



Self-Study Design

**Submitted to Dr. Sean McKittrick, Vice President
Middle States Commission on Higher Education**

on

Tuesday, May 28, 2019

State University of New York at New Paltz

Chief Executive Officer

Donald P. Christian, President



Table of Contents

Purpose of Self-Study Design	3
Institutional Overview	4 - 5
Institutional Priorities to be Addressed in the Middle States Self-Study	5 - 6
Intended Outcomes of the Middle States Self-Study	6
Self-Study Approach	7
Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee & Working Groups	7 - 8
Members of the Middle States Steering Committee and Working Groups	8 - 11
Consultants/Support Personnel	11 - 12
Charges to the Working Groups	12 - 13
Specific Lines of Inquiry for the Middle States Self-Study	13 - 17
Working Group Guidelines for Reporting	17 - 18
Editorial Guidelines and Format for Reporting	18 - 19
Characteristics of Editorial Team	19
Editorial Team Charges	19
Organization of the Final Self-Study Report	19 - 21
Verification of Compliance Strategy	21
Timeline for the Self-Study	21 - 23
Communication Plan	23
Profile of the Evaluation Team	23
Evidence Inventory	24 - 36

State University of New York at New Paltz is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher
Education
3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (267) 284-5000

Purpose of the Self-Study Design

This Self -Study Design serves as a guide for SUNY New Paltz’s Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) self-study process, including the final Self-Study Report. It includes a brief overview of New Paltz, describes the process we engaged to select the institutional priorities that the self-study will evaluate, outlines our approach to the self-study, and summarizes our intended outcomes for the self-study. This Self-Study Design also delineates the sections of the self-study and tasks that are to be accomplished throughout the self-study process. It serves as a reference guide for the Self-Study Steering Committee and Working Groups and helps to ensure that required elements of the self-study are completed as stipulated and by certain deadlines.

Institutional Overview

The State University of New York at New Paltz (New Paltz) is a comprehensive regional university in the Hudson Valley of southeastern New York, about halfway between New York City and Albany. Founded in 1828, New Paltz was created as a school to teach the classics, then became a state normal school in 1885 – offering courses to prepare graduates to teach in the New York public school system – and was incorporated into State University of New York (SUNY) in 1948. New Paltz offers its nearly 8,000 undergraduate and graduate students 150-plus programs of study, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, taught by 351 full-time and 277 part-time faculty. The College of Liberal Arts & Sciences, School of Business, School of Science & Engineering, School of Education, and School of Fine & Performing Arts house the College’s programs.

New Paltz is committed to the mission of providing high quality, affordable education to students from all social and economic backgrounds. Accordingly, we dedicate ourselves to the construction and support of an engaged academic, scholarly, and creative community that reflects and celebrates the diversity of our society. Among our most prominent characteristics are our strong and growing academic quality, sound educational foundation and belief in the liberal arts, vibrant intellectual engagement between students and faculty/staff, range of academic programs, diverse student population, and connection to the culture and economy of the Mid-Hudson Valley. Throughout the curriculum, faculty value and nurture the development of critical and creative thinking, problem solving, use of evidence-based practices, and the ability to write and speak with clarity and precision.

Following our last Middle States Commission on Higher Education self-study (MSCHE self-study), the College engaged in an extensive strategic planning process that resulted in a Strategic Plan which includes seven broad goals that guide priorities and receive special attention institutionally. Since the plan’s implementation, many of its goals have been realized which keep New Paltz on track toward providing the highest quality teaching, student learning experience, residence-life, and service programming while maintaining its commitment to diversity, access, and selectivity.

The Strategic Plan’s seven goals are:

1. Nurture innovation and the learning environment – including building quality online education
2. Establish an engaged living and learning community
3. Strengthen philanthropic relationships and success
4. Engage alumni in the life of the College
5. Market New Paltz internally and externally
6. Improve internal processes and institutional capacity
7. Strengthen regional and community engagement

Both our mission and Strategic Plan convey and reinforce the perspective that diversity and inclusion are highly valued institutionally. The number of first-generation students increased from 20 percent in fall 2012 to 24 percent in fall 2015. Approximately 33 percent of our degree-seeking undergraduate students and 21 percent of graduate students are from traditionally underrepresented groups, figures that grow each year. The College has been recognized for high retention and graduation of students

from historically underrepresented groups, which are well above State and national averages for both public and private institutions. “Achievement gaps” in retention and graduation between majority and underrepresented minority students are much narrower than at many institutions. Our Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) is the second largest among our sector in the SUNY system. EOP serves economically disadvantaged students who are also academically at risk. New Paltz’s EOP students have first-year retention rates similar to the overall student body and graduate at rates above national averages for all students, either at public or private institutions. New Paltz has been recognized nationally for its success in engaging underrepresented students in study abroad and by the *US Department of State* as one of the top colleges (tied for 4th place among medium-sized colleges and universities) in the nation for students receiving the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship for overseas study. The Institute of International Education (IIE) awarded the Andrew Heiskell Award for Study Abroad to New Paltz in 2015 in recognition of the partnership between our Center for International Programs (CIP) and EOP for providing greater access to study abroad for underrepresented students.

There are more SUNY community colleges within a 45-mile radius of New Paltz than any other SUNY baccalaureate campus. Known for our long tradition of promoting a seamless transfer experience for transfer and incoming first-year students, each fall, we enroll around 1,100 first-year and 850 transfer students and another 350 or so transfer students each spring. About half of each year’s graduating class came to New Paltz as transfers. Retention and graduation rates of transfer students are among the very highest in SUNY.

New Paltz’s reputation and profile have grown substantially. We compete successfully for strong students with excellent public and private colleges and universities across the northeast. In addition, we are selective in admitting students who show promise of thriving in a learning environment that is challenging, student-centered, personalized, and grounded in best practices including high-impact learning experiences such as study abroad, undergraduate student research with faculty scholars, internships, and living/learning communities. We are leaders in the number of students studying abroad and international students studying on campus. Enrollment in our honors program has grown and continues to grow. Since 2010, more than 39% of our incoming first-year students have come from the highest selectivity group used by SUNY to assess students’ academic preparation. In fall 2018, we had our highest percentage ever, with 45% of first-year students coming from this highest selectivity group. Our retention and graduation rates are high. Compared with a national average rate of 60%, the six-year graduation rate in 2018 was 76.5%, up from 72.3% the year before and 70% in 2011.

The College’s rising reputation has been acknowledged in several college rankings publications. In *US News and World Report*, New Paltz was ranked 22nd as a “Best College for Veterans” in the north, 41st among the best “Public Regional Universities” in the north, and as having the 3rd “Best Metals/Jewelry” program in the nation. *Princeton Review* included New Paltz in its “Best Colleges in the Northeast” list and among the “Top Green Colleges Nationwide” and *Forbes Magazine* included us among “America’s Top Colleges.” Likewise, *collegefactual* ranked our MBA accounting program as a great value.

Institutional Priorities to be Addressed in the Middle States Self-Study

New Paltz will pursue the following institutional priorities for this self-study:

1. Nurture a learning environment founded on critical thinking, creativity, and the growth and sharing of knowledge
2. Cultivate sustainability in all its forms, including institutional, social, economic, and environmental sustainability
3. Forge community and enhance our commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion
4. Increase accessibility of undergraduate and graduate education in the region

The priorities align with the College's mission and with our Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan sets the course for the priorities that receive special attention each year. The plan's development drew upon a communal sense of our past; an assessment of external challenges; and the perspectives of prospective and current students, faculty, staff, and alumni regarding the most important work to undertake to sustain and grow our institution and its contributions. The 2010-11 MSCHE self-study report and other important institutional reports also provided context and information relevant to the Strategic Plan's development. The Steering Committee co-chairs engaged various campus groups in discussions about identifying institutional priorities. The President and Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs also participated in determining these institutional priorities.

