

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

Table of Contents

1. Purposes	2
2. Specific Objectives	2
3. Timelines	3
4. Planning	4
5. Online Task Force.....	6
6. Task Force on Complaint and Grievance Policies and Procedures	7
7. Addressing Administrative Stability.....	7
8. Addressing Shared Governance.....	8
9. Assessment:	9
a. Institutional Assessment Committee	9
b. Program Assessment and School Assessment Committees	10
c. General Studies Assessment.....	12
d. Multicultural Assessment	13
e. Assessment of Diversity Strategies	13
10. Diversity Task Force.....	13
11. Task Force on Advising and Transfer Issues.....	14
12. Task Force on Engagement and Service.....	15
13. Schools of Business, Professional Studies, and Letters, Arts and Sciences	16
a. Items requested from program faculty	16
b. Annual Report and Program Review.....	16
c. Items requested from the deans	18
14. Vice Presidential Areas Except Academic Affairs.....	20
15. Student Government Assembly	21
16. Faculty Senate.....	22
17. Council of Chairs.....	23
18. Council of Administrators	24
19. Classified Staff Council.....	25

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

Purposes of the Self-Study

The purpose of the Self-Study is to:

1. Focus the college's planning and decision making on student learning.
2. Determine the effectiveness of what MSCD does.
3. Identify opportunities for improvement.
4. Determine the extent to which MSCD meets the criteria of the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association.
5. Achieve reaccreditation.

Specific Objectives

The Steering Committee has adopted the following objectives. It plans to:

1. Encourage clarity and/or revision of the Operational Mission Statement, and encourage the adoption of a vision statement. (Steering Committee)
2. Make the self-study process beneficial for the college.
3. Engage the campus community and provide opportunities for others to be involved. It hopes to use existing structures, committees, and task forces whenever possible.
4. Review the concerns noted in previous accreditations and determine how the college has responded. (Appropriate entities)
5. Review assessment activities in Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. Encourage follow-up, and make recommendations to integrate assessment, program review, and planning.
6. Review MSCD's outreach efforts and determine the outside community's perception of MSCD. (Special Task Force)
7. Determine if the General Studies Program prepares students for the future. (General Studies Committee or Special Task Force)
8. With the approval of the President, ask HLC of NCA for one or more of the following change requests:
 - Offer the Social Work Program (and others?) online
 - Offer the Surveying and Mapping Program by distance delivery
 - Offer courses at the University of Guadalajara and the University of London
9. Determine if MSCD fulfills its mission of offering "high-quality accessible education." That is, ensure that online and other accessible course offerings are of high quality.
10. Determine the campus climate for and perceptions of various campus constituencies. (Various groups)
11. Determine students' perceptions of all aspects of the college. (Review existing survey results.) (Student Government)

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

12. Review the college’s resources and steps the college has taken and can take to improve its resources and at the distribution of resources across the college. *This may be assigned to the Criterion Two group.*

Communication with Campus Community:

1. A member of the Steering Committee will work with @ Metro and the Metropolitan to write up press reports. Items will be published early in the Fall ‘05 semester.
2. Open hearings will be held on the Self-Study Report.

Timelines

Task	Timeline
Steering Committee develops a self-study plan and submits it to Commission staff for review. Steering Committee organizes and selects principal subcommittees	Jan ‘05 - August ‘05
Sub-committees/Task Forces gather data, develop draft reports	<i>August ‘05 - April 1 ‘06</i>
Steering Committee analyzes information prepares rough draft	<i>Jan. ‘06 - August ‘06</i>
Steering Committee circulates and receives reaction to draft report	<i>August ‘06 – Oct. ‘06</i>
Final version of self-study prepared	<i>Oct. ‘06 - Dec. ‘06</i>
Send evaluation materials to team & staff	Early Jan. ‘07
Visit	March 12 - 14, 2007

Special Task Forces or New Committees:

1. Assessment Committees
 - a. School Assessment Committees
 - b. Institutional Assessment Committee
2. Task Force on Engagement and Service: Criterion Five
3. Task Force on Diversity
4. Planning Task Force
5. Task Force for Advising and Transfer Issues
6. Task Force on Complaint and Grievance Policies and Procedures.
7. Online Task Force (for a Change Request)

Committee/Task Force/Organizational Unit Assignments to Accomplish the Above General Guideline: Use existing groups and committees as much as possible.

Liaisons: Liaisons from the Steering Committee will be assigned to work with different groups.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE AND INTEGRATING PLANNING WITH ASSESSMENT, PROGRAM REVIEW, AND THE PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future

The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

An accredited institution

- anticipates emerging factors that may impact its activities e.g., changing technology, demographic shifts, and workforce needs;
- is aware of all the resources it has, the resources support the programs offered, and the resources can be maintained and strengthened;
- measures and therefore knows how well it is doing various activities; and
- **makes budget decisions or sets budget priorities that will help it move towards accomplishing its mission and goals in the light of the emerging factors, existing resources, and quality of its existing operations** (the three bullets above).

Existing Planning:

Many units of the college have plans and do strategic planning. See the Criterion Two Table for examples. Members of the Self-Study Committee have been collecting and noting all the planning done by various units in the past. Existing plans and mission statements from various MSCD units indicate that the college has at least four values or goals (wording needs to be developed):

1. **Accessible** -- in cost, in convenience (availability of courses in different formats), in modified admissions requirements, and in the academic experiences we offer. (Is this the meaning of “**The College of Opportunity**”?)
2. **Engaged or connected** with the community in many ways.
3. **Diversity** -- not only in faculty, staff, and students, but in being an institution that supports it.
4. **High quality** in all areas, academic programs, technology, student services, (want to do the best job)

The label “College of Opportunity” may mean that MSCD tries to meet the needs of all. Being “high quality” may be the lowest budget priority.

PLANNING TASK FORCE

MSCD needs a planning process or document that will link planning with the budget and establish budget priorities. The plan will serve as the umbrella for the plans of all units of the college.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

A new planning process will be established by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the President. The Planning Task Force will develop a Strategic Plan for Academic Affairs that will provide a framework for the plans of other units.

The Planning Task Force might:

1. Determine if the values listed above are the values that MSCD has, determine if the values we have are the best for the college, determine if there should be other values, determine the activities and operations that tie to that value, and recommend priorities.
2. Define or determine how we would recognize “high quality” in various areas.
For example, the quality of an academic program might be determined by the perceived quality of the curriculum, the perceived quality of the facilities (laboratories, library collection, computers, etc.), the perceived quality of the program faculty, the importance of the program to general education, and the community demand for the program.
3. Be sure that program review and other evaluation activities are linked to the budget and planning.
4. Other activities as determined by the President and the Vice President of Academic Affairs

There was a focused visit on institutional planning in 2000 so we may not need to respond separately to the 1997 concern. We will have to respond to the 2000 concern shown below.

