for development and advancement fairly distributed amongst faculty?
10. Is the faculty teaching load appropriate, given the Mission and Vision of the College? Does the teaching load reflect an appropriate institutional commitment to scholarship and other forms of professional development, and to community service?
11. How does the College support faculty members with different development needs in different phases of their careers? What support and incentives exist for faculty to engage in life-long learning, innovation and experimentation?
12. Given the heavy reliance on, and the large number of adjunct faculty, does the College direct a proportional amount of its resources to providing orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development opportunities for adjuncts? Are professional development benefits available to adjuncts?
13. How does the College support faculty pursuit of grants and other external funding?
14. Does the College engage in sound ethical practices, and demonstrate respect for individuals, in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service? Are faculty given reasonable and sufficient autonomy in choice of teaching methods and selection of course materials?
15. How well does the College foster a climate of academic inquiry and engagement? Is there a plan for fostering such a climate? What programs or

processes are devoted to achieving this goal, and how is the College's achievement of it assessed?

16. Are there widely disseminated policies concerning academic and intellectual freedom? How does the College educate its community members, particularly faculty, about the rights and responsibilities of academic freedom?

Faculty Evaluation

17. Describe the review process for faculty. Who is charged with decision-making regarding faculty review, and does the system work effectively and fairly? Are all levels of review appropriate? What procedures are in place to apply "checks and balances" within the process?
18. Are all faculty and staff provided with accurate information on personnel policies and procedures? Do such procedures include hiring, promotion, tenure, grievance, and discipline? How is such information communicated? Is it in print? Is it reasonably accessible? How are the relevant constituencies involved in the establishment, implementation, and assessment of such policies and procedures? Are there written and widely disseminated policies for each? How does the College insure that standards are clearly applied?
19. How are adjuncts, lecturers, and non-tenured faculty reviewed, relative to tenured faculty, and is there parity in review to the extent that is possible? How does the College accomplish review of these faculty members given the realities of short-duration appointments, acute staffing needs, and potential imbalance in qualifications between short- and long-term faculty members?
20. What is the role of collective bargaining in implementing standards for promotion, tenure, and grievance? To what extent does collective bargaining work effectively with faculty and administrative committees and their processes when it comes to faculty promotion, tenure, and grievance?
21. How does the College plan for, and evaluate, excellence in academic advising, student mentoring, and other teaching related activities?

General

22. In faculty affairs, are there any actual or apparent conflicts of interest? If so, how has the College and/or faculty leadership resolved, or attempted to avoid, such conflicts, or the appearance of such? Are such conflicts, real or apparent, openly discussed, examined, refuted, or discouraged?
23. What faculty groups or positions are charged with academic leadership? Who oversees and reviews performance in this area?
24. Have class sizes increased since the last Self-Study? Have they increased for some types of courses, but not others? If so, what is the rationale for such increases, and is it balanced against reasonable concerns about educational quality?

25. How are the principles of academic freedom reflected in the College's hiring, retention, promotion, and dismissal practices?

Standard 11

Educational Offerings

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

Study Group Purpose: The General Education and Educational Offerings Study Group is charged with reviewing Bergen Community College's educational offerings to determine the degree to which they display academic rigor that is appropriate to the College's higher education mission. The Task Force will determine the extent to which (1) student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, have been identified, (2) programs provide a coherent experience that leads to the desired outcomes and (3) appropriate resources are available to support these educational offerings.

1. In what ways do our educational offerings reflect and promote the mission of the College? How are these offerings developed and evaluated? In what ways do the educational offerings reflect and promote the Core Competencies for student learning, approved by the Faculty Senate in May 2003? Are there plans underway to identify and fill gaps?
2. What evidence do we have that our educational offerings provide sufficient rigor, content and breath? How is this evaluated? Do programs like the Allied Health programs adhere to standards of outside organizations? How is this measured?
3. Are the programs leading to degrees or other recognized credentials structured in such a way that the students' learning experience is coherent? To what extent do the courses proceed in logical order? Is the order evaluated periodically? Are adjustments made? Are there testing/evaluative instruments in place to measure students' progress?
4. To what extent are program goals in place? Where are they stated? What is the process for the development and /or revision of these goals and does this process take into account new developments or changes in the academic disciplines? Do these goals adequately reflect the College's mission? In what ways are students made aware of these goals? Are these goals used for outcomes assessment?
5. What is the process for selecting co-curricular and extra-curricular goals? Do students participate? How? Do faculty participate? How? How are co-curricular and extra-curricular experiences organized, coordinated and promoted? To what extent is the effectiveness and success of these programs periodically evaluated, and are the results used to improve these programs? In what ways do curricular,

- co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs complement one another and enhance the students' academic experience at the College?
6. Are there resources (library, lab space, instructional equipment) available to support the educational offerings? Are they adequate? Are they utilized in appropriate, responsible, and honest ways? How do we know?? If not, why not? How do the various academic programs promote student (and faculty) use of information and learning resources? Are students trained to access information? What kinds of learning resources are particularly important at the College? Are there ways in which we can improve the availability and accessibility of these resources?
 7. What is the library's role in promoting information literacy? How well does it fulfill its role? To what extent is the library staff skilled in this area, and appropriate for this role? Is the library staff offered professional development opportunities? How do professional library and information technology staff collaborate with faculty? Is this collaboration sufficient?
 8. What role does the Curriculum Committee play in the development and revision of the College's educational offerings? What role do department heads play? What guiding principles underlie decisions in this area? To what extent are curricular decisions based on the needs of the students, and how is information about such needs collected and delivered to the relevant parties?
 9. What is the policy for transfer credit? Is it published in the College catalogue? Are these policies implemented in a fair and consistent manner? How is this evaluated? Are there resources available to help students to make decisions about the transferability of courses?
 10. How is the Honors Program administered? What criteria are used to select Honors Faculty? Who is responsible for the quality and content of the courses? How is this program evaluated?
 11. Can we show that all syllabi incorporate student learning objectives? If not, is there a plan in place for the completion of this? What are the details of this plan? Are the objectives consistent with Mission of the College? How well do these stated objectives communicate to students the College's expectations for their success?
 12. Do educational offerings take into account the needs of underprepared and physically challenged learners? What changes have we made since the last Self-Study? How do we address the needs of adult learners? To what degree are the needs of adult learners different from those of traditional students? How do we access the services that we offer to adult learners?
 13. To what extent have the College's educational offerings responded to demographic change? Have our curricular improvement efforts been marked by equitable and consistent treatment of all constituencies involved?
 14. Are there assessment plans in place for the various programs at the College? Are these plans consistent with the Mission of the College? To what extent does

the faculty participate in outcomes assessment? How can we ensure that faculty participation continues?

15. To what extent are we a “learning college”? To what extent do we make adjustments as we collect information? To what extent do we use assessment of student learning and program outcomes to improve student learning?

Standard 12

General Education

Middle States Standard: *The institution’s curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy.*

Study Group Purpose: The General Education and Educational Offerings Study Group is charged with the task of examining the role that the General Education Program plays at the College. This role will be analyzed from a variety of perspectives. The group will examine how the program advances the Mission of the College and how it relates to the Core Competencies. Since the General Education Program includes a wide range of courses, the group will review the process by which these courses are approved as well as how these courses are designed to enhance the abilities of students in the following areas: oral and written communication; scientific and quantitative reasoning; technology; and information literacy. As at many colleges, General Education courses at Bergen are an integral part of many of the degrees that students earn; therefore, this group will analyze how the program communicates its requirements and policies to students and faculty alike. Finally, this group will examine the committee responsible for the operations of the General Education Program and how the program is assessed.