Although institutional priorities largely focus on successful teaching, learning, campus climate, and institutional management, we also attend to larger issues in higher education that directly influence our success. These include declining state support for higher education, efforts to increase graduation rates, threats to competitiveness in recruiting academically well-qualified students in numbers to sustain enrollment, and the need for diversification of revenue streams to sustain and grow programs. All units on campus look to the mission and Strategic Plan to identify and achieve tasks or projects appropriate to their areas. The President and the Cabinet charge individual areas with priorities taken directly from the Strategic Plan. For this self-study, the Steering Committee and Working Groups are using a document that maps the Middle States standards to elements in our Strategic Plan and to the institutional priorities, where appropriate.

The campus will receive information about the purpose of the self-study and the institutional priorities from the Steering Committee and through campus-sponsored media and the President's reports. Information about the self-study also will be disseminated through campus meetings/events and will be posted on our website.

Intended Outcomes of the Middle States Self-Study

The MSCHE self-study process provides New Paltz the opportunity for comprehensive self-assessment of the extent to which it meets or exceeds the Middle States standards. Beyond accreditation, this self-study enables us to assess the progress our campus has achieved in implementing the Strategic Plan. With achievement of the MSCHE standards, requirements, and the pursuit of continuous institutional improvement as goals, the outcomes for the self-study are to:

1. Pursue reaffirmation of accreditation by MSCHE by engaging the New Paltz community in an inclusive and transparent self-appraisal self-study process.
2. Integrate MSCHE self-study and Strategic Plan review to identify strengths and opportunities and to develop forward-looking and aspirational recommendations to advance New Paltz's mission.

3. Engage in continuous quality maintenance and improvement by documenting current assessment practices and making recommendations about the use of assessment to advance educational and institutional effectiveness.

Self-Study Approach

The College selected the standards-based approach for this self-study. This approach was chosen because it will facilitate campus-wide review of institutional performance within the seven standards of accreditation, appraisal of our accomplishment of our mission and Strategic Plan, and of achievement of the institutional priorities for this self-study. Further, the standards-based approach was selected because of its potential to help the College determine the next set of goals and Strategic Plan priorities to pursue.

Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

In spring 2018, the President invited a group of faculty and staff to serve on the 2021 Middle States Steering Committee. The associate provost for Strategic Planning & Assessment, who serves as the Middle States Accreditation Liaison Officer and has substantial Middle States experience, was named co-chair of the Steering Committee, along with a senior faculty member, who has considerable experience and expertise in educational effectiveness. The associate provost for Strategic Planning & Assessment/Accreditation Liaison Officer appointed the members of the standards Working Groups in fall 2018, with input from the Steering Committee. Working Groups were created to be intentionally diverse and broadly representative of the campus community. The associate provost for Strategic Planning & Assessment/Accreditation Liaison Officer, in consultation with the provost and vice president for academic affairs, assigned Cabinet members and academic deans to support the Steering Committee and Working Groups as consultants/resource personnel. Cabinet members and deans are not required to attend Steering Committee and Working Group meetings but are encouraged to do so when their schedules permit. Over 100 members of the campus community are participating in the Middle States Steering Committee and Working Groups.

There are eight Working Groups for the self-study – one for each of the seven standards and an eighth for the verification of compliance with accreditation-relevant federal regulations. The Strategic Planning & Assessment Council, which oversees (along with Cabinet and Associate Provost for Strategic Planning & Assessment) institutional planning and assessment processes, will support the Standard 1 Working Group to fulfill its charge. The Council has representation from a wide range of schools and departments and a clear perspective of how the criteria in Standard 1 have been addressed in the Strategic Plan. A member of the Self-Study Steering Committee chairs each Working Group, thereby increasing coordination and efficiency between Working Groups.

The Steering Committee is responsible to ensure that the standards and institutional priorities are addressed, data are interpreted appropriately and demonstrate institutional performance, and to conduct appropriate analysis of opportunities for institutional improvement. It also is the Steering Committee's responsibility to assemble and edit the drafts submitted by the Working Groups and to

help to prepare the final Self-Study Report and related documents. In addition to directing the efforts of the Working Groups, Steering Committees will ensure that the MSCHE standards, the mission, institutional priorities, and the elements in the Strategic Plan are central to the analysis of the self-study. Equally important, the Steering Committee will engage the campus in the self-study process in meaningful ways, ensure the campus follows the self-study timeline, and help to achieve a good balance between the self-study narrative, analysis, and documentation. The Steering Committee will inform institutional leaders and community members about self-study progress and opportunities for participation.

Members of the Middle States Steering Committee and Working Groups

Steering Committee

Laurel M. Garrick Duhaney, Associate Provost, Strategic Planning & Assessment	Standard 1 Co-Chair & Steering Committee Co-Chair
Deb Gould, Assistant Provost, Academic Affairs & Co-Chair, Strategic Planning & Assessment Council	Standard 1 Co-Chair
Anne Deutsch, Associate Librarian & Instructional Program Coordinator, Sojourner Truth Library	Standard II Co-Chair
Jason Wrench, Professor, Communication & Chair, Human Research Ethics Board	Standard II Co-Chair
Heather Morrison, Associate Professor & Chair, History	Standard 3 Co-Chair
Ken Goldstein, Professor & Chair, Theatre Arts	Standard 3 Co-Chair & Steering Committee Co-Chair
Dante Cantu, Executive Director, Academic Advising & Center for Student Success	Standard 4 Co-Chair
Robin Cohen La Valle, Dean of Students, Student Affairs	Standard 4 Co-Chair
Shuguang Liu, Associate Dean, School of Business	Standard 4 Co-Chair
Laurel M. Garrick Duhaney, Associate Provost, Strategic Planning & Assessment	Standard 5 Co-Chair
Jennifer Waldo, Associate Professor & Chair, Biology	Standard 5 Co-Chair
Julie Walsh, Assistant VP, Finance & Budget	Standard 6 Co-Chair
Isidoro Janeiro, Associate Professor, Languages, Literatures, & Cultures & Co-Chair, Strategic Planning & Assessment Council	Standard 6 Co-Chair
Anne Balant, Associate Professor, Communication Disorders & Presiding Officer of the Faculty	Standard 7 Co-Chair
Simin Mozayeni, Assistant Professor, Economics	Standard 7 Co-Chair
Lucy Walker, Assistant VP, Institutional Research	Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations

Working Groups

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

Laurel M. Garrick Duhaney, Associate Provost, Strategic Planning & Assessment, Co-Chair
Deb Gould, Assistant Provost, Academic Affairs, Co-Chair
Sue Books, Professor, School of Education
Dante Cantu, Executive Director, Academic Advising & Center for Student Success
Linda Eaton, Associate Vice President, Student Affairs
Isidoro Janeiro, Associate Professor, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Julie Majak, Assistant Vice President, Administration & Finance
Lisa Mitten, Sustainability Coordinator, Facilities Management
Heather Morrison, Associate Professor & Department Chair, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Tom Nolen, Associate Dean, School of Science & Engineering
Matt Newcomb, Associate Professor, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Stacie Nunes, Assistant Professor & Chair, Physics & Astronomy
Kevin Saunders, Desktop Support Manager, IT & Computer Services
Surinder Tikoo, Professor, School of Business
Chih-Yang Tsai, Professor, School of Business
Stella Turk, Registrar, Records & Registration
Andrea Varga, Associate Professor, School of Fine & Performing Arts
Lucy Walker, Assistant Vice President, Institutional Research