Past Concern #2 (1997): The lack of initial involvement of faculty and staff in the early phases of thematic planning at Metropolitan State College of Denver has not fostered faculty and staff ownership of the themes. The next phase of thematic planning should contain processes which nurture broad-based faculty and staff input and support for the themes.

Past Concern #4 (2000): The institution has a complex planning process which requires elaborate communication to keep the many committees and constituent groups involved in detailed plan development and informed of progress and results as the plan is implemented.

Plans relative to Space

The **Space and Facilities Planning Committee**, chaired by Interim VP Natalie Lutes, will be asked to respond to Past Concern #1.

It is hoped that the Committee would be provided a list of academic programs’ needs for space and would organize those needs into planning documents. The space needs would include space needed for instruction in general as well as special needs of individual programs, including administrative support space. One member would be a liaison to AHEC’s Space Planning Committee.

Items that need to be covered are: Tivoli renovation, King Center, Administration Building, new parking garage, Plaza Building renovation, and, perhaps the CVA. Handicap accessibility and parking need to be kept in mind.

Past Concern #1 (1997): While the physical resources of the Auraria Higher Education Center are well maintained and well suited to the needs of the three institutions, space allocation is of major concern for Metropolitan State College. The need for new space includes, but is not limited to, faculty office space,

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

student service space, classroom facilities, an art gallery, a theatre, and an auditorium for the performing arts.

Past Concern # 10 (1997): Seating in the Auraria library accommodates only 4% of the total student population on the Auraria Campus. Library hours have been reduced to 80.5 per week despite a large number of evening and weekend classes offered by Metropolitan State College. Funding per FTE student for the Auraria Library is below all other four-year colleges and universities in Colorado.

Plans relative to Enrollment Management and the Performance Contract

Outside agencies, e.g., HLC of the NCA, the CCHE, expect MSCD to strive to meet the terms of the performance contract. Plans should be established to accomplish this. The Task Force on Student Success and Admission Index, which issued a report in February 2005, made suggestions on how to address this. *The recommendations of this Task Force are on hold.*

Performance Contract 1.1 Retention Rates: By December 31, 2008, the Institution shall increase its fall-to-fall retention rate for first-time, full-time, degree-seeking freshman from 60.8% to 62.8%. The Institution shall increase its fall-to-fall retention rate for first-time, full-time freshman, including transfers to other institutions, from 71.1% to 73.1%.

Performance Contract 2.1 Graduation Rates By December 31, 2008, the Institution shall increase its six-year graduation rate for first-time, full-time, degree-seeking freshmen students from 20.8% to 21.8%.

Past Concern #8 (1997): There is concern about past declining enrollments at Metropolitan State College of Denver. An increase in enrollment in Fall 1996 over Fall 1995 bodes well, but such increases must be continued to alleviate the concern. There is also concern for second year retention rates of 57% and 5th year graduation rates of less than 3%.

The Office of Institutional Research Data Books can be used to show the trends in enrollment and retention.

ONLINE TASK FORCE (WORKING ON THE CHANGE REQUEST) (Working on the theme of high quality and accessible education)

This task force should

1. Determine the tasks that need to be done to request a change in status from the HLC to offer online programs and *make a recommendation on proceeding towards that goal*. Asking for a change in status must be approved by the President.
2. Recommend a timeline for completion of the needed tasks.
3. Write up the Documentation to Support the Change Request.
4. Tie in the above with the implementation of the recommendations of the Online Task Force and the Strategic Plan for Online Education.
5. Determine what needs to be done to make the online program of consistent high quality and accessible.

Note: The goal or vision of MSCD relative to online instruction needs to be clarified and agreed upon by the College. The Policy Committee of the Online Task Force wrote in its Final Draft “Web-based instruction is part of Metro’s overall course offering strategy and it is not Metro’s intention to promote the acquisition of a Metro degree in a totally online manner. Therefore, it is not Metro’s intention to make all student services available

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

online. Certain programs, courses, and services will require on-campus attendance.” At the same time, some academic programs have been working to place all their courses online with the intent that students could take that major online. Students can complete their General Studies coursework online. If students can complete all of the coursework online, then why does MSCD not ask for a change in status? *This needs to be resolved.*

Past Advice and Suggestion #1 (2000): As the institution expands the number of on-line courses and programs it offers, there is an increasing need to fully develop the policies and procedures which define relationships with faculty and regulate the conditions under which these activities will occur.

Past Advice and Suggestion #2 (2000): The institution has plans to offer on-line programs, Accounting and Criminal Justice, and, potentially to offer these programs outside of the MSCD service area and beyond the state of Colorado. **As these plans are developed, the institution is advised to consult with staff from the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education since Commission approval will be required.**

TASK FORCE ON COMPLAINT AND GRIEVANCE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

(PART OF CRITERION ONE)

This Task Force will collect information on the different complaint and grievance policies and procedures that exist at MSCD: faculty complaints about students, student complaints about faculty, student complaints about students, safety concerns, grading concerns, etc.

1. Are all processes clearly communicated to faculty and students?
2. Is some effort made to determine if the processes are effective? If not, the Task Force should make recommendations.
3. SPAN (Student Problem Action Network) seems prepared to handle most student complaints; a separate committee is established for each complaint. Is SPAN effective? How is its effectiveness determined? Can SPAN provide data on the number of complaints and grievances?
4. How many grade appeals have there been? How many were sustained?

Past Concern #3 (1997): The Metropolitan State College grievance procedures lack faculty input into the process of resolution of a complaint and are not in congruence with the Trustees procedures for dealing with grievances.

ADDRESSING ADMINISTRATIVE STABILITY

Past Concern #9 (1997): The high rate of turnover among administrators at the level of President through Deans and Directors has continued since the last focused review. The turnover has brought many changes and new initiatives which, while sound, are resulting in a high level of anxiety among long-time faculty and staff. **This resulted in a Focused Visit in 2000, but even though it was addressed at that time will probably need to be addressed again.**

Core Component 2b: The organization’s resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

It could be argued that part of the resource base is administrative stability. It also can be argued that administrative stability is needed for planning.