1. Does the College have a philosophy of General Education? How does this philosophy inform decisions about specific courses that are being considered for General Education status? Is this philosophy used to review and update the list of General Education courses?
2. How is the General Education Program related to the Mission of the College? Is there a relationship between General Education and the academic majors? Explain this relationship. Are students made aware of this relationship? How?
3. In what ways are the skills and abilities expected to be developed in the General Education Program related to the Core Competencies? Since the General Education Goals and Core Competencies specify the College’s expectations for student learning, how are these expectations communicated and conveyed to students and faculty? Are they published and widely disseminated? To what extent are students and faculty familiar with them?
4. What are the General Education Goals, and what processes exist to ensure that General Education courses are geared toward meeting these goals? To what

extent are faculty and students made aware of these goals? How are they made aware of them?

5. How is the General Education Program organized? Does this organizational pattern ensure that students are exposed to General Education courses sufficiently early in their programs so that these courses can serve as a foundation for their learning? Is the General Education Program of sufficient scope? Are there any subject areas that are either under- or over-represented in the program? Do all associate degree programs require at least 15 semester hours of General Education? If not, what alternative approaches are in place?
6. What is the Diversity Requirement, and what learning objective(s) was it designed to satisfy? How is it assessed for effectiveness?
7. How does the General Education Program incorporate the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives in a way that is consistent with the Mission of the College? In what ways are these qualities instilled in students? How is this measured? How does the College ensure that students study these qualities in an environment that is sensitive to and respectful of the needs of our diverse community?
8. What General Education courses, activities, and experiences are designed to foster learning in the following areas: oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, technologic capabilities appropriate to the discipline, and information literacy, which includes critical analysis and reasoning? How do these courses, activities, and experiences ensure that students are proficient in these areas by the completion of their degrees? How is this assessed? Is the responsibility for the teaching of these skills shared between the General Education Program and the majors? In what ways?
9. How are students and faculty made aware of the College's General Education requirements? How does the College ensure that students understand these requirements both before and after matriculation? How is the College community made aware of the transfer policies for General Education courses? Are these policies made available to students so that they can make informed choices before they consider transferring? Do advisors and counselors receive special training in the implementation of these policies? Is the process for determining the transferability of General Education courses from other institutions applied in a timely, consistent, fair, and equitable manner?
10. What is the role of the General Education Committee? How is this role assessed? How is the committee organized? In what ways are members chosen? How long do members serve on the General Education Committee? What interaction exists between this committee and the various other components of the College community?
11. How are General Education courses approved? How heavily does the College rely on external (other institutions) approval for its General Education courses? Does this process also take into account College's own definition of General Education? How is the approval process evaluated and assessed? In what ways

- does the General Education Committee become involved in the approval of these courses?
12. How is the General Education Program assessed? Is this assessment process linked to the strategic plan and to program level plans for student learning? How? Are there intended outcomes in place for the program? Do these outcomes include the program's ability to provide a foundation for other learning? When does the College assess these outcomes? How is the General Education Committee involved in assessment?

Standard 13

Related Educational Activities

Middle States Standard: *Institutional programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.*

Study Group Purpose: The Related Educational Activities Study Group will determine the extent to which Bergen Community College's Basic Skills, ESL, Certificate, Non-Credit, and Distance Learning programs meet appropriate standards and are consistent with the College's Mission. We will include Experiential Learning, Contractual Relationships and Affiliated Providers in our overall evaluation of content, quality, mode of delivery, and effectiveness of the College's related educational activities.

BASIC SKILLS

1. How effective is placement testing in identifying students not fully prepared for college-level courses? What is the impact of the new computerized tests (Accuplacer and LOEP) used to place students in developmental courses: Math Basic Skills, English Basic Skills and English as a second language? How is effectiveness of placement testing determined?
2. How are placement criteria determined? What are the criteria? Is challenge testing available? What are the profiles of the students entering these courses? How many students require remediation in Basic Skills and ESL?
3. How effective and adequate are programs and services (e.g., Introduction to the College Experience AIMS, Office of Special Services programs, EOF program, counseling workshops, and tutoring) which are provided for under prepared students who enter the College to strengthen academic skills? What assessment instruments are used to assess their effectiveness?
4. What remedial or pre-collegiate level courses are available (in Math, English BS & ALP)? To what degree are the courses adequate to meet the needs of the students? How many courses and sections are offered? Are remedial programs structured in a way that optimally promotes student success? Under what circumstances are students permitted to enroll in credit-bearing courses prior to completing required developmental courses?

5. Who oversees remedial programs? How effective is administrative and operational oversight?
6. Who teaches remedial courses? What credentials are required? What is the student-teacher ratio? How adequate is it? What methods, materials and approaches are used? Which are most successful? How is success measured?
7. What is the impact of developmental program completion on student persistence and academic achievement in degree programs and courses?

CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS

1. What constitutes a certificate program? What programs are available as “credit,” and which are non-credit? Are they a coherent and sequential group of related courses with distinct learning objectives? What, if any, is the “value added” in a certificate program vs. completing the same sequence of courses outside the program?
2. What do we know about the students who take certificate programs? What do we know about the career and/or academic goals of the students who choose these programs?
3. How is a “certificate” defined and how well is the definition understood? Certificate of Completion vs. Certificate of Achievement vs. Credential of Certification? Can we (or should we) hold all certificates programs to the same quality standards? How is their “successfulness” determined?
4. Are these certificates “stand alones,” or do they allow for transition into a more rigorous course of study? Are there any articulation processes in place?
5. Who teaches certificate programs? What credentials are required? How often are certificate programs evaluated so as to ensure that they still meet the needs for which they were designed? How closely connected are certificate programs with what is actually occurring in the field, i.e. business, healthcare etc. environments?

EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING (EL)

1. What policies does the College have regarding EL in the admissions process and/or in the waiver of certain prerequisite courses? How are these decisions made, and by whom? How well are these policies articulated and understood? Does the idea of giving credit for EL fit in with the Mission and Goals of the College?

NON-CREDIT OFFERINGS (NCO)

1. What are the components of the College's non-credit offerings? How do the roles of the NC areas, i.e. DCE, ILR, Corporate Training, CLC and Hispanic Institute, fit into the overall Mission of the College?
2. How many students enroll in NC areas per semester?
3. How are NCO designed, approved, priced, implemented, marketed and evaluated? Has this been successful, and how is success determined?
4. How are the needs of both internal and external constituencies determined, and once determined, what is the process whereby needs are fulfilled or not fulfilled? Are the NC areas of the College doing all that they can?
5. What are the connections between NCO and credit side offerings? Are the NC areas integrated into the College or viewed as separate entities? To what extent do NCOs serve as a platform for entry into credit bearing programs? Should they?
6. To what extent is the College responsive to collaborations between the NC areas? Have collaborative credit/non-credit efforts been successful? How well have areas of collaboration been developed? Is there a desire for, and sufficient institutional support for, such collaborations?
7. How are NC instructors chosen? What credentials are required? Are adequate resources given to the development and implementation of the non-credit areas of the College?

DISTANCE OR DISTRIBUTED LEARNING

1. How many distance learning courses are available? Which courses? How many students participate in the program? What modes of delivery are used? Are offerings via distance learning consistent with College Mission and Goals and rationale for distance learning?
2. To what extent do distance learning courses meet institution-wide standards for quality of instruction, articulated expectations of student learning, academic rigor and educational effectiveness? Do online courses meet the same standards as parallel on-site offerings? How is the quality of online courses assessed?
3. Has planning for distance learning included consideration of legal and regulatory requirements such as copyright, intellectual property, ownership of courses? Do the Teacher Learning with Technology Roundtable and Technology Governance Council function effectively as technology planning agents?
4. What formal online degree programs are offered? Do online degree programs demonstrate coherence, including appropriate learning outcomes and academic rigor?

