

Self-Study Design

Middle States Commission
on Higher Education

800 Allegheny Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15233

COMMUNITY

COLLEGE OF

ALLEGHENY

COUNTY

OUR GOAL IS YOUR SUCCESS

CCAC[®]

Self-Study Design

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	2
	<i>Overview of the Community College of Allegheny County.....</i>	<i>2</i>
	<i>Mission, Vision, Values, and Strategic Goals.....</i>	<i>2</i>
	<i>Recent Developments and Expectations for the Future.....</i>	<i>4</i>
	<i>Steps Taken to Prepare for Self-Study.....</i>	<i>4</i>
II.	Nature and Scope of the Self-Study.....	6
III.	Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study.....	6
IV.	Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups.....	7
V.	Charges to the Working Groups and Guidelines for Their Reports.....	13
	<i>Working Group I: Mission and Goals.....</i>	<i>14</i>
	<i>Working Group II: Ethics and Integrity.....</i>	<i>15</i>
	<i>Working Group III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience.....</i>	<i>15</i>
	<i>Working Group IV: Support of the Student Experience</i>	<i>17</i>
	<i>Working Group V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment.....</i>	<i>18</i>
	<i>Working Group VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement</i>	<i>19</i>
	<i>Working Group VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration</i>	<i>20</i>
VI.	Organization of the Self-Study Report.....	21
VII.	Editorial Style and Format of All Reports.....	23
VIII.	Timetable for the Self-Study and Evaluation.....	23
IX.	Profile of the Visiting Evaluation Team.....	25
X.	Inventory of Support Documents.....	25

I. INTRODUCTION

Overview of the Community College of Allegheny County

In 1963, the Pennsylvania General Assembly passed the Community College Act, providing the legal framework to establish community colleges in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Through the “People's Bond Issue” in May, 1965, the voters of Allegheny County approved funding for a community college with 66% of the vote, and six months later, the Pennsylvania State Board of Education unanimously approved Allegheny County's application for the founding of a community college.

In September 1966, classes began at the new Community College of Allegheny County (CCAC) with 59 full- and 16 part-time faculty members serving 1,505 students at its first two locations, CCAC-Boyce Campus in suburban Monroeville, and CCAC-Allegheny Campus on Pittsburgh's North Shore. Throughout the next decade, the college continued to expand, adding two additional suburban locations, CCAC-South Campus in 1967 and CCAC-North Campus in 1972.

In its current configuration, CCAC consists of the four campuses with an additional four neighborhood centers serving as satellite facilities: Braddock Hills, Homewood-Brushton, West Hills and Washington County centers.

The college offers 152 degree programs in over 100 disciplines of study, enrolling more than 32,000 credit and 28,000 non-credit students annually.

CCAC's student body consists of 57% women and 43% men, with 65% part-time students and 35% full-time students. The average age of students at the college is 27. Enrollment consists mainly of Allegheny County residents. Since 2000, CCAC has served 479,450 students, of whom 359,303 were Allegheny County residents. By this measure, the college has served one in three county residents 18 years & older. CCAC also enrolls 88 international students representing 39 countries. This group is growing due to population trends within Allegheny County. The college enrolls a diverse student population. The 27% ethnic minority enrollment compares with the county population of about 20% ethnic minority. The college is almost evenly balance between career program enrollment, at 49.5%, and transfer program enrollment, at 50.5%.

Mission, Vision, Values, and Strategic Goals

The Mission of the Community College of Allegheny County is to provide affordable access to quality education and offer a dynamic, diverse and supportive learning environment that prepares the region's residents for academic, professional and personal success in our changing global society.

CCAC's Vision statement establishes a link between the institution and the broader community, “The Community College of Allegheny County provides a supportive and transformative learning environment that prepares graduates to meet critical needs in the region's workforce. Stakeholders have strong personal connections with CCAC and support it as a sound investment in community and economic vitality.”

The following values shape decision making at the college:

- Learning—We provide a caring and professional learning environment that places the needs of students first in our decision making.
- Excellence—We are committed to high academic standards, quality services and the ongoing development, recruitment and retention of qualified and accomplished faculty and staff.
- Innovation—We expect and reward exploration, inquiry and entrepreneurship that anticipate and respond to the needs of students, the community and employers.
- Diversity—We are a leader in forging positive relationships among diverse communities in our region by creating an inclusive environment for teaching and learning, with a commitment to the recruitment and success of a diverse student body, faculty and staff.
- Community—We develop collaborative internal and external partnerships that include the sharing of resources, information and ideas to meet the educational, economic and social needs of the community.
- Teamwork—We create a positive college culture in which everyone is valued. Our effective work environment is built on a foundation of trust, empowerment and cooperation.
- Integrity—We maintain an environment that encourages an open exchange of ideas. Data and information are used to drive decision making, allocate resources, set strategic direction and assess results.
- Performance—We are strategically focused and committed to achieving and recognizing results that are consistent with our mission, college goals and strategic objectives.
- Stewardship—We are effective and ethical stewards of the resources placed in our trust. Seeking, using and protecting financial, physical, technological and human resources are a shared responsibility

Strategic planning is an ongoing and dynamic process at CCAC. The development of the current strategic plan began during the 2010 College-wide Council Summer Retreat. College-wide Council was formed in the summer of 2008 and functions as the college planning committee. The strategic planning process identified seven strategic priorities (goals) which are supported by thirty strategic objectives.

CCAC Strategic Priorities 2011-2016

1. Ensure the success of learners through ongoing assessment of learning outcomes and overall institutional effectiveness.
2. Provide learners with opportunities, including programs and services, that enable success in academic, career, personal and civic pursuits
3. Develop and enhance partnerships, internal and external, that help identify and respond to the educational needs of the community.
4. Guide and support the economic development of our region with responsive, solution-driven workforce training programs.
5. Develop and deliver educational opportunities for learners at every stage of their lives.
6. Promote learning through the effective application of available and expanded resources.
7. Enable CCAC learners to share, learn, and apply principles of diversity that foster a culture of inclusion and understanding at the college and within the global community

The strategic plan is implemented through subsequent assessment, planning and resource allocation cycles, and adherence to the college Values statement. The current strategic plan will be updated by September of 2016 using insights derived from the self-study process.

Institutional Research developed an institutional scorecard as a companion document to the strategic plan to provide measures of overall institutional effectiveness as well as metrics to assess the implementation of the strategic plan. The scorecard is organized with multiple measures, which are directly aligned with the seven strategic priorities identified in the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan.