Plan: The Steering Committee will work with the President to address this concern in the Self-Study document.

ADDRESSING SHARED GOVERNANCE

The following concerns will need to be addressed in the Self-Study:

Past Concern (Challenge) #1 (2003): A not unexpected challenge faced by the institution and the board is the need to address the inevitable issues arising from the transition from a long-standing governance model to a new independent model. The issues and needs for sustained and deliberate communication, shared decision making involved faculty, staff, and students, for the building of a good working rapport between the board and the campus constituencies, and for a deliberate process that attends to the academic culture require sustained attention in this transition period.

Past Concern (Challenge) #3 (2003): A perception exists on the part of faculty and staff that the new board of trustees does not endorse or fully support the principles of shared governance and involvement of campus constituencies in decision-making processes. (p. 20).

Past Concern (Challenge) #4 (2003): The new board policies have created wide-spread concern about the lack of campus involvement in the processes developing the draft and about the impact the draft policies will have on faculty and staff. At the time of the Team visit, the board was compiling significant input solicited from faculty and staff on the draft in preparation for a campus-wide hearing and any subsequent revisions it chooses to make to the policies. A notable challenge for the board will be to demonstrate that the input from the constituencies has been taken into account in subsequent revisions and that concerted dialogue occurs about some of the more controversial policies affecting the work of faculty and staff.

Advice and Suggestion for Improvement #5 (2003): The team recommends that the administration and the board develop means by which the change to an independent board can be assessed and evaluated. The solicitation of campus responses to the revised board policy manual and the open meeting held on April 2, 2003, were important steps to assess one aspect of the change. *The College might consider using other strategies as well, such as focus group evaluations and surveys to assess further the campus perspectives about the board and the change in governance.* The board could consider hiring an independent evaluator to provide an objective assessment of the board and its relationship to the campus community. Through regular evaluations and assessments, the board will demonstrate to the campus a sincere interest in improving the board and its alliance with the campus constituencies. In this transition and in a time of a certain amount of anxiety about the role of the board, assessment and evaluation will be viewed positively and will provide the campus on-going opportunities for offering feedback and contributing to the strengthening of the independent board and its governance of the institution.

In addition, the following core component must be addressed:

Core Component 1d: The organization's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.

[Shared governance has been a long-standing attribute of most colleges and universities in the United States. Whatever the governance and administrative structures, they need to enhance the organization's capacity to fulfill its mission. p. 3.2.4]

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

The Trustees Operational Mission Statement contains the following statement about shared governance “. . . faculty, staff and student participation through shared governance is encouraged and valued.”

The executive officers of the Faculty Senate, Student Government Assembly, Classified Staff Council, Council of Chairs, and the Council of Administrators should be asked to report if they believe they are appropriately involved in decision-making processes. That is, they need to be asked to comment on the above concerns. The officers may want to survey members of their group to determine their constituents' views about shared governance and other matters. If they do, help should be provided in choosing, creating, and conducting the survey. (*Institutional research will be able to provide some assistance if the surveys are a college priority. Psychology faculty and faculty in some other programs might also be willing to provide some assistance with creating surveys so they are unbiased and meet the needs of the group conducting the survey.*)

If surveys are used, the representative from the group on the HLC-NCA Steering Committee should be involved in the creation of the survey so that there is some consistency and collaboration on the survey and the goals of the Steering Committee are met.

The groups might want to ask other questions, such as whether or not MSCD provides effective staffing and support for its learning resources, e.g., laboratories, libraries, art and music studios. Information about past surveys will be provided.

Other: The board should be asked to respond to the “Advice and Suggestion for Improvement #5” made in 2003. A survey of Board members might be conducted to determine their impressions of shared governance.

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEES

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

An Institutional Assessment Committee should be established that will:

1. Review the report of the Task Force on Student Learning Assessment.
2. Review the results of the NSSE and Noel Levitz surveys to determine the ways in which MSCD could improve and enhance student learning. The committee should also determine if there are other surveys that would be better to use and/or if questions specific to MSCD should be added to existing surveys.
3. Review the response rate to electronic surveys versus paper surveys and make a recommendation.
4. Review appropriate policies at the college to determine if those policies help student learning. For example, does the current drop/add policy promote student learning or does it primarily increase student satisfaction?
5. Review the methods used to evaluate or assess non-academic units (units not in academic departments) and the follow-up that results from the assessment. Make recommendations for improvement of existing evaluation procedures if appropriate.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

6. Work with different non-academic units to determine the ways in which they contribute to student learning and how they assess their contributions to that learning. Determine if there is any commonality of student learning goals across different units. The chief contribution of a unit may be to provide the needed support and/or environment to enhance student learning.
7. Make non-academic units, as well as academic units, aware of the goals of the General Studies Program and ask if the units contribute to students achieving any of the goals.
8. Examine how co-curricular activities sponsored by non-academic units contribute to student learning and how they are assessed. For example, what are the student learning goals for the Diversity Program and how are they being assessed? What changes have been made as a result of the assessment?
9. Consider creating a program review process for appropriate non-academic units if it seems advisable.
10. Encourage communication with the University of Colorado, especially UCD, other nearby institutions, and CCD about the performance of students as they move from institution to institution.
 - Set up a mechanism/survey whereby MSCD can receive feedback about the performance of its graduates who attend nearby higher education institutions to obtain post-baccalaureate degrees. Communicate the information to the academic programs.
 - Examine the performance of students who took remedial work at CCD and how they subsequently perform at MSCD.
 - Additional information might also be gained by looking at the course enrollment patterns in pooled courses, both directions (MSCD to UCD and UCD to MSCD).

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND SCHOOL ASSESSMENT COMMITTEES:

The following tasks need to be accomplished. It is recommended that each school establish at least one assessment committee, which may be an existing group. The dean will select the individuals who will serve on the committee(s) and, if necessary, those members will be provided with information about assessment prior to undertaking their task. The purpose of the committee/group will be to help program faculty with the following tasks. The focus will be on using assessment to improve student learning. One goal will be to increase faculty and staff awareness of the assessment of student learning outcomes and the importance for using assessment results to improve student learning.

The following tasks connected with assessment need to be accomplished.