5. Has the College demonstrated a commitment to continue online offerings for a period sufficient to enable admitted students to complete the degree in a publicized timeframe?
6. What assurance is there that arrangements with consortial partners (NJVCC, Vet Tech, Med Lab Tech) or contractors (WebCT, Smarthinking, Ed2Go.) do not compromise the integrity of the College or of the educational offerings?
7. What is the process by which the faculty validates any course materials or technology-based resources developed outside the College, e.g., publisher-developed courses?
8. Who registers for online courses? What is known about student expectations of distance learning and whether the expectations are met? Are students required to demonstrate that they have appropriate hardware and technology skills and competencies needed to succeed? What is the attrition rate in online courses?
9. How effective are learning resources (tutoring, library services) available to students in online courses? How accessible are these resources and how adequate are they for the courses that offered online?
10. What kind of orientation, training and support does The Online Professor (TOPP) provide for faculty participating in distance learning? How are instructors chosen to participate in TOPP? How well does the Center for Instructional Technology (CIT) meet the expectations and needs of faculty?
11. How adequate is the equipment and infrastructure provided to support distance education? What staff and technical assistance is there?

CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIPS AND AFFILIATED PROVIDERS

1. What contractual arrangements currently exist, and in what areas of the College? What mechanisms are in place to ensure quality? How and by whom are these relationships evaluated?
2. What is the involvement of in-house faculty/expertise in the development of contractual relationships? How integrated is this component?
3. What is the role of such ancillary programs such as the Study Abroad program and the SBDC programs, and how well are they understood and subscribed?

Standard 14

Assessment of Student Learning

Middle States Standard: *Assessment of student learning demonstrates that the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with*

institutional goals and that students at graduation have achieved appropriate higher education goals.

Study Group Purpose: The Institutional and Student Assessment Study Group will analyze the degree to which Bergen Community College demonstrates that its students achieve intended learning outcomes. This analysis requires review of the BCC Mission and Goals statement to determine the level of establishment and grounding of overall learning goals and objectives. Our analysis also necessitates reviewing the extent to which systematic learning assessment plans are implemented at the course, program, and institutional levels. Finally, the group will analyze the extent to which the results of assessment are utilized for strategic planning and making improvements.

1. What is the institutional, program, and/or course plan for assessment of student learning outcomes? Are student learning objectives defined in institutional, program, and course plans for assessment?
2. Does each academic program have a mission statement that is consistent with the College's mission? Does this mission statement articulate student learning goals and objectives?
3. Have the new Core Competencies been articulated in all courses and programs?
4. To what extent are student learning objectives clearly stated for each program and for each course (e.g., on the course syllabus or outline)? To what extent are student learning objectives at the program and course levels linked to the Core Competencies? Have these objectives been operationalized for measurement?
5. What are the methods utilized to measure if the objectives (including the Core Competencies) have been met? What methods should or could be added to further validate that intended learning outcomes are being met?
6. To what extent is there support at the program and institutional levels to ensure that ongoing assessment is conducted, reviewed, and the results utilized in planning new initiatives for improvement?
7. What method(s) does the College and its programs use to communicate learning outcomes findings to the administration, faculty, and students?
8. What resources (e.g., budgetary, manpower, time) does the College provide to conduct assessment of student learning at the course, program and institutional levels? Are these resources adequate to accomplish comprehensive assessments?
9. What areas (e.g., offices or departments) of the College assist in the assessment of student learning outcomes? How are the learning assessment findings communicated to the college community (e.g., administration, faculty, students)?
10. Who is responsible to oversee the process of assessment at the institutional, program, and course levels?

11. When recommendations are made in response to assessment findings, to whom are they made? What evidence exists that assessment findings are utilized for change and development of new initiatives?

VIII. Inventory of Support Documents

Two collections of data and resources have been prepared to assist in the Self-Study process, and both are integrated in the Suggested Resources List contained in the Study Guide for each study group. The first is a general list of data and resources, organized by content, and compiled by the Office of Research and Planning. The second is an inventory of assessment-related documents that was prepared by the Director of Learning Outcomes Assessment and Testing. Both are included in full below.

In addition to the existing data and resources, three surveys are being prepared for the fall semester. Students, faculty, and staff will all be surveyed on topics and issues of interest to the study groups. By identifying and coordinating the data needs and interests of the various study groups at this early stage in the process, and having one survey per College sector prepared and administered by the Office of Research and Planning, we hope to ensure valid results and reduce wasteful duplication of effort.

Documents that are not available through a link to the MSSS Website (see Section IX below) will be available in the Middle States Steering Committee Office (L-230).

Office of Research and Planning **Self-Study Resource List:**

College Mission, Goals, Vision, Catalog

BCC 2003-2004 Catalog
BCC Mission Statement and Goals (in Catalog)
BCC Vision Statement (in Catalog)

Institutional Profiles

Fact Books 2003-04, 2002-03, 2001-02, 2000-01, 1999-2000
Institutional Characteristics, 2003-2004 (IPEDS)
Bergen Community College Annual Reports, 2001, 2002, 2003
NJCHE Accountability Reports 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003

Middle States Reports

Periodic Review Report 2001
Reviewers' Report Analyzing the Periodic Review Report 2001
Periodic Review Report 2001 Fiscal Analysis and Response
1994-95 Self-Study Report
Evaluation Team's Report (for 1994-95 Self-Study)
Middle States Annual Institutional Profile, 2003-2004, 2002-2003, 2001-2002
Middle States Follow-up Reports (March 1998, September 2002)
Distance Learning Report to Middle States
Reaccreditation Recommendations, Status as of Fall 1998 (internal report)

Planning

Status of Goals and Objectives 2000-2001, 2001-2002, 2002-2003
Five-Year Plan, Fiscal Years 2001-2005
NJCHE Enrollment Projections
Economic Impact Study Report (The Socioeconomic Benefits Generated by Bergen Community College, Executive Summary)
Projected Additional Online Instructional Needs (Spring 2004)
Trailblazer Report
Bergen County Data Book, 2003
Continuing the Quest for Excellence: A Multifaceted Planning Approach (includes planning documents in use through 2000)

Enrollment – Credit Courses

Fact Book (Sections on Enrollment, Program Data and Number of Credits)
Enrollment Memos: Fall 2001, Fall 2002, Fall 2003, Spring 2002, Spring 2003, Spring 2004, Summer 2002, Summer 2003
Enrollment Profile, Fall 2003
Fall 2003 Distance Education (NJIPEDS)
Course Enrollments, Summer 2 2000 – Fall 2003
Distance Learning Report to Middle States
ALP Enrollments
Online Course Enrollments (2000S1 – 2003FA)
Course Schedules, Summer 2003, Fall 2003, Spring 2004
College Experience Program for High School Students
Study Abroad Program

Enrollment – Non-Credit Courses

Non-credit Enrollments FY 2003
Fact Book (Section on Non-Credit Enrollment)
Continuing Education Catalogs, Fall 2003, Spring 2004, Summer 2004,

Student Demographics

Fact Book (Section on Student Characteristics)
Continuing Education Student Demographics
Continuing Education Residency Analysis
Student Profile, Fall 2002 Pell Students
Linguistic and Educational Background of Fall 2003 ALP Students
2001 New Jersey ESL Program Survey

Outcomes

Graduation and Transfer Rates, 6/03
Graduation Memos 2002-2003, 2001-2002
Graduate Follow-up Reports, 2001-2002, 2000-2001, 1999-2000 graduates
Graduate Follow-up program-specific surveys, 2001, 2002 graduates
Fact Book (Section on Degrees Awarded)
Online Course Completion, Fall 2002
Enrollments and Grade Distributions in Online/On-Campus Courses, Fall 2003
Graduation Rates of Non-Traditional Students
Transfer Data, Fall 2001/Spring 2003 Former Students
Retention Reports (Fall 2001 through Spring 2004)
Concurrent Enrollment Report (National Student Clearinghouse Data)

Program Review-Related Reports

Accounting Program Grade Distribution and Placement
Drafting Program Review Data
English Department Library Questionnaire (Fall 2003)
Exercise Science Program Review Data (June 2003, March 2004)
Information Technology Program Review Data (Spring 2004)
INF Enrollment Data, Fall 2001, 2002, 2003
Legal Assistant/ Legal Nurse Consultant Enrollment and Retention
Mathematics Program Review Data
Algebra Support Study, Fall 2002, Spring 2003, Fall 2002/Spring 2003
Success due to Algebra Support Classes, April 2003
Comparison of Outcomes in CAI MAT-011 Sections and Regular MAT-011
Sections, Fall 2003
Music Program Review Data
Travel and Tourism Survey Results
Program Review Data for World Languages and Cultures
World Languages Student Survey Results (Fall 2003)

Applications and Admissions

Applications and Admissions, Fall 2003 (IPEDS)
Your Community Your College (brochure)

Student Services/Satisfaction

Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory and Institutional Priorities Report
Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory Results, 1998 and 2003
Student Handbook, 2002-2003
Graduates' Assessment of Bergen's Services (2001 and 2002 graduates)
Center for Collegiate Deaf Education
Where Will You Go From Here? brochure

College Personnel

Organization Chart
Center for the Study of Intercultural Understanding Faculty Survey Highlights
Noel-Levitz Institutional Priorities Survey, 2003
Employees by Assigned Position (EAP - 2003) (IPEDS)
Fact Book (Section on Faculty Characteristics)
Faculty Handbook, Spring 2004
Faculty Development Program Projects
Faculty Speakers Bureau
CUPA-HR Faculty Salary Survey, 2002

Finance Data

Finance (IPEDS)
Student Financial Aid Report, AY 2002-2003 (NJ IPEDS)
Fact Book (Section on Financial Data)
Grants Report

External Surveys (Misc.)

College Board Survey of Colleges, 2004
US GAO Survey of Community Colleges and Technical Schools, 2004
Chronicle Guidance Publications Annual Survey 2003-2004

Hispanic Outlook Publisher's Questionnaire, 2003
 USDoE/NCES Distance Education at Higher Education Institutions, 2000-2001
 Crime Statistics Report
 Athletics Statistics Report (EADA, 2002-03)

Facilities

BCC Master Plan Report (April 2000)
 2003 EDUCAUSE Core Data Survey
 Library Surveys

Other College Information

In a Nutshell (R&P), February 2003, October 2002, August 2002
 Focus On publications
 Program Brochures
 This & That from Here & There, 2003-2004 Season Schedule

Middle States Resources

Middle States Statement of Accreditation Status, 12/02
 Characteristics of Excellence
 Designs for Excellence: Handbook for Institutional Self-Study
 Resources for Student Learning Assessment
 Handbook for Conducting and Hosting an Evaluation Visit

Inventory Of Assessment-Related Documents

The following list includes all assessment and planning-related documents forwarded to the Office of Testing and Assessment as of May 26, 2004:

Academics

- Academic Vice President
 - Accomplishments, 2000 – 2002 Academic Year
- Division of Business, Math and Social Sciences
 - Annual Report, 2002 – 2003
 - Annual Report, 2001 – 2002
 - Business Administration, 5 – Year Program Review
 - Legal Nurse Consultant Program, Program & Proposal for Curriculum, 2/2001
 - American Bar Association Report, 1997
 - Office Systems Technology, 5-Year Program Review, 12/1994
 - ABA Interim Report, 2/1996
 - Advanced Legal Assistant Certificate (as submitted to ABA), 7/1996
- Division of Arts & Humanities
 - English Language Resource Center, Annual Report, 2002 – 2003, 6/18/2003
 - English Language Resource Center, Annual Report, 2001 – 2002, 6/20/2002
 - English Language Resource Center, Annual Report, 2000 – 2001, 6/20/2001
- Division of Science & Health

Administrative Services

- Facilities Master Plan Report
- Goals & Objectives, 2003 – 2004
- Goals & Objectives, 2002 – 2003
- FY 2003, Goals for the Year, Budget Manager

General Education

- Goals and Objectives of the BCC General Education Program, 2/3/1998
- Report on General Education Administrative Assignment, Fall 1999, 1/5/2000
- Report on General Education Administrative Assignment, Spring 2000, 5/15/2000
- Report on General Education Administrative Assignment, Fall 2000, 1/2/2001
- Report on General Education Administrative Assignment, Spring 2001, 6/8/2001
- Report on General Education Administrative Assignment, Fall 2001, 1/16/2002
- Report on General Education Administrative Assignment, Spring 2002, 5/15/2002
- Report on General Education Administrative Assignment, Summer 2002, 8/20/2002
- Report on General Education Administrative Assignment, Fall 2002, 1/15/2003
- Classroom Syllabus Form for BCC Gen. Ed. Courses, Box Version, 12/17/2002
- Classroom Syllabus Form for BCC Gen. Ed. Courses, List Version, 12/17/2002
- Writing a Syllabus
- General Education Committee Report to Senate, Part II, 4/24/2001
- Core Competencies Audit Survey Form
- The Center for the Study of Intercultural Understanding @ BCC, Faculty Survey, Highlights

Learning Outcomes Assessment and Testing

- Assessment Status Report, March 9, 2004
- Accuplacer 2003, Computerized Basic Skills Testing Pilot Project Report
- External Reviewer Guidelines (current)
- Memo, Office of Testing and Assessment Fall 2003 Activity, 2/2/2004
- Memo, Office of Testing and Assessment Spring 2004 Activity, 5/25/2004
- Goals and Objectives, 2002-2003, Final Report
- Goals and Objectives, 2003-2004, Year-End Report
- Program Review Guidelines, Revised September 2002
- Memo, Analysis of Accuplacer Arithmetic Placement Scores and MAT-011 Student performance for the Spring 2004 Semester, 5/26/2004
- Memo, EBS Placement Scores and Spring 2004 EBS Student Course Performance, 5/26/2004

Office of Institutional Research & Planning

- Accounting Program Review Enrollment and Grade Data, 12/2003
- Linguistic and Educational Background of Fall 2003 ALP Students, 11/2003
- Continuing Education Residency Analysis, 12/2003
- Enrollments and Grade Distributions in Online and On-Campus Courses, 1/2004
- Fall 2003 Enrollment Profile, 11/2003
- The Report of the Findings of the Graduate Follow-Up Survey, 1/2004
- The Report of the Findings of the Graduate Follow-Up Survey, 12/2002
- Enrollment and Retention in Legal Assistant/Paralegal and Legal Nurse Consultant Programs, 11/2003