Recent Developments and Expectations for the Future

In the past decade, CCAC has worked to establish a culture of assessment, reflection, and data-driven change, an effort in which the college community takes great pride. As confirmation of its move toward evidence-based reform, CCAC was honored along with six other Pennsylvania community colleges by being selected to join Achieving the Dream (ATD) in 2006, and by subsequent selection as an ATD Leader College in 2011. As a result of association with ATD, CCAC has developed and implemented innovative math, reading and English initiatives, such as the college's Math Cafés, Learning Commons and the Roadmap to Success.

A number of factors mark this as a time of substantial change, which carries with it the potential for significant institutional progress. On December 4, 2013, the Community College of Allegheny County Board of Trustees unanimously appointed Dr. Quintin B. Bullock as the college's ninth president. He began serving as CCAC president on March 5, 2014. The transition in college presidency followed closely on the heels of marked enrollment and budget challenges. An early retirement program, changes in the institution's operating structure, and the creation of new leadership positions aim to stabilize the institution and position it to enhance its commitment to community college education.

Moving forward, President Quintin Bullock's commitment is to "maintain the high quality of our academic and career programs, continue to expand into new and exciting areas, and continue to position our college to be recognized as a leading community college and an extraordinary environment for achieving excellence in learning and student success." CCAC is in the final year of its "An Investment in the Community: Strategic Plan 2011–16." This is a potentially transformative period for the institution, and this self-study process will inform the development and adoption of a new Strategic Plan.

Steps Taken to Prepare for Self Study

Preparation for this self-study began immediately following the conclusion of the prior self-study. CCAC instituted broad changes to practices surrounding student and institutional assessment and gathered PRR documents with an eye toward future utilization of the resulting document library as a part of the present self-study. The PRR team established a SharePoint site as a central and accessible repository of this document library, and the self-study team has access to this valuable institutional resource.

More immediate self-study preparation began with presidential appointment of the two co-chairs, Kevin Smay and Stephen Wells, in August of 2013. The co-chairs engaged in preliminary discussion about the broad outline of the self-study timeline, reviewed initial self-study documents, and agreed to use the SharePoint site established for the 2011 PRR process as a starting point for organizing the self-study process. The co-chairs attended the MSCHE Self-Study Institute in November 2013. In December 2013, they, along with CCAC CAO Mary Frances Archey, attended the MSCHE Annual Conference.

Mr. Smay is the Assistant Vice President for Strategic Planning & Institutional Research and serves as CCAC's MSCHE Accreditation Liaison Officer. He has been with the college since 1986. He successfully co-chaired CCAC's Periodic Review in 2011. His experience also includes leading small team evaluation visits and serving on full visits to four community colleges in the SUNY system.

Dr. Wells is a Professor in the English department at CCAC's South Campus. He has been with the college since 2002. In addition to teaching, he served as an American Federation of Teachers vice president and as the Professional Development Coordinator for the South Campus. He acted for two years as CCAC's representative on a statewide committee tasked with examining practices in placement testing and developmental education. He is currently a College Council representative, chairing the Academic Planning Subcommittee.

In May of 2013, Dr. Alex Johnson, who had been CCAC's president since 2008, left the college to serve as president of Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, and the search for a new president began. CCAC's Board of Trustees selected Dr. Michael Murphy as interim president of the college. Dr. Murphy had served earlier as interim president at CCAC during the presidential search in 2007 and 2008, which brought Dr. Johnson to the college.

After his appointment as the college's ninth president, Dr. Quintin Bullock requested a Continuation of Accreditation for one year to familiarize himself with the college and to ensure an accurate representation of the institution through self-study.

In August of 2014, Dr. Bullock re-initiated the self-study process by again appointing Kevin Smay as Self-Study Co-chair. The college posted the other Co-chair position, following the process used to post other internal institutional positions. Following this hiring process, President Bullock again appointed Stephen Wells as faculty co-chair of the self-study process.

As the co-chairs had attended MSCHE Self-Study Institute in November 2013, they consulted with CCAC's MSCHE Staff Liaison, Dr. Christy L. Faison, and determined that attending the Self-Study Institute again in 2014 was unnecessary. In December 2014, they, along with CCAC CAO Mary Frances Archey, again attended the MSCHE Annual Conference.

In January of 2015, Mr. Smay gave a presentation at CCAC's Spring All-College Day, providing the college community with an overview of CCAC's accreditation history and sharing the timeline for the current self-study.

The Co-chairs, in consultation with Dr. Archey and Dr. Bullock, identified members of the administration to serve on the Steering Committee. The Board of Trustees approved these appointments at its January 2015 meeting. Faculty positions on the Steering Committee were listed in compliance with CCAC's hiring policy and filled with appropriate faculty representatives.

During a series of meetings from February to April of 2015, the Steering Committee worked to establish the self-study design. At an early meeting, the co-chairs provided an overview of expectations, and the group as a whole began to gather information necessary for crafting the Self Study Design document. The group also agreed on the outline of a communications plan. The recently redesigned CCAC web site will serve as the public face of the self-study process, while the SharePoint site established by the PRR team will function for internal communications.

At subsequent meetings, the Steering Committee developed and refined the seven working group model to reflect the new MSCHE standards, to improve efficiency, and to engage working group members more broadly in the self-study process. Members of the Steering Committee agreed to chair or co-chair the working groups, and work began to draft and refine self-study research questions, to propose Working Group membership, and to identify supporting documents of value to each group.

By the middle of March, the Steering Committee had a complete draft of the Self-Study Design to discuss. Steering Committee members offered revisions to the document, focusing on refinements to research questions, Working Group membership lists, and support documents inventory. Administrative members of the Working Groups were appointed to their positions. A request for voluntary participation went out to those faculty members identified in the membership lists. The faculty response was very positive, and the Working Groups needed only minor adjustments to maintain adequate balance of representation.

The Steering Committee members received a complete copy of the Self-Study Design draft in mid-April and submitted edits and revisions for the document to be submitted two weeks prior to the MSCHE Staff Liaison visit.

Following the MSCHE Staff Liaison visit on 6 May 2015, the Steering Committee made changes to the Self-Study Design document in response to Dr. Faison's recommendations. The role of students and the Board of Trustees now appears more explicitly in the document. Language concerning the Steering Committee members' positions as chairs or co-chairs of the Working Groups is more prominent in the section about the organization of these two bodies. Most importantly, the Steering Committee approved language as part of the charges to the Working Groups to provide a contextual framework for reading the Research Questions for each Working Group.

A draft of the revised document went out again to the Steering Committee members, and a few minor changes to the document concluded the design process.

II. NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE SELF-STUDY

The Community College of Allegheny County has opted to undertake a comprehensive self-study, addressing all fourteen standards in *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*. This Self-Study will address CCAC's compliance with the *Characteristics of Excellence* and will function as part of the process for developing the new Strategic Plan. The institution is entering a time of significant change and opportunity, and the self-study will be an element in the process of maintaining and improving the institution's current programs while simultaneously identifying and implementing innovative approaches to community college education.

III. INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE SELF-STUDY

The Steering Committee established outcomes to measure the success of the self-study process. The college's mission and values inform all outcomes, and all outcomes assume the college's focus on providing "a caring and professional learning environment that places the needs of students first in our decision making." Successful completion of the self-study process will:

1. Establish and document CCAC's compliance with the Fourteen Characteristics of Excellence.
2. Gather evidence and provide analysis to inform the institution's ongoing strategic planning process.
3. Engage the entire college community in the process of reflection and self-evaluation.
4. Examine the effectiveness of CCAC's assessment processes across all areas of the college.
5. Identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement with a particular focus on student learning and success.

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUPS

The self-study co-chairs, in consultation with the President and President's Cabinet, established administrative membership of the Steering Committee. The College posted the faculty Steering Committee positions, following the process used to post other internal positions. Three applicants applied for three positions. Following the standard hiring process, President Bullock approved the three faculty Steering Committee members. In keeping with the mission of the college, the Steering Committee includes a diverse and inclusive group representing the many facets of the college. Steering Committee members include employees who hold a variety of leadership roles from across the institution. The Steering Committee members embody many years of experience and dedication to CCAC as one college.

Membership of the Steering Committee is as follows:

Co-Chairs:

Kevin Smay, Assistant Vice President of Strategic Planning, MSCHE Accreditation Liaison Officer, Office of College Services
 Stephen Wells, Professor of English, South Campus

Members:

Mary Frances Archey, Executive Director for Strategic College Initiatives, Office of College Services
 Joyce Breckenridge, Vice President for Finance, Office of College Services
 Yvonne Burns, Dean of Student Development, Boyce Campus
 Elizabeth Claytor, Professor of English, North Campus
 John Dziak, Assistant Professor of Biology, Allegheny Campus
 Mary Lou Kennedy, Acting Campus President, North Campus & West Hills Center
 Gretchen E. Mullin-Sawicki, Acting Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic & Student Affairs, Office of College Services
 Clyde Pickett, Special Assistant to the President for Diversity & Inclusion, Allegheny Campus
 Mary Kate Quinlan, Director of Learning Outcomes & Achieving the Dream, Office of College Services
 Elizabeth Throesch, Associate Professor of English, North Campus
 Tomi Waters, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Boyce Campus

Ex Officio

Anthony DiTommaso, Vice President and General Counsel, Allegheny Campus

The organization of the Working Groups reflects CCAC’s commitment to looking forward in that we have aligned the *Characteristics of Excellence* to the new Standards recently approved. The resulting Self-Study will address all 14 Standards from *Characteristics of Excellence*, but will do so within the logical structure established in the latest revision.

Standards 2014	Characteristics 2006
Standard I: Mission and Goals	Standard 1: Mission and Goals
Standard II: Ethics and Integrity	Standard 6: Integrity Verification of Compliance with Accreditation- Relevant Federal Regulations
Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience	Standard 10: Faculty Standard 11: Educational Offerings Standard 13: Related Educational Activities
Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience	Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention Standard 9: Student Support Services
Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment	Standard 12: General Education Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning
Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement	Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal Standard 3: Institutional Resources Standard 7: Institutional Assessment
Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration	Standard 4: Leadership and Governance Standard 5: Administration

The Steering Committee formed Working Groups to parallel the structure outlined above and developed draft self-study questions for each of the 14 Standards. A member of the Steering Committee chairs or co-chairs each of the Working Groups and will serve as liaison to the Steering Committee. Working Group membership was limited to about fifteen participants, exclusive of the chair(s), in each of the seven groups. During the college’s last self-study, there were fourteen Working Groups, each with fifteen to sixteen members. Members of these groups reported a fragmented experience. With so many members, the groups distributed individual research and writing assignments based on 1-2 fundamental elements rather than working collaboratively to answer broader research questions. Individuals had great depth of knowledge within a very narrow range and often failed to see the relationship between the work they contributed and the complete self-study report. In an attempt to mitigate such limitations, the Steering Committee formed fewer Working Groups and will express to them the importance of engaging additional assistance as necessary.

The Steering Committee formed Working Groups with experience and diversity in mind. Some members of each Working Group have experience relating to the standard(s) assigned to that group. At the same time, the Steering Committee attempted to assign members from across the college to avoid information silos and to provide fresh perspectives on the Standards.

The Steering Committee adopted a list of characteristics to help identify an appropriate combination of Working Group members. Members of the group do not necessarily possess all the listed traits, but the groups as a whole represent a mix of these characteristics.

Working Group members:

- Should represent a broad range of constituencies and stakeholders within the institution;
- May have prior experience with Middle States Self-Studies or Periodic Review;
- Should have strong organizational abilities;
- Are able to make the time commitment;
- Should be action and results oriented;
- Must have the ability of work independently and on a team;
- Should offer content matter expertise;
- May have varying lengths of service (fresh sets of eyes and deep institutional memory);
- May have deep institutional knowledge;
- May have an interest or concern about the college that is being addressed by the working group.

Membership of the Working Groups is as follows:

Working Group I: Mission and Goals

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

Co-Chairs:

John Dziak, Assistant Professor of Biology, Allegheny Campus
Tomi Waters, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Boyce Campus

Members:

Judy Collins, Administrative Assistant, Allegheny Campus
Norm Downey, Perkins Grant Director, Allegheny Campus
Caroline Evans, Associate Professor, Biology, Allegheny Campus
Ginger Underwood, Student Success Coach, Allegheny Campus
Kalina White, Associate Professor, Biology, Allegheny Campus
Waseem Ahmed, Professor, Biology, Boyce Campus
Norm Johnson, Professor, Physical Therapy, Boyce Campus
Kristin Spiker, Director of Admissions and International Students, North Campus
Justin Busch, Instructional Technologist, Office of College Services
Susanne Kelley, Senior Graphic Designer, Office of College Services
Christopher Robinson, Assistant Professor, Social Work, South Campus
Tara Zirkel, Director of Admissions, South Campus
Theresa Bryant, VP for Workforce Development, West Hills Center

Working Group II: Ethics and Integrity

Standard 6: Integrity; Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations

Co-Chairs:

Clyde Pickett, Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion, Allegheny Campus
Anthony DiTommaso, Vice President and General Counsel, Allegheny Campus