Program faculty as a group (not just one or two) will be requested to:

1. Review the student learning goals (assessment goals or outcomes) and their assessment methodology for their major. A separate set of goals for each concentration within the major may be needed for effective assessment.
 - The goals for multidisciplinary majors, e.g., environmental science, should be reviewed by faculty who offer courses for the program.
 - Student learning goals should be placed on the program's Web site.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

2. Answer the following questions:
 - a. Which General Studies student learning goals are reinforced by courses in your program? Are they reinforced in your senior experience courses? [The General Studies goals will be made available.]
 - b. Students' achievement of which of your program' student learning goals is enhanced by their participation in an internship, practicum, cooperative education, or a service-learning course. How do you evaluate the effectiveness of those experiences?
 - c. How do courses in your program enhance students' preparation for a life time of learning and how do or could program faculty assess seniors' preparation for a life time of learning? Is this done in the senior experience course? [MSCD states that it prepares graduates for a "lifetime of learning." This has been interpreted to mean that students have developed the skills of critical inquiry and a positive attitude towards the acquisition of a breadth of knowledge.]
 - d. How do you determine that your potential graduates have the type of technological skills they will need in the future? That is, how does your program ensure that graduates can succeed in a technological society? [MSCD states that it prepares graduates to succeed in a *technological* society. If your program does not have access to the new technology needed to prepare students adequately, that should be noted and placed in planning documents. Are arrangements made for students to obtain access to this technology at other locations?]
 - e. Do you sponsor co-curricular activities that contribute to students' achievement of some student learning goals? Which activities contribute to which goals? How do you measure the effectiveness of the co-curricular activity?
 - f. What does your program do to ensure that graduates have gained the skills and knowledge they will need in a *global* society?
3. Develop student learning goals for all certificate and minor programs during 2005-06
4. Develop methods of assessing student learning goals for all certificate and minor programs during 2006-07.
5. Share and discuss the assessment results with faculty and classified staff in the program.
6. Share the assessment results with students and others, including their advisory council members if the program has an advisory council.

Role of the School Assessment Committee:

As mentioned above, the purpose of the School Assessment Committee will be to help program faculty with the above. The School Assessment Committees will serve as a resource and work with the chairs and program faculty. More specifically the School Assessment Committee will:

1. Review the student learning outcomes and assessment methodologies used by each program in that school. The purpose of the review will be to improve the statements of the student learning outcomes if possible, e.g., are the statements measurable; and, if appropriate, to provide suggestions about additional methods of assessing whether or not students meet the stated goals.
2. Encourage the use of direct measures of student learning.
3. Work with faculty on their consideration of and responses to items 2-9.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

4. Recommend a common place on the school's website design where student learning goals for the major and certificate will be posted.
5. Work with chairs and the deans to ensure that assessment results are shared with program faculty.
6. Encourage faculty to share the results of their assessment activities with their external advisory councils if appropriate.
7. Review the results of the NSSE Survey pertaining to academic and intellectual experiences and, if appropriate, make recommendations to faculty in the school.

Some items to discuss are the following:

- If it is determined that sufficient useful data could be obtained from GRE, LSAT, and MCAT scores, encourage students to have the scores sent to MSCD and entered into Banner. Consider paying the fee for students. *MSCD gets MCAT scores – or knows how to get them -- and may get GRE scores if we ask. Students can request that the GRE scores be sent to four places. To have the scores sent to an additional place costs \$15. It costs students \$30 to send MCAT scores to different institutions.*
- Can and is PRAXIS data used for improvement? Is PLACE data being used for improvement? Is it still being collected?

Past Concern #5 (1997): Assessment is in initial phases of development. Many apparently desirable elements are in use. Much refinement is needed and results should be utilized in the overall planning process. A higher level of involvement, understanding, and support by faculty should be achieved.

Past Suggestion #3 (1997): Strengthen assessment efforts by using assessment results in the School and College planning processes. Establish a standing faculty assessment committee with a faculty coordinator, to be appointed by the Provost, to gain greater involvement, understanding, and support by faculty. Assign the committee responsibility to fully institutionalize and implement the approved Assessment Plan.

Performance Contract 4.1 To the extent possible and based upon available data, the Institution shall report annually, in accordance with the Commission reporting schedule, on student achievement by providing data on outcomes on licensure, professional, graduate school admission, and other examinations taken by baccalaureate graduates and/or career and technical graduates employed or continuing their education.

GENERAL STUDIES ASSESSMENT

The existing General Studies Committee should reevaluate MSCD's current method of assessing General Studies. It should consider the following questions:

1. Can the current assessment methodologies be improved?
2. Is there a way to obtain information that will help MSCD "close the loop" and improve its general education program?
3. A stated goal of MSCD's General Studies Program is to "prepare its graduates for a lifetime of learning." (HLC interpretation of how students are prepared: how does your program promote and assess students' development of the skills of inquiry and of a positive attitude towards the acquisition of a breadth of knowledge?) Currently MSCD assesses attainment of this goal by program review surveys. The committee should review the survey question, results, and determine if additional measures are needed. *Discuss with the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.*

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

4. Our role and mission states that MSCD “prepares students for successful careers, postgraduate education, and **lifelong learning in a multicultural, global, and technological society.**” Currently, MSCD also assesses attainment of these goals by its program review surveys. The committee should review the survey results and determine if additional assessment measures are needed. Preparation for success in a multicultural society will be addressed by the Multicultural Committee.
5. The committee should also examine the impact of the State-Guaranteed General Education Programs on attainment of the General Studies goals.

Past Concern #4 (1997): The current general studies program at Metropolitan State College of Denver is based upon a broadly stated philosophy (page 44 in the Course Catalog) and goals (as stated in the Self-Study Report). These published statements do not clearly delineate the important skills and student learning outcomes expected from general education. Statements contained in the NCA Assessment Plan are more appropriate, but these are not in published documents nor do they seem to drive the general studies curriculum. [They are now in the Catalog.] Consequently, an excessive number of courses can be counted in the general studies program. This large number of courses makes it difficult, if not impossible, to develop a multiple-measures approach for assessing student academic achievement and generating assessment results that can be used to improve the general studies program.

Past Suggestion # 2 (1997): Review and revise, as needed, the philosophy and goals for the general studies program so that the important skills and student learning outcomes expected from general education are clearly delineated. Develop curricular offerings in line with the goals. Develop multiple-measured approaches to assessing student academic achievement in meeting the goals of the general studies program.

Performance Contract 4.2 The Governing Board agrees to cooperate with the Department [CCHE] in developing and implementing standard methods to assess students’ knowledge and improve the delivery of content taught in courses approved for the Institution’s general education core curriculum. These programs shall be in place no later than January 1, 2007. The Department and the Governing Board agree that implementation of these assessment methods is contingent on additional resources being made available for these purposes.

MULTICULTURAL ASSESSMENT

The Multicultural Committee should determine measurable goals of the Multicultural Requirement especially with respect to preparing students to live in a multicultural society and make recommendations on how achievement of those goals can be measured. (*Surveys are currently used.*)

ASSESSMENT OF DIVERSITY – DIVERSITY TASK FORCE (PART OF CRITERION ONE AND TWO)

The purpose of this Task Force will be to evaluate the effectiveness of MSCD programs used to increase diversity and/or to retain students, faculty, and staff of diverse ethnicities. More specifically, the charge to the Task Force will be to:

1. Address Past Concern #3 stated below.
2. Follow up on the work of the Equity Scorecard Task Force.
3. Follow up on the work of the *ad hoc* Senate Committee on Faculty of Color and Tenure-Track Faculty.
4. Gather any additional data needed on the diversity of faculty, staff, students, and administrators.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

5. Review the Diversity Reports sent to CCHE.
6. Gather information on the strategies used to increase diversity and the success of those strategies. (See Diversity Reports to CCHE.)
7. Examine the measures used to assess the effectiveness of the MSCD programs that are aimed at increasing the diversity of faculty, staff, and students and make recommendations.
8. Determine if there are elements of the college that do not adequately support individuals of diverse ethnicities and recommend steps that could be taken to increase support and thereby increase retention.

Past Suggestion #4 (1997): Develop strategies for recruitment and retention of minority students into the Honors Program.

Past Suggestion #6 (1997): Continue efforts to recruit and retain minority faculty.

Past Concern #3 (2000): While the institution has had success in generally furthering its diversity agenda, it has not hired the number of minority faculty and staff reflective of the student body and the percentage of minorities in the greater Denver area.

Past Suggestion #4 (2000): More minority faculty and staff should be hired to more closely approximate the number of minorities in the student body and surrounding community.

TASK FORCE ON ADVISING AND TRANSFER ISSUES

The goal of this Task Force will be to:

1. Address Past Concern #6. See below.
2. Review and consider implementation of the recommendation of the Task Force on Student Learning Assessment connected with the assessment of advising.
3. Review and encourage implementation of the Task Force on Student Success and Admission Index.
4. Review the report of the Advising Consultant, the results of questions about advising and transfer on the NSSE and the Noel-Levitz Surveys, and other information about advising and transfer, e.g, program review survey results.
5. Review the use of the Tracking System and the implementation of required advising at 60 hours by the School of Business to determine if either should be used college wide.
6. Assess the impact of CAPP and WebCAPP on advising. Has the development of CAPP been beneficial?
7. Review the First-Year Program, placement testing, and “developmental advising” in connection with an answer to the following HLC-NCA *Example of evidence*:
Advising systems focus on student learning, including the mastery of skills required for academic success.
8. Review the impact of the state-guaranteed general education courses and the 60+60 agreements on students, faculty, staff, and on academic programs. Are the rules clear to students? Are the new guidelines benefiting students? Are most faculty aware of the agreements?
9. Study how well MSCD is following its transfer agreements.
10. Make recommendations for improvement of advising.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

Past Concern # 6 (1997): Academic advisement at Metropolitan State College of Denver is not coordinated nor are there clearly articulated guidelines and expected outcomes in harmony with what the State Legislature has mandated. Academic advisement has insufficient resources to deal adequately with overall advisement.

Core Component 5c: *The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.*

HLC-NCA states: “The team will review the organization’s transfer of credit policies as a part of its visit. The Commission encourages organizations to review transfer policies and procedures periodically to ensure clarity for those who administer them, for the students who follow them, and for employers and other stakeholders who refer to them, as well as the consistency of their interpretation and application through the institution. The organization should also consider whether its policies and procedures are responsive to new types of learning opportunities outside institutions of higher education.”

TASK FORCE ON ENGAGEMENT AND SERVICE (PART OF CRITERION FIVE)

The purpose of this task force will be to collect information that shows how MSCD meets aspects of Criterion Five. It should:

- Determine how various MSCD units discern the needs of the external constituents that they serve.
- Determine if the services/engagement opportunities provided by MSCD are valued by internal and external constituencies.
- Determine if the ways students can be involved in service learning are valued.
- Collect information on how co-curricular activities engage students, staff, administrators, and faculty with external communities.
- Determine if MSCD has a process for identifying and prioritizing the needs of its constituencies. Indicate instances where MSCD does not have the capacity or resources to meet the needs of the community.

To accomplish its charge, it should:

1. Ask Extended Campus/Metro Education Ventures to describe how it decides to offer extension, continuing education, or customized training courses. How does it discern the needs of MSCD’s constituents and how does it determine that it has the capacity to respond? How does it evaluate the effectiveness of its offerings? How do we know that the structures and processes of Metro Education Ventures are effective and valued?
2. Work with and obtain information from Academic Affairs and the academic deans about substantial services and engagement opportunities (those that require significant personnel time or funds) provided by the schools and their departments. How are the services and engagement opportunities assessed? How is the feedback used? Are those services and engagement opportunities valued?
3. Work with the other vice presidents (outside of Academic Affairs) to locate units of the college that provide service and engagement opportunities for MSCD’s constituents and communities. If the services are substantial, then the task force should inquire how the service/engagement opportunities are assessed and/or encourage assessment in the future. Are the services valued? [Contact should be maintained with the Institutional Assessment Committee.]

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

4. Ask Cooperative Education how it discerns the needs of the community and how it determines that MSCD has the capacity to respond. In what ways are the cooperative education experiences evaluated by students, faculty, and employers? Are changes made as a result?
5. Encourage OIR and Cooperative Education to continue to calculate the performance indicator that determines how many graduates had an internship or cooperative education experience.
6. Determine all the ways students can be involved in service learning and determine if all ways are appropriate.
7. Make recommendations regarding MSCD's engagement with and service to the community.

SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS, PROFESSIONAL STUDIES, AND LETTERS, ARTS, AND SCIENCES

ITEMS REQUESTED FROM PROGRAM FACULTY

Assessment (See SCHOOL ASSESSMENT AND SCHOOL ASSESSMENT COMMITTEES, page 8)

Effective Teaching: Qualified Faculty and Up-to-date Syllabi

- Updated syllabi in electronic form for all catalog courses. Updated is defined to mean having a signature date of 2000.
- Updated résumés from all full-time faculty in electronic form. Schools and programs may determine their own format. They must include at a minimum: the educational background of the faculty, professional experience, major professional development activities since 2000, and major service activities since 2000. Major consulting activities since 2000 (if any) may be included. Résumés will not be needed until 2006-07.
- Résumés of persons who are teaching at the off-campus sites. Copies of the résumés should be at the off-campus sites. Résumés will not be needed until 2006-07.

Annual Reports:

The following should be supplied to the dean for him/her to summarize. This information should be included in the program's/department's Annual Report.

1. Professional development activities of faculty, both those activities that are supported financially or by reassigned time, and those that are not. The support that was given should be described.
2. Faculty's participation in professional organizations
3. Honors and awards received.
4. A description of important community service provided by faculty, staff and students.
5. A description of co-curricular activities that contribute to student learning, e.g., visiting artists, hosting speakers and conferences. Explain the activities' relationship to the in-class curriculum, e.g., the goals for student learning, and how the activities supported and enhanced student learning.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

6. A description of any new innovative teaching practices or innovative technology that faculty used for the first time during the year to enhance student learning along with an analysis of its effectiveness.
7. A description of the service and engagement opportunities provided to the community that required significant personnel time or funds. The method by which the service/engagement opportunity was assessed should be described. Results should be provided along with proposed changes.
8. Evidence that the services/engagement activities provided were valued by the internal and external constituencies. *Numbers attending can be used as one measure.*
9. A description of the needs of the community that the program cannot meet because it does not have the resources to meet the needs.

Program Review and Accreditation Self Studies

The following documents/information will be taken from materials submitted for program review and/or accreditation self-studies as much as possible.

- Mission statements provided for program review will be assumed to be each program's current mission statement. Program mission statement should be in line with college and school's mission statements. If a mission statement is revised, the revision should be provided to Academic Affairs for insertion in the program review notebooks.
- Program review and accreditation self-studies will be linked to planning. Follow-up reports for program review and accreditation will be important.
- Information that can/will be obtained from the Program Review Narratives (*Some effort may be made to collect electronic versions of the program review narratives. Programs that are accredited by national accrediting agencies will not have the narrative completed.*)
 1. How the program determines the *curricular* needs of the external community that it serves. By an external advisory group? Other?
 2. How the program determines the *non-curricular* needs of the external community that it serves. (*May need this earlier than on the program review cycle.*)
 3. A description of new technologies and their use in the program. If the program does not have access to a new technology needed to prepare students adequately, that should be noted and placed in planning documents. If arrangements are made for students to gain access to this technology at other locations, that should be described. (*May need this earlier than on a program review cycle.*)
 4. A description of any substantial innovative teaching practices or innovative technology that program faculty started using during the review period along with an analysis of the effectiveness of the new practice or technology.
 5. A description of resources, e.g., labs, libraries, used at other institutions or locations. (*May need this earlier than on a program review cycle.*)
 6. The relationship of the program to the General Studies Program and how the program develops students' ability to contribute to and succeed in the larger society.
 7. A description of the General Studies student learning goals that are reinforced in the program, e.g., the ability to write clearly. In which courses are they reinforced? (*May need earlier -- see assessment.*)

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

8. A description of how courses in the program enhance students' preparation for a life time of learning and how faculty assess seniors' preparation for a life time of learning? Is this done in the senior experience course? (Students' preparedness for a life time of learning has been interpreted to mean that students have developed the skills of critical inquiry and a positive attitude towards the acquisition of a breadth of knowledge.) (*May need earlier -- see assessment.*)
9. An explanation of how the program helps students develop the skills and attitudes fundamental to the responsible application of knowledge.
10. A description of the important ethical issues for the program. How are these addressed?
11. Steps taken to ensure the ethical conduct of students and faculty.
12. How students' participation in an internship, practicum, cooperative education or a service-learning course helps them achieve one or more of the program's student learning goals. Which goals? How is the effectiveness of those experiences evaluated? (*Done originally for assessment*)
13. How faculty determine that potential graduates have the technological skills and/or the type of technological skills they will need in the future? That is, how do program faculty ensure that graduates can succeed in a technological society? (*Done originally for assessment*)
14. A description of the impact the 60+60 agreement has had on student mobility and academic quality
15. A description of the impact the state-guaranteed general education courses have had on student mobility and academic quality

Other

1. Copies of all reports by external consultants since 2000? aside from consultants connected with program review and accreditation.

ITEMS REQUESTED FROM THE DEAN

1. Role and Mission Statement for the school
2. Goals for the school
3. Latest Plan

Each dean will be asked to provide a summary or overview describing:

1. The major accomplishments and changes in the school and its academic programs since 2003.
2. Innovative programs in the school.
3. How resources were allocated to address concerns about quality. In the academic area, this task is important with respect to program review recommendations. A description of how one-time funds were spent during 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06 and how the allocations related to the program review recommendations should be provided.
4. The services and/or engagement opportunities provided to the community by programs in the school. If the services/engagement opportunities require significant personnel time or funds, then the method by which they are assessed and/or will be assessed in the future should be described along with the results of the assessment

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

activity. Evidence that the services/engagement activities are valued should also be provided.

5. Visions for the future services and/or engagement opportunities with the community.
6. Past and future efforts to increase diversity among the staff.
7. The school's commitment to professional development for faculty and staff.
8. The school's relationship to the other two schools and the vision for the future. The relationship of specific academic programs may need to be addressed.
9. The school's relationship to the other vice presidential areas, e.g., Student Services, and any changes desired in the future.
10. The school's off-campus offerings and plans for the future.
11. An evaluation of the services provided to the school and how those could be enhanced.
12. An evaluation of the library and the services provided by the library.
13. Ways that technology could be used to make the school work more effectively and efficiently. Comment on possible innovative uses of technology.
14. Any concerns raised since 1998 by accrediting agencies of programs in the school and how those concerns have been addressed.
15. The recommendations of external consultants brought in to assess certain activities since 1998 and the resulting changes.
16. The consequences of having limited resources. In particular, the dean should describe
 - a. alternative sources of funds being sought by the school. Information on how successful the Grant Mentoring Program has been.
 - b. the school's funding priorities.
 - c. what activities may be curtailed due to a lack of resources or the procedures used to determine funding priorities.

Other:

Chairs need to be encouraged to take steps to ensure that faculty teach as specified on the official course syllabus. Electronic copies of official syllabi are being made available.

REVIEW OF QUALIFIED PART-TIME FACULTY BY SCHOOL

Core Component 3b states: "The organization values and supports effective teaching." Part of the description of 3b is that "Organizations providing higher learning must have qualified faculties . . ."

The following are concerns from past accreditation visits:

Past Concern #7 (1997): The institution currently employs 131 part-time faculty who hold, as the highest degree, the bachelor's degree. These faculty are teaching courses in bachelor's degree programs including engineering technology, art, music, business, computing, and modern languages.

Past Suggestion #5 (1997): Reduce the reliance on part-time instructors, especially in program areas where instruction by part-time faculty exceeds that by full-time faculty.

Past Concern #1 (2000): Many adjunct faculty are employed by MSCD, some of whom do not have the proper credentials for the subject matter and level of the courses they are teaching and often do not have the proper space in which to meet students and fulfill their other responsibilities while on campus.

Past Concern #2 (2000): Because of the reliance on part-time faculty, frequently students do not have sufficient opportunity to interact with faculty.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

Past Advice and Suggestion #3 (2000): More attention needs to be given to the ratio of instruction provided by part-time instructors, particularly when the percentage of credits taught is greater than that of full-time faculty.

Performance Contract 3.1: By July 1, 2007, the Governing Board shall require that the proportion of core courses taught by the highest quality and/or most qualified faculty, as identified by the Institution, in those departments of academic units offering core courses, is equivalent to that in undergraduate core courses.

Each school will be asked to:

1. Determine which areas are not meeting the standards for qualified faculty.
2. Determine which disciplines have undue reliance on part-time faculty.
3. Prepare recommendations or a plan to address these concerns.

Deans will determine who will be responsible for undertaking this effort.

SPECIAL SCHOOL CONSIDERATIONS

Professional Studies and LAS

Describe MSCD's connections and relationships with the K-12 systems, including describing and listing the grants that we have and have had with K-12 partners.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Need:

1. Betsy Zeller to provide a report that contains evidence that we have fulfilled our grant responsibilities. (Criterion One – 1d)
2. Perhaps to address technological advances, we need to have a summary list of the special computer labs and/or special software packages that have been purchased for different programs. *Help from IT*

VICE PRESIDENTIAL AREAS EXCEPT ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE -- STUDENT SERVICES – INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT – INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Items requested from each vice presidential area:

- Role and mission statement and/or vision statements, purposes, goals for the area.
- Mission statements, vision statements, purposes, and/or goals, as appropriate, for units under the VP.
- Latest long range/strategic plan and goals.
- Copies of all available reports by external consultants since 1998.
- Updated résumés of persons who report to the VP. Résumés are not needed until January 2007.

Responsibility of the Vice President

Each vice president will be asked to provide a report describing:

1. The major accomplishments and changes in the vice presidential area since 2000.
2. How the area does evaluation and planning.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

3. Professional development opportunities provided to staff in the unit aside from those opportunities provided college-wide.
4. Past and future efforts to increase diversity among the staff.
5. The services and/or engagement opportunities provided to the community by units in the vice presidential area. If the services/engagement opportunities require significant personnel time or funds, then the method by which they are assessed and/or will be assessed in the future should be described along with the results of the assessment activity. Evidence that the services/engagement activities are valued should also be provided.
6. The changes that resulted from the recommendations of external consultants brought in to examine a unit.
7. The area's relationship with other programs and services relevant to the area, including the other vice presidential areas.
8. The area's relationship to AHEC -- difficulties, advantages.
9. The ramifications of having limited resources. In particular, the vice president should describe:
 - a. alternative sources of funds being sought by the VP area.
 - b. the area's funding priorities and the procedures used to determine funding priorities.
 - c. the activities that may be curtailed due to a lack of resources.
10. Including other comments deemed appropriate.

If desired, a vice president might establish a Vice Presidential Self-Study Committee (VPSSC) consisting primarily of members of the area. The Steering Committee recommends that the committee be broadly representative of the area, i.e., that it include persons at different levels, e.g., classified, mid-level administrators, higher-level administrators. If appropriate, consideration should be given to including alumni. A major purpose of the VPSSC would be to review and evaluate the VP area. The committee should take an honest but critical look at the programs and services provided within the area. Recommendations for improvement are highly desirable in any self study process. This self-study committee should, to some extent, determine the scope of its self-study. However, it is encouraged to do the following, although it is not limited to these suggestions.

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of the organizational/committee structure of the area and make recommendation for improvement.
2. Evaluate the professional development procedures and opportunities within the area and describe improvements, if any, that could be made.
3. Comment on ways that technology could be used to make the area work more effectively and efficiently. Comment on possible innovative uses of technology.
4. Discuss concerns raised by accrediting, governing, or regulating agencies of programs and services in the VP area, if any. How have the concerns been addressed?

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSEMBLY (SGA)

The following are only some of the items that will be asked of the Student Government Assembly. Other questions will be asked after the student government is reconstituted.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

The Student Government Assembly with guidance and assistance from Student Services will be asked to provide:

1. The mission and goals of the SGA. The goals should be meaningful and achievable, and SGA officers should determine how they will know they have achieved their goals.
2. A description of how they communicate with their student constituency to share information and solicit feedback about student issues and concerns.
3. A description of their interaction with SACAB, the Student Advisory Council to the Auraria Board.
4. A description of their relationship with the UCD and CCD student governments.
5. Copies of SGA's
 - Constitution
 - Policies and Procedures
 - List of committees upon which they serve
 - Minutes of meetings of the SGA since 2003
 - Resolutions passed by the Student body and student referenda
 - Other official documents deemed important to include.

FACULTY SENATE

Ask the Faculty Senate to:

1. Approve the revised role and mission statement for MSCD or suggested modifications of the wording.
2. Report if they believe they are now appropriately involved in decision-making processes. That is, the officers need to comment on the shared governance “challenges” or concerns #1, 3, and 4 raised by HLC-NCA in 2003. See page 6.
3. Survey members of their group to determine their constituents’ views about shared governance and other matters if they so desire. If they do, help will be provided in choosing, creating, and conducting the survey.* Copies of surveys conducted during the last self-study will be made available and it is recommended that the Senate leaders review those surveys. If surveys are used, the representative from the group on the HLC-NCA Steering Committee should be involved in the creation of the survey so that there is some consistency and collaboration on the survey and the goals of the Steering Committee are met. (Institutional research will be able to provide some assistance if the surveys are a college priority. Psychology faculty and faculty in some other programs might also be willing to provide some assistance with creating surveys so they are unbiased and meet the needs of the group conducting the survey.)
4. Ask other questions that might be helpful to the self-study such as if
 - MSCD consistently implements clear and fair policies regarding the rights and responsibilities of faculty.
 - MSCD provides effective staffing and support for its learning resources, e.g., laboratories, libraries, art and music studios.
 - MSCD supports professional development opportunities and makes them available to all of its administrators, faculty, and staff.

Additional questions may be suggested by the Steering Committee. Consideration should be given to asking faculty about their perceptions of the Senate’s strengths and weaknesses.

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

5. If considered desirable, reexamine the tenure/retention/promotion process to determine if any changes should be made. If there are no problems or if the outstanding issues have recently been discussed, there is no need to duplicate the effort.
6. Provide copies of the
 - Constitution and bylaws
 - Minutes of meetings of the Faculty Senate and the Curriculum Committee since 2003.
 - Resolutions passed
 - Other documents, studies, or surveys deemed important

* Help will be provided in choosing, creating, and conducting the survey the Faculty Senate wishes to conduct. The main responsibilities of the Senate will be to (a) choose and/or create an appropriate survey with help from OIR and (b) interpret the results. The basic statistics will be provided by OIR.

COUNCIL OF CHAIRS

Ask the Council of Chairs, in consultation with its members, to:

1. Approve the revised role and mission statement for MSCD or suggested modifications of the wording.
2. Report if they believe they are now appropriately involved in decision-making processes. That is, the officers need to comment on the shared governance “challenges” or concerns #1, 3, and 4 raised by HLC-NCA in 2003. See page 6.
3. Survey members of their group to determine their constituents’ views about shared governance and other matters if they so desire. If they do, help will be provided in choosing, creating, and conducting the survey. If surveys are used, the representative from the group on the HLC-NCA Steering Committee should be involved in the creation of the survey so that there is some consistency and collaboration on the survey and the goals of the Steering Committee are met. (Institutional research will be able to provide some assistance if the surveys are a college priority. Psychology faculty and faculty in some other programs might also be willing to provide some assistance with creating surveys so they are unbiased and meet the needs of the group conducting the survey.)
4. Ask other questions that might be helpful to the self-study such as if
 - MSCD consistently implements clear and fair policies regarding the rights and responsibilities of faculty.
 - MSCD provides effective staffing and support for its learning resources, e.g., laboratories, libraries, art and music studios.
 - MSCD supports professional development opportunities and makes them available to all of its administrators, faculty, and staff.Additional questions may be suggested by the Steering Committee. Consideration should be given to asking faculty about their perceptions of the Council of Chairs’ strengths and weaknesses.
5. If considered desirable, reexamine the tenure/retention/promotion process to determine if any changes should be made. If there are no problems or if the

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

outstanding issues have recently been discussed, there is no need to duplicate the effort.

6. Provide copies of the
 - Constitution and bylaws if they exist???
 - Minutes of meetings since recognition as an approved organization.
 - Resolutions passed
 - Other official documents

COUNCIL OF ADMINISTRATORS

Ask the Council of Administrators, in consultation with its members, to:

1. Approve the revised role and mission statement for MSCD or suggested modifications of the wording.
2. Report if they believe they are appropriately involved in decision-making processes. That is, the officers need to comment on the shared governance “challenges” or concerns #1, 3, and 4 raised by HLC-NCA in 2003. See page 6.
3. Survey members of their group to determine their constituents’ views about shared governance and other matters if they so desire. If they do, help will be provided in choosing, creating, and conducting the survey. Copies of surveys conducted during the last self-study will be made available and it is recommended that the Council of Administrators leaders review those surveys. If surveys are used, the representative from the group on the HLC-NCA Steering Committee should be involved in the creation of the survey so that there is some consistency and collaboration on the survey and the goals of the Steering Committee are met. (Institutional research will be able to provide some assistance if the surveys are a college priority. Psychology faculty and faculty in some other programs might also be willing to provide some assistance with creating surveys so they are unbiased and meet the needs of the group conducting the survey.)
4. Ask other questions that might be helpful to the self-study such as if
 - MSCD consistently implements clear and fair policies regarding the rights and responsibilities of administrators.
 - MSCD provides effective staffing and support for its learning resources, e.g., laboratories, libraries, art and music studios.
 - MSCD supports professional development opportunities and makes them available to all of its administrators, faculty, and staff.Additional questions may be suggested by the Steering Committee. Consideration should be given to asking faculty about their perceptions of the Council of Administrators’ strengths and weaknesses.
5. Review and comment on the performance evaluation process.
6. Provide copies of the
 - Constitution and bylaws
 - Minutes of meetings since 2003
 - Resolutions passed
 - Other official documents

Self Study Plan for the 2007 HLC-NCA Visit – 8/18/05

CLASSIFIED STAFF COUNCIL

Ask the Classified Staff Council, in consultation with its members, to:

1. Approve the revised role and mission statement for MSCD or suggested modifications of the wording.
2. Report if they believe they are appropriately involved in decision-making processes. That is, the officers need to comment on the shared governance “challenges” or concerns #1, 3, and 4 raised by HLC-NCA in 2003. See page 6.
3. Survey members of their group to determine their constituents’ views about shared governance and other matters if they so desire. If they do, help will be provided in choosing, creating, and conducting the survey. Copies of surveys conducted during the last self-study will be made available and it is recommended that the Classified Staff Council leaders review those surveys. If surveys are used, the representative from the group on the HLC-NCA Steering Committee should be involved in the creation of the survey so that there is some consistency and collaboration on the survey and the goals of the Steering Committee are met. (Institutional research will be able to provide some assistance if the surveys are a college priority. Psychology faculty and faculty in some other programs might also be willing to provide some assistance with creating surveys so they are unbiased and meet the needs of the group conducting the survey.)
4. Ask other questions that might be helpful to the self-study such as if
 - MSCD consistently implements clear and fair policies regarding the rights and responsibilities of classified staff.
 - MSCD provides effective staffing and support for its learning resources, e.g., laboratories, libraries, art and music studios.
 - MSCD supports professional development opportunities and makes them available to all of its administrators, faculty, and staff.
 - There are resources, data, or information that would help them perform their jobs better.Additional questions may be suggested by the Steering Committee. Consideration should be given to asking faculty about their perceptions of the Classified Staff Council’s strengths and weaknesses.
5. Describe changes or items that would improve their working conditions including improvements resulting from changes in technology.
6. Describe the impact of changes made at the state level.
7. Review and comment on the performance evaluation process.
8. Provide copies of the
 - Constitution and bylaws
 - Minutes of meetings since 2003
 - Resolutions passed
 - Other official documents