- Comparison of Outcomes in CAI MAT-011 Sections and Regular MAT-011 Sections, Fall 2003
- Mathematics Program Review Data
- Newsletter, "In A Nutshell", 8/2002
- Newsletter, "In A Nutshell", 10/2002
- Newsletter, "In A Nutshell", 2/2003
- Music Program Review Data, 2/2004
- Retention, Fall 2001- Spring 2002
- Program Review Data for World Languages and Cultures, 1/2004
- Fact Book, 2002 – 2003
- Five-Year Plan, Fiscal Years 2001 - 2005
- Five-Year Plan, Fiscal Years 2001 – 2005, Status of Goals and Objectives 2000 – 2001
- Five-Year Plan, Fiscal Years 2001 – 2005, Status of Goals and Objectives 2001 – 2002
- Five-Year Plan, Fiscal Years 2001 – 2005, Status of Goals and Objectives 2002 – 2003
- Student Satisfaction Inventory & Institutional Priorities Survey, Results, 9/2003
- Institutional Enrollment Projections, 4/19/2004
- FY 2004 – FY 2010 Capital Needs, 7/15/2003
- Memorandum, 2002-2003 Graduates, 8/6/2003

Philip Ciarco Learning Center

- Small Business Development Center
 - Expenditures, 10/1/2001 – 12/31/2001, Exhibit D – 4th Quarter
 - Progress Report, 2001 Deliverables, 12/31/2001, Exhibit C
 - Progress Report, 2002 Deliverables, 12/31/2002, Exhibit C
 - Expenditures, 1/1/2003 – 12/31/2003, Exhibit D
 - Progress Report, 2003 Deliverables, 12/31/2003
 - Expenditures, 10/1/2002 – 12/31/2002, Exhibit D – 4th Quarter
 - Annual Report, 1/1 – 12/31/2003, SBDC
 - Annual Report, 1/1 – 12/31/2002, SBDC
 - Annual Report, 1/1 – 12/31/2001, SBDC

President

- President's Annual Report, 2001
- President's Annual Report, 2002
- President's Annual Report, 2003
- President's Annual Report, 2004
- Trailblazer 2000, Continuing the Quest for Excellence

Student Services

- Office of Admissions & Recruitment
 - Annual Report, Office of Admissions & Recruitment, 2002 – 2003, 7/17/2003
 - Annual Report, Office of Admissions & Recruitment, 2000 – 2001, 4/26/2001
 - Goals 2001 – 2002, Office of Admissions and Recruitment

- Counseling Center
 - Annual Report, Counseling Center, 2000 – 2001, 9/10/2001
 - Annual Report, Counseling Center, 2001 – 2002, 7/2002
 - Annual Report, Counseling Center, 2002 – 2003
 - Mid Year Report, Counseling Center, July – December 2003, Revised 2/2004
 - Counselor Evaluation Form
 - Transfer Advising Program, Program Evaluation Form
- Academic Advising Center
 - Vision of Academic Advising at BCC, Summer 2003
- Educational Opportunity Fund
 - Mid-Year Report, Educational Opportunity Fund Program, July – December 2003
 - Summary of Accomplishments, 2003
 - CHE Letter, Re: EOF Performance Criteria data, 8/19/2002
 - CHE Letter, Memo – FY2004 EOF Preliminary Allocations, 4/7/2003
 - CHE Letter, Re: EOF Performance Criteria data, 1/12/2004
 - Summary of Accomplishments, 2002 – 2003 Academic Year
 - EOF Annual Report, 2001 – 2002
 - EOF Annual Report, 2000 – 2001
 - EOF Annual Report, 1999 – 2000
- Financial Aid Office
 - Mid-Year Report, Financial Aid, 2003 – 2004
 - Financial Aid Basic Statistics, as of 1/12/2004
 - Financial Aid Goals and Objectives, 2002 – 2003
 - Financial Aid Goals and Objectives, 2001 – 2002
 - Mid-Year Assessment Report, 2/10/2000
- Registration Office
 - Goals and Objectives, 2003 – 2004 Mid-Year, Registrar
 - Goals and Objectives, 2002 – 2003, Office of Registration and Student Information Services
- Office of Student Life
 - Goals and Objectives, 2002 – 2003, Office of Student Life
 - Leadership Weekend, The Theme For Leadership Weekend: The Big CCCCC
 - List of Accomplishments, 2002 – 2003
- Division of Student Services
 - Goals and Objectives, 2003 – 2004, Vice President, Student Services
 - Summary of Accomplishments, 2002 – 2003, Vice President, Student Services
 - Goals and Objectives, 2000 – 2001, Division of Student Services
 - Board of Trustees Retreat, 10/23/2001, Division of Student Services, Status Report

- Office of Specialized Services
 - Office of Special Services, E-mail from Jerry Walter, re: Evaluation reports of Bergen & Camden, 9/17/03
 - Program Review Results, Center for Collegiate Deaf Education, April 15 – 16, 1999
 - Program Review Results, Office of Special Services, April 15 – 20, 1999
 - Findings: Fall 2002 Survey of NJ Campus Programs for Students with Disabilities, 6/2003
 - State of New Jersey, Commission on Higher Education, letter regarding summary report of findings of survey conducted of the directors of services for students with disabilities on campuses across the state.
 - Office of Specialized Services, Mid-Year Report, July 2003 – December 2003
 - Report, Student Needs Assessment, Fall 2000
 - Annual Report, 2000 – 2001, Collegiate Center for Deaf Education
- Cooperative Education & Career Development Center
 - Accomplishments, 2002-2003
 - Accomplishments, 2002
 - Students Served by Center

Technology and Information Services

- Office of Information Technology
 - Annual Report, Fiscal 2002 – 2003, 6/13/2003, OIT
 - OIT Annual Report, Fiscal 2002, 5/15/2002, Status Report OIT Unit Goals for Fiscal 2002
 - Annual Report, Fiscal 2000 – 2001, 7/15/2001, OIT
 - Goals and Objectives, 2002 – 2003
 - Goals and Objectives, 2001 – 2002
 - Goals and Objectives, 2000 – 2001
 - Annual Communication Plan, 3/2004
- Sidney Silverman Library & LRC
 - Annual Report, 7/1/2002 – 6/30/2003, Sidney Silverman Library & LRC
 - Annual Report, 2001 – 2002, Sidney Silverman Library & LRC
 - Annual Report, 2000 – 2001, Sidney Silverman Library & LRC
- Office of Public Relations
 - Public Relations – Divisional Accomplishments for College's Annual Report, 2000-2001
 - Annual Report, 2002 – 2003, Office of Public Relations
 - Annual Report, 2001 – 2002, Office of Public Relations
 - Annual Report, 2000 – 2001, Office of Public Relations
- Center for Instructional Technology and Distance Learning
 - Annual Report, Fiscal 2002-2003, 6/2/2003
 - Annual Report, Fiscal 2001-2002, 5/31/2002
 - Distance Learning Business Plan Outline
 - On-Line Course Completion, Fall 2002, 11/2003

- Preplanning Findings and Suggested Major Goals and Strategies, 6/13/2003
- Report on Institutional Change, Distance Learning, 5/2000

IX. Self-Study Website

MSSC is currently planning a multipurpose website that will be fully operational by the start of the Fall 2004 semester. The website will be both a hub of information and resources for study groups and the larger college community, and it will also be a vehicle for MSSC to communicate with the campus community. In addition to containing links to resources like the MSACHE website, the site will have many data and resource documents in downloadable PDF format. During the Open Forum phases of the process, draft reports will be available on the website. We expect this will be a very effective tool.

X. Timetable

1. Submission of final Design Plan—by June 9, 2004
2. Construction of Self-Study Website—by August 15, 2004
3. Study Group activity—September through December 2004
4. Study Group Progress Reports due—November 1, 2004
5. Study Group Reports due—December 1, 2004
6. MSSC review of Study Group Reports—December 2004 through January 2005
7. MSCHE selects Visiting Team Chair—January 2005
8. MSCHE selects Visiting Team Members—February to May 2005
9. Open Forums on Study Group Findings and Recommendations—February and Early March 2005
10. Study Groups make revisions based on Open Forums—March 2005
11. Submission of First Draft of Report to Faculty Senate and Executive Council—early May 2005
12. Submission of Executive Summary and Final Draft of Report—June 2005
13. Final Review of Report by MSSC—by August 2005
14. Review of Report by the Board of Trustees—September 2005
15. Evaluation Team Chair's Preliminary Visit—October 2005
16. Final Self-Study Report mailed to the Evaluation Team and MSCHE—by January/February 2006
17. Evaluation Team Visit and Team Report—March or April 2006
18. College's Response—May 2006
19. Commission's Reaccreditation Decision—June 2006

XI. Study Group Reports

In determining how Study Groups should construct their reports, we considered two key parts of the process: the Open Forum phase, in which community feedback on the various reports is sought, and the later process of converting the reports into a narrative that is written in a single voice. In the interest of facilitating both parts of this process,

we believe that a detailed outline, conforming to the general structure indicated below, will be the best way to deliver Study Group Reports.

We anticipate several ways of gathering feedback on the reports, including posting the reports on the MSSS website and using electronic bulletin boards to thread reactions and discussion, and using the more traditional Open Forum meeting. In both cases, a detailed outline, as opposed to a conventional narrative, should facilitate communication and understanding. Outlines can quickly be made into PowerPoint presentations, to be used on the web or during an Open Forum. We expect that the Open Forums will be more effective and productive if they begin with a short presentation or overview of the content of the report, rather than simply be a block of time for any concerns to be voiced.

With respect to the process of weaving the reports into a single, coherent narrative, detailed outlines will allow the Chair to express the content of the reports without having to rework other's sentences, and it will facilitate the reorganization of the content, if that is needed. Because complete sentences will not be required, considerations of mechanics will not be relevant. Our expectation is that these guidelines will ease the reporting process, and make it less time-consuming.

Outlines will contain the following sections, numbered and labeled as below. Major points within each will be "square" bulleted or numbered, as appropriate.

- I. Description of Standard(s) and the functions of the College relevant to the Standard
- II. Brief description of major changes and developments since the last Self-Study (in order to set context)
- III. Analysis & evaluation based on Charge Questions
- IV. Identification of strengths
- V. Identification of weaknesses
- VI. Recommendations

As you can see, both *description* (Sections I and II) and *analysis* (Section III) are necessary, and the recommendations you produce (Section VI) must be linked to the findings that are reported (Sections IV and V). Please note that recommendations not based on findings will be omitted from the Self-Study Report.

Report outlines must conform to the following standards:

- Submitted electronically
- In Microsoft Word
- Using Arial 11 pt. font
- Double-Spaced
- Standard one inch margins on all sides
- Approximately 15 pages maximum

Any graphs or charts that are submitted must be submitted electronically, and must be compatible with Microsoft Word. PowerPoint charts and graphs are recommended for ease of use and compatibility.

XII. Organization of the Self-Study Report

The following is a sketch of the Table of Contents of our final Self-Study report. Within each chapter for the 14 standards, we expect that there will be four general sections: a descriptive overview, an analysis of key issues, a list of major findings, and a list of recommendations. At this point we are uncertain whether we will have a separate chapter on the Integrity Standard. We believe that the decision to include such a separate chapter can only be made once study groups reports have been reviewed.

- 1) Introduction
 - Overview of the College
 - Overview of the Self-Study process
 - Eligibility Requirements 1-7
 - Annual Institutional Profile
- 2) Executive Summary
 - Highlights and resulting emphases
 - Major Findings and Recommendations
- 3) Mission, Goals, and Objectives
- 4) Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
- 5) Institutional Resources
- 6) Leadership and Governance
- 7) Administration
- 8) Integrity
- 9) Institutional Assessment
- 10) Student Admissions
- 11) Student Support Services
- 12) Faculty
- 13) Educational Offerings
- 14) General Education
- 15) Related Educational Activities
- 16) Assessment of Student Learning
- 17) Summary of Major Findings and Recommendations
- 18) Inventory of Support Documents
- 19) Appendices

XIII. Profile of the Evaluation Team

General Qualities and Areas of Expertise in Evaluators

MSSC requests that Evaluation Team members have the following qualities in general:

- Familiarity with the ethos of a large and diverse suburban community college
- Familiarity with state policies concerning community colleges in New Jersey

MSSC is also mindful of the shift in emphasis from structure to function in the new Characteristics of Excellence, as well as the increased emphases on the assessment of student learning and institution-wide assessment. Thus, in addition to these general qualities, we request an evaluator with expertise in the dynamics of community college governance, and an evaluator with expertise in institutional effectiveness measures.

MSCHE may find it helpful to consider the following facts when selecting members of the Evaluation Team:

- In the Fall 2003 semester, 6,907 students were enrolled full-time, and 7,084 students were enrolled part-time, for a total enrollment of 13,991. 70% of students who declared a major were in transfer programs, and 30% were in career programs. 60% of first-time freshmen tested into remedial English courses, and 74% tested into remedial mathematics courses.
- Based on **course enrollments**, the largest disciplines (with the number of courses enrollments in Fall 2003 noted in parentheses) are:
 - Mathematics (5,264, of which 4,005 were in MAT-010 through MAT-045, the remedial sequence)
 - English Basic Skills (4,171)
 - American Language Program (ESL) (3,680)
 - Psychology (2,131)
 - Speech Communication (2,110, including 606 in SPE-001 through SPE-009 and, 1,504 in college-level speech classes)
 - Wellness and Exercise Science (2682)
 - Composition (3,395)
- The programs with the largest number of **declared majors** are (number of majors in Fall 2003 indicated in parentheses):
 - Liberal Arts AA
 - General AA (3,680)
 - Communication Arts (137)
 - Psychology (265)
 - Fine and Performing Arts AA
 - Art (145)
 - Music Arts (4 options combined, 143)
 - Natural Science and Math AS
 - General Option (157)
 - Biology (142)
 - Computer Science (257)
 - Engineering Science AS (120)
 - Professional Studies AS
 - General option (647)
 - Business Admin (5 options combined, 1,122)
 - Education (285)
 - AAS
 - Nursing (251)
 - Graphic Design/Computer Graphics (224)
 - Accounting (245)
 - Banking/Credit/Finance (120)

- Paralegal (113)
- Information Technology (160)
- Network Administration (144)
- Criminal Justice (525)
- Early Childhood Education (265)
- Hotel/Restaurant (3 options combined, 149)
- Industrial Tech (4 programs combined, 184)

We have a large number of students majoring in Allied Health programs and Nursing, but it should be noted that these programs have their own specialized accreditation.

Qualities of the Team Chair

We request that the Team Chair have experience working with collective bargaining units, and we request that, if possible, the Team Chair not be the chancellor of a system of community colleges, but rather a Chief Executive Officer or Chief Academic Officer, preferably at a comparable, single campus school.

Institutions of Similar Size and Scope

Using the IPEDS Peer Analysis System, the following 11 out-of-state institutions were found to be of similar size and scope:

Anne Arundel Community College	Arnold, MD
Montgomery College	Rockville, MD
Prince Georges Community College	Largo, MD
Hudson Valley Community College	Troy, NY
Onondaga Community College	Syracuse, NY
SUNY Westchester Community College	Valhalla, NY
Bucks County Community College	Newton, PA
Delaware County Community College	Media, PA
Harrisburg Area Community College—Harrisburg	Harrisburg, PA
Montgomery County Community College	Blue Bell, PA
Community College of Philadelphia	Philadelphia, PA
The Community College of Baltimore County	Catonsville, MD

* * * * *

Acknowledgement

We wish to gratefully acknowledge the fine work of the '94-'95 Self-Study Steering Committee, whose carefully archived records have served as a point of reference and guide for our own work.