Members:

Jane Greenwood, Assistant Dean Homewood Brushton Center, Allegheny Campus
Michael Bennett, Instructor, English, Allegheny Campus
Dwight Boddorf, Director of Military and Veterans Service, Allegheny Campus
Darla Coleman, Student Success Coach, Allegheny Campus
Devin Patterson, Counselor - Assistant Professor, Boyce Campus
Chuck Bell, Student Development Specialist, North Campus
Srujana Kanjula, Professor Sociology, North Campus
Della Pappas, Director of Supportive Services, North Campus
Mike Cvetic, Director of Purchasing, Office of College Services
Elizabeth Johnston, Executive Director of Public Relations and Marketing Department, Office of College Services
Kathy Mayle, Dean of Nursing, Office of College Services
Terry O'Leary, Recorder, Office of College Services
Paul Schwarzmiller, Executive Director of Human Resources, Office of College Services
Kyle Mosley, Director Financial Aid, South Campus
Michele Thomas, Student Success Coach, South Campus

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

Standard 10: Faculty; Standard 11: Educational Offerings; Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

Co-Chairs:

Stuart Blacklaw, Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, Office of College Services
Elizabeth Claytor, Professor of English, North Campus

Members:

Don Breitbarth, Assistant Instructor, Developmental Studies, Allegheny Campus
David Sluss, Professor, Mathematics, Allegheny Campus
Carol Yoannone, Director of Contracts and Grants, Allegheny Campus
Nina Lyons, Director Student Life, North Campus
Barbara Thompson, Librarian, North Campus
Dwight Bishop, Director of Distance Learning, Office of College Services
Diane Jacobs, Registrar, Office of College Services
Carmen Livingston, Associate Professor, English, South Campus
Megan Rice, ITS—Assistant Director of Field Operations, South Campus
Justin Tatar, Assistant Dean, Washington Center, South Campus
Deb Killmeyer, Director of Community Education, West Hills Center

Working Group IV: Support of the Student Experience

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention; Standard 9: Student Support Services

Co-Chairs:

Yvonne Burns, Dean of Student Development, Boyce Campus
Mary Frances Archey, Executive Director for Strategic College Initiatives, Office of College Services

Members:

Lucille Adkins, Director of Registration and Advisement, Allegheny Campus
Doralee Brooks, Professor, Developmental Studies, Allegheny Campus
Christine McQuaide, Student Development Specialist, Allegheny Campus
Roslynn Wilson, Dean of Student Development, Allegheny Campus
Gyn Bradford, Assistant Dean Braddock Hills Center, Boyce Campus
Patty Florentine, Director of Supportive Services, Boyce Campus
Pamela Nichols, Director of Job Placement and Career Services, Boyce Campus
Janice Boyle, Accounting Clerk, North Campus
Jo Ann Hunter, Professor, Business, North Campus
Nancy Keilly, Director of Financial Aid, Boyce Campus
Theresa Smochko, Student Support Specialist, North Campus
Kenneth Bush, Bursar, Office of College Services
Natasha Walton, Grant Resource Associate, Office of College Services
Kelly Maxwell, Dean of Student Development, South Campus
Kathleen Johnstone, Student Development Specialist, West Hills Center
Laurel Westrom, Director of Career and Technical Education, West Hills Center

Working Group V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Standard 12: General Education; Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Co-Chairs:

Gretchen E. Mullin-Sawicki, Campus President, North Campus
Mary Kate Quinlan, Director of Learning Outcomes and Achieving the Dream, Office of College Services

Members:

Mark Domencic, Assistant Professor, Music, Allegheny Campus
Ebony English, Assistant Professor, Social Work, Allegheny Campus
Bob Kmetz, Director of Job Placement and Career Services, Allegheny Campus
Michael Self, Dean of Academic Affairs, Allegheny Campus
Lilly Briola, Professor, Occupational Therapy, Boyce Campus
Melanie Yeshenko, Associate Professor, Child and Family Studies, Boyce Campus
Rhen McCaskill, Director of Admissions, North Campus
Scott Cornish, Associate Professor, Art, South Campus
Carissa Monaco, Director of Supportive Services, South Campus
Tammy Sawmelle, Associate Professor, Nursing, South Campus
Michael Zdilla, Assistant Professor, Biology, South Campus
Sylvia Elsayed, Center for Professional Development, Project Manager, West Hills Center

Working Group VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal; Standard 3: Institutional Resources; Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

Co-Chairs:

Joyce Breckenridge, Vice President for Finance, Office of College Services
Elizabeth Throesch, Associate Professor of English, North Campus

Members:

Jodi Beemer, CCAC Educational Foundation, Allegheny Campus
Lori Cunningham, Librarian, Allegheny Campus
Bev Fury, Senior Secretary, Allegheny Campus
Dan Lowe, Professor, English, Allegheny Campus
Cathy Brock, Coordinator of Student Accounts/Business Assistant, Boyce Campus
Sue Gardner, Senior Administrative Secretary, North Campus
Tom Gross, Lead Skilled Maintenance Worker, North Campus
Jessica Heathcote, Instructor, English, North Campus
Kenneth Weber, Physical Plant Supervisor, North Campus
Ibrahim Garbioglu, Assistant Vice President of ITS and CIO, Office of College Services
Giovanni Garofalo, Assistant Director of Planning and Research, Office of College Services
Valerie Keibler, Director of Faculty and Staff Development, Office of College Services
Raymond Marks, Assistant Director of Facilities, Office of College Services
Lori McKinney, Assistant Controller, Office of College Services
James Messer, Chief Facilities Officer, Office of College Services
Joe Miller, Senior Staff Accountant, Office of College Services
Paul Swearingin, Assistant Vice President of Finance and Controller, Office of College Services
Sharon Mills, Dean of Administration, South Campus

Working Group VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance; Standard 5: Administration

Co-Chairs:

Mary Lou Kennedy, Dean of Student Development, North Campus and West Hills Center
Vladimir St. Surin, Director of Student Life, Allegheny Campus

Members:

Maryann Anderson, Professor, Health Information Tech, Allegheny Campus
Chris Richardson, Learning Disabilities Coordinator, Allegheny Campus
Rita Gallegos, Professor, Developmental Studies, Boyce Campus
Nancy Jenkins, Dean of Administration, Boyce Campus
Greg Joyce, Professor, Criminal Justice, Boyce Campus
Rebecca Senkowicz, Assistant Professor, Mathematics, North Campus
Cathy Stewart, Faculty Secretary, North Campus
Michelle Talbert-Horsey, Director of Job Placement and Career Services, North Campus
Rick Adams, Assistant Vice President, Center for Learning, Office of College Services
Kimberly Manigault, Vice President of Human Resources, Office of College Services

Bonita Richardson, Assistant to the President and Board of Trustees, Office of College Services

Alex Tongchinsub, Instructor, Mathematics, South Campus

Brenda Trettel, Dean of Academic Affairs, South Campus

V. CHARGES TO THE WORKING GROUPS AND GUIDELINES FOR THEIR REPORTS

Working Groups will produce a draft and a final research report addressing the fundamental elements of each standard and responding to the research questions developed by the Steering Committee. Deadlines for submission of materials are included in section VII of this document.