Standard II: Ethics and Integrity

Anne Deutsch, Associate Librarian & Instructional Program Coordinator, Sojourner Truth Library,
Co-Chair
Jason Wrench, Professor, Communication & Chair, Human Research Ethics Board, Co-Chair
Kathie Baker, Manager, RF Personnel Services, Sponsored Programs & Research Compliance
Niza Cardona, Director, Student Accounts
Steven Deutsch, Executive Director, Campus Auxiliary Services
David Farbaniec, Director, Procurement
Ginger Jurecka Blake, Director, Organizational Development & Training, HRDI
Melissa Kaczmarek, Director, Communication
Lou Roper, Professor, History
Jean Vizvary, Director, Disability Resource Center, Student Affairs
Suzanne Stokes, Associate Professor & Foundation/Co-Foundation Coordinator, Art

Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

Heather Morrison, Associate Professor & Chair, History, Co-Chair

Ken Goldstein, Professor & Chair, Theatre Arts, Co-Chair
Kathryn Bohan, Instructional Technology, IT, & Computer Services
Laura Dull, Professor & Chair, Teaching & Learning
Aaron Hines, Assistant Dean, School of Business
Deanna Knapp, Assistant Director, Disability Resource Center
Colleen Lougen, Electronic & Web Librarian, Sojourner Truth Library
Valerie McAllister, Academic Program Specialist, Academic Affairs
Spencer Mass, Instructor, Biology
Shala Mills, Assistant VP, Graduate & Extended Learning
Sarah Roberson, Associate Registrar, Records & Registration
Anne Roschelle, Professor, Sociology & Chair, Women's, Gender & Sexuality Studies
Mark Rumnit, Director, Scholars' Mentorship Program
Pat Sullivan, Director, Honors Program

Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience

Dante Cantu, Executive Director, Center for Student Success & Office of Academic Advising, Co-Chair
Robin Cohen La Valle, Dean of Students, Student Affairs, Co-Chair
Shuguang Liu, Associate Dean, School of Business, Co-Chair
Antonio Bonilla, Director, Educational Opportunity Program
Nancy Campos, C-STEP Director, AMP/C-STEP
Corinna Caracci, Director, Residence Life
Cindy Cullen, Coordinator, International Student Services
Devon C. Duhaney, Associate Professor, Teaching & Learning
Lisa Jones, Dean, Undergraduate Admission
Harriett Lettis, Director, Administrative Computing, IT, & Computer Services
Gweneth Lloyd, Director, Student Counseling
Maureen Lohan-Bremer, Director, Financial Aid
Richard McElrath, Instructional Support, IT & Computer Services
Mark McFadden, Director, Career Resource Center
Michael Patterson, Director, Student Activities & Union Services
Rachel Rigolino, Instructor, English & Coordinator, SWW Program
Stuart Robinson, Athletic Director, Athletics, Wellness, & Recreation
Jean Vizvary, Director, Disability Resource Center
Jennifer Wawrzonek, Assistant Registrar, Records & Registration

Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Laurel M. Garrick Duhaney, Associate Provost, Strategic Planning & Assessment, Co-Chair
Jennifer Waldo, Associate Professor & Chair, Biology, Co-Chair
Thomas Albrecht, Associate Professor & Assistant Dean, School of Fine & Performing Arts
Michelle Combs, Director, Student Development
Sunny Duerr, Assistant Dean, School of Education
Linda Eaton, Associate VP, Student Affairs
Deb Gould, Assistant Provost, Academic Affairs & Co-Chair, Strategic Planning & Assessment Council
Nancy Johnson, Professor & Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Shuguang Liu, Professor & Associate Dean, School of Business

Stephan Macaluso, Coordinator, Distance Learning Planning, Assessment & User Experience Librarian
Julie Majak, Assistant VP, Administration & Finance
Vanessa Netzley, Academic Advisor & Assessment Coordinator & Data Analyst, Academic Advising
Matt Newcomb, Associate Professor, English & GE Board Co-Chair
Tom Nolen, Associate Professor & Associate Dean, School of Science & Engineering
Matt Skillman, Director, Digital Media, Communication & Marketing
Stella Turk, Registrar, Records & Registration
Lucy Walker, Assistant VP, Institutional Research

Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Julie Walsh, Assistant VP, Finance-Budget, Co-Chair
Isidoro Janeiro, Associate Professor, Languages, Literatures, & Cultures & Co-Chair, Strategic Planning & Assessment Council, Co-Chair
Shana Gaaney, Associate Director, Human Resources, Diversity, & Inclusion
Gwen Havranek, Director, Business Operations, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Lisa Mitten, Coordinator for Sustainability, Facilities Management
Brian Obach, Professor, Sociology
John Reina, AVP Technology & Chief Information Officer, IT & Computer Services
John Shupe, Assistant VP, Facilities Management

Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

Anne Balant, Associate Professor, Communications Disorders & Presiding Officer of the Faculty, Co-Chair
Simin Mozayeni, Assistant Professor, Economics, Co-Chair
Meg Devlin O'Sullivan, Associate Professor, History
Haley Hershenson, Vice President, Student Association
Julietta Majak, Assistant VP, Administration & Finance
Scott Minkoff, Assistant Professor, Political Science
Patrick Saxe, Assistant Director, Academic Advising
Richard Winters, Director, Community & Government Relations

Working Group VIII: Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations

Lucy Walker, Assistant VP, Institutional Research, Chair
Paul Chauvet, Information Security Officer, IT & Computer Services
Maureen Lohan-Bremer, Director, Financial Aid
Valerie McAllister, Academic Program Specialist, Academic Affairs
Stella Turk, Registrar, Records & Registration

Consultants/Support Personnel

Standard I: Mission and Goals

Stephanie Blaisdell, VP for Student Affairs

Donald P. Christian, President
L. David Eaton, VP for Enrollment Management
Michele Halstead, VP for Administration & Finance
Barbara Lyman, Interim Provost/VP for Academic Affairs
Erica Marks, VP for Development & Alumni Relations
Shelly Wright, VP for Communication & Chief of Staff

Standard II: Ethics and Integrity

Erica Marks, VP for Development & Alumni Relations

Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

Kristin Backhaus, Dean, School of Business
Laura Barrett, Dean, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Daniel Freedman, Dean, School of Science & Engineering
Jeni Mokren, Dean, School of Fine & Performing Arts
Barbara Lyman, Interim Provost/VP for Academic Affairs
Michael Rosenberg, Dean, School of Education

Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience

Stephanie Blaisdell, VP for Student Affairs
L. David Eaton, VP for Enrollment Management

Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Barbara Lyman, Interim Provost & VP for Academic Affairs

Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Michele Halstead, VP for Administration & Finance

Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

Shelly Wright, VP for Communication & Chief of Staff

Working Group VIII: Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations

W. Mark Colvson, Dean, Sojourner Truth Library

Charges to the Working Groups

Working Groups use research questions to evaluate the College's strengths, challenges, and opportunities related to each standard of accreditation and to institutional priorities and Strategic Plan initiatives. Accordingly, each Working Group, except Working Group 8, received the common charges below. They also received questions/lines of inquiry that relate to the specific standards.

- Examine relevant documentation, processes, and procedures related to the standard under review and analyze the extent to which New Paltz meets or exceeds the criteria established by the standard;
- Provide an analysis of New Paltz’s strengths, challenges, and opportunities with regard to the standard;
- Provide evidence, where such evidence exists, regarding periodic assessment of the standard;
- State the recommendations for improving student success and institutional effectiveness that evolved from the review of the standard; and
- Evaluate the standard (and the Requirements of Affiliation) through the landscape of the institutional mission and Strategic Plan.

Specific Lines of Inquiry for the Middle States Self-Study

Working Group I: Mission and Goals

What evidence does the College have that:

1. The mission, goals, and strategic plan were developed through an inclusive and collaborative process and address internal and external contexts and constituencies?
2. It engages continuing planning processes that guide faculty, administration, staff, and governing structures in decision making related to planning, resource allocation, program and curricular development, and in defining institutional and educational outcomes?
3. The mission and strategic plan include support for student learning, scholarly inquiry, and creative activities at levels that are appropriate to an institution such as New Paltz?
4. The mission, goals, and strategic plan are publicized and widely known by the institution’s internal stakeholders?
5. It is cultivating sustainability, including institutional, social, economic, and environmental sustainability
6. Mechanisms are in place to ensure that faculty and staff activities (e.g., decision making related to planning, resource allocation, curricular and co-curricular offerings, facilities operations) support achievement of the College’s mission and strategic goals?
7. Institutional mission and strategic goals provide the framework for ongoing institutional development and self-evaluation?
8. Its institutional goals related to student learning, related outcomes, and institutional improvement are achieving the desired results?
9. The mission and goals are assessed periodically?

Working Group II: Ethics and Integrity

What evidence does the College have that:

1. It is committed to academic freedom, intellectual freedom, freedom of expression, respect for intellectual property rights, and to avoidance of conflicts of interest in all activities and among all constituents?

2. It is forging community and maintaining a climate that fosters respect for diversity of persons, ideas, and perspectives; equity; and inclusion?
3. Grievance policies regarding students, faculty, or staff complaints are documented, disseminated, and followed?
4. Institutional policies and procedures are fair and impartial and assure that grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably?
5. Fair and impartial practices are employed in the hiring, evaluation, promotion, discipline, and separation of employees?
6. Public relations announcements, advertisements, recruitment, and admissions materials and practices, and internal communications are honest and truthful?
7. Services and/or programs are available to promote accessibility, affordability, and to help students understand funding sources and options, value received for cost, and to make informed decisions about incurring debt?
8. New Paltz complies with applicable federal, state, and Commission reporting policies, regulations, and requirements, including disclosure of information on institution-wide assessments, graduation, retention, and pass rates on licensure exams?
9. Policies, processes, and practices regarding ethics and integrity are assessed periodically?

Working Group III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

What evidence does the College have that:

1. Courses and academic programs have clear and meaningful educational goals and outcomes?
2. Students perceive they are equipped with the knowledge and skills required in their chosen careers and for life after graduation?
3. Certificate, undergraduate, and graduate programs leading to a degree or other higher education credential are of a length that is appropriate to the degree or credential objectives, are designed to foster a coherent student learning experience, and promote synthesis of learning?
4. Academic programs, including general education (GE), are effectively evaluated to ensure rigor, coherence, and effective delivery, irrespective of modality?
5. The GE program expands students' cultural and global awareness/sensitivity, and enables students to acquire information management and critical thinking competencies, oral and written communication skills, and scientific, artistic, humanistic, and quantitative ways of knowing?
6. Students' exposure to curriculum that emphasizes issues and topics related to the institutional priorities of sustainability and diversity, equity, and inclusion has increased over time?
7. The College maintains sufficient learning opportunities and resources to facilitate student success and academic progression?
8. The faculty are qualified and sufficient in number to design, deliver, and assess educational programs and student learning?
9. Faculty are aware of and utilize, through campus or their professional and academic networks, support for professional growth and innovative teaching that facilitates academic rigor and knowledge development?
10. Faculty are reviewed regularly through clear and equitable processes based on written, disseminated, clear, and fair criteria, expectations, policies, and procedures?

11. Academic program information in college publications is accurate, clear and helps students, including transfer students, to follow degree and program requirements, and to maintain expected time to degree?
12. Students and faculty know about and make use of High Impact Practice opportunities (<https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips>)?
13. Students perceive a connection to faculty through mentorship and advising?

Working Group IV: Support of the Student Experience

What evidence does the College have that:

1. It recruits and admits students whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals align with its mission and educational offerings?
2. It is committed to student retention, persistence, completion, and success through a coherent and effective support system sustained by qualified professionals, which supports the quality of the learning environment, contributes to students' educational experiences, and fosters students' success?
3. Students are provided accurate and comprehensive information about costs, financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, repayment, and refunds?
4. Students who lack adequate preparation for study at New Paltz are identified, placed, and supported to attain their educational goals?
5. Orientation, academic, and student support services such as advising and counseling programs support retention and guide students' success throughout their program of study?
6. Academic and administrative units collaboratively examine pathways to optimize course scheduling, ensure program curricula are coherent and provide scaffolded content to facilitate student learning, connect pathways to career exploration and opportunities, and support timely completion?
7. The institution supports student transitions into and through the curriculum (i.e., recruitment/application, orientation/placement/matriculation, enrollment, first time major declaration, transferring, major changes, pre-major programs, completion, stop outs in good academic standing, and readmission)?
8. Policies and procedures regarding evaluation and acceptance of transfer credits are clear and available to students?
9. Policies and procedures for the safe and secure maintenance and release of student information and records adhere to proper guidelines and relevant regulations?
10. Athletic, student life, and other extracurricular activities are regulated by the same academic, fiscal, and administrative policies, principles, and procedures that govern all other programs?
11. It engages in periodic assessment of the effectiveness of support programs?

Working Group V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

What evidence does the College have that:

1. Expectations for student learning outcomes are clearly stated at the institutional, program, degree, course, and division or department (where appropriate) levels, are interrelated with one another,

relevant to students' in- and out-of-class educational experiences, and to institutional mission and strategic goals?

2. Assessments address differences between learning experiences based on students' race, ethnicity, gender, age, veteran/military status, and first-year and transfer status?
3. The revisions to and implementation of the GE program (GE III to GE IV) is meeting the institution's educational mission and the SUNY GE outcomes?
4. It maintains an organized and systematic faculty- and appropriate professional-led student learning outcomes assessment process that collects, evaluates, and uses information to determine the extent to which students are achieving stated learning outcomes?
5. Assessment results at the institutional, program—including GE—and degree levels are collected, shared, and used (e.g., to improve student learning outcomes, programs, key indicators of student success such as retention and graduation rates, implement appropriate changes, and inform activities such as planning and budgeting, including support of academic programs and services, co-curricular programs, and professional development activities)?
6. It has achieved efficiencies in processes and practices?
7. The effectiveness of the assessment processes used to improve educational effectiveness is assessed periodically?

Working Group VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

What evidence does the College have that:

1. Its units use the mission and goals for planning and allocating resources?
2. It informs the campus community about its plans and decisions pertaining to the allocation of resources?
3. Institutional resources (physical, financial, human, etc.) are adequate to support an effective learning environment and operations?
4. Planning and improvement processes are clearly articulated and foster meaningful involvement of campus constituents?
5. It has planning processes in place that address issues pertaining to information technology and facilities and their upkeep, including the resources needed to address these?
6. Decision-making processes are well defined and assignment of responsibility and accountability are clear-cut?
7. Responsible fiscal management is prioritized?
8. The adequacy and efficient utilization of institutional and human resources (including recruitment, training and development, and succession planning) required to support students, faculty, and staff are measured?
9. The institution possesses, maintains, and implements an organized and systematic planning process – including short-, long-term, strategic, and operational goals – that incorporates the use of assessment results to address current and emerging needs?
10. It carries out periodic assessment of the effectiveness of planning and resource allocation processes?
11. It uses assessment results and conclusions in planning and budgeting processes?

Working Group VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

What evidence does the College have that:

1. There is a clearly articulated and effective governance structure outlining roles, responsibilities, and accountability for institutional decision-making by the governing body, administration, faculty, staff, and students?
2. Its processes and procedures are effective in fostering collaboration among faculty governance, unions, and administration?
3. Its processes and procedures are monitored to ensure that shared governance is functioning well?
4. The College Council (local governing body) functions effectively in relation to the SUNY Board of Trustees (central governing body)? Do the actions and recommendations of the College Council demonstrate that it advances the mission and institutional priorities of the College and exercises its fiduciary responsibility?
5. Allied administrative bodies (e.g., College Foundation, CAS Board) support the advancement of the college's mission and institutional priorities?
6. The President maintains appropriate authority and autonomy to fulfill the responsibilities of the office and advance institutional priorities? Is the President evaluated periodically?
7. Changes to its administrative structure are effective and advance institutional priorities? By what process are decisions to reorganize reached? How has the effectiveness of those changes been assessed?
8. It employs sufficient numbers of qualified professional faculty and classified staff? Do these employees have adequate resources to meet regulatory requirements, conduct day-to-day operations, advance the College's mission and institutional priorities, and conduct assessment?
9. The administration effectively promotes quality teaching/learning and research/creative work? How effectively does the administration support the implementation of academic policies and faculty personnel policies?
10. Changes to the faculty governance system are effective? Are the processes of consultation between faculty and administration outlined in the bylaws being followed? How has the perception of faculty governance and shared governance changed?
11. It effectively provides students with opportunities for involvement in leadership and governance? Do students have a way to provide input regarding decisions that affect them?

Working Group Guidelines for Reporting

Working Group reports are limited to 10-15 pages and are to focus on evidence such as documents and data from surveys, focus groups, and program and course assessments. Although reports will contain descriptive information, responses to the research questions should be mainly analytical and evaluative. In addition to gathering and analyzing evidence, each Working Group will produce progress reports, preliminary drafts of the group's report, and a final draft following the format described below. Each report is to be a cohesive, integrated response to not only the specific standard and criteria, but also to institutional efforts to accomplish the mission and strategic goals. The report should discuss connections between the group's standard and other standard(s) and collaborations that occurred between or among Working Groups. While reports will evaluate institutional strengths, challenges, and opportunities with respect to the group's standard and criteria, institutional mission, and strategic goals, the tone should be constructive. The Steering Committee co-chairs will edit the self-study document before forwarding it to the Cabinet and then to the campus for review and feedback. All significant changes to the document will be discussed with members of the Self-Study Steering Committee.

Format for Working Group Report

- Introduction
- A synopsis of how lines of inquiry were addressed, how they have changed over time, and, where applicable, their connection to the institutional priorities
- Evidence utilized to evaluate the lines of inquiry
- Analytical narrative (Not purely descriptive; Assessment information leading to appropriate conclusions; Objective; Includes review of mission, SP, standards, and institutional priorities)
- Conclusion
- Areas of strength and opportunities for improvement and innovation related to assessment-based analysis; Suggested initial strategies to address them)
- Appendices

Editorial Guidelines and Format for Reports

To promote uniformity across Steering Committee and Working Group reports, please adhere to the following capitalization guidelines:

- College (when referring to New Paltz)
- Committee (when referring to an official college committee)
- Evaluation Team
- Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
- MSCHE self-study
- Standards Working Group
- Institutional documents when referring to official materials (e.g., Strategic Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Institutional Effectiveness Plan)
- Do not capitalize fall and spring

In addition to the foregoing, the Steering Committee and Working Groups are to adhere to the following:

- Use the Microsoft Word default format for bulleted and numbered lists
- Use a comma before the word “and” at the end of a series (e.g., The College admits students from Ulster, Dutchess, Orange, and Rockland counties).
- Spell out an acronym during its first use with the affiliated acronym in parentheses (e.g., Scholars’ Mentorship Program (SMP); subsequent mentions can use the acronym)
- Write in third person
- Use titles or positions in place of individual names
- Use the tab and not the space bar for alignments
- Do not use contractions
- Use APA format for all citations
- When listing names, order them alphabetically

The Steering Committee and all Working Groups will use the following general stylistic guidelines:

- Calibri font

- Font size 11
- Tables should be labeled and numbered with standard number, Table number, and Title Example:
Table 1.5 Student Demographic Data
- Standard 1-inch margins (top, bottom, left, and right)
- Paragraph style: Left justified
- Sentence spacing: One space between sentences
- Header and footer margins: 0.5
- Headings:
 - Major headings: Left Justified, upper and lower case, underlined, bold, 11 point
 - Subheadings: Left Justified, upper and lower case, italics, bold, 11 point
- Use one space to separate paragraphs (paragraph spacing set to 0)
- Page Numbers: Right justified in footer

Characteristics of Editorial Team

Members of the editorial team possess the following characteristics:

- Longtime members of the New Paltz community and experience and knowledge of Middle States and/or disciplinary accreditation
- Interest and expertise in Strategic Planning, shared governance, assessment, and institutional effectiveness and improvement
- Superior writing and editorial skills (e.g., experience with proofreading and substantive editing of academic material)
- Strong attention to detail
- Skill to organize manuscript and incorporate input from numerous contributors
- Ability to rewrite and edit logically and clearly with accuracy, consistency, and in the same voice
- Ability to adhere to the subject material and analyze evidence
- Strong communication skills--both written and verbal--and ability to communicate feedback
- Good organizational skills and ability to coordinate with contributors
- Congenial while able to get others to meet deadlines
- Ability to work well in a team environment

Editorial Team Charges

The editorial team is charged to:

- establish chapter headings for the self-study and organize the drafts from Working Groups within the appropriate chapter.
- provide Working Groups feedback on drafts.
- evaluate whether assertions and conclusions are supported by evidence.
- evaluate the extent to which conclusions and recommendations are consistent with findings.
- analyze the comprehensiveness of responses to analytical questions for the self-study and to the MSCHE standards and criteria.
- integrate comments received from the College community into the draft self-study
- proofread and edit the self-study document for clarity, accuracy, and consistency.

Organization of the Final Self-Study Report

The final self-study report will be organized as follows:

Chapter 1: Executive Summary

Chapter 2: Introduction - Institutional Context; Rationale for institutional priorities; Description of Self-Study process and approach; Description of remaining chapters

Chapter 3: Standard I – Mission and Goals

- Introduction
- Evidence and Analysis
- Conclusion
- Areas of strength and opportunities for improvement and innovation related to assessment-based analysis; Suggested initial strategies to address them)

Chapter 4: Standard II – Ethics and Integrity

- Introduction
- Evidence and Analysis
- Conclusion
- Areas of strength and opportunities for improvement and innovation related to assessment-based analysis; Suggested initial strategies to address them)

Chapter 5: Standard III – Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

- Introduction
- Evidence and Analysis
- Conclusion
- Areas of strength and opportunities for improvement and innovation related to assessment-based analysis; Suggested initial strategies to address them)

Chapter 6: Standard IV – Support of the Student Experience

- Introduction
- Evidence and Analysis
- Conclusion
- Areas of strength and opportunities for improvement and innovation related to assessment-based analysis; Suggested initial strategies to address them)

Chapter 7: Standard V – Educational Effectiveness Assessment

- Introduction
- Evidence and Analysis
- Conclusion
- Areas of strength and opportunities for improvement and innovation related to assessment-based analysis; Suggested initial strategies to address them)

Chapter 9: Standard VI – Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

- Introduction
- Evidence and Analysis
- Conclusion

- Areas of strength and opportunities for improvement and innovation related to assessment-based analysis; Suggested initial strategies to address them)

Chapter 10: Standard VII – Governance, Leadership, and Administration

- Introduction
- Evidence and Analysis
- Conclusion
- Areas of strength and opportunities for improvement and innovation related to assessment-based analysis; Suggested initial strategies to address them)

Chapter 11: Conclusion

Glossary of Terms

Appendices

Verification of Compliance Strategy

As indicated earlier, a separate Working Group has been created to lead the College through the Verification of Compliance process. The Working Group’s chair, also a member of the Steering Committee, directs the Steering Committee and others regarding collecting and filing compliance-related documentation.

Timeline for the Self-Study

New Paltz requests a spring 2021 Evaluation Team visit.

Fall 2018	
February 2018	Confirm self-study co-chairs
November 2018	Co-chairs attend self-study institute
November 2018	Confirm Self-Study Steering Committee members and standards Working Groups
November 2018	Choose self-study approach
November 2018	Write the charges for the Working Groups
December 2018	Discuss with the President and Provost the priorities, objectives, and approaches to the self-study
December 2018	Convene introductory meeting of Steering Committee
Spring 2019	
January 2019	Convene meeting of Working Groups and outline scope of work Develop research questions for the self-study Confirm data storage
February 2019	Review communication plan, editorial style and format, and stylistic guidelines
February 2019	Finalize draft self-study design, including charge questions for Working Groups and documentation roadmap Discuss chapter draft outline

March 2019	Submit draft self-study design and documentation roadmap to MSCHE VP liaison
April 2019	Host MSCHE VP liaison self-study preparation campus visit
April 2019	Revise self-study design, as needed
April or May 2019	Revision and submission of self-study design to MSCHE VP liaison
June 2019	Acceptance of self-study design by MSCHE
Fall 2019	
September 2019	Begin writing chapter reports
October 2019	Submit draft outlines for standards reports to Steering Committee co-chairs
November 2019	Hold Community Forums
December 2019	Review progress of self-study and discuss plans for ongoing investigation
Spring 2020	
January 2020	Submit first drafts for each standard to Steering Committee co-chairs
February 2020	MSCHE selects the evaluation team Chair and the institution confirms selection (by May 2020)
March 2020	MSCHE selects evaluation team members and institution confirms the selection
March 2020	Chair and institution select dates for chair's preliminary visit and team visit
March 2020	Send copy of the self-study design to team chair
March 2020	Hold community forums
April 2020	Working Groups co-chairs submit second drafts of self-study reports
Summer 2020	
Sub-set of Steering Committee organizes draft text from working groups and develops preliminary draft of self-study report, following the pre-approved format	
Fall 2020	
September 2020	Review and community-wide discussion of draft self-study report, revisions made
September 2020	Begin preparing Verification of Compliance Report
October 2020	Second draft of self-study generated and distributed
November 2020	Self-study draft sent to MSCHE Team Chair in advance of Preliminary Visit
November 2020	Team chair makes preliminary visit (at least four months prior to team visit)
	Institution receives feedback on self-study draft
December 2020	Verification of Compliance Report due
Spring 2021	
January 2021	Edits/Revisions to self-study based on feedback from MSCHE Team Chair and others

February - March 2021	Final Self-Study/Evidence Inventory uploaded to MSCHE portal (6 weeks before team visit)
February 2021	Final version of self-study produced and sent to Visiting Team (6 weeks prior to campus visit)
March 2021	Finalize plans for hosting Evaluation Team
April 2021	Visiting Team on campus (late March or April)
May 2021	Team Report
May 2021	Institutional response to preliminary Evaluation Team Report
Summer 2021	
June 2021	Commission meets to determine accreditation status

Communication Plan

A primary function of the Steering Committee is maintaining open and active communication with the entire campus community during the self-study. Thus, the Steering Committee plans to use multiple strategies to accomplish this goal. These include launching a MSCHE self-study website, circulating flyers and newsletters on the self-study, and publicizing self-study updates on television screens around the campus. We will employ surveys, forums, and structured interactive activities (e.g., What are two things that you hope New Paltz will gain from the self-study process? How do you contribute to the College’s mission in your role? What do you think are strengths, areas of concern, and priorities that we should focus on in standards one, three, and five? Where am I in the standards?) The Steering Committee and others will discuss the MSCHE self-study process with student and employee groups and a “Standard a Month” will be presented at each Academic Senate meeting. The President and Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will include MSCHE-related updates (provided by the Self-Study co-chairs) in their reports. The President also will inform students about the self-study process in his “Hot Chocolate with the President” conversations with students. Leaders of campus bargaining units will be informed about the self-study and will be invited to meet with the visiting team. The campus will be able to provide feedback on self-study drafts through a specific email account and drafts of the self-study will be placed in the Sojourner Truth Library for review, alongside a secure box for comments.

Profile of the Evaluation Team

Given New Paltz’s mission, size, structure, profile, and classification as a comprehensive college within the SUNY System, we prefer evaluation team members who possess the following characteristics:

- Team Chair – President or Chancellor of a public, four-year college;
- Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs;
- Chief Financial Officer with experience in administration (e.g., Facilities Management, Technology, Telecommunications);
- A senior/executive level administrator from a college within SUNY;
- A member of the Provost Dean’s Council or Senior Staff;

- Members with knowledge, experience, and expertise in strategic planning, assessment, academic advising/student success, student affairs;
- A faculty from a discipline with a specialized accrediting body; and
- Some experience working within a collective bargaining institution.

Evidence Inventory

Standard I: Mission and Goals

Criteria	Documents
<p>1. clearly defined mission and goals that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. are developed through appropriate collaborative participation by all who facilitate or are otherwise responsible for institutional development and improvement; b. address external as well as internal contexts and constituencies; c. are approved and supported by the governing body; d. guide faculty, administration, staff, and governing structures in making decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curricular development, and the definition of institutional and educational outcomes; e. include support of scholarly inquiry and creative activity, at levels and of the type appropriate to the institution; f. are publicized and widely known by the institution's internal stakeholders; g. are periodically evaluated; <p>2. institutional goals that are realistic, appropriate to higher education, and consistent with mission;</p> <p>3. goals that focus on student learning and related outcomes and on institutional improvement; are supported by administrative, educational, and student support programs and services; and are consistent with institutional mission;</p>	<p>Mission Statement Strategic Plan Strategic Planning & Assessment website Undergraduate Catalog Graduate Catalog Student Learning Outcomes and Institutional Effectiveness Plan Budget Request Document Brochures College Council Minutes Senate Resolutions SUNY Trustee Initiatives GE IV Process Faculty Handbook Student Handbook Employee Handbook Senate Minutes/Resolutions</p> <p>Institutional Student Learning Outcomes General Education Outcomes</p> <p>Curriculum Maps Program Learning Outcomes Five-to-Seven Year Academic Program Reviews Academic Program Review Guidelines Student Affairs Student Learning Outcomes</p>

and	Mission, Goals, and Outcomes for Administrative Units
4. periodic assessment of mission and goals to ensure they are relevant and achievable.	Strategic Plan Progress Reports

Standard II: Ethics and Integrity

Criteria	Documents
1. a commitment to academic freedom, intellectual freedom, freedom of expression, and respect for intellectual property rights;	Selected Human Resources, Diversity, & Inclusion Policies and Procedures
2. a climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration from a range of diverse backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives;	Diversity and Inclusion Plan
3. a grievance policy that is documented and disseminated to address complaints or grievances raised by students, faculty, or staff. The institution’s policies and procedures are fair and impartial, and assure that grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably;	Faculty Handbook Student Handbook Employee Handbook Grievance Policy
4. the avoidance of conflict of interest or the appearance of such conflict in all activities and among all constituents;	Conflict of Interest Policy Policy for Agreements with Outside Vendors New York Ethics Guidelines Human Resources Ethics Policy
5. fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation, promotion, discipline, and separation of employees;	Non-Discrimination policies Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Statement Search Committee Guidelines Diversity Plan and Reports Office of Human Resources, Diversity, & Inclusion website
6. honesty and truthfulness in public relations announcements, advertisements, recruiting and admissions materials and practices, as well as in internal	Selected Recruiting /Marketing Materials Website Policies/Guidelines

<p>communications;</p> <p>7. as appropriate to its mission, services or programs in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. to promote affordability and accessibility; b. to enable students to understand funding sources and options, value received for cost, and methods to make informed decisions about incurring debt; <p>8. compliance with all applicable federal, state, and Commission reporting policies, regulations, and requirements to include reporting regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the full disclosure of information on institution-wide assessments, graduation, retention, certification and licensure or licensing board pass rates; b. the institution’s compliance with the Commission’s Requirements of Affiliation; c. substantive changes affecting institutional mission, goals, programs, operations, sites, and other material issues which must be disclosed in a timely and accurate fashion; d. the institution’s compliance with the Commission’s policies; and <p>9. periodic assessment of ethics and integrity as evidenced in institutional policies, processes, practices, and the manner in which these are implemented.</p>	<p>Campus Crimes Report Selected College Brochures/Publications Cleary Report</p> <p>Selected Financial Aid Program materials Financial Aid Program Inventory and award data Disability Resource Center website Financial Aid website New Student Orientation Process Student Consumer Information</p> <p>Most recent Verification of Compliance Report Institutional Research website</p> <p>Research Misconduct policies Academic Integrity policy Policy on Intellectual Property Mandatory Training on State Ethics Law</p>
---	---

Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

Criteria	Documents
<p>1. certificate, undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional programs leading to a degree or other recognized higher</p>	<p>Undergraduate Catalog Graduate Catalog General Education Requirements</p>

<p>education credential, of a length appropriate to the objectives of the degree or other credential, designed to foster a coherent student learning experience and to promote synthesis of learning;</p> <p>2. student learning experiences that are designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full-time or part-time) and/or other appropriate professionals who are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. rigorous and effective in teaching, assessment of student learning, scholarly inquiry, and service, as appropriate to the institution’s mission, goals, and policies; b. qualified for the positions they hold and the work they do; c. sufficient in number; d. provided with and utilize sufficient opportunities, resources, and support for professional growth and innovation; e. reviewed regularly and equitably based on written, disseminated, clear, and fair criteria, expectations, policies, and procedures; <p>3. academic programs of study that are clearly and accurately described in official publications of the institution in a way that students are able to understand and follow degree and program requirements and expected time to completion;</p> <p>4. sufficient learning opportunities and resources to support both the institution’s programs of study and students’ academic progress;</p>	<p>Selected departmental websites/program pages Curriculum Committee meeting minutes Graduate Council meeting minutes Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation Data Time to Graduation and Graduation Deficiency Data New Program Proposals and Program of Study Forms Curricular Maps Articulation agreement website Disciplinary accreditation records Alumni Surveys</p> <p>Faculty qualifications summary data Faculty CV Faculty Handbook Student evaluations of faculty process Process for annual performance reporting by faculty Process for peer observation of faculty Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Guidelines Institutional Data on Student-to-Faculty Ratios Institutional Data on Class Size Selected General Education Assessment annual reports Faculty Development Center annual reports Faculty Development Center website Chancellors Awards Other Faculty Awards and Recognition Travel Funds Documentation</p> <p>Undergraduate Catalog Graduate Catalog General Education Requirements Selected Eight Semester Plans Articulation agreement website Academic Advising website Data on website use</p> <p>Computer Equipment and Support Report Sojourner Truth Library annual reports Academic Advising and Center for Student Success website Academic Advising and Center for Student Success website Early Alert Data Selected Scholars’ Mentorship Program annual reports</p>
--	--

<p>5. at institutions that offer undergraduate education, a general education program, free standing or integrated into academic disciplines, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. offers a sufficient scope to draw students into new areas of intellectual experience, expanding their cultural and global awareness and cultural sensitivity, and preparing them to make well-reasoned judgments outside as well as within their academic field; b. offers a curriculum designed so that students acquire and demonstrate essential skills including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy. Consistent with mission, the general education program also includes the study of values, ethics, and diverse 	<p>Scholars' Mentorship Program website Selected Educational Opportunity Program annual reports Educational Opportunity Program website Selected Summer Undergraduate Research Experience annual reports Selected Academic Year Undergraduate Research Experience annual reports Applied Learning Taskforce Report Internships and Experiential Learning website Career Resource Center website Selected Career Resource Center annual reports Operating budgets for Labs Early Alert data Supplemental Instruction data Selected Student Affairs annual reports/ initiatives Study Abroad website Selected Study Abroad annual reports University Requirements for Graduation Honors Program website Selected Honors Program annual reports Data on pass rates on licensure examinations Student survey data (e.g., NSSE, SOS) Alumni surveys High Impact Learning Practices Data</p> <p>General Education Program Proposal General Education Requirements General Education website GE Focus Group Data</p>
---	---

<p>perspectives; and</p> <p>c. in non-US institutions that do not include general education, provides evidence that students can demonstrate general education skills;</p> <p>6. in institutions that offer graduate and professional education, opportunities for the development of research, scholarship, and independent thinking, provided by faculty and/or other professionals with credentials appropriate to graduate-level curricula;</p> <p>7. adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval on any student learning opportunities designed, delivered, or assessed by third-party providers; and</p> <p>8. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of programs providing student learning opportunities.</p>	<p>Selected Summer Undergraduate Research Experience annual reports</p> <p>Selected Academic Year Undergraduate Research Experience annual reports</p> <p>Recent new program proposals</p> <p>Selected Faculty/Staff-Student Scholarly and Research Publications/Activities</p> <p>Documentation about student research activities from graduate programs</p> <p>Not applicable</p> <p>Strategic Plan annual reports</p> <p>Selected General Education Assessment annual reports</p> <p>Selected annual assessment reports from academic programs</p> <p>Five-to-Seven Year Academic Program Reviews</p> <p>Selected reports from Student Affairs</p> <p>School-wide Annual Assessment Reports</p>
--	--

Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience

Criteria	Documents
<p>1. clearly stated, ethical policies and processes to admit, retain, and facilitate the success of students whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals provide a reasonable expectation for success and are compatible with institutional mission, including:</p> <p>a. accurate and comprehensive information regarding expenses, financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans,</p>	<p>Selected Financial Aid Program materials</p> <p>Financial Aid Program Inventory and Award Data</p> <p>Office of Accessibility website</p> <p>Financial Aid website</p> <p>New Student Orientation Program</p> <p>Student Consumer Information</p> <p>Student Accounts website</p>

<p>repayment, and refunds;</p> <p>b. a process by which students who are not adequately prepared for study at the level for which they have been admitted are identified, placed, and supported in attaining appropriate educational goals;</p> <p>c. orientation, advisement, and counseling programs to enhance retention and guide students throughout their educational experience;</p> <p>d. processes designed to enhance the successful achievement of students' educational goals including certificate and degree completion, transfer to other institutions, and post-completion placement;</p> <p>2. policies and procedures regarding evaluation and acceptance of transfer credits, and credits awarded through experiential learning, prior non-academic learning, competency-based assessment, and other alternative learning approaches;</p> <p>3. policies and procedures for the safe and secure maintenance and appropriate release of student information and records;</p> <p>4. if offered, athletic, student life, and other extracurricular activities that are regulated by the same academic, fiscal, and administrative principles and procedures that govern all other programs;</p> <p>5. if applicable, adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval of student support services designed, delivered, or assessed by third-party providers; and</p> <p>6. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of programs supporting the student experience.</p>	<p>Selected Student Accounts brochures Records and Registration website Selected Records and Registration information Information on student scholarships and grants Emergency Funds/Support information ALEKS initiative Selected student outcomes/assessment reports from Academic Advising/Center for Student Success Student Counseling website Selected Student Counseling information Co-curricular Transcript Starfish CRLA-1 certification information for the CSS tutoring services Quantitative and Qualitative results from new student orientations (including advising & registration) Information on the Progress Report</p> <p>Transfer Student Policies Transfer Credit website Articulation agreement website</p> <p>FERPA website Records and Registration website Selected Records and Registration policies Data Security Policies and Procedures</p> <p>Student Handbook Selected information from Athletics</p> <p>Not applicable</p> <p>Examples suggested by Laurel: Selected assessment plans and annual reports from administrative areas including the Division</p>
--	--

	of Student Affairs, Academic Advising, and Career Resource Center Planning and Assessment Practices for Academic, Student Support, and Administrative Divisions Handbook
--	---

Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Criteria	Documents
<p>1. clearly stated educational goals at the institution and degree/program levels, which are interrelated with one another, with relevant educational experiences, and with the institution’s mission;</p> <p>2. organized and systematic assessments, conducted by faculty and/or appropriate professionals, evaluating the extent of student achievement of institutional and degree/program goals. Institutions should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. define meaningful curricular goals with defensible standards for evaluating whether students are achieving those goals; b. articulate how they prepare students in a manner consistent with their mission for successful careers, meaningful lives, and, where appropriate, further education. They should collect and provide data on the extent to which they are meeting these goals; c. support and sustain assessment of student achievement and communicate the results of this assessment to stakeholders; 	<p>Strategic Plan Institutional Student Learning Outcomes Strategic Planning & Assessment website Selected departmental websites showing program learning outcomes Selected Curriculum Maps Institutional Syllabus guidelines Sample Course Syllabi Co-curricular Transcript</p> <p>Planning and Assessment Practices for Academic, Student Support, and Administrative Divisions Handbook GE IV Assessment Plan Institutional Effectiveness Plan Strategic Planning annual reports Selected General Education Assessment annual reports Assessment-related memos Information on first year and transfer student advising Selected annual assessment reports from academic programs Five-to-Seven Year Academic Program Reviews Selected External Evaluation Program Reports and outcomes from those reports Selected reports from Student Affairs Strategic Planning & Assessment Committee annual reports Strategic Planning & Assessment website Proficiency Exam Results (School of Education) Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation Data Internship and Applied Learning Data Graduated Student Data Assessment websites for each of the five schools Selected Student Opinion Survey and National Survey of Student Engagement survey results</p>

<p>3. consideration and use of assessment results for the improvement of educational effectiveness. Consistent with the institution’s mission, such uses include some combination of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. assisting students in improving their learning; b. improving pedagogy and curriculum; c. reviewing and revising academic programs and support services; d. planning, conducting, and supporting a range of professional development activities; e. planning and budgeting for the provision of academic programs and services; f. informing appropriate constituents about the institution and its programs; g. improving key indicators of student success, such as retention, graduation, transfer, and placement rates; h. implementing other processes and procedures designed to improve educational programs and services; <p>4. if applicable, adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval of assessment services designed, delivered, or assessed by third-party providers; and</p> <p>5. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of assessment processes utilized by the institution for the improvement of educational effectiveness.</p>	<p>Examples of evidence of the use of assessment results in resource allocation and budgetary decisions, curricular decisions, and to improve processes and services</p> <p>Curriculum Maps</p> <p>Curriculum Committee minutes</p> <p>Graduate Council minutes</p> <p>Sample Program Proposals</p> <p>Sample Course Proposals</p> <p>Support for Assessment Summary Report</p> <p>Information on first year and transfer student advising</p> <p>Comparative DFWI rates for native and transfer students</p> <p>Retention and graduation data</p> <p>Not applicable</p> <p>Selected information on the impetus for General Education review and revision</p> <p>Comparative assessment data for the old and new GE programs</p> <p>Rationale for curricular changes and new course and programs developed</p>
---	--

Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

--	--

Criteria	Documents
<p>1. institutional objectives, both institution-wide and for individual units, that are clearly stated, assessed appropriately, linked to mission and goal achievement, reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results, and are used for planning and resource allocation;</p> <p>2. clearly documented and communicated planning and improvement processes that provide for constituent participation, and incorporate the use of assessment results;</p> <p>3. a financial planning and budgeting process that is aligned with the institution's mission and goals, evidence-based, and clearly linked to the institution's and units' strategic plans/objectives;</p> <p>4. fiscal and human resources as well as the physical and technical infrastructure adequate to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered;</p> <p>5. well-defined decision-making processes and clear assignment of responsibility and accountability;</p> <p>6. comprehensive planning for facilities, infrastructure, and technology that includes consideration of sustainability and deferred maintenance and is</p>	<p>Mission Statement Strategic Plan Institutional Student Learning Outcomes General Education Outcomes Assessment Reports</p> <p>Planning and Assessment Practices for Academic, Student Support, and Administrative Divisions Handbook Institutional Effectiveness Plan Facilities Master Plan President's State of the College addresses Applied Learning Plan Energy Master Plan Space Utilization Master Plan Instructional Technology Strategic Plan Performance Improvement Plan Diversity and Inclusion Plan Sustainability Plan</p> <p>Budget Process Budget Updates</p> <p>Capital Projects Planning Space Utilization Report Information Technology Report Sojourner Truth Library Report Financial Report Dormitory Income Fund Reimbursable (DIFR) Financial Plan Enrollment and Financial Trends and Projections</p> <p>Organizational Chart Faculty and Staff Evaluation Procedures</p> <p>Facilities Master Plan IPEDS Peer Comparison Report Instructional Technology Strategic Plan</p>

<p>linked to the institution's strategic and financial planning processes;</p> <p>7. an annual independent audit confirming financial viability with evidence of follow-up on any concerns cited in the audit's accompanying management letter;</p> <p>8. strategies to measure and assess the adequacy and efficient utilization of institutional resources required to support the institution's mission and goals; and</p> <p>9. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of planning, resource allocation, institutional renewal processes, and availability of resources.</p>	<p>Financial Audit Reports</p> <p>Budget Updates Sample annual reports</p> <p>Budget Updates Student Technology Fee Plan and Report Staffing Report</p>
--	---

Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

Criteria	Documents
<p>1. a clearly articulated and transparent governance structure that outlines roles, responsibilities, and accountability for decision making by each constituency, including governing body, administration, faculty, staff and students;</p> <p>2. a legally constituted governing body that:</p> <p>a. serves the public interest, ensures that the institution clearly states and fulfills its mission and goals, has fiduciary responsibility for the institution, and is ultimately accountable for the academic quality, planning, and fiscal well-being of the institution;</p> <p>b. has sufficient independence and expertise to ensure the integrity of the institution. Members must have primary responsibility to the accredited</p>	<p>Governance Chart By-Laws Faculty Handbook Student Handbook Academic Senate Charge and Guidelines College Council Charge and Guidelines SUNY Research Foundation Guidelines Foundation Bylaws</p> <p>SUNY Board of Trustees website Process for Evaluating SUNY Presidents SUNY Conflict of Interest Policy SUNY Board of Trustees Bylaws</p>

<p>institution and not allow political, financial, or other influences to interfere with their governing responsibilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. ensures that neither the governing body nor its individual members interferes in the day-to-day operations of the institution; d. oversees at the policy level the quality of teaching and learning, the approval of degree programs and the awarding of degrees, the establishment of personnel policies and procedures, the approval of policies and by-laws, and the assurance of strong fiscal management; e. plays a basic policy-making role in financial affairs to ensure integrity and strong financial management. It may include a timely review of audited financial statements and/or other documents related to the fiscal viability of the institution; f. appoints and regularly evaluates the performance of the Chief Executive Officer; g. is informed in all its operations by principles of good practice in board governance; h. establishes and complies with a written conflict of interest policy designed to ensure the impartiality of the governing body by addressing matters such as payment for services, contractual relationships, employment, and family, financial or other interests that could pose or be perceived as conflicts of interest; i. supports the Chief Executive Officer in maintaining the autonomy of the institution; <p>3. a Chief Executive Officer who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. is appointed by, evaluated by, and reports to the governing body and shall not chair the governing body; b. has appropriate credentials and professional experience consistent with the mission of the organization; c. has the authority and autonomy required to fulfill the responsibilities of the position, including developing and implementing institutional plans, staffing the organization, identifying and 	<p>Organizational Chart President's Job Description President's Biographical Information President's Evaluation process President's State of the College addresses</p>
---	--