Appendix

Study Guide for Standards 1 and 2:

Mission, Goals, and Objectives

and

Planning, Resource Allocation,
and Institutional Renewal

Middle States 2005-06 Self-Study L-230



Bergen Community College
400 Paramus Rd.
Paramus, New Jersey 07652
www.bergen.edu

1. Introduction

Your task is to study the Mission, Goals, and Objectives of the College, as well as its Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal processes. The Chair of this study group is Professor Marybeth Klein of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science.

Your ultimate goal is to evaluate how the College is performing in these areas relative to the relevant Middle States Standards. Your evaluation must involve data or other resources, must identify the strengths and weakness of the College in these areas, and must include specific recommendations for how to build on our strengths, and—perhaps more importantly—how to improve on, or remedy, our weaknesses.

In Section 8 below, you will find the “charge questions”—questions which must be answered as part of your study and analysis—that were reviewed and revised in draft form by your study group in April 2004. Carefully answering these charge questions will be the primary work of this study group. Your findings and recommendations will be reported in a detailed outline that must be submitted to the Middle States Steering Committee by December 1, 2004. Prior to that, meetings minutes and an interim progress report must also be submitted. (Details about this will be provided in the sections that follow.) Additionally, you will be asked to share your group’s findings and recommendations with the entire campus community in the Open Forums that will take place in February and early March, 2005, and revise your report in light of these forums. President Winn intends to use the major recommendations of the study groups as the basis for the next multi-year strategic plan, so please approach your task with the knowledge that your work will contribute in a very tangible way to our continuing quest for excellence.

2. What makes for a good Self-Study?

Self-evaluation is not always easy to do, and doing it well requires starting the process in the right frame of mind. As with any form of inquiry, good self-study requires adherence to a host of intellectual virtues—qualities that result in good critical thinking. Here are two of the most important for our purposes¹:

- **Intellectual humility:** you may think you know the answers to these charge questions without having to engage in any careful study, without collecting and reviewing the facts. But good inquiry requires being open to a conclusion that you did not anticipate—allowing reason and the relevant evidence to inform your view. That’s intellectual humility. Without it, you are not really *studying* anything.
- **Fair-mindedness:** the fair-minded person tries to treat every viewpoint in an unbiased, unprejudiced way. She is mindful of the fact that we all naturally tend to prejudge the views of others—we look favorably on the views of people with whom we agree, and look unfavorably on the views of people with whom we disagree. The fair-minded person tries to judge between different viewpoints without reference to their own interests, or the interests of their friends and community.

¹ See Paul & Elder, *Critical Thinking*, Prentice Hall, 2001, pgs. 4-5.

These virtues will become critical once you pass the first part of the process—reviewing the Middle States Standards, and the processes and areas of the College relevant to these standards—and you begin to analyze how well the College is meeting these standards.

You may be inclined to think that you will be hurting the College, or more directly yourself and your colleagues, if you point out weaknesses or areas we need to improve. But “putting our best foot forward,” when it comes to self-study, means frankly acknowledging both our strengths *and* our weaknesses. When the Middle States Evaluation Team visits our campus in the spring of 2006, it will be judging the quality of our Self-Study report by how well it reflects the realities of our campus and the evidence we have collected. What Middle States really wants to see in our report is whether we understand (1) where we are with respect to our strengths and weaknesses, and (2) what we need to do to improve ourselves. That’s what institutional renewal is all about, and that’s the main purpose of self-study. All good institutions do this—that’s how they become, and stay, good.

3. Using the Middle States Accreditation Standards

The main criteria you will use to judge the College’s performance are Standards 1 and 2 of the Middle States *Characteristics of Excellence*; the summary statement of each appears below in Section 9. If you are not already familiar with these standards, obtain a copy from your Chair (also available in PDF format at www.msache.org) and study them carefully. Pay particular attention to the “Fundamental Elements” of Standards 1 and 2; these are the specific requirements that we must demonstrate that we meet or fail to meet. Specific reference to these Standards and Elements are expected throughout your report.

You should also pay close attention to Standard 6: Integrity, since each study group is being asked to study the level of institutional integrity reflected in the specific areas they are examining.

4. Data and Resources

It cannot be overemphasized that the findings (the identified strengths and weakness) of your report must be based on an analysis of relevant data or other evidence. In an effort to assist you in your work, we suggest that the following resources be consulted:

- Accountability Reports (NJCHE)
- Assessment Plan
- BCC Mission Statement and Goals
- BCC Facilities Master Plan Report
- BCC Vision Statement
- Capital Needs Questionnaire 2004-2010 (NJCHE) [Enrollment Projections and Facilities Planning]
- Capital Planning Survey 2001-2002 (NJCHE)
- Continuing the Quest for Excellence: A Multifaceted Planning Approach
- Economic Impact Study Report
- Fact Books
- Graduate Follow-Up Reports
- Middle States Annual Institutional Profiles

- Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory/ Institutional Priorities Report
- Non-credit Enrollment Research Brief
- Periodic Review Report
- Planning Books 2000-2001, 2001-2002, 2002-2003
- Retention Reports
- Technology Plans
- Trailblazer Report

Check to see if the document you are interested in is available in downloadable PDF format on the Middle States Self-Study website <insert URL>. If it is not, you may access the document in the Self-Study Steering Committee Office, L-230.

If you find that you need additional data, please discuss your needs with Barbara Erdsneker, Director of Research and Planning (x9207). However, please do so as early in the process as possible, since it may take considerable time to collect and analyze the data. If no data is available, it may be appropriate to note this in your report, and to recommend that the data be collected in the future.

5. Meetings

We expect that your group will need to meet at least twice a month in order to accomplish your task, and additional meetings will probably be necessary. Your group may decide to divide into subgroups in order to more efficiently tackle your charge, and if this occurs, meetings may more easily be scheduled at the convenience of the subgroup members. Regardless, your attendance is critical to the success of the study group.

6. Chairs and Deputy Chairs

In order to ensure good communication between the Steering Committee and Study Groups, and in order to facilitate communication across Study Groups, Study Group Chairs are members on the Steering Committee. To ease the burden of both being a member of the Steering Committee and the leader of a study group, Study Group Chairs will appoint a Deputy Chair or Chairs from amongst their volunteers to assist with the operations of the group and, if desired, with the preparation of the group's report. Deputy Chairs may also occasionally fill in for the Chair at Steering Committee and Study Group meetings, but Chairs will bear ultimate responsibility for the administration of the group and the content and quality of the group's report.

If the Chair of your group asks you to serve as a Deputy Chair, be sure to find out exactly what will be expected of you before you agree. Duties may vary from group to group, depending on the specific needs of the group. Regardless of the group, Deputy Chairs have an important role to play in this process, and the Chair must be able to rely on you if you accept this role.

7. Housekeeping, Important Dates, and Deadlines

Meeting Minutes:

Brief minutes of each study group meeting should be filed with MSSC within one week of the meeting. Your chair will be ultimately responsible for these minutes, but she will decide how they are to be taken and who will submit them. Minutes should focus on

action steps taken, action steps needed, and any problems that may arise. Minutes should be as concise as possible—normally less than a page.

Progress report:

A brief progress report on the group's efforts is due in the Steering Committee office (L-230) on November 1, 2004. The report should focus on what the group has accomplished and what remains to be done. It should also note any problems that have arisen, particularly if the Steering Committee can be of assistance. This report should likely be no more than a page or two.

Final Due Date:

Your report is due on December 1, 2004. Plan from the very start of your work to meet this deadline, and if you believe you will need an extension, this should be noted and requested in your progress report.

8. General Timetable

1. Submission of final Design Plan—by June 9, 2004
2. Construction of Self-Study Website—by August 15, 2004
3. Study Group activity—September through December 2004
4. Study Group Progress Reports due—November 1, 2004
5. Study Group Reports due—December 1, 2004
6. MSSC review of Study Group Reports—December 2004 through January 2005
7. MSCHE selects Visiting Team Chair—January 2005
8. MSCHE selects Visiting Team Members—February to May 2005
9. Open Forums on Study Group Findings and Recommendations—February and Early March 2005
10. Study Groups make revisions based on Open Forums—March 2005
11. Submission of First Draft of Report to Faculty Senate and Executive Council—early May 2005
12. Submission of Executive Summary and Final Draft of Report—June 2005
13. Final Review of Report by MSSC—by August 2005
14. Review of Report by the Board of Trustees—September 2005
15. Evaluation Team Chair's Preliminary Visit—October 2005
16. Final Self-Study Report mailed to the Evaluation Team and MSCHE—by January/February 2006
17. Evaluation Team Visit and Team Report—March or April 2006
18. College's Response—May 2006
19. Commission's Reaccreditation Decision—June 2006

9. Charge Questions

As noted earlier, answering the charge questions below will be the bulk of your work in the study group. However, please note that your report will not simply be a list of questions and answers. Rather, your answers to these questions will form the basis of a report that must be organized along the lines described in Section 9 below. Please also note that the recommendations that your group produces after answering these questions must be based on specific findings. Recommendations not based on findings will be omitted from the Self-Study Report.

Standard 1**Mission, Goals, and Objectives**

Middle States Standard: *The institution's mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and explains whom the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals and objectives, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission, goals, and objectives are developed and recognized by the institution with its members and its governing body and are utilized to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.*

Study Group Purpose: The Mission and Goals/Institutional Renewal Study Group is charged with reviewing the College Mission and Vision Statements. The group will (1) determine how the College measures the extent to which it meets the goals and objectives articulated in these statements, and (2) analyze how the College utilizes the Mission and Vision Statements to develop and shape its programs and practices.

1. What are the major components of our Mission? How does our Mission Statement guide faculty, staff, administration and governing bodies in the decision making process? How familiar are the various constituents of the College with the Mission Statement?
2. How effective is our Mission Statement? How is our Mission Statement aligned with the major goals and objectives of the College? To what extent are there elements in the Mission Statement that do not pertain to any stated goal or objective? How do we measure the effectiveness of our Mission Statement?
3. The College Vision Statement supports the College Mission and Goals Statement. How effective or useful is our Vision Statement? Our Vision Statement professes the support of an ongoing process of improvement through assessment. Describe this process.
4. To what extent does the Vision or Mission Statement contain a discernable statement of the College's philosophy of education? To what extent is such a statement appropriate, here or elsewhere, especially in light of the many students the College serves who are under-prepared for college-level work?
5. Describe the process whereby the current Mission and Vision statements were constructed. Who was involved, and what processes were used to ensure the approval of campus community? To what extent are the Mission and Vision widely embraced across campus? How is this determined and evaluated?
6. How do the goals and objectives in our Mission Statement flow into all areas and levels of the College? How, and to what extent, is the Mission Statement used as a guide affecting all areas of the College?

7. How does the College use innovative techniques to support and renew its Mission? To what extent are College goals and objectives responsive to new and emerging technologies?
8. In what ways do the College's Mission and Goals support scholarly growth? In what ways, and to what extent, do the creativity and scholarship of the College's constituents fulfill the College's mission?
9. Our Mission and Vision Statements, like all college mission statements, are designed in part to define the College, to convey to our stakeholders who we are and what we do, and not merely what we aspire to. To what extent do our statements accomplish this? To what extent do they transparently characterize our institutional culture and practices?

Standard 2

Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Middle States Standard: *An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and uses the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.*

Study Group Purpose: The Mission and Goals/Institutional Renewal Study Group is charged with examining the nature and quality of planning within the College. The group will (1) analyze the planning processes within the College, (2) determine how these processes are assessed, and (3) determine to the extent to which these processes and their outcomes are used to support the development and change necessary to improve and maintain College quality.

1. To what extent is planning clearly defined? How are planning objectives established? What processes are in place for planning and resource allocation? What groups or individuals are involved in planning?
2. To what extent are all of the goals and objectives of the College supported by current resources? Are appropriate resources devoted to long-term planning? How are the elements of planning and resource allocation prioritized? How is the effectiveness of the College's planning and resource allocation measured?
3. How does each unit or office of the College assess its success in achieving its objectives? How does each unit/office use this assessment to support and improve its efforts? How is each unit/office's assessment incorporated into overall institutional assessment?
4. To what extent do the various units/offices of the College, and the College as a whole, create explicit objectives for improvement? To what extent are these objectives based on the results of specific assessments?

5. How are improvements communicated to the college community? How are improvement efforts measured? Which results of this measurement are incorporated into planning and improvement process? How are these results brought into the planning process?
6. Where does the responsibility for improvements and accountability lie? What groups or individuals hold this responsibility? How and when are these groups or individuals held accountable? How effective has this process been?
7. To what extent are there well-defined processes for decision-making when it comes to planning and renewal? How does the College assess whether planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes are effective and efficient? Do the results of this assessment lead to proactive or reactive efforts?
8. In the mid- and late nineties, the College engaged in various CQI (Continuous Quality Improvement) initiatives, and in 2000, conducted a Trailblazer Self-Study Retreat, which is based on CQI principles. To what extent does the College subscribe to a particular philosophy of change, improvement, and institutional renewal? To what extent is it consistently adhered to, and embraced campus wide? To what extent have the College's planning and resource allocation processes led to institutional renewal?

10. Your report

Rather than construct a polished, narrative report, your study group will report its work in the form of a detailed outline. This will facilitate presentation of the content during the Open Forum, particularly if a PowerPoint presentation will be used. It will also more easily allow the editor of the full Self-Study Report to weave the various study group reports into a unified narrative written in a single voice.

Outlines must contain the following sections, numbered and labeled as below. Major points within each will be "square" bulleted or numbered, as appropriate.

- I. Description of Standard(s) and the functions of the College relevant to the Standard.
- II. Major changes and developments since the last Self-Study
- III. Analysis & evaluation based on Charge Questions
- IV. Identification of strengths
- V. Identification of weaknesses
- VI. Recommendations

As you can see, both description (Sections I and II) and analysis (Section III) are necessary, and the recommendations you produce (Section VI) must be linked to the findings that are reported (Sections IV and V).

Report outlines must conform to the following standards:

- Submitted electronically
- In Microsoft Word
- Using Arial 11 pt. font
- Double-Spaced
- Standard one-inch margins on all sides
- Approximately 15 pages maximum

Any graphs or charts that are submitted must be submitted electronically, and must be compatible with Microsoft Word. PowerPoint charts and graphs are recommended for ease of use and compatibility.

11. Additional Assistance

The Chair of your study group, Marybeth Klein, has been working on the Steering Committee since the beginning of the self-study process, and has a good deal of background knowledge about it. Should you have questions or concerns, or are experiencing difficulties with the workings of your group, the first step should be to consult Marybeth or her Deputy Chair. If Marybeth cannot answer your question, or resolve your concern, please contact Peter Dlugos, Steering Committee Chair (x3619).