The college intends the Self-Study process as an integral part of its Strategic Planning cycle and thus plans to use the Working Group research questions to focus institutional attention on core concerns.

As part of the presidential transition, Dr. Bullock commissioned a series of studies addressing areas of concern within the institution, including a *Comprehensive Review of the Leadership and Administrative Structure* prepared by the Association of Community College Trustees, a report on advising services prepared by the National Academic Advising Association, an internal climate survey administered by CCAC's Department of Planning and Institutional Research, a comprehensive review of the financial aid processes by Kay Jacks and Associates, an assessment of the operations of the institutional technology area by Campus Works, and a comprehensive review of enrollment by Ruffalo Noel Levitz. These studies identified some common themes, which focused and informed the research questions for each of the Working Groups. The Steering Committee intends for the Working Groups to read each of the research questions with the following contextual information in mind:

1. In recent years, CCAC has seen external demographic factors lead to steep declines in enrollment. Responding to these changes has been a primary concern for the college over the past two years. Policy changes have mitigated the detrimental effects of these factors, but further action is necessary to realize the potential for improvement these changes represent. Assessment and adjustment of constituent outreach, enrollment management, student services, and academic programs will align college offerings to new demographic realities. The college hopes to explore these new possibilities through Self-Study and concurrent Strategic Plan update and implementation.
2. Internally, disunity across the college remains a part of CCAC's institutional culture, a holdover from the period when the four campuses acted as separately accredited institutions. This lack of unity results in distrust and reduces collaboration between elements within the institution. Inadequate communication exacerbates this lack of unity, leading many employees to report feeling disconnected from the larger institution. A series of leadership changes over the past decade added to this longstanding conflict between centralization and campus autonomy to establish an institutional distrust of senior leadership. The Self-Study process and the parallel strategic planning process will identify actions necessary for reversal of this trend and for establishing unity, communication, and trust as new institutional paradigms.

3. A third issue of continued concern is assessment. MSCHE placed CCAC on warning following the institution's 2005 self-study because the College failed to comply with Standard Seven, Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness, and Standard Fourteen, Assessment of Student Learning. Self-study and Team Visit recommendations included many with assessment implications in the remaining twelve standards. As noted in its 2007 Monitoring Report, CCAC wrote and implemented a comprehensive Plan for Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness and Student Learning. The Self-Study process will provide an update on the inclusion of assessment as a part of CCAC's culture.
-
-

Working Group I: Mission and Goals

The Charge to Working Group I: Mission and Goals is to gather and analyze evidence related to CCAC's compliance with Standard 1. The Working Group will establish and document the institution's compliance with the fundamental elements of Standard 1. In addition, the Working Group will identify strengths, outline areas for improvement, and make suggestions and recommendations regarding CCAC's mission and goals. Answers to the Research Questions will inform this analysis.

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

The institution's mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are used to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

Research Question 1.1:

By what means and to what extent does the college measure how effectively it communicates its mission, vision, values, and goals statements to its diverse internal and external constituencies?

Research Question 1.2:

By what process does the institution regularly reconsider the relevance of its Mission Statement? How successful is the process for periodic review, evaluation, and revision of the mission, vision, values, and goals? To what extent does this process adequately involve all stakeholders?

Research Question 1.3:

How effectively does the college coordinate implementation of its goals at various levels across the institution?

Working Group II: Ethics and Integrity

The Charge to Working Group II: Ethics and Integrity is to gather and analyze evidence related to CCAC's compliance with Standard 6. The Working Group will establish and document the institution's compliance with the fundamental elements of Standard 6. In addition, the Working Group will identify strengths, outline areas for improvement, and make suggestions and recommendations regarding ethics and integrity at CCAC. Answers to the Research Questions will inform this analysis. This Working Group will also verify and document CCAC's compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations.

Standard 6: Integrity

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

Research Question 6.1:

Has the institution clearly stated and does the institution effectively disseminate its policies concerning academic and intellectual freedom and its policies concerning intellectual property rights?

Research Question 6.2:

Does the college ensure equity in the development, communication, and implementation of policies and procedures, and through what mechanisms and how effectively does the institution assess its adherence to its own ethical standards and stated policies?

Research Question 6.3:

To what extent have CCAC's policies and procedures been effective in ensuring an environment of civility, mutual respect, and cooperation?

Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations

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

The Charge to Working Group III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience is to gather and analyze evidence related to CCAC's compliance with Standard 10, Standard 11, and Standard 13. The Working Group will establish and document the institution's compliance with the fundamental elements of Standards 10, 11, and 13. In addition, the Working Group will identify strengths, outline areas for improvement, and make suggestions and recommendations regarding the design and delivery of the student learning experience at CCAC. Answers to the Research Questions will inform this analysis.

Standard 10: Faculty

The institution's instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

Research Question 10.1:

What evaluative criteria ensure the effectiveness of procedures for appointment, tenure, promotion, performance review, grievance, discipline, and dismissal of instructional and support personnel?

Research Question 10.2:

What evaluation standards and procedures measure CCAC's full-time and part-time faculty's performances? How carefully articulated, equitable, and fairly implemented are these standards and procedures?

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

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

Research Question 11.1:

What measurement tools does the institution use to assess effectively and regularly the distribution of curricular offerings to maintain appropriate balance between career and transfer offerings and to provide adequate offerings in the most appropriate modalities of course and program delivery?

Research Question 11.2:

How effectively and accurately does the college track student academic progress, and how does it use this information to adjust course and program offerings?

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

The institution's programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.

Research Question 13.1:

What instruments does the institution use to accurately place students at the appropriate academic level upon initial placement, and does the college provide adequate support, both within and beyond the classroom, to allow a reasonable opportunity for student success in the developmental education sequence?

Research Question 13.2:

How does CCAC maintain the same high quality of instruction and academic rigor through distance learning as it has through traditional face-to-face instruction?

