Self-study Design
The City College of New York of the City University of New York

Introduction

The City College of New York (CCNY) is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). At ten-year intervals, the institution prepares a detailed self-study to demonstrate compliance with the Commission's Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation, and to develop recommendations for improvement. The next self-study will be submitted to MSCHE in 2018.

The Commission, in close collaboration with its member institutions, issued revised standards in 2015, and CCNY's self-study is based on these new Standards for Accreditation (I-VII) and the re-alignment of the Requirements of Affiliation.

In the following self-study design, CCNY provides an outline of its *2018 Self-study Report*. This design will serve as the guiding document that identifies the principal institutional priorities: student success; research and creative endeavors; innovative undergraduate and graduate programs; diversity; financial health; community; and campus maintenance and enhancement. It also describes how CCNY will prepare and benefit from the self-study; and offers direction to the working groups that will analyze the current processes, procedures, and performance. In addition, this document will inform the entire college community of the importance of the self-study process and the opportunities for participation. The design is organized according to MSCHE's *Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report* (2016):

1. Institutional Overview

The Middle States Standards for Accreditation describe the characteristics of excellence that member institutions should demonstrate. In preparation for its decennial evaluation and peer review, The City College of New York (CCNY) has convened a steering committee and eight working groups to assess the institution's performance for each of the seven Standards for Accreditation and their associated criteria. An eighth working group is charged with verifying compliance with accreditation-relevant federal and state regulations.

Equally important is using the MSCHE self-study process to focus, where appropriate, on those features and priorities that are specific to the institution. A brief summary of the characteristics, mission, recent developments, and current priorities that should be given special consideration by the working groups as they study CCNY follow.

► *Characteristics*

The City College of New York (CCNY) was established in 1847 by a state-wide referendum as the Free Academy—one of the nation's earliest public institutions of higher education and its first municipal college. The founder, Townsend Harris, described the goal: "Open the doors to all—let the children of the rich and the poor take their seats together and know of no distinction save that of industry, good conduct, and intellect." This ambition was reaffirmed by the Free Academy's first president, Dr. Horace Webster: "The experiment is to be tried, whether the children of the people, the children of the whole people, can be educated; and whether an institution of the highest grade, can be successfully controlled by the

popular will, not by the privileged few." CCNY thus became one of the United States's great democratic experiments, showing tolerance for diversity, especially in comparison to the private universities of New York City. For almost 170 years, CCNY graduates have proven the wisdom of Townsend Harris's vision. They include architects, artists, authors, community leaders, educators, health professionals, inventors, public servants, scientists, and ten Nobel Laureates, an achievement that no other public institution has surpassed.

Today, CCNY is one of 24 institutions in the City University of New York (CUNY). The university, which is comprised of eleven senior colleges, including CCNY, and seven community colleges, serves over 250,000 degree-seeking students and nearly as many in continuing education and other non-degree programs. CCNY's schools and divisions are The Bernard and Anne Spitzer School of Architecture, Grove School of Engineering, School of Education, Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education/CUNY School of Medicine, Colin Powell School for Civic and Global Leadership (formerly the Division of Social Science), Division of Humanities and the Arts, Division of Interdisciplinary Studies at the Center for Worker Education (CWE), and the Division of Science. Its main campus is situated on 36 tree-lined acres in West Harlem, between 135th Street and 141st Street along Convent Avenue, where students attend day and evening classes. This campus consists of fourteen buildings, including the five original Neo-Gothic buildings designed by George Browne Post, the New York State Structural Biology Center (NYSBC), and two new state-of-the-art research facilities, the CCNY Center for Discovery and Innovation (CDI) and the CUNY Advanced Science Research Center (ASRC). Working adult students also attend classes at CCNY's Center for Worker Education, which is located at 25 Broadway in downtown Manhattan.

CCNY's schools and divisions offer more than seventy undergraduate majors and over fifty master-level programs; its Grove School of Engineering also awards doctoral degrees. Students interested in pursuing other doctoral programs may apply to the CUNY Graduate Center, the university's principal doctorate-granting institution, which has over thirty programs in the arts, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. The only consortium of its kind in the nation, the Graduate Center draws upon more than 1,700 faculty from across the CUNY colleges, as well as from academic, cultural, and scientific institutions throughout New York City. For example, several academic departments at CCNY sponsor doctoral degree programs in biology, biochemistry, chemistry, clinical psychology, earth and atmospheric sciences, mathematics, and physics, with the PhD degrees granted by the Graduate Center. Any examination of assessment, curriculum, governance, planning, or the student experience must acknowledge this structure and the advantages of the university system.

Located in one of the most cosmopolitan cities in the world, CCNY has an exceptionally diverse student body. In fall 2015, CCNY's schools and divisions enrolled 13,340 undergraduate and 2,591 graduate students, representing over 84 percent of the world's countries.

- American Indian or Alaska Native: 0.1%
- Asian: 22.4%

- Black or African American: 16.8%
- Hispanic or Latino: 33.9%
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 0.3%
- White: 18.1%
- Two or more races: 1.6%
- Non-resident Alien: 6.8%

Approximately 35 percent of enrolled undergraduate and graduate students are the first in their families to attend college; almost 21 percent identify themselves as foreign born; and over 38 percent report speaking a foreign language at home. Over 42 percent of the undergraduates receive financial aid from the New York State Tuition Assistance Program (TAP), and almost 34 percent are Pell Grant eligible. This combination of aid and the college's affordable tuition means that an estimated 66 percent of the full-time undergraduates attend tuition-free, and approximately 82 percent of CCNY's undergraduates are debt-free upon graduation.

Sources: CUNY OIRA, CCNY Office of Financial Aid, CCNY Office of the Provost, CCNY Office of Institutional Research

►*Mission Statement*

The City College of New York's mission statement expresses the guiding principles for planning and assessment:

Our Mission

Since its founding in 1847, The City College of New York (CCNY) has been true to its legacy of access, opportunity, and transformation. CCNY is as diverse, dynamic, and boldly visionary as the city itself. CCNY advances knowledge and critical thinking, and fosters research, creativity, and innovation across academic, artistic, and professional disciplines. As a public institution with public purpose, CCNY produces citizens who make an impact on the cultural, social, and economic vitality of New York, the nation, and the world.

"Open the doors to all. Let the children of the rich and the poor take their seats together and know of no distinction save that of industry, good conduct, and intellect"

Townsend Harris
Founder, 1847

Our Vision

City College stands at the intersection of its historical past and promise for a vibrant future. Building on its strong foundation of unleashing potential, a City College education integrates knowledge with experience to nurture scholars, professionals, and leaders who are ready to meet the challenges of our contemporary society. CCNY will attract students who have a tenacious desire to learn, lead, and contribute to the greater good of society on their path to a successful future. CCNY graduates will be committed to supporting access to opportunity and mentorship for future generations of learners.

Sources: https://www.ccny.cuny.edu/about/mission, https://www.ccny.cuny.edu/strategicplanning/vantage-point-2022

►*Recent Developments*

Administration and Faculty

Administration

In August 2010, Dr. <u>Lisa S. Coico</u> became the 12th president of CCNY and the first CUNY graduate to lead the college. She is a nationally prominent educator and researcher in microbiology and immunology, having served as provost and executive vice president for academic affairs at Temple University and as executive director of the Tri-institutional Research Program, a consortium of Cornell University, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, and The Rockefeller University. During her tenure President Coico has built an administrative team that shares her vision of the College's promise and potential. Over the course of the last six years, she has had the opportunity to recruit leaders to the following positions in the College's senior administration:

- Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer
- Senior Vice President and Provost
- Vice President for Communications and Marketing
- Vice President for Development and Institutional Advancement
- Vice President for Finance
- Vice President for Government, Community, and Cultural Affairs
- Vice President for Student Affairs
- Dean of Diversity, Compliance, and Faculty Relations
- Dean of the Grove School of Engineering
- Dean of the School of Education
- Dean of the Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education
- Dean of the Colin Powell School for Civic and Global Leadership
- Dean of the Division of Humanities and the Arts
- Dean of the Division of Science
- Assistant Vice President for Facilities
- Assistant Vice President for Human Resources
- Assistant Vice President for Information Technology

Searches are currently underway for provost, dean of the Spitzer School of Architecture, and dean of the Division of Humanities and the Arts. Progress in these searches will be reported in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

Faculty

Reflecting its commitment to teaching and research, CCNY has created and filled over 150 full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty positions since 2011, and has defined a process for start-up packages for new faculty, in coördination with the Offices of the Provost, Finance and Administration, Human Resources, and Facilities Management. An integral part of this process is the cost-planning worksheet, which lists both standard and discipline-specific commitments, such as nine-month salary, summer salary, teaching obligation, office and research space, estimated cost of equipment and

renovations, number and cost of doctoral students and other personnel, one-time relocation costs, and research initiatives. Approvals from the aforementioned offices are necessary before formal offers may be made to prospective faculty. This process clarifies agreements for all parties, ensures institutional resources and support, and promotes development and satisfaction. Other changes and developments, including the participation of full- and part-time faculty in the online professional development workshops created and hosted by the [Association of College and University Educators](#) (ACUE), will be described in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

Strategic Plan (*See* "[**Priorities**](#)," p. 9.)

New Academic Units, Centers, and Programs

- **Sophie Davis Biomedical Education Program/CUNY School of Medicine** (2016)

  At its February 2016 session, the MSCHE Executive Committee for Substantive Change acknowledged "receipt of [CCNY's] substantive change request and to include the Doctor of Medicine degree within the scope of the institution's accreditation." The college's current entry in the [MSCHE Institution Directory](#) reflects this change, and an updated assessment of the [Sophie Davis Biomedical Education Program/CUNY School of Medicine](#)'s BS/MD program and confirmation of continuing accreditation by the [Liaison Committee on Medical Education](#) (LCME) will be provided as part of the *2018 Self-study Report*.

- **Center for Discovery and Innovation** (2015)

  The [City College Center for Discovery and Innovation](#) (CDI) opened in 2015 and features approximately 100,000 square feet (net) of assignable space for collaborative research in four major interdisciplinary clusters: materials research, neuroscience, organic chemistry, and structural biology. The facility, which was designed for optimal research functionality and collaboration, is a magnet for regional, national, and international researchers and serves as a hub of interdisciplinary learning for students and faculty, who were successfully relocated to the CDI. An assessment of its early achievements and contributions to the intellectual life of the campus will be presented in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

- **CUNY Pathways Initiative** (2013)

  In fall 2013, CUNY implemented the Pathways initiative across its undergraduate colleges. This new system of general education curriculum and revised transfer guidelines reinforce educational excellence while ensuring seamless transfer opportunities to undergraduate students across the university. The centerpiece of this initiative is a 30-credit [Common Core](#), with each CUNY college also requiring the baccalaureate-degree student to complete another six to twelve credits of general education course work ([College Option](#)). Additionally, Pathways has aligned specific [gateway courses](#) leading to the most popular undergraduate majors. At CCNY, the impact study of the Pathways Initiative at CCNY is ongoing, and its outcome assessment will be presented in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

- **Colin Powell School for Civic and Global Leadership** (2013)

  Immediately prior to CCNY's submission of its *2013 Periodic Review Report* to MSCHE, the CUNY Board of Trustees approved the renaming of the Division of Social Science after General Colin L. Powell (Ret.), one of the institution's most highly respected and engaged alumni. Inspired by Gen. Powell's career in public service, the mission of the school is "to transform students, faculty, communities, and the traditional university experience by adopting problem-based approaches to education." A description of its programming, engagement with other CCNY units, and assessment of its effectiveness will be provided in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

- **Branding + Integrated Communications (BIC) Graduate Program** (2013)

  The Department of Media and Communication Arts admitted its first cohort of graduate students into its new master's degree program in Branding + Integrated Communications in fall 2013. The 36-credit, portfolio-driven program was created with the guidance, insight, and support of significant individuals in New York City's advertising and public relations community. An outcome assessment of this program will appear in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

- **CUNY Reserve Officers' Training Corps** (2013)

  After a four-decade absence, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) returned to CCNY in 2013. The college serves as the headquarters for the new CUNY-wide ROTC program, offering rigorous academics and training for leadership in the armed services to students from all university campuses. ROTC students complete 24 elective credits as part of the traditional baccalaureate degree program. Currently, approximately 150 students from seventeen CUNY campuses are enrolled in the program at CCNY, and the US Department of Defense continues to recognize the program for its excellence. An update will be offered in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

- **CUNY Zahn Innovation Center at CCNY** (2012)

  Supported in part by a $1 million gift from the Moxie Foundation, which was founded by CCNY alumnus Irwin Zahn, the Zahn Innovation Center at CCNY opened in 2012. Available to students, faculty, and alumni entrepreneurs, it serves as a start-up incubator for both technology-enabled initiatives and social impact ventures. The center also provides instruction, a start-up boot camp, mentorship, networking opportunities, *pro bono* services, and rapid prototyping facilities. In addition to $150,000 in annual prizes, the Zahn Innovation Center has created 100 internships, and its start-ups have earned $600,000 to date. An assessment of its performance will be provided in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

- **J. Max Bond Center on Design for the Just City at CCNY** (2012)

  To architect J. Max Bond, Jr. (1935-2009), social equity was a core value, as was design integrity, and the J. Max Bond Center on Design for the Just City at CCNY is committed to advancing his vision through collaborative faculty research projects, urban design advocacy and projects, leadership development, and educational programs at it home within the Spitzer School

of Architecture. In keeping with the college's mission, the Bond Center is a reimagining of the City College Architecture Center (CCAC) that operated in the 1980s and 1990s primarily as a *pro bono* architecture and planning service for the Harlem community. An update of the Center's internal activities and external collaborations will be presented in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

Other Strategic Initiatives

▪ **Adoption of the CUNYfirst Business Systems**

CUNY*first*, or the *F*ully *I*ntegrated *R*esources and *S*ervices *T*ool, is transforming the way that the university and its colleges manage multiple processes, including student administration, human resources, and finance. Implemented across the university in phases, the new CUNYfirst applications will streamline and standardize activities by replacing aging legacy systems, such as SIMS (Student Information Management System) and CUPS (CUNY Personnel System). An update and assessment of the implementation and effectiveness of CUNYfirst at CCNY will be presented in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

▪ **Council for Inclusive Excellence**

In 2011, the president charged sixteen administrators and faculty—the President's Council for Inclusive Excellence—to assess faculty diversity and institutional inclusiveness at CCNY. The product of its one-year study, *Report of the President's Council on Inclusion and Excellence* (September 2012), focuses on full-time faculty; identifies eight goals and multiple strategies for their achievement; and discusses over thirty major findings supported by extensive data. Progress on the council's recommendations will be described in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

▪ **Fundraising**

In the *2013 Periodic Review Report* (4.2 Research and Philanthropic Funding), CCNY stated its determination to "increase fundraising to $46 million annually, with additional gifts to support the Powell School and the proposed medical school." Reports from the Research Foundation of CUNY—CCNY, CCNY 21st Century Foundation, City College Fund, and specific college offices on the progress of their research and philanthropic funding efforts, as well as descriptions of the initiatives made possible by unrestricted, temporarily unrestricted, and permanently restricted gifts, will be presented in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

▪ **Capital Projects**

Since submitting its *2013 Periodic Review Report*, CCNY has completed a significant number of capital projects: the J. Max Bond Center for a Just City in the Bernard and Anne Spitzer School of Architecture facility; redesigned and refurbished instructional and office spaces for the Department of Art; the Department of Media and Communication Arts; Colin L. Powell Center for Leadership and Service; Public Service Management Program; Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service; Skadden, Arps Honor Program in Legal Studies suite; Grove School of

Engineering; TECH Center; Shepard Hall (exterior); Center for Discovery and Innovation; and many classrooms, small computer labs, and lecture halls.

As explained in the *2013 Periodic Review Report* (3.10 Facilities), CCNY is now using "CUNY, institutional, and external funding to support numerous capital projects, such as renovations to Alumni House, North Academic Center, and Shepard Hall." An update on all post-2013 projects will be provided in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

►*Priorities*

The priorities addressed by the self-study process are embodied in the CCNY strategic plan, *Vantage Point 2022*, which is the product of an intensive campus-wide effort begun in February 2013. At that time, the CCNY leadership initiated a strategic planning process by creating a framework to review the institutional vision and strategic focus. The intent was to align its current strategies and initiatives with a modern and dynamic plan for the future.

In consultation with a professional services firm, Excelcor, four committees comprised of representatives from all campus constituencies prepared a new strategic plan, *Vantage Point 2022*, which identifies key themes and implementation strategies:

- **Student Success**

  CCNY will increase opportunities for undergraduate and graduate research and internships, integrating classroom learning with actual practice in laboratories, businesses, schools, and social service and cultural organizations. New majors will reflect the importance of interdisciplinary learning, including a commitment to opportunities for experiences beyond New York City. In addition, CCNY will enhance student services, e.g., advisement and career development; will support timely progress toward degree completion, e.g., improved course scheduling and updated, sequential curricula; and will increase student-faculty engagement as part of its broader plan to enrich an excellent student experience. (Working Groups III, IV, V, Compliance)

- **Research, Scholarship, and Creativity**

  CCNY will establish a culture in which significant research and creative endeavors are intrinsic to the missions of all departments and programs. Building upon its reputation for excellence in teaching, the institution will increase productivity in research and scholarship to advance cutting-edge exploration and innovation; to facilitate and strengthen interdisciplinary research; to recruit and retain faculty with demonstrated research agendas; and to improve the dissemination, reputation, impact and commercialization of the knowledge and technologies developed at the college. (Working Groups III, IV, V, VI)

- **New Academic Initiatives**

  By investing in specific large-scale initiatives, CCNY will enhance its academic reputation; will promote interdisciplinary fields and introduce new undergraduate and graduate programs; will refine the institution's academic framework through careful consideration of new and existing schools; and will support innovation and entrepreneurship. (Working Groups III, IV, VI, VII)

- **Diversity**

  CCNY will continue to implement the recommendations of the President's Council for Inclusive Excellence (2012), such as protecting faculty and community diversity through departmental and institutional recruitment; and raising awareness of the college's historical commitment to equity, inclusion, and diversity among all campus constituencies. (Working Groups I, II, VI, VII)

- **Financial Health**

  Shifting economic conditions and funding sources have required CCNY to develop a budget model that ensures stability and predictability over multiple years, while increasing transparency and efficiency and maintaining exceptional academic programs, student services, and faculty support. To achieve this, CCNY has identified or is pursuing new revenue streams, including more aggressive student recruitment; pursue intentional fundraising strategies; and restructure internal business practices. (Working Groups I, II, VI, VII)

- **Promoting Community**

  Since 1847, CCNY's greatest resource has been its people—students, alumni, faculty, staff, and immediate neighborhoods—and the institution remains dedicated to "the children of the whole people," their families, educators, workforce, and vibrant West Harlem community. To enrich the campus experience for all, CCNY is committed to attracting, recruiting, and retaining faculty and staff who support and advance the institutional mission; to increasing professional development, performance, and accountability of faculty and staff; to promoting opportunities for shared participation; to expanding alumni participation in campus life and student success; and to cultivating a campus environment and spirit that supports and enable success. (Working Groups I, II, IV, VI, VII)

- **Iconic Campus / Physical Plant**

  Transforming the campus to embrace technological and futuristic needs will be a priority in the development of a master plan that furthers CCNY's academic, research, and creative mission while maintain a thriving intellectual community. The college will continue to develop state-of-the-art spaces for teaching and scholarship; will continue infrastructure maintenance and enhancements; and will implement and upgrade technologies to address campus-wide demands. (Working Groups I, IV, VI, VII)

Detailed descriptions of progress in each strategic plan area will be presented in the *2018 Self-study Report*.

►*MSCHE Self-study Activities to Date*

Immediately following the submission of the *2013 Periodic Review Report*, CCNY's MSCHE Liaison, Dr. Doris Cintrón, and her team began preliminary preparations for the decennial review: reading pertinent MSCHE publications, developing CCNY-specific materials, compiling a list of prospective members of the steering committee and working groups, and attending the MSCHE Self-study Institute (9-10 November 2015).

In 2015, the team also readied and submitted a Substantive Change Request: New Degree/Credential Level for the transformation of the Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education (SDSBE) into the SDSBE/CUNY School of Medicine, with the St. Barnabas Hospital/Health System (SBH/HS) as the clinical partner. MSCHE approved this request, and an updated assessment of the Sophie Davis Biomedical Education Program/CUNY School of Medicine's BS/MD program, as well as confirmation of continuing accreditation by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME), will be provided as part of the *2018 Self-study Report*.

The provost, in consultation with the president, appointed Dr. Doris Cintrón, senior associate provost and MSCHE Liaison, and Professor Edwin Lamboy, chair of the Department of Secondary Education, as co-chairs of the steering committee. In December 2015, the president and the provost refined the list of prospective steering committee members, and the president's letters of invitation were released. Next, the representative steering committee met to review recommendations for working group membership; and, with the approval of the co-chairs of the eight working groups, additional letters of invitation were sent. The structure and membership of the committee and the working groups, as of May 2016, are presented in "**Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups**" (Section 4).

In January 2016, the provost and the senior associate provost met with the steering committee to provide an overview of the self-study process; to emphasize its value in identifying and articulating clear, constructive recommendations; to align the MSCHE Standards and Requirements with the college's new strategic plan, *Vantage Point 2022*; and to integrate the study with other institutional planning and renewal processes. The co-chairs convened additional steering committee meetings throughout the spring 2016 semester, and often met individually with the co-chairs of the working groups. Those groups also maintain regular meeting and communication schedules to advance their work.

2. Model for the Self-study Design

CCNY will use the comprehensive model for its self-study. This thorough approach will ensure:

- campus-wide assessment of priorities, planning, and resource allocation that advances institutional mission and goals; and

- alignment and agreement with each of the revised **Standards for Accreditation**, **Requirements of Affiliation**, and **compliance** with federal and state requirements.

Specifically, CCNY will use the MSCHE self-study process to:

- meet and exceed the Standards;
- engage in intentional self-reflection to strengthen both the institution and the campus community;
- collect, analyze, and disseminate institutional data to foster a culture of continuous improvement;
- nurture future CCNY leaders through their involvement in the working groups; and
- develop explicit plans to realize the promise of the new strategic plan, *Vantage Point 2022*.

Although the college's professional schools are subject to other rigorous external reviews, such as the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME), and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), CCNY is best served by engaging in an inclusive self-study to measure the effectiveness of academic, administrative, and institutional programs and processes.

The seven Standards for Accreditation, associated criteria, and preliminary documentation sources for the Standards and Requirements of Affiliation are listed in the "**Documentation Roadmap**" (Section 11).

3. Intended Outcomes

To achieve a productive self-analysis and contribute to its continuing renewal, CCNY has identified the following major goals for the self-study process:

1. demonstrate satisfaction of the Standards for Accreditation, Requirements of Affiliation, and federal and state compliance;
2. create a concise, constructive document that complements and advances the college's new strategic plan, *Vantage Point 2022*, and that serves as a foundation for on-going institutional planning and assessment;
3. leverage the activities of the MSCHE working groups to determine specific short- and long-term activities and phased implementation plans;
4. determine how institutional mission and defined goals drive academic allocations, comprehensive planning, and effective, ethical operations;
5. contribute to the expansion and generation of new academic programs in emerging fields and alternate delivery modes;
6. spur entrepreneurship and innovation among the college's faculty and students; and
7. enhance the college's reputation as one of the most diverse institutions by maintaining a respectful campus environment and by executing an innovative and determined recruitment initiative in new domestic and international markets.

4. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

The steering committee is comprised of 24 individuals: two co-chairs overseeing the committee and two or more co-chairs guiding each of the eight working groups (Standards for Accreditation I-VII and Verification of Compliance). One steering committee co-chair is a member of the administration, and the other is a member of the faculty. Their appointment and oversight ensure that all constituencies are represented; that all areas and procedures are studied; and that all institutional resources are available to the committee and the eight working groups.

Of the eight working groups, seven are responsible for the evaluation of the revised Standards for Accreditation I through VII; the eighth group is dedicated to the verification of compliance with federal and state regulations. Each working group has one or more co-chairs. In fall 2016, each working group will recruit undergraduate and graduate students, as well as alumni, who are available to participate actively in the self-study process until its conclusion. As of August 2016, the list of members of the steering committee and the working groups is as follows. Additional members are being recruited during 2016-17.

Steering Committee

Co-chairs

Doris Cintrón (Senior Associate Provost and **MSCHE Liaison**)

Edwin Lamboy (Chair, Department of Secondary Education)

Members

Gilda Barabino (Dean, Grove School of Engineering)

Thomas Castiglione (Registrar)

Yvel Crevecoeur (Faculty, Department of Special Education)

Kevin Foster (Faculty, Department of Economics)

Erica Friedman (Deputy Dean, Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education)

Jane Gallagher (Chair, Office of Academic Standards and Ombudsperson)

Marta Gutman (Faculty, Spitzer School of Architecture)

Ellen Handy (Faculty, Department of Art)

Kenneth Ihrer (Associate Vice President and Chief Technology Officer)

David Jeruzalmi (Faculty, Department of Chemistry, and Chair, Faculty Senate)

Felix Lam (Vice President for Finance and Administration and Chief Financial Officer)

Tony M. Liss (Dean, Division of Science)

Eva Medina (Director of Budget, Office of Finance and Administration)

Juan Carlos Mercado (Dean, Division of Interdisciplinary Studies)

Fred Moshary (Faculty, Department of Electrical Engineering)

Geraldine Murphy (Director, Honors Center, and Faculty, Department of English)

Kathy Powell-Manning (Director of Learning Assessment, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences)

Juana Reina (Dean, Division of Student Affairs)

Carlos Riobó (Chair, Department of Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures)

Mary Ruth Strzeszewski (Associate Provost for Academic Services)

Terri Watson (Faculty, Department of Educational Leadership)

Joshua Wilner (Faculty, Department of English)

Working Group Standard I: Mission and Goals

Steering Committee Liaisons and Working Group Co-chairs

Erica Friedman (Deputy Dean, Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education)

David Jeruzalmi (Faculty, Department of Chemistry, and Chair, Faculty Senate)

Members

Carlos Aguasaco (Faculty, Division of Interdisciplinary Studies)

Rajan Menon (Faculty, Department of Political Science)

Renata Miller (Chair, Department of English)

Ardie Walser (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Grove School of Engineering)

David Weissman (Faculty, Department of Philosophy)

Students (individual students and representatives from student organizations)

Working Group Standard II: Ethics and Integrity

Steering Committee Liaisons and Working Group Co-chairs

Jane Gallagher (Chair, Office of Academic Standards, and College Ombudsperson)

Joshua Wilner (Faculty, Department of English)

Members

Richard Belgrave (Director, Office of Environmental Health and Occupational Safety)

Jeffrey Blustein (Faculty, Department of Philosophy)

Carla Cappetti (Faculty, Department of English, and Grievance Counselor)

Denise Dyce (Director of Labor Relations, Office of Human Resources)

Jorge Gonzalez (Faculty, Department of Mechanical Engineering / NOAA-CREST)

Jonathan Levitt (Faculty, Department of Biology, and Director, MARC Program)

Tricia Mayhew-Noel (Administrator, Institutional Review Board)

Simone McMillion (Director of Marketing, Office of Communications and Public Relations)

Maribel Morua (Director, Office of International Student and Scholar Services)

Guillermo Rivera (Senior Admissions Counselor, Office of Admissions)

Wendy Thornton (Dean of Student Development, Division of Student Affairs)

Students (individual students and representatives from student organizations)

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

Steering Committee Liaisons and Working Group Co-chairs

Yvel Crevecoeur (Faculty, Department of Special Education)

Marta Gutman (Faculty, Spitzer School of Architecture)

Tony M. Liss (Dean, Division of Science)

Geraldine Murphy (Director, Honors Center, and Faculty, Department of English)

Members

Joseph Bak (Faculty, Department of Mathematics)

Hannah Borgeson (Graduate Student Services Advisor, Spitzer School of Architecture)

Maudette Brownlee (Director, SEEK Program)

Marco Castaldi (Faculty, Department of Chemical Engineering)

Katherine Levin (Advisor, Honors Center)

Eric Lopez (Assistant Coördinator for Curriculum, Office of the Provost)

Joseph Moore (Faculty, Department of Art)

Marie Nazon (Faculty, SEEK Program)

Brett Silverstein (Faculty, Department of Psychology)

Richard Steinberg (Faculty, School of Education & Department of Physics)

Charles Stewart (Associate Dean and Chief Librarian)

Ana Vasović (Director of General Education, Office of the Provost)

Melissa Watson (Faculty, Department of English)

Students (individual students and representatives from student organizations)

Working Group Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience

Steering Committee Liaisons and Working Group Co-chairs

Juana Reina (Vice President, Division of Student Affairs)

Mary Ruth Strzeszewski (Associate Provost for Academic Services)

Terri Watson (Faculty, Department of Educational Leadership)

Members

Shellye Belton (Deputy Director, Office of Financial Aid)

Kamilah Briscoe (Director, Student Success, Powell School for Civic and Global Leadership)

Robert Curry (Assistant Director, Office of Public Safety and Security)

Alejandro Gonzalez (Associate Director for Student Life and Leadership Development)

Ana King-Garcia (Executive Director for Campus Engagement, Division of Student Affairs)

Joseph LoGiudice (Manager, Office of AccessAbility / Disability Services)

Dani McBeth (Associate Dean for Student Affairs, Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education)

Pauline Pabon (Assistant Director for Graduate Admissions, Office of Admissions)

Issa Salame (Lecturer, Department of Chemistry)

Teresa Scala (Research Associate, Office of the Provost)

Nkem Stanley-Mbamelu (Associate Director, CCAPP, Division of Science)

Dominic Stellini (Executive Director for Student Engagement Initiatives, Office of the President)

Diane Watford (College Accounting Assistant, Office of the Bursar)

Kern Williams (Director for Housing and Residence Life, Division of Student Affairs)

Students (individual students and representatives from student organizations)

Working Group Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Steering Committee Liaisons and Working Group Co-chairs

Ellen Handy (Faculty, Department of Art)

Fred Moshary (Faculty, Department of Electrical Engineering)

Kathy Powell-Manning (Director of Learning Assessment, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences)

Members

Svetlana Bochman (Director, The Writing Center, Office of the Provost)

Richard Braverman (Lecturer, Department of English)

Deborah Edwards-Anderson (Program Manager, Department of Early Childhood Education)

Leslie Galman (Director, Academic Administration, Powell School for Civic and Global Leadership)

Jay Jorgenson (Faculty, Department of Mathematics)

Matthew Nagler (Faculty, Department of Economics and Business)

Thomas Peele (Faculty, Department of English, and Director, First-Year Writing Program)

Migen Prifti (Academic Advisor, Division of Humanities and the Arts)

Stacia Pusey (Assistant Dean for Enrollment and Student Services, School of Education)

Susanna Rosenbaum (Faculty, Department of Sociocultural Anthropology)

Elizabeth Rudolph (Assistant Dean, Division of Science)

Lindsay Siegel (Executive Director, Zahn Innovation Center)

Shailesh Thacker (Director, Office of Evaluation and Testing)

Justin Williams (Faculty, Department of History)

Ana Zevallos (Faculty, SEEK Program)

Students (individual students and representatives from student organizations)

Working Group Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Steering Committee Liaisons and Working Group Co-chairs

Kevin Foster (Faculty, Department of Economics and Business)

Felix Lam (Vice President for Finance and Administration and Chief Financial Officer)

Members

Marta Bengoa (Faculty, Department of Economics and Business)

Shawn Chin-Chance (Alumnus)

Gabriel Lopez (Associate Director, Office of Human Resources)

Jeffrey Machi (Vice President for Development and Institutional Advancement)

Eva Medina (Director of Budget, Office of Finance and Administration)

Dee Dee Mozeleski (Director of Advancement, Powell School for Civic and Global Leadership)

Alan Sabal (Senior Associate Director, Office of Admissions)

Alan Shih (Director, Grants and Sponsored Programs, Office of the Provost)

Leonard Zinnanti (Senior Vice President and Chief Operations Officer)

Students (individual students and representatives from student organizations)

Working Group Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

Steering Committee Liaisons and Working Group Co-chairs

Gilda Barabino (Dean, Grove School of Engineering)

Juan Carlos Mercado (Dean, Division of Interdisciplinary Studies)

Carlos Riobó (Chair, Department of Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures)

Members

Annita Alting (Director, Planning, Reporting, and Assessment, Grove School of Engineering)

Alessandra Benedicty (Faculty, Division of Interdisciplinary Studies)

John Calagione (Academic Coördinator, Division of Interdisciplinary Studies)

Alan Feigenberg (Faculty, Spitzer School of Architecture, and Chair, Professional Staff Congress)

Nancy Guitierrez (Staff, Department of Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures)

Devid Paolini (Faculty, Department of Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures)

Elena Romero (Communications Coördinator, Division of Interdisciplinary Studies)

Susanna Schaller (Faculty, Division of Interdisciplinary Studies)

Students (individual students and representatives from student organizations)

Working Group: Verification of Compliance

Steering Committee Liaisons and Working Group Co-chairs

Thomas Castiglione (Registrar)

Kenneth Ihrer (Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer)

Members

Michele Baptiste (Chief Diversity Officer and Dean of Faculty Relations)

Joseph Boselli (Bursar)

Joseph Fantozzi (Executive Director for Enrollment Management, Office of Admissions)

Deidra Hill (Vice President for Communications and Marketing)

Warren Orange (Financial Aid Coördinator, Division of Interdisciplinary Studies)

Arshaw Ramkaran (Director, Office of Financial Aid)

Students (individual students and representatives from student organizations)

5. Charges to the Working Groups

The eight working groups demonstrate wide representation in their membership, including faculty, staff, students; and some groups also count alumni among their membership. Additional members may be added at any time prior to November 2016, with immediate notification to the steering committee co-chairs.

Each of the working groups assigned to Standards I through VII will conduct a thorough investigation of CCNY's performance with respect to its assigned standard and all associated criteria, as listed in the attached *Documentation Roadmap*, which remain an in-progress document. The groups also will examine the Requirements of Affiliation that pertain to their standard, as indicated in the following table:

Working Group		Standard for Accreditation	Requirement(s) of Affiliation
1	I.	Mission	7, 10
2	II.	Ethics and Integrity	-
3	III.	Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience	8-10, 15
4	IV.	Support of the Student Experience	8, 10
5	V.	Educational Effectiveness Assessment	8-10
6	VI.	Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement	8, 10, 11
7	VII.	Governance, Leadership, and Administration	12,13
8		Verification of Compliance	1-6, 14

Working Group 8 will address the remaining Requirements of Affiliation (1-6, 14) and verify institutional compliance accreditation-relevant federal regulations (5). In addition, this group will compile the information necessary for the required *Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations* form, which focuses on student identity verification, transfer of credit policies and articulation agreements, Title IV Program responsibilities, institutional records of student complaints, required information for students and the public, institutional standing with New York State and other accrediting agencies, contractual relationships, and assignment of the credit hour.

All working groups must examine and respond to the mission, goals, and intended outcomes described in sections 2 through 4 of this document in their evaluations. In particular, each working group must ensure that pertinent issues presented in *Vantage Point 2022* and other relevant institutional processes are acknowledged and examined; that suitable and ongoing assessments are in place; and that with specific individuals and offices assigned responsibility are verified. Although a working group may identify new criteria or topics for further research, they must be deemed appropriate to the associated standard. Any new areas of exploration should be discussed with the entire steering committee to avoid redundant efforts by other working groups.

Following focused discussions, each working group will select areas determined to receive special consideration, and relevant documents will be listed in the "Documentation Roadmap." The repository of all current and additional documents will be a Microsoft SharePoint® site, created by CCNY's Office of Information Technology. Editing privileges will be restricted to the co-chairs of the steering committee and the working groups. Once again, the college anticipates significant additions to the "Documentation Roadmap" throughout the self-study process.

The final product of the working group will be a report of approximately ten pages in length, with the accompanying appendices not to exceed ten pages of pertinent materials that may be excerpts from more extensive documents and websites. This report should include several significant recommendations

for improvement. The format for the working group report is described in "Guidelines for Reporting" (Section 6).

Following its review and edit of all reports, the steering committee will produce a draft of CCNY's complete self-study report. This narrative, which will include no more than five major recommendations drawn from those identified by the working groups, will be made available to the campus community and CUNY before finalization and submission to MSCHE.

Working groups may contact offices and other college units for documents that are not readily available on the CCNY and CUNY websites. Requests for institutional data must be submitted via email to the Provost, Mary Driscoll (provost@ccny.cuny.edu), for approval. Approved requests will be forwarded to the Senior Data Analyst to the Senior Associate Provost, Hsueh Leung (hleung@ccny.cuny.edu) by email, with a copy to the Senior Associate Provost, Steering Committee Co-chair, and MSCHE Liaison, Dr. Doris Cintrón (dcintron@ccny.cuny.edu).

6. Guidelines for Reporting

The report of the working group should address the following issues, as recommended by MSCHE in *Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report* (MSCHE, 2016, p. 40):

- overview of the working group's charge, which defines the scope of its tasks and responsibilities in relation to its assigned Standard for Accreditation and Requirement(s) of Affiliation;
- key sources of pertinent documentation to be gathered, reviewed, summarized, and used to support conclusions of the self-study report[1];
- relevant institutional processes and procedures to be reviewed, summarized, and used to support conclusions of the self-study report[1];
- discussion of linkages, where appropriate, between the assigned Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation and significant institutional priorities, as identified in the "Overview" section of the self-study design[2];
- analytical discussion of the materials and data reviewed;
- identification of institutional strengths, challenges, and opportunities for improvement (recommendations); and
- updated listing of names and titles of members, and the designation of working group chair(s).

It is imperative that the working group make specific references to the "Intended Outcomes" (MSCHE, *Self-Study*, p.39) for the assigned Standard for Accreditation, as well as discuss the connection of the

---

[1] to be included in the "Documentation Roadmap"

[2] To alert the readers to the linkages, MSCHE recommends a header, e.g., Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement (Requirements 8, 10, 11), or text-box notation, e.g., Requirements 8, 10, 11.

working group's charge with those of other groups, including a description of any collaboration between—or among—the working groups.

The final self-study report will be approximately 100 pages in length, exclusive of appendices, i.e., "Documentation Roadmap" materials in the Microsoft SharePoint® repository. Each working group will submit a draft report of about ten pages, with the length of its appendices not to exceed ten pages, as per MSCHE. Therefore, the working group must select pertinent excerpts from supporting documents, although links to the complete documents may be provided. Please note that all supporting materials must be in PDF format.

To maintain uniformity of style, all draft reports from the working groups will be subject to revision and reorganization. The editorial style and policy is described in "**Editorial Style and Format**" (Section 8).

The first drafts of the working group reports are due to the committee by 13 February 2017, and comments will be posted on the Microsoft SharePoint® site. The final draft must be submitted to the committee by 1 April 2017. See "**Timetable for the Self-study**" (Section 9).

7. Organization of the Final Self-study Report
In accord with the MSCHE guidelines, the final self-study report will be approximately 100 pages in length, exclusive of appendices, and it will be organized as follows:

- *Executive Summary*
    A brief synopsis of the major findings and recommendations of the steering committee and working groups
- *Introduction*
    A concise overview of CCNY and a description of its self-study process
- *Presentation of Standards for Accreditation*
    There will be seven sections dedicated to the Standards for Accreditation. Each will be approximately ten pages in length, exclusive of supporting documentation, with an emphasis on institutional priorities as they relate to the particular Standard. A working group report should provide an analytical discussion of the data reviewed and the inquiry undertaken; cross-references to pertinent materials in other sections of the report; descriptions of strengths and challenges with references to Standard-specific criteria; and identification of Standard-specific opportunities for improvement (recommendations) at CCNY.
- *Requirements of Affiliation*
    A short description of compliance with the Requirements of Affiliation, including compliance with federal and state regulations, will be provided. This section also will note where the Requirements of Affiliation are addressed elsewhere in the *2018 Self-study Report* and will offer a summary and recommendations for institutional improvement.

- *Conclusion*

    The steering committee and the working groups will offer a final summary of their major conclusions, as well as their recommendations for improvement.

- *Appendices*

    This section will begin with a guide to the appendices, accompanied by short descriptions for each entry. The documents will follow in the appropriate order.

8. Editorial Style and Format

CCNY's Office of Information Technology is creating a Microsoft SharePoint® site to house MSCHE publications; CCNY publications, reports, and resources; and individual folders for the steering committee and the eight working groups. Eventually, this location will contain most of the documents listed in the "**Documentation Roadmap**," as well as copies of pertinent CCNY presentations and resources.

Documents should adhere to the following guidelines:

- Use 10-point Arial font, 1-inch margins, and a 0.25" tab setting.
- Do not incorporate headings or footers, other than page numbers.
- Avoid footnotes.
- References should be in American Psychological Association (APA) style, with a reference list at the end of the working group report.
- Number section and associated sub-headings, e.g., 2.4, and avoid using more than two numbers in a heading.
- Do not write in the first person; use "CCNY," "The institution," "The college," and so forth.
- Figures and tables should be numbered consecutively, e.g., Fig. 1, Table 1.
- Figure captions should be in 9-point Arial font and appear directly below the figures and tables.
- Table headings and descriptions should appear above the tables in 10-point Arial font.

In addition, MSCHE has requested that for referenced web materials, PDFs of pertinent excerpts replace live links, which are not always maintained. Any working group experiencing difficulty complying with this requirement should contact the Office of the Senior Associate Provost (osap@ccny.cuny.edu) for assistance, and enter "MSCHE" in the subject line of the email.

The self-study report will be assembled by the steering committee from the working group reports, with the committee having final editorial authority over content, including the selection of recommendations.

9. Timetable for the Self-study

Fall 2015	- The Accreditation Liaison Office and her team attend the **MSCHE Self-Study Institute**. - Office of the Provost, in consultation with President Coico, selects the **steering committee** co-chairs and members. - The MSCHE staff liaison (Heather Perfetti) schedules the **self-study preparation visit**.

Spring 2016 *and* **Summer 2016**	▪ CCNY selects its **self-study model**. ▪ Office of the Provost and the steering committee determine the types of **working groups** required to prepare the self-study review. ▪ The Office of the Provost and the steering committee finalize the **self-study design**.
Fall 2016 *and* **Winter 2017**	▪ 1 September 2016 Steering Committee Meeting ▪ 15 September 2016 Campus-wide Informational Meeting ▪ 21 September 2016 MSCHE Self-study Preparation Visit (MSCHE VP Heather Perfetti) *VP Perfetti with meet with various campus constituencies and offer suggestions and final approval of the Self-study Design.* ▪ 10 October 2016 Office of Communications and Public Relations develops a communications plan, to be launched in fall 2016, for 2016-2018. ▪ 13 October 2016 Steering Committee Meeting ▪ 17 November 2016 Steering Committee Meeting During the fall 2016 semester, the steering committee will continue to oversee research and reporting by the working groups, many of which are meeting and/or communicating bi-weekly.
Spring 2017 *and* **Summer 2017**	▪ MSCHE selects the **evaluation team chair**, and CCNY approves the selection. ▪ The evaluation team chair and CCNY select **dates** for the **chair's preliminary visit** and for the **team visit**. ▪ CCNY sends a copy of the **self-study design to the team chair**.2 February 2017 Steering Committee Meeting ▪ 13 February 2017 The working groups will complete their research and submit **preliminary drafts** to the Steering Committee. ▪ 3 March 2017 The steering committee will return **preliminary drafts** with comments. ▪ 9 March 2017 Steering Committee Meeting ▪ 1 April 2017 The working groups will submit **final drafts** to the steering committee. ▪ 6 April 2017 Steering Committee Meeting *The Steering Committee begins work on the **Self-study Report draft**.* ▪ 4 May 2017 Steering Committee Meeting ▪ MSCHE selects **members of the evaluation team**, and CCNY approves the selection.
Fall 2017	▪ **TBD** Steering Committee Meetings ▪ The **CUNY Central**, CCNY senior staff, and the campus community review the draft **self-study report**. ▪ CCNY releases the **draft self-study report to the evaluation team chair**, prior to his/her preliminary visit in October 2017. (The evaluation team chair makes a **preliminary visit** at least four (4) months prior to the team visit.) ▪ 8 October 2017 Working Group 8 submits its draft of the **Verification of Compliance Report** to the steering committee ▪ 15 December 2017 **Verification of Compliance Report** is submitted to MSCHE. ▪ 30 December 2017 The steering committee prepares the **final version** of its **self-study report**.
Winter 2018 *or* **Spring 2018**	▪ CCNY sends the **final self-study report to the evaluation team and to MSCHE** at least six (6) weeks before the team visit.

Spring 2018	▪ The **evaluation team visit**s CCNY. ▪ The evaluation team issues its **report**. ▪ CCNY prepares the **institutional response**. ▪ The **MSCHE Committee on Evaluation Reports** meets and determines its action.
Summer 2018	▪ The **MSCHE action** is announced to CCNY.

10. Profile of the Evaluation Team

CCNY recommends that the MSCHE Evaluation Team have strong representation from public institutions with the Carnegie Classification of "Master's Colleges and Universities – Larger Programs," of which one or more are located in a large urban area. To ensure familiarity with those opportunities and challenges of a public college, the evaluation team chair should be the president of a similar or aspirational* institution; and representatives from large colleges within a university system and large private institutions, particularly those in an urban area, also are recommended as team members. The following institutions are among those that satisfy the suggested criteria:

Institution	Undergraduates	Graduates	Preferred Expertise
Kean University (Master's Colleges & Universities – Larger Programs) Union, NJ	11,987	2,372	Education Humanities
Rowan University (Master's Colleges & Universities – Larger Programs) Glassboro, NJ	12,022	2,756	professional schools
Rutgers University – Newark* (Doctoral Universities – Highest Research Activity) Newark, NJ	7,713	4,007	Biomedical / Health Sciences
SUNY Albany* (Doctoral Universities – Highest Research Activity) Albany, NY	12,908	4,270	Research (atmospheric, life, and social sciences; public policy)
SUNY Buffalo State (Master's Colleges & Universities – Larger Programs) Buffalo, NY	9,475	1,608	promotion and support of excellence in faculty teaching
University of Massachusetts – Boston* (Doctoral Universities – Highest Research Activity) Boston, MA	12,949	4,081	institutional development and financial management
West Chester University of Pennsylvania (Master's Colleges & Universities – Larger Programs) West Chester, PA	13,844	2,242	articulation / admission assurance agreements (engineering, liberal arts, medicine) paraprofessional studies (law, medicine, theology)
William Patterson University of New Jersey (Master's Colleges & Universities – Larger Programs) Wayne, NJ *President Kathleen Waldron is the former president of Baruch College – CUNY.*	9,619	1,429	Health Sciences Liberal Arts and Sciences Social Sciences

A representative from at least one New York institution, such as SUNY Albany or SUNY Buffalo State, is recommended to provide a perspective on state regulations and budget, as well as issues related to finance and governance within a central university system.

11. Documentation Roadmap

Using the MSCHE template, the eight working groups have requested and/or collected the following materials to provide evidence of CCNY's ability to meet the Commission's expectations of the Requirements of Affiliation and the Standards for Accreditation. Adjacent to the Standards and their criteria is a listing of pertinent items. This inventory of documents, processes, and procedures is preliminary, as of 1 August 2016.

Documentation Roadmap

CHE
MSA

Documents, Processes, and Procedures

Evidence of Institutional Ability to Meet the Expectations of the
Requirements of Affiliation and Standards for Accreditation of the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Requirements of Affiliation (Working Groups)

To be eligible for, to achieve, and to maintain accreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, an institution must demonstrate that it fully meets the following Requirements of Affiliation. Compliance is expected to be continuous and will be validated periodically, typically at the time of institutional self-study and during any other evaluation of the institution's compliance. Once eligibility is verified, and institution then must demonstrate that it meets the Standards for Accreditation.

Assemble the following, as appropriate:

- □ **Documentation of an implemented, systematic, and sustained process to assess student learning at all levels and utilization of results**
- □ **Processes and procedures relevant to educational effectiveness assessment**

In the (expandable) box below, list any other documentation demonstrating the institution's ability to meet the expectations of this standard that the institution has assembled.

▪ Articulation agreements
▪ Online course recommendations from the Center for Teaching and Learning (CETL) and pertinent academic departments
▪ Transfer credit policies from the Office of Admissions
▪ Financial Aid data (cohort default rate)
▪ Title IX policies and training materials

This standard includes the following criteria, which explicate the standard and specify particular characteristics or qualities that are incorporated in the standard. The criteria are not a simple checklist. When an institution does not demonstrate evidence of a particular criterion, it may demonstrate through alternative information that it meets the standard. This alternative information should be included in the expandable box above.

Requirement of Affiliation	Compliance Process /Standard Alignment	Documents, Processes, and Procedures
1. The institution is authorized or licensed to operate as a postsecondary educational institution and to award postsecondary degrees; it provides writing documentation demonstrating both. Authorization or licensure is from an appropriate governmental organization or agency within the Middle States region (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands), as well as by other agencies as required by each of the jurisdictions, regions, or countries in which the institution operates.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS Working Group 8	▪ New York State Department of Education Inventory of Registered Programs
2. The institution is operational, with students actively pursuing its degree programs.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS Working Group 8	

	Requirement of Affiliation	Compliance Process /Standard Alignment	Documents, Processes, and Procedures
3.	For institutions pursuing Candidacy or Initial Accreditation, the institution will graduate at least one class before the evaluation team visit for initial accreditation to take place (Step 7 of the initial accreditation process), unless the institution can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Commission that the lack of graduates does not compromise its ability to demonstrate appropriate learning outcomes.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS Working Group 8	
4.	The institution's representatives communicate with the Commission in English, both orally and in writing.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS Working Group 8	
5.	The institution complies with all applicable government (usually federal and state) policies, regulations, and requirements.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS Working Group 8	▪ Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) ▪ Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) ▪ CUNY Export Control Policy ▪ Research Misconduct Policy ▪ CUNY Conflict of Interest Policy ▪ Financial Conflict of Interest ▪ Research Foundation of CUNY Policy ▪ CCNY Hazardous Waste Management Plan ▪ CCNY Hazardous Waste Contingency Plan ▪ CCNY Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan ▪ CCNY Control of Hazardous Energy (Restricted Access) ▪ CCNY Radiation Safety Program ▪ CCNY Chemical Hygiene Plan ▪ CCNY Hazard Communication Plan ▪ CCNY Campus Closure Plan
6.	The institution complies with applicable Commission, inter-regional, and inter-institutional policies. These policies can be viewed on the Commission website, www.msche.org.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS Working Group 8	▪ Financial Aid documents - last three years of the cohort default notification from the Department of Education (*More recent documents will be included in the final submission.*) - last three years of the A133 audit reports (*The source will be the VP for Finance.*)
7.	The institution has a statement of mission and goals, approved by its governing body, that defines its purpose within the context of higher education.	Working Group 1	
8.	The institution systematically evaluates its educational and other programs and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purpose.	Working Group 3 Working Group 4 Working Group 5 Working Group 6	

Requirement of Affiliation	Compliance Process /Standard Alignment	Documents, Processes, and Procedures
9. The institution's student learning programs and opportunities are characterized by rigor, coherence, and appropriate assessment of student achievement throughout the educational offerings, regardless of certificate or degree level or delivery and instructional modality.	Working Group 3 Working Group 5	
10. Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.	Working Group 1 Working Group 3 Working Group 4 Working Group 5 Working Group 6	
11. The institution has documented financial resources, funding base, and plans for financial development, including those from any related entities (including without limitation systems, religious sponsorship, and corporate ownership) adequate to support its educational purposes and programs and to ensure financial stability. The institution demonstrates a record of responsible fiscal management, has a prepared budget for the current year, and undergoes an external financial audit on an annual basis.	Working Group 6	
12. The institution fully discloses its legally constituted governance structure(s) including any related entities (including without limitation systems, religious sponsorship, and corporate ownership). The institution's governing body is responsible for the quality and integrity of the institution and for ensuring that the institution's mission is being carried out.	Working Group 7	
13. A majority of the institution's governing body's members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. The governing body adheres to a conflict of interest policy that assures that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution. The institution's district/system or other chief executive officer shall not serve as the chair of the governing body.	Working Group 7	

	Requirement of Affiliation	Compliance Process /Standard Alignment	Documents, Processes, and Procedures
14.	The governing body/bodies are prepared to demonstrate in writing, as may be required, that the institution will make freely available to the Commission accurate, fair, and complete information on all aspects of the institution and its operations. The governing body/bodies ensure that the institution describes itself in identical terms to all of its accrediting and regulatory agencies, communicates any changes in accredited status, and agrees to disclose information (including levels of governing body compensation, if any) required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.	INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED THROUGH THE COMMISSION'S COMPLIANCE PROCESS Working Group 8	
15.	The institution has a core of faculty (full- or part-time) and/or other appropriate professionals with sufficient responsibility to the institution to assure the continuity and coherence of the institution's educational programs.	Working Group 3	

STANDARD I: Mission and Goals

The institution's mission defines its purpose within the context of higher education, the students it serves, and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals are clearly linked to its mission and specify how the institution fulfills its mission.

Assemble the following, as appropriate:
- ☐ **Statements regarding institutional mission and goals**
- ☐ **Processes and procedures relevant to mission and goals**

In the (expandable) box below, list any other documentation demonstrating the institution's ability to meet the expectations of this standard that the institution has assembled.

- City Facts
- Common Data Set
- IPEDS Data
- Enrollment Trends
- number of full- and part-time faculty, titles, and scholarship (*pending HR*)
- resources in support of student and faculty success

This standard includes the following criteria, which explicate the standard and specify particular characteristics or qualities that are incorporated in the standard. The criteria are not a simple checklist. When an institution does not demonstrate evidence of a particular criterion, it may demonstrate through alternative information that it meets the standard. This alternative information should be included in the expandable box above.

An accredited institution possesses and demonstrates the following attributes or activities:

Standard I Criteria	Documents

1. clearly defined mission and goals that:
 	
 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 curriculum development, and the definition of institutional educational outcomes;
 	
 e. include support of scholarly inquiry and creative activity, at all levels and of the type appropriate to the institution;
	University System
	 ▪ CUNY master plan (*Investing in Our Future*)
	 ▪ CUNY Central mission and history
	
	 Institution
	 ▪ CCNY mission and vision
	 ▪ strategic plan (*Vantage Point 2022*)
	 ▪ prior MSCHE self-study and periodic review reports
	 ▪ CCNY Faculty Senate governance and bylaws
	 ▪ college bulletins
	 ▪ college website
	
	 Specific Administrative Units
	 ▪ Affirmative Action, Compliance, and Diversity mission
	 ▪ Counsel to the President mission
	 ▪ Development and Institutional Advancement mission
	 ▪ Finance and Administration goals
	 ▪ Information Technology mission
	
	 ▪ Provost: mission
	   - Institutional Research mission
	   - library website

Standard I Criteria	Documents
f. are publicized and widely known by the institution's internal stakeholders; and g. are periodically evaluated;	▪ Student Affairs mission **Other** ▪ Alumni Association of CCNY mission ▪ CCNY 21st Century Foundation mission
2. institutional goals are realistic, appropriate to higher education and consistent with mission;	▪ strategic plan (*Vantage Point 2022*)
3. institutional goals 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; and	▪ strategic plan (*Vantage Point 2022*) ▪ General Education/Pathways requirements ▪ graduation requirements (college bulletins)
4. periodic assessment of mission and goals to ensure that they are relevant and achievable.	▪ *2013 Periodic Review Report* ▪ self-study reports to other accreditation bodies, e.g., ABET, LCME

STANDARD II: Ethics and Integrity

Ethics and integrity are central, indispensable, and defining hallmarks of effective higher education institutions. In all activities, whether internal or external, an institution must be faithful to its mission, honor its contracts and commitments, adhere to its policies, and represent itself truthfully.

Assemble the following, as appropriate:
- □ **Recruitment and marketing materials (printed and electronic)**
- □ **Public disclosure information required by the Commission and government entities (printed and electronic)**
- □ **Institutional by-laws, guidelines, and policies**
- □ **Handbooks (student, faculty, employee, etc.)**
- □ **Processes and procedures relevant to ethics and integrity**

In the (expandable) box below, list any other documentation demonstrating the institution's ability to meet the expectations of this standard that the institution has assembled.

> - strategic plan (*Vantage Point 2022*)
> - college bulletins
>   - 2015-2016 Undergraduate Bulletin
>   - 2015-2016 Graduate Bulletin
> - City Facts

This standard includes the following criteria, which explicate the standard and specify particular characteristics or qualities that are incorporated in the standard. The criteria are not a simple checklist. When an institution does not demonstrate evidence of a particular criterion, it may demonstrate through alternative information that it meets the standard. This alternative information should be included in the expandable box above.

An accredited institution possesses and demonstrates the following attributes or activities:

Standard II Criteria	Documents
1. commitment to academic freedom, intellectual freedom, freedom of expression, and respect for intellectual property rights;	- Academic Freedom Policies - PSC-CUNY Academic Freedom - CUNY Guide to Academic Freedom - CUNY Faculty Senate on Academic Freedom - CUNY Statement on Academic Freedom - Academic Integrity Policy - CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity - Intellectual Freedom Policy - CUNY Intellectual Property Policy
2. a climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration from a range of diverse backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives;	- CUNY Policies and Procedures for Non-discrimination and Sexual Harassment - CUNY Policy on Workplace/Domestic Violence - CUNY Student Experience Survey - COACHE Faculty Satisfaction Survey (CCNY data) - CCNY Workplace Violence Prevention Program

Standard II Criteria	Documents
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;	▪ CUNY Student Complaint Procedure
4. the avoidance of conflict of interest or the appearance of such conflict in all activities and among all constituents;	▪ CUNY Conflict of Interest Policy ▪ Export Control Regulations
5. fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation, promotion, discipline, and separation of employees;	▪ Affirmative Action, Compliance, and Diversity
6. honesty and truthfulness in public relations announcements, advertisements, recruiting and admissions materials and practices, as well as in internal communications;	▪ Admissions ▪ Bursar ▪ Communications and Marketing ▪ CUNY Financial Aid Code of Conduct
7. as appropriate to mission, services, or programs in place: a. to promote affordability and accessibility; and b. to enable students to understand funding sources and options, value received for cost, and methods to make informed decisions about incurring debt; c. substantive changes affecting institutional mission, goals, programs, operations, sites, and other material issues which must be disclosed in a timely and accurate fashion; and d. the institution's compliance with the Commission's policies;	▪ CUNY Financial Aid Information ▪ CUNY *Paying for College* Guide ▪ Office of Financial Aid (federal, state, and institutional guides) ▪ CUNY Financial Aid Code of Conduct ▪ Scholarships ▪ External Financial Aid Resources
8. compliance with all applicable federal, state, and Commission reporting policies, regulations, and requirements to include reporting regarding: 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	▪ CUNY Performance Goals and Targets (PMP) Reports (CCNY) ▪ City Facts
9. periodic assessment of ethics and integrity as evidenced in institutional policies, processes, practices, and the manner in which these are implemented.	▪ Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) ▪ Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) ▪ CUNY Export Control Policy ▪ Research Misconduct Policy ▪ CUNY Conflict of Interest Policy ▪ Financial Conflict of Interest ▪ Research Foundation of CUNY Policy ▪ CUNY Intellectual Property Policy ▪ CUNY Technology Commercialization Office ▪ CCNY Faculty Senate governance and bylaws

STANDARD III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

An institution provides students with learning experiences that are characterized by rigor and coherence of all program, certificate, and degree levels, regardless of instructional modality. All learning experiences, regardless of modality, program pace/schedule, level, and setting, are consistent with higher education expectations.

Assemble the following, as appropriate:

☐ **Student catalogs, handbooks, course catalogs, and other information regarding the student learning experience**

☐ **Program development and approval procedures**

☐ **Faculty review procedures**

☐ **Processes and procedures relevant to the design and delivery of the student learning experience**

In the (expandable) box below, list any other documentation demonstrating the institution's ability to meet the expectations of this standard that the institution has assembled.

This standard includes the following criteria, which explicate the standard and specify particular characteristics or qualities that are incorporated in the standard. The criteria are not a simple checklist. When an institution does not demonstrate evidence of a particular criterion, it may demonstrate through alternative information that it meets the standard. This alternative information should be included in the expandable box above.

An accredited institution possesses and demonstrates the following attributes or activities:

Standard III Criteria	Documents
1. certificate, undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional programs leading to a degree or other recognized higher education credential, designed to foster a coherent student learning experience and to promote synthesis of learning;	▪ college bulletins ▪ General Education/Pathways requirements
2. student learning experiences that are: a. designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full- or part-time), and/or other appropriate professionals who are rigorous and effective in teaching, assessment of student learning, scholarly inquiry, and service, as appropriate to the institution's mission, goals, and policies;	▪ assessment committee reports
b. designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full- or part-time), and/or other appropriate professionals who are qualified for the positions they hold and the work they do;	▪ percentage of full- and part-time faculty holding specific degrees (CCNY P&B, Office of Human Resources)

Standard III Criteria	Documents
c. designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full- or part-time), and/or other appropriate professionals who are sufficient in number;	▪ average class size, faculty-to-student ratio, etc. (City Facts) ▪ student experience survey(s)
d. designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full- or part-time), and/or other appropriated professionals who are provided with and utilize sufficient opportunities, resources, and support for professional growth and innovation;	▪ departmental travel funds for conferences
e. designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full- or part-time), and/or other appropriate professionals who are reviewed regularly and equitably based on written, disseminated, clear, and fair criteria, expectations, policies, and procedures;	▪ data from the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) workshops and attendance ▪ departmental peer evaluation forms ▪ pre-tenure evaluation guidelines ▪ course evaluation data
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 that follow degree and program requirements and expected time to completion;	▪ prior MSCHE reports (2013, 2008) ▪ college bulletins ▪ special programs (Honors, Study Abroad, etc.)
4. sufficient learning opportunities and resources to support both the institution's programs of study and students' academic programs;	▪ academic advising ▪ academic support centers (tutoring, writing, etc.) ▪ CCNY Libraries ▪ SEEK Program ▪ SSSP ▪ non-traditional academic programs ▪ grant opportunities (PSC-CUNY Grants, CUNY CAT Research Grant) ▪ departmental symposia ▪ Career and Professional Development Institute ▪ scholarships/scholarship programs, e.g., Skadden, Arp Honors Program in Legal Studies ▪ experiential education opportunities, e.g., CUNY Service Corps
5. at institutions that offer undergraduate education: a general education, free standing or integrated into academic disciplines, that: 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, technological competency, and information literacy. Consistent with mission, the general education program also includes the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives; and c. in non-US institutions that do not include general education, provides evidence that students can demonstrate general education skills;	▪ General Education/Pathways requirements (overview, course descriptions and requirements) ▪ study abroad opportunities ▪ experiential education (CUNY Service Corps, departmental internships, Career and Professional Development Institute, etc.) ▪ goals for student writing, reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy
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;	▪ institutional and departmental information listing research opportunities (websites, handbooks)

Standard III Criteria	Documents
7. adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval on any student learning opportunities designed, delivered, or assessed by third-party providers; and	▪ professional school accreditation reports
8. periodic assessment of the programs providing student learning opportunities.	▪ guidelines for department and program self-studies ▪ CUNY Performance Management Process (PMP) goals and targets ▪ General Education/Pathways measurable goals and objectives ▪ Coördinated Undergraduate Education (CUE) Program (Academic Advising, Freshman-year Initiative, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Writing Across the Curriculum, Academic Support Services, etc.) ▪ NSSE Engagement Indicators (EIs) ▪ 2012, 2013 College Learning Assessment ▪ 2015 Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory ▪ MARC-RISE Program, City Fellows Program, etc. ▪ CUNY Student Experience Survey ▪ College Portraits website ▪ *2013 Periodic Review Report*

STANDARD IV: Support of the Student Experience

Across all educational experiences, settings, levels, and instructional modalities, the institution recruits and admits students whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals are congruent with its mission and educational offerings. The institution commits to student retention, persistence, completion, and success through a coherent and effective support system sustained by qualified professionals, which enhances the quality of the learning environment, contributes to the educational experience, and fosters student success.

Assemble the following, as appropriate:
- □ **Reports from student support offices**
- □ **Student handbooks**
- □ **Analysis of enrollment management plan (admissions, retention, and completion)**
- □ **Processes and procedures relevant to the support of the student experience**

In the (expandable) box below, list any other documentation demonstrating the institution's ability to meet the expectations of this standard that the institution has assembled.

- ▪ The institution's print and web materials provide accurate, comprehensive information about the cost of attendance, methods of meeting those costs, policies governing student appeals of financial holds and cancellation of registration for non-payment.
- ▪ Institutional policies for the maintenance and security of student records.
- ▪ Standard policies and procedures for the evaluation of transfer credits, experiential learning, and other alternative learning opportunities.
- ▪ Procedures for assessing the academic preparedness of new students and for their assignment to special immersion courses, e.g., English language, mathematics.
- ▪ Degree completion rates, attrition due to transfer, and post-graduation placement in internships, jobs, and graduate programs.
- ▪ Descriptions and regulations for athletics and recreation programs, and student clubs and organizations.

This standard includes the following criteria, which explicate the standard and specify particular characteristics or qualities that are incorporated in the standard. The criteria are not a simple checklist. When an institution does not demonstrate evidence of a particular criterion, it may demonstrate through alternative information that it meets the standard. This alternative information should be included in the expandable box above.

An accredited institution possesses and demonstrates the following attributes or activities:

Standard IV Criteria	Documents

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:
 	
  a. accurate and comprehensive information regarding expenses, financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, repayment, and refunds;
 	
  b. a process by which students who are not adequately prepared for the study at the level for which they have been admitted are identified, placed, and supported in attaining appropriate educational goals:
 	
  c. orientation, advisement, and counseling programs to enhance retention and to guide students throughout their educational experience;
 	
  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;
	▪ information provided to new and returning students, e.g., college and departmental information; financial aid information; and scholarship, grant, and emergency loan information
	▪ materials explaining orientation, advising, counseling services, e.g., new student guides, college bulletins, advisement guides, tutoring and peer services
	▪ data about degree completion, transfer statistics, career placement, etc., from the CUNY and CCNY Offices of Institutional Research, the CCNY Career and Professional Development Institute, National Clearinghouse, and so forth

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;	▪ policies and procedures regulating transfer evaluation and advising
3. policies and procedures for the safe and secure maintenance and appropriate release of student information and records;	▪ availability of the campus FERPA policy ▪ frequency of FERPA training for those will access to student records
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;	▪ documentation from the Department of Recreation and Campus Fitness (Division of Student Affairs)
5. if applicable, adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval of student support services, designed, delivered, or assessed by third-party providers; and	▪ information about third-party providers, e.g., food service, tuition payment plan
6. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of programs supporting the student experience.	▪ assessment documentation and statistical information from those units assessing student support services

STANDARD V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Assessment of student learning demonstrates that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their programs of study, degree level, the institution's mission, and appropriate expectations for institutions of higher education.

Assemble the following, as appropriate:
- ☐ **Documentation of an implemented, systematic, and sustained process to assess student learning at all levels and utilization of results**
- ☐ **Processes and procedures relevant to educational effectiveness assessment**

In the (expandable) box below, list any other documentation demonstrating the institution's ability to meet the expectations of this standard that the institution has assembled.

This standard includes the following criteria, which explicate the standard and specify particular characteristics or qualities that are incorporated in the standard. The criteria are not a simple checklist. When an institution does not demonstrate evidence of a particular criterion, it may demonstrate through alternative information that it meets the standard. This alternative information should be included in the expandable box above.

An accredited institution possesses and demonstrates the following attributes or activities:

Standard V Criteria	Documents
1. clearly stated student learning outcomes, at the institution and degree/program levels, which are interrelated with one another, with relevant educational experiences, and with the institution's mission;	**Institutional** ▪ CCNY Mission and Vision Statements ▪ college-wide learning outcomes ▪ General Education/Pathways learning outcomes **Program/Degree** College of Liberal Arts and Science (CLAS) ▪ program goals by department/program ▪ department/program mission statements and outcomes (Copies of the archived documents will be moved to the Microsoft SharePoint® site.) Professional Schools (Architecture, Biomedical Education, Education, Engineering) ▪ websites ▪ external accreditation reports Student Support Units ▪ Academic Advising mission ▪ CCAPP mission ▪ Writing Center mission ▪ Zahn Center mission

Standard V Criteria	Documents
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: 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 missions 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; and c. support and sustain assessment of student achievement and communicate the results of this assessment to stakeholders;	**Institutional** Any assessment that has been completed at the institutional level: ▪ College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS), Freshman Inquiry and Writing Seminar (FIQWS), Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) ▪ National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA/CLA+), CUNY Student Experience Survey (SES) ▪ CUNY Proficiency Examination (*discontinued in 2011*) **Program/Degree** ▪ assessment cycles and annual reports from schools, divisions, and programs that describe their assessment procedures and findings ▪ department/program/course outcomes ▪ embedded assessment in capstone courses ▪ discipline-specific benchmarks ▪ periodic evaluation of syllabi ▪ internship/career services assessments ▪ TutorTrac® reports (2013 to present)
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: 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; and h. implementing other processes and procedures designed to improve educational programs and services;	**Institutional** Any official responses to assessment work: ▪ advising services and tutoring programs ▪ Coördinated Undergraduate Education (CUE) initiatives, e.g., student success activities, tutoring services, Writing Center ▪ faculty and professional development ▪ analyses of relationship between funding allocations and educational effectiveness **Program/Degree** ▪ curricular changes resulting from evidenced-based assessment, e.g., Division of Science, Division of Humanities and the Arts (Departments of Art, English, History, Jewish Studies, Media and Communication Arts, and Music), Department of Economics and Business ▪ periodic evaluation of syllabi ▪ Career and Professional Development Institute (annual assessment report) ▪ Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (annual assessment report) ▪ tutoring (Tutoring Observation Reports) ▪ summer bridge and peer-mentoring programs ▪ Writing Center (faculty-to-tutor referral forms, long-term appointment intake forms) ▪ Zahn Center (semi-annual reports to Board of Advisors, Provost, donors)
4. if applicable, adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval of assessment services designed, delivered, or assessed by third-party providers; and	**Institutional** Any documents, memoranda, meeting minutes responding to the CLA, NSSE, and Noel Levitz reports
5. periodic evaluation of the assessment process utilized by the institution for the improvement of educational effectiveness.	**Institutional** ▪ CCNY Faculty Senate and/or special committee reports ▪ CCNY Writing Program Report from the Council of Writing Program Administrators (external evaluators) ▪ annual CLAS staff retreat (review of metrics and quality of data)

STANDARD VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

The institution's planning processes, resources, and structures are aligned with each other and are sufficient to fulfill its mission and goals, to assess and improve its programs and services continuously, and to respond effectively to opportunities and challenges.

Assemble the following, as appropriate:
- ☐ **The institution's two most recent externally-audited financial statements, including management letters**
- ☐ **Financial projections for the next two years**
- ☐ **Documentation of an implemented, systematic, and sustained institutional assessment process linking planning, assessment, and resource allocation decisions**
- ☐ **Institutional strategic planning documents**
- ☐ **Processes and procedures relevant to planning, resources, and institutional improvement**

In the (expandable) box below, list any other documentation demonstrating the institution's ability to meet the expectations of this standard that the institution has assembled.

This standard includes the following criteria, which explicate the standard and specify particular characteristics or qualities that are incorporated in the standard. The criteria are not a simple checklist. When an institution does not demonstrate evidence of a particular criterion, it may demonstrate through alternative information that it meets the standard. This alternative information should be included in the expandable box above.

An accredited institution possesses and demonstrates the following attributes or activities:

Standard VI Criteria	Documents
1. institutional objectives, both institution-wide and for individual units, that are stated clearly, assessed appropriately, linked to mission and goal achievement, reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results, and are used for planning and resource allocation;	**Institutional** ▪ evidence of planning and resource allocations determined by institutional objectives ▪ CUNYfirst manuals ▪ CUNYfirst website (restricted access) **Individual Units** ▪ requests and corresponding justifications
2. clearly documented and communicated planning and improvement processes that provide constituent participation and incorporate the use of assessment results;	

Standard VI Criteria	Documents
3. a financial planning and budgeting process that is aligned with the institution's mission and goals, is evidenced-based, and linked clearly to the institution's and units' strategic plans/objectives;	**Institutional** ▪ recent CUNY FY budget process ▪ budget review meetings with deans, chairs, and program directors **Individual Units** ▪ completion of the CUNY Tax Levy Budget Request worksheets ▪ evaluate OTPS spending relative to the strategic plan and institutional goals ▪ multi-year financial OTPS reports from prior periods referenced in planning new fiscal year budget ▪ assessment of marketing for The Towers residence hall, Continuing and Professional Education, and summer and winter programs
4. fiscal and human resources as well as the physical and technical infrastructure are adequate to support the institution's operations wherever and however programs are delivered;	**Planning Documents** ▪ Capital Request Plan ▪ NYC Resolution A (Reso A) Request Plan ▪ ongoing capital projects plan ▪ Facilities Master Plan ▪ other CCNY master plans
5. a well-defined decision-making processes and clear assignment of responsibility and accountability;	**Institutional** ▪ assessment of electronic processes that replaced manual processes
6. comprehensive planning for facilities, infrastructure, and technology that includes consideration of sustainability and deferred maintenance and is linked to the institution's strategic and financial planning processes;	**Institutional** ▪ Campus Planning and Facilities Management initiatives ▪ Facilities Master Plan ▪ deferred maintenance ▪ campus energy assessment plan and reports ▪ central chiller plan and assessment reports ▪ sustainability plan and assessment reports ▪ CCNY Green ▪ Sustainable CUNY at CCNY ▪ CCNY Greenhouse Gas Emissions ▪ Information Technology initiatives ▪ other institutional plans, initiatives, and outcomes, e.g., CUNY Five-Year Capital Plan Request, CCNY-DASNY Capital Project Status
7. an annual independent audit confirming financial viability with evidence of follow-up on any concerns cited in the audit's accompanying management letter;	▪ CUNY financial information, e.g., CUNY audited financial statements, CUNY year-end financial reports ▪ institutional financial information, e.g., CCNY Budget Calendar, overview of financial condition
8. strategies to measure and assess the adequacy and efficient utilization of institutional resources required to support the institution's mission and goals; and	▪ CCNY five-year trends in enrollment ▪ CCNY-DASNY Capital Project Status ▪ NYC Resolution A (Reso A) Request Plan ▪ Development and Institutional Advancement, e.g., major gifts, strategic initiatives ▪ CCNY Alumni Association
9. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of planning, resource allocation, institutional renewal processes, and availability of resources.	

STANDARD VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

The institution is governed and administered in a manner that allows it to realize its stated mission and goals in a way that effectively benefits the institution, its students, and the other constituencies it serves. Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, religious, educational system, or other unaccredited organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose, and it operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.

Assemble the following, as appropriate:
- ☐ **By-laws and other institutional documents identifying the group legally responsible for the institution and its role in governance**
- ☐ **Conflict of interest policies and other ethics policies of the board**
- ☐ **A list of current governing board members (name, affiliation, and occupation; members who are remunerated by the institution through salaries, wages, or fees; members who are creditors of the institution, guarantors of institutional debt, or active members of businesses of which the institution is a customer)**
- ☐ **Organizational chart for the institution (names and titles of the individuals in each position)**
- ☐ **Succession planning for board members and senior leadership**
- ☐ **Processes and procedures relevant to governance, leadership, and administration**

In the (expandable) box below, list any other documentation demonstrating the institution's ability to meet the expectations of this standard that the institution has assembled.

This standard includes the following criteria, which explicate the standard and specify particular characteristics or qualities that are incorporated in the standard. The criteria are not a simple checklist. When an institution does not demonstrate evidence of a particular criterion, it may demonstrate through alternative information that it meets the standard. This alternative information should be included in the expandable box above.

An accredited institution possesses and demonstrates the following attributes or activities:

Standard VII Criteria	Documents
1. a clearly articulated and transparent governance structure that outlines its roles, responsibilities, and accountability for decision making by each constituency, including governing body, administration, faculty, staff, and students;	▪ CUNY Board of Trustees Bylaws (Articles II, VIII, IX, XI) ▪ CCNY Faculty Senate Bylaws

Standard VII Criteria	Documents

2. a legally constituted governing body that:
 	
  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;
 	
  b. has sufficient independence and expertise to ensure the integrity of the institution. Members must have primary responsibility to the accredited institution and not allow political, financial, or other influences to interfere with their governing responsibilities;
 	
  c. ensures that neither the governing body nor an individual member 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 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. This 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 that impartiality of the governing body by addressing matters such as payment of services, contractual relationships, employment, and family, financial, or other interests that could pose or be perceived as conflicts of interest; and
 	
  i. supports the Chief Executive Officer in maintaining the autonomy of the institution;
	▪ CUNY Board of Trustees, *Manual of General Policy*

3. a Chief Executive Officer who:
 	
  a. 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 allocating resources, and directing the institution toward attaining the goals and objectives set forth in its mission; and
	▪ CCNY organizational chart
	▪ *curricula vitae* of CEO and other senior-level administrators
	▪ policies and procedures affecting senior administration

Standard VII Criteria	Documents
d. has the assistance of qualified administrators sufficient in number to enable the Chief Executive Officer to discharge his/her duties effectively; and is responsible for establishing procedures assessing the organization's efficiency and effectiveness;	

4. an administration possessing or demonstrating:
 	
    a. an organizational structure that is clearly defined and that clearly defines reporting relationships;
 	
    b. an appropriate size and with relevant experience to assist the Chief Executive Officer in fulfilling his/her roles and responsibilities;
 	
    c. members with credentials and professional experience consistent with the mission of the organization and their functional roles;
 	
    d. skills, time, assistance, technology, and information systems expertise required to perform their duties;
 	
    e. regular engagement with faculty and students in advancing the institution's goals and objectives; and
 	
    f. systematic procedures for evaluating administrative units and for using assessment data to enhance operations; and
	▪ CUNY organizational charts
	▪ CCNY organizational chart
	▪ verification of credentials and professional experience (Human Resources)
	▪ Academic Roundtables (frequency and report)
	▪ evidence of "regular engagement of faculty and students"
	▪ evidence of "systematic procedures for evaluating administrative units and for using assessment data to enhance operations"

5. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of governance, leadership, and administration.	▪ CUNY Performance Goals and Targets, e.g., overview of the PMP and CCNY's goals, targets, and progress for 2008 to present ▪ institutional governance, e.g., CCNY Faculty Senate Charter, Personnel and Budget (P&B)