



*SUNY Broome Community College Self-Study Design  
Spring 2019*

**A Report to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)**

**I. Institutional Overview**

**Overview of the Institution.** SUNY (State University of New York) Broome Community College, or SUNY Broome, is a comprehensive community college supervised by SUNY, sponsored by the County of Broome, and governed by a ten-member Board of Trustees. SUNY Broome is one of thirty SUNY community colleges. In 1946, the College was chartered as the New York Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences at Binghamton. In 1971, the College assumed the name Broome Community College. In 2013, BCC was renamed SUNY Broome Community College. SUNY Broome’s campus is located in the Town of Dickinson, three miles north of Binghamton, in the Southern Tier of New York State.

**Mission Statement.** “SUNY Broome Community College supports all members of the learning community by creating access to inclusive, diverse educational experiences. Success is achieved through the provision of innovative academics, transformative student support, and meaningful civic & community engagement.”

We realize our mission by fostering an environment that exemplifies the college’s institutional goals to the highest quality.

**Institutional Goals.**

**Goal 1. DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION:** Foster the essential connections among diversity, equity, and inclusion in all of the college’s endeavors. *Demonstrate commitment to diversity and inclusion by making SUNY Broome an increasingly engaged, culturally responsive, socially responsible and equitable place to learn, teach, work, and live.*

**Goal 2. TEACHING AND LEARNING:** Provide dynamic educational experiences to afford students opportunities for transfer, employment, personal enrichment and to contribute to community life. *Develop an inclusive teaching- and learning-centered environment that supports pedagogical excellence, student success and student attainment of key learning outcomes:*

- i. *Cultural and global awareness;*

- ii. *Critical analysis and decision-making;*
- iii. *Oral and written communication;*
- iv. *Scientific and quantitative reasoning;*
- v. *Technological competency;*
- vi. *Information literacy*

**Goal 3. FISCAL, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUSTAINABILITY:** Provide sustained open access to diverse and innovative educational experiences and *transformative* student support; the institution commits to responsible acquisition and stewardship of resources. *Practice fiscal responsibility and sustainability as part of a comprehensive decision making process to support equity among all members of the learning community to ensure continuous improvement.*

**Goal 4. STUDENT SUPPORT AND SUCCESS:** Foster student growth and success by providing transformative academic and student supports, comprehensive resources, and an enriching climate that contributes to the attainment of individuals' goals and achievements from initial inquiry through graduation and beyond. *Enhance accessibility and use of support services to help students obtain their academic and personal goals.*

**Goal 5. CIVIC, COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT, AND SERVICE-LEARNING:** Emphasize the importance of each individual being an informed and engaged citizen. *Provide opportunities to increase community engagement by developing collaborative, socially-just and responsive and effective solutions to local, national and global community needs.*

**Goal 6. STRATEGIC AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT:** We continue to take full responsibility for our institutional outcomes to continuously improve and fulfill our college mission. *Enhance assessment and decision-making that is grounded in reflective practices to best align existing and emerging initiatives, fiscal capacity, and human resources with the college mission.*

**Enrollment.** Total enrollment for Fall 2017 was 5,624 based on census data; Spring 2018 recorded a student enrollment of 4,588 based on census data. Seventy-two percent of the Fall 2017 students were enrolled full-time while 28% were enrolled part-time. For Spring 2018, 76% of students were enrolled full-time and 24% part-time. Further, 707 students were enrolled exclusively in online courses. The College enrolled 1,632 students through its Fast Forward partnership program with local high schools in Fall 2017, and 1,589 students in Fall 2018. The faculty headcount in Fall 2017 was 436, made up of 165 full-time and 271 part-time faculty members, resulting in a 20:1 student to faculty ratio.

SUNY Broome is making efforts to increase its enrollment through in-depth data analytics to identify programmatic areas where it has most sharply declined and is projected to remain low. In addition, the college is assessing logical target populations within and outside of Broome County in order to refine its marketing strategies to improve recruitment. The college has

retained a research firm, Riger Marketing Communications, to explore enrollment opportunities in the adult learning market and identify programs likely to attract adult learners.