Working Group IV: Support of the Student Experience

The Charge to Working Group IV: Support of the Student Experience is to gather and analyze evidence related to CCAC's compliance with Standard 8 and Standard 9. The Working Group will establish and document the institution's compliance with the fundamental elements of Standards 8 and 9. In addition, the Working Group will identify strengths, outline areas for improvement, and make suggestions and recommendations regarding support of the student experience at CCAC. Answers to the Research Questions will inform this analysis.

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students' educational goals.

Research Question 8.1:

What steps should CCAC take to prepare itself for projected changes in the student population of Allegheny and surrounding counties?

Research Question 8.2:

How can CCAC improve the success with which it collects attrition information and the effectiveness with which it utilizes this information to improve student retention through achievement of educational objectives?

Standard 9: Student Support Services

The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.

Research Question 9.1:

How does the institution identify students who might be "at risk," and how effective are its efforts to provide support for these students?

Research Question 9.2:

What changes to student support services have been implemented in the past five years, and how effective were these changes? How might these services be augmented and expanded to fulfill projected needs of future students?

Research Question 9.3:

How are student support services made available to off-site and distance learning students, and how effective are these services as compared to those offered to traditional students?

Research Question 9.4

Are communications to students effectively coordinated and/or linked between enrollment services (registration, financial aid, and student accounts) so students will clearly understand their financial obligation to the college?

Working Group V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

The Charge to Working Group V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment is to gather and analyze evidence related to CCAC's compliance with Standard 12 and Standard 14. The Working Group will establish and document the institution's compliance with the fundamental elements of Standards 12 and 14. In addition, the Working Group will identify strengths, outline areas for improvement, and make suggestions and recommendations regarding Educational Effectiveness Assessment at CCAC. Answers to the Research Questions will inform this analysis.

Standard 12: General Education

The institution's curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency.

Research Question 12.1:

Does CCAC's program of general education provide adequate opportunities for students in the institution's various degree and certificate programs to achieve the learning outcomes for each of the college's six general education goals—communication, technological competency, critical thinking and problem solving, quantitative and scientific reasoning, culture, society and citizenship, and information literacy?

Research Question 12.2:

How effectively does the institution integrate the assessment of general education outcomes into its overall plan for assessing student learning? How does the college support these activities? In what ways are the assessment results used to improve student learning?

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.

Research Question 14.1:

How and how effectively does CCAC measure students' achievement of key learning outcomes?

Research Question 14.2:

Who is responsible for assessment of student learning, and to what extent does the institution use the results of various assessment activities to improve student learning and to allocate institutional resources?

Working Group VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

The Charge to Working Group VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement is to gather and analyze evidence related to CCAC's compliance with Standard 2, Standard 3, and Standard 7. The Working Group will establish and document the institution's compliance with the fundamental elements of Standards 2, 3, and 7. In addition, the Working Group will identify strengths, outline areas for improvement, and make suggestions and recommendations regarding Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement at CCAC. Answers to the Research Questions will inform this analysis.

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

Research Question 2.1:

How effectively does CCAC integrate relevant information about the economic, political, and social climate of Southwestern Pennsylvania into its planning process?

Research Question 2.2:

How thoroughly is a culture of planning integrated into the institutional culture of CCAC?

Research Question 2.3:

How well aligned are goal statements at various levels in the college, and how much do they contribute to decisions concerning resource allocation?

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

The human, financial, technical, physical facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution's mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution's mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution's resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

Research Question 3.1:

What challenges does the institution face over the next five years in regard to providing resources necessary to achieve the institution's mission and goals? How effective is the process by which CCAC identifies such challenges, and how successfully does the college formulate and implement plans to meet these challenges?

Research Question 3.2:

How effectively does CCAC assess the adequacy of staffing, support, and equipment needs for its educational programs and support services? How efficient is the process by which it responds to these needs?

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

Research Question 7.1:

How widely accepted is the culture for institutional assessment within CCAC's various internal constituencies?

Research Question 7.2:

How effective is CCAC in developing, communicating, and implementing assessment methods, plans, and results across institutional divisions, programs, and services (including administrative services)? Does the institution devote adequate resources to supporting faculty and front-line staff in using assessment data to achieve the institution's mission?

Working Group VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

The Charge to Working Group VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration is to gather and analyze evidence related to CCAC's compliance with Standard 4 and Standard 5. The Working Group will establish and document the institution's compliance with the fundamental elements of Standards 4 and 5. In addition, the Working Group will identify strengths, outline areas for improvement, and make suggestions and recommendations regarding Governance, Leadership, and Administration at CCAC. Answers to the Research Questions will inform this analysis.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

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

Research Question 4.1:

To what extent does the Board encourage and facilitate involvement of institutional constituencies in the decision-making process? How does the Board provide appropriate opportunities for student input?

Research Question 4.2:

How effective is the Board of Trustees in advancing the mission and strategic goals of the institution? How and by whom is this effectiveness assessed, and how are the results of this assessment communicated to the college community?

Research Question 4.3:

How effective are Board policies and procedures in planning for and implementing transitions in institutional leadership? How and by whom are these policies and procedures assessed, and how do these assessments lead to improvements in these processes?

Standard 5: Administration

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

Research Question 5.1:

How does the college assess the effectiveness of administrative structures, and how effectively are any existing assessment instruments and procedures being utilized for decision making?

Research Question 5.2:

How open and effective are avenues of communication across the college between administration, faculty, and staff?

Research Question 5.3:

How effective are initial and ongoing training programs in developing administrators' understanding of current organizational structures and their relationships to institutional priorities?

VI. ORGANIZATION OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

The Self-Study report will contain seven chapters, one for each category in the revised standards. The content of these chapters will address each of the 14 standards in *Characteristics of Excellence*.

Working Group Report Template

The purpose of this template is to provide a plan to ensure that each Working Group report follows a similar format and organization. In their reports to the Steering Committee, Working Groups should go beyond simple description and provide thoughtful and honest evaluation. The reports should be guided by the Self-Study Research Questions, and written using clear and concise prose and complete sentences. Working Groups will submit preliminary reports to the Steering Committee in December of 2015 and Final Reports in February of 2016. The Steering Committee will incorporate these reports into a Self-Study Draft Report and distribute the draft to the College community for dialog and feedback. Each Working Group report should be based on the following template:

- 1) Overview of the Standard and Research Questions
 - a) The Standard(s) being addressed
 - b) Brief description of the Standard
 - c) Charge to the Working Group
 - d) Research Questions

- 2) Analysis of evidence
 - a) Description of the inquiry taken to address the charge questions
 - b) Description of the documentation used
 - c) An analytic discussion on how the documentation and inquiry addresses the Research Questions assigned to the work group
 - d) Discussion of the outcomes of the inquiry
 - i) Strengths identified
 - ii) Challenges identified
 - e) Student Input

- 3) Relation of findings to Commission Standards
 - a) Documentation establishing compliance with the fundamental elements of the Standard addressed by the Working Group
 - b) A discussion of strengths and challenges with respect to the Standard and fundamental elements

- 4) Relation to other Working Groups
 - a) Description of the connection between the Working Groups topic with those of other Working Groups
 - b) Description of collaboration with other Working Groups

- 5) Conclusions and recommendations
 - a) Develop specific recommendations for institutional improvement, for enhancing strengths or addressing challenges.

- 6) Lists of Supporting Documents
 - a) Provide a complete list of supporting documents used by the Working Group.

VII. EDITORIAL STYLE AND FORMAT OF ALL REPORTS

All reports should follow the editorial style described below:

- Each report must be completed in Microsoft Office Word 2007 or 2010 and submitted electronically via the SharePoint site maintained for this purpose.
- Font: Garamond 12 point
 - Headings: Bold font and all caps
 - Subheadings: Bold font and title case
 - Main Text: Regular font and sentence case
- Justification: Left justified
- Margins: 1” margins
- Spacing: Single space with extra space between paragraphs
- Limit use of acronyms for programs and reports within the text of the document.
- Format for charts and figures: APA Style

Working Groups are responsible for tracking all resources used in developing their reports. Resources will be gathered in print as well as in a virtual document room for the Visiting Team’s reference. Include copies of supporting data not readily available, including any surveys, summaries of interviews, and uncommon documents.

Submit clearly dated electronic copies of Work Group reports through SharePoint. Be sure to maintain current backup versions of each draft.

VIII. TIMETABLE FOR THE SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION

Date	Event
Fall 2014	Co-chairs selected and announced.
	Self-Study Institute held
	MSCHE staff liaison schedules Self-Study Preparation Visit
January - February 2015	Steering Committee membership finalized
	Self-study model and outcomes identified by Steering Committee
	Steering Committee finalizes Research Questions
	Working groups and working group membership identified
March 2015	Draft <i>Self-Study Design</i> document finished and distributed for comment
April 20, 2015	Submit Draft <i>Self-Study Design</i> document to MSCHE
May- June 2015	Self-Study MSCHE Staff Liaison Visit (05/06/2015)

Date	Event
	<i>Self-Study Design</i> document revised as needed
	President seeks endorsement of the revised Self-Study Design from the Board of Trustees
	Submit Revised <i>Self-Study Design</i> document to MSCHE
Summer 2015	SharePoint Site is established for Working Group use.
August 11, 2015	Kick-Off Meeting is held for Steering Committee and Working Groups on All College Day
August-December 2015	Working Groups engage community, conduct research and prepare reports to the Steering Committee
	Supporting documentation identified and assembled
September 18, 2015	Steering Committee Meeting (<i>Monitoring and troubleshooting</i>)
October 16, 2015	Steering Committee Meeting (<i>Monitoring and troubleshooting</i>)
November 13, 2015	Steering Committee Meeting (<i>Monitoring and troubleshooting</i>)
November 20, 2015	Preliminary Working Group Draft Reports Due (<i>Draft of work product posted to SharePoint before Thanksgiving holiday ensures tangible progress and that reports will be on target for first of year due date.</i>)
December 2015	Board of Trustees updated on Self-Study Process
January 6, 2016	Working Group Reports Due (<i>Posted to SharePoint on Wednesday to allow for transitions back to work and for review by Steering Committee prior to All College Day Steering Committee Workshop</i>)
January 12, 2016	All College Day Steering Committee Workshop (<i>Steering committee presentations and critique of reports to generate feedback for the working groups</i>)
January 2016	Evaluation Team Chair identified
	Dates for the Team Chair Preliminary Visit and Evaluation Team Visit set.
February –March 2016	Working groups address Steering Committee feedback
March 18, 2016	Final Working Group Reports Due (<i>Final draft from working groups posted to SharePoint before Spring Break</i>)

Date	Event
March-May, 2016	MSCHE Evaluation Visit Team members identified and approved
	Copy of Self-Study Design sent to Evaluation Team Chair
	Supporting documentation repository is substantially completed
May 2016	Board of Trustees updated on Self-Study Process
June – July 2016	Co-Chairs, with Steering Committee oversight, prepare first draft of Self-Study Report
	First draft of Self-Study shared with key internal stakeholders
August-December 2016	Draft of Self-Study presented and discussed on All College Day
	Campus community, including representative student groups, and Board of Trustees review the draft of the Self-Study report and provide feedback
	Co-Chairs, with Steering Committee oversight, prepare next draft of Self-Study Report
	Revised draft of Self Study document shared with Evaluation Team Chair
	Evaluation Team Chair makes preliminary visit to the College
	Board of Trustees updated on Self-Study Process in November
	Co-Chairs and Steering Committee prepare final draft of Self-Study Report
January - February 2017	Board approves final Self-Study Report
	Final Self-Study Report submitted to the Evaluation Team and MSCHE
	Steering Committee coordinates Evaluation Team Visit logistics
March or April 2017	Evaluation Team Visit
June 2017	Commission Action

IX. PROFILE OF THE VISITING EVALUATION TEAM

CCAC is a large, multi-campus institution, and enrolls a diverse population of students at its campus locations, centers, and online. The institution maintains a reputation as a leading producer of graduates in the fields of nursing and allied health, offers broad transfer opportunities in many

programs and disciplines, and provides workforce training recognized regionally and nationally. The college is an active leader in the Achieving the Dream network and delivers many developmental courses. Professional Employees are part of the American Federation of Teachers, and the Service Employees International Union represents many support staff. The college has been increasingly successful in acquiring grant funding to support its mission.

The visiting team should include members who understand the above characteristics of the college. The chair of the visiting team, as well as most of its members, should be familiar with the operation of two-year, comprehensive, multi-campus institutions. We are particularly interested in having at least one visiting team member familiar with the unique nature of skilled trades programs as the institution continues growth and improvement in this area.

X. INVENTORY OF SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

Working Group I: Mission and Goals

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

- Mission Card
- Mission Poster
- An Investment in the Community, Community College of Allegheny County Strategic Plan 2011-2016
- Staff Mission Dialog Review Documentation, Fall 2014
- Student Mission Dialog Review Documentation, Spring 2015

Working Group II: Integrity

Standard 6: Integrity

- Non-Discrimination policy
- College Catalog
- Faculty handbook
 - Anti-discrimination policy
 - Academic freedom policy
- Student Handbook
 - Academic honest policy
 - Plagiarism policy
 - Student rights and Responsibility
 - Anti-discrimination policy
 - Electronic use policy
 - Student appeals policy
- Employee Handbook
- Civil Rights Compliance Policy
- Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Community College of Allegheny County and the American Federation of Teachers Local 2067, AFL-CIO, September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2017
- HR Hiring Policy
- Climate Study

- Board of Trustees Handbook

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

Standard 10: Faculty

- College Catalog
- Faculty handbook
- Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Community College of Allegheny County and the American Federation of Teachers Local 2067, AFL-CIO, September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2017
- HR Hiring Guidelines
- Collection of the materials used the past few years for new faculty orientation
- Reports from the Center for Learning and now Professional Development on programs held
- Summer Faculty Institute Information
- Report(s) of the results of the administration of the Survey of Student Opinions
- Climate Study
- Mary Frances Archey's and Aaron Hoffman's surveys of faculty incorporating civic engagement/service learning in their classes
- Reports prepared by IR used by Departments to request full-time faculty

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

- Catalog
- Common Course Syllabi
- College Council's guidelines for curriculum development
- Chapter 335 course reviews as mandated by the PA Department of Education
- Five Year Program Reviews
- Minutes from the Curriculum Committee meetings
- CCSSE Results
- Noel Levitz Results
- Minutes from Advisory Board Meetings
- IPEDS Reports
- VFA Reports
- Nursing Accreditation Reports
- Allied Health Accreditation Reports
- Automotive Reports to the 3 Automotive Corporations
- Facilities Master Plan outlining the need to modify the use of the library space
- Catalog Statement (2014-2015 Catalog)
- Institutional articulation agreements are all on the web
- TAOC (Transfer Articulation and Oversight Committee) State wide agreements

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

- Pertinent IR Reports
- Tactical Plans—Diversity and Inclusion; Student Success; Workforce

- 2014-2015 Enrollment Management Plan: Academic Programming
- Review of the number of credits awarded for CP
- Distance learning annual reports
- Aviation Flight School Contract
- EIC MOU

Working Group IV: Support of the Student Experience

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

Standard 9: Student Support Services

- Comprehensive Annual Student Development Services Assessment Plans
- Noel Levitz Student Survey Results
- Title III Report
- Title IV FA Report
- CCSSE Reports
- NJCAA Athletic Reports
- Math Café Final Report
- Student Life Cultural Event Calendar
- FISAP to Title IV Report
- Safety and Security Reports
- ARC Enrollment Reports
- CCAC Catalog
- Online Learning Handbook
- Student Handbook
- Enrollment Steps and Application for Admission
- Transfer Guide
- Enrollment Management Plans
- Institutional Research Data on Retention and Graduation rates
- FERPA Guidelines
- Title IX Regulations

Working Group V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Standard 12: General Education

- Catalog describing general education
- Statements of general education learning objectives (catalog and web)
- Samples of syllabi from a representative selection of general education courses, showing expected course learning outcomes (master course syllabi website)
- Samples of graduation check sheets
- Samples of program review documents for “general education” disciplines.
- Samples of assessment tools in place in the general education program and courses (Mostly internally designed rubrics, writing prompts and assignments. Includes one standardized test The Test of Everyday Reasoning.)

- General Education Assessment Plans and Reports for college's six general education goals. (web)
- Samples of Program Review Appendix H: Course Outcomes Match to General Education Student Behaviors
- TracDat report showing Program Objectives matched to General Education Goals
- Evidence that assessment results are discussed and shared (All-college day agendas and presentations – need dates)

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

- CCAC Plan for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness and Student Learning
- Institutional plan(s) for assessment of student learning : A Guide to Program Assessment (web)
- Resources, forms and tools for assessment of student learning: Program Assessment (Academic) Appendix E , Appendix I ; Program Assessment (Student Services) Appendix E, Appendix F; checklists; CAT form (web); assessment toolkits.
- Institutional and/or unit-level policies and practices for recognizing and rewarding efforts to assess student learning: Classroom Assessment Certificate of Participation (Heather Murphy)
- CBA Article X: Teaching Portfolio requires participation in assessment
- Statements of expected learning outcomes for the institutional, program, and general education levels (Gen Ed – course catalog & web, Program – course catalog)
- Samples of syllabi from a broad cross-section of programs and courses showing course-level expected learning outcomes (master course syllabi website)
- Curriculum committee's role – examination of the relevance of academic programs includes review and approval of program objectives and course learning outcomes (sample of meeting notes)
- Academic Planning's role – facilitating Program Review process (sample of meeting notes)
- Evidence of faculty training in assessment (New faculty orientation, workshops – *need dates*, presentations (web), assessment toolkit (web) , ASL handbook(web))
- Samples of assessment tools in place (e.g., rubrics, surveys, portfolios, or capstone courses) from a broad cross-section of programs and courses (TracDat)
- A cross-section of examples of the use of assessment results to improve teaching and learning (Program Review Appendix G: One Year After Report a.k.a. Responses to Recommendations)
- Evidence of evaluation of assessment processes (Assessment Advisory Group notes)
- Evidence that assessment results are discussed and shared (samples of discipline meeting agendas and notes)

Working Group VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

- CCAC Facilities Master Plan, October 2009
- Facilities Condition Assessment
- Annual Operating Plans
- Operating Plan Reviews
- Program Review Reports

- Enrollment Forecasts
- Information Technology Strategic Plan
- Enrollment Management Action Plan 2014-15

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

- Annual Budgets
- Audited Financial Statements
- Budget Projections
- CCAC Facilities Master Plan, October 2009
- Foundation/Fundraising Strategic Plan
- Board Budget Policy October 2014
- Foundation Annual Report
- Capital Improvements Report
- Five Year Financial Projections
- Faculty hiring process documentation

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

- CCAC Plan for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness and Student Learning
- Strategic Plan(s)
- Operating Plans
- Operating Plan Status Reports
- Student Success Matrix
- Noel Levitz SSI 2013 and 2015 Reports
- CCSSE Reports
- CCAC Scorecard

Working Group VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

- Charter and Bylaws
- List of board members with titles
- Governing Board Orientation Manual
- Conflict of Interest Policy
- Job Description of the President
- President's Reports to the Board
- Board of Trustees Policy Manual
- College Policies and Procedures Manual
- Student Government Constitution and Bylaws

Standard 5: Administration

- Organization Chart
- Public Safety Reports
- Performance evaluation processes and guidelines

- Position Descriptions
- Search Committee Guidelines
- College Policies and Procedures Manual