**Educational Offerings.** SUNY Broome Community College has four academic divisions: Business and Professional Services; Health Sciences; Liberal Arts; and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM). These divisions offer four different degrees and certificate programs. Associate in Arts (AA) and Associate in Science (AS) degrees provide students the necessary coursework and preparation for transfer. The Associate in Occupational Studies (AOS) and Associate in Applied Sciences (AAS) degrees provide education and training for students moving directly into the workforce while building the groundwork for possible transfer. The College has 80 degree offerings registered through the New York State Education Department: 34 AAS, 24 AS, 1 AA, 1 AOS, and 20 Certificates, available in full- and part-time study, day and evening, and in a distance education format. Sixteen of these offerings are available in a fully-online format with at least one fully-online-only program available in each division. Five of our fully-online programs have been selected as Open SUNY Powered Plus programs for their academic quality and for targeting in-demand professions. These high-quality offerings are maintained through programmatic accreditation and SUNY program review, as well as regularly conducted unit and course assessments.

**Structure and Resources.** SUNY Broome Community College is supervised by the State University of New York, sponsored by the county of Broome, and governed by a 10-member Board of Trustees. The ten-member Board consists of five appointees of the Broome County Executive, four of the New York State Governor, and one elected by the student body.

Shared governance at SUNY Broome is a process of consultation and communication by which decisions and policies are developed to meet the College's educational mission. The purpose is to recommend and influence institutional policy, discuss and influence matters that will significantly affect the College, communicate on issues of broad institutional concern, and to provide expert, informed opinion to the Administration and the Board of Trustees. Members are elected or appointed to specific roles on an annual basis according to established, democratically agreed-upon bylaws. The chief shared governance bodies are the College Assembly, the Council for Academic Issues, the Council for Operational Issues, and the Student Assembly.

SUNY Broome receives its revenues from FTE-based New York State Aid, from its Sponsor (Broome County), from student tuition, charge-backs to other counties, out of state tuition, and miscellaneous additional revenues. Grants, both public and private, support many of the College's initiatives.

**Demographic and Structural Challenges Contributing to SUNY Broome's Choice of Institutional Priorities for the Self-Study.** Since the 2010 Self-Study, Broome County and SUNY Broome Community College have undergone significant changes. These include outmigration and population decline within the county and beyond. Between 2010 and 2017, an estimated 10,549 persons left Broome County; 3,934 international immigrants arrived, resulting in a total net loss of 6,615. More people died than were born, accounting for an additional loss of 483 persons (see: <https://www.pressconnects.com/story/news/local/2018/06/28/upstate-new-york-population-declining-census/721456002/>). The county Chamber of Commerce, "The

Agency,” has been working diligently in Broome County to improve economic development and attract new workers. However, the efforts of this organization, as of the writing of this Self-Study Design, have been unable to halt the pattern of outmigration.

A more recent trend has been high school graduation decline. SUNY estimates growth for high school graduates in New York City to increase 8.7% between 2017 and 2029. Non-New York City locations, including Broome County, will in aggregate experience an 11.6% decline in high school graduates during the same time period. This is a logical outcome of the 7.5% decline in live births between 1995 to 2015 (Faculty Council of Community Colleges [FCCC] Spring Plenary Presentation). For Broome County specifically, the high school graduation population in 2011 was 2,110. This remained somewhat stable in subsequent years. However, a sharp enrollment decline will occur in 2020/21, when only 1,789 persons are expected to graduate from high school.

While the impact on the campus’ budget has been limited in recent years compared to other SUNY community colleges, the college is starting to experience a significant decline in enrollment. This decline is partly explained by decreased high school graduation rates. Further, a consistent concern since the last Self-Study is that the state funding model for SUNY community colleges has not kept pace with emerging enrollment trends or funding needs. For instance, in 2016/17, the percentage difference between revenue per student FTE and expense per student FTE was negative 1.3% (see FCCC Spring Plenary). Hence, the college faces a combination of a lagging state funding model, county outmigration, declining birth rates, and fewer high school graduates.

At the same time, the institution’s retention standing among SUNY schools has also experienced significant change. In 2014, Broome was ranked 17 out of 29 SUNY community colleges evaluated, with a 56.9% 1-year retention rate. This decreased in 2018, with Broome ranking 28 out of 29 with a 50.0% 1-year retention rate.<sup>1</sup> Retention rates for white versus non-white students differ significantly. In 2014 (n=752), white students had a 62.3% 1-year retention rate, while non-white students had a 58.0% 1-year retention rate. In 2018 (n=854), retention for white students declined to 59.9% and 40.4% for non-white students. Between the two time periods, the failing rate of non-retained students declined from 23% to 17%, the transfer rate declined from 40% to 36%, and the percent of students who did not retain for unidentified reasons rose from 37% to 47%. While the state’s adoption of the Excelsior Scholarship in 2018 may account for some declines in enrollment and retention, it is clear that the issue of retention cannot be accounted for solely by the state’s adoption of this program.

Relatedly, since the last MSCHE site visit, significant changes in the SUNY Broome student population have occurred, changes, which are partly attributable to the establishment of campus

---

<sup>1</sup> It is, however, important to note that students enrolled in the Binghamton Advantage Program (BAP), who typically do not graduate but spend only a year at the college before transferring to Binghamton University, constitute part of the enrollment numbers that impact retention. When the BAP population is excluded, retention for Fall 2017 to Fall 2018 increases to 57.3% and that of Fall 2016 to Fall 2017 improves to 55.5%. This ranks the College 18th of 29 New York State Community Colleges (excluding the Fashion Institute of Technology) for Fall 2016 to Fall 2017 retention rates.

housing in 2014. While the average headcount between Fall 2013 and Fall 2017 remained similar (6,693 versus 6,961), the composition of the student body has shifted. For instance, in Fall 2013, the Fast Forward population constituted 12% of the student headcount, but rose to 23% in Fall 2018. In Fall 2013, the New First Time student group accounted for 23% of the student headcount and slightly increased to 25% in Fall 2018. Continuing/Returning students made up 54% in Fall 2013 but fell to 38% in Fall 2018. The Race/Ethnicity Headcount in Fall 2013 was as follows: non-white students accounted for 7%, White students 55%, and Unknown students 38% of student enrollment. This changed significantly in fall 2018, with White students increasing to 67%, Unknown students decreasing to 12%, and Non-Whites increasing to 21%. The transition of students from “unknown” to “known” sharply increased, which is largely attributable to more students now reporting their ethnicity.

The changing composition of the student body is no passing phenomenon. Hence, **Diversity and Inclusion** will be one of our institutional priorities. In the same vein, it is clear that action must be taken to address student retention. SUNY Broome has attempted to address this through the identification of various student success and support initiatives, and will continue to do so. These must be strategically employed in a manner consistent with the college’s mission, and their effectiveness must be continually assessed. Hence, **Student Retention, Support, and Success** will be a consistent theme of the Self-Study. The college has engaged in and will continue efforts to grow enrollment even as we confront the question of retention, yet the College is cognizant of the need to maintain the academic rigor and the effectiveness of our programs for our diverse student population. As a result, the College considers it critical to adopt **Institutional and Pedagogical Sustainability** as one of our Self-Study priorities.

## **II. Institutional Priorities to be Addressed in the Self-Study**

The College intends to focus on three priorities: (1) Diversity and Inclusion; (2) Student Retention, Support, and Success; and (3) Institutional and Pedagogical Sustainability.

The Steering Committee leadership (Dr. Sesime Adanu, Dr. Amy Brandt, and Dr. Andrew Haggerty), guided by information provided at the MSCHE Self-Study Institute in November 2018, developed a broad initial draft document outlining proposed Institutional Priorities and circulated this to the Steering Committee as a whole. After receiving feedback from the Steering Committee, the draft was presented to various campus constituencies, including the Councils of the four academic divisions, Executive Council, shared governance bodies, the Student Learning Assessment Committee, the Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning Committee, and the Working Groups. Deliberations regarding the priorities were guided by the college’s Mission and Strategic Plan, by a mindfulness of our current and future students’ needs and aspirations, and by a frank consideration of the material challenges the college faces. Based on the input provided by these groups, a second draft of the priorities was shared with these constituencies for refinement. Ultimately, the college’s three priorities were reviewed and approved by Executive Council and the Steering Committee.

The priorities are consistent with the college’s Mission Statement, the goals of the Strategic Plan, and MSCHE accreditation standards:

**Institutional Priorities Mapped to Institutional Mission**

	<b>Mission of SUNY Broome Community College:</b> SUNY Broome Community College supports all members of the learning community by creating access to inclusive, diverse educational experiences. Success is achieved through the provision of innovative academics, transformative student support, and meaningful civic & community engagement.	<b>Institutional Priority 1:</b> Diversity and Inclusion.	<b>Institutional Priority 2:</b> Student retention, support and success.	<b>Institutional Priority 3:</b> Institutional and pedagogical sustainability
<b>Elements of Institution's Mission Statement</b>	Learning Community			x
	Access and Inclusion	x		
	Diverse educational experiences	x	x	
	Student success		x	
	Innovative academics			x
	Civic and Community Engagement	x		x
	Student support		x	

**Institutional Priorities Mapped to Goals**

<b>Strategic Plan Goals</b>	<b>Institutional Priority 1:</b> Diversity and Inclusion.	<b>Institutional Priority 2:</b> Student retention, support and success.	<b>Institutional Priority 3:</b> Institutional and pedagogical sustainability.
<b>Goal 1.</b> Diversity and Inclusion	x		
<b>Goal 2.</b> Teaching and Learning		x	x
<b>Goal 3.</b> Fiscal, Program Development and Infrastructure Sustainability			x
<b>Goal 4.</b> Student Support and Success		x	
<b>Goal 5.</b> Civic, Community Engagement and Service Learning		x	
<b>Goal 6.</b> Strategic and Continuous Improvement	x	x	x



### Institutional Priorities Mapped to Accreditation Standards

MSCHE Accreditation Standards	Institutional Priority 1: Diversity and Inclusion.	Institutional Priority 2: Student retention, support and success.	Institutional Priority 3: Institutional and pedagogical sustainability
<b>Standard 1-</b> Mission and goals	x	x	x
<b>Standard 2-</b> Ethics and Integrity			x
<b>Standard 3-</b> Design and delivery of student learning experience	x	x	x
<b>Standard 4-</b> Support of the student experience	x	x	x
<b>Standard 5-</b> Educational effectiveness assessment		x	x
<b>Standard 6-</b> Planning, resources and institutional improvement	x	x	x
<b>Standard 7-</b> Governance, leadership and administration	x	x	x

### III. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

The Self-Study process will demonstrate that:

- The college currently meets the Commission’s *Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation*.
- The college focuses on continuous improvement in attaining its mission and its institutional priorities.
- The college engages in an inclusive and transparent self-appraisal process that actively and deliberately seeks to involve members from all areas of the college community.
- The College anticipates that the Self-Study will provide lasting institutional value over the next 3-5 years, evident in enhanced improvement in Strategic Planning and assessment efforts, and a better understanding of pedagogical sustainability.

Further outcomes of the Self-Study are directly tied to the three Institutional Priorities: (1) Diversity and Inclusion; (2) Student Retention, Support, and Success; and (3) Institutional and Pedagogical Sustainability.

**1. Diversity and Inclusion:** *The Self-Study will show that* the college implements diverse and inclusive approaches to student-centered teaching and learning through various modalities, including online, hybrid, in class, and onsite instruction. The college anticipates and responds to individual, community, and global needs, and provides

accessible, lifelong, learning opportunities, thereby meeting the labor market needs of the community and the academic and career goals of each individual student.

*The college will demonstrate achievement of the above through demonstration of direct evidence that identifies:*

1. The development of partnerships with the local community through specialized trainings and access options, including the development and assessment of credit and non-credit academic programs, vocational experiences, and alternative credentials.
2. Increased recruitment and enrollment of students of diverse backgrounds to the College, assisting them through to degree completion, direct entry into the workforce, or transfer to four-year colleges/universities.

**2. Student Retention, Support, and Success:** *The Self-Study will show that the college commits to fostering student success as evidenced by increased retention, graduation, and transfer rates, and to providing continuously improved student support structures.*

*The college will demonstrate achievement of the above through demonstration of direct evidence that identifies:*

1. Increased student retention through success-related challenges such as gateway courses, developmental courses, financial planning, and time management and study skills.
2. Investment in student support services and facilities to assist students of varied needs and diverse backgrounds become successful.
3. Increased student engagement through the development of innovative student support programs and events.

**3. Institutional and Pedagogical Sustainability:** *The Self-Study will show that the college is committed to continuous institutional improvement and sustainability, especially in regards to student learning, through the implementation of useful and durable assessment processes, as well as the efficient, data-based allocation of resources.*

*The college will demonstrate achievement of the above through demonstration of direct evidence that identifies:*

1. Development and provision of professional development training opportunities for faculty and staff to improve pedagogy and service delivery to students.
2. Investment in technology, facilities, and resources to support faculty in the effective and efficient delivery of instruction to students of diverse backgrounds.

**4. Enhanced Strategic Planning and Assessment Implementation:** *The Self-Study will provide lasting institutional value over the 3-5 years following the submission of the report.*

*The college anticipates the results will provide for:*

1. Enhanced Strategic Planning and assessment efforts.



2. Better understanding of how strategic planning affects pedagogy.
3. An infrastructure for streamlining processes pertaining to policies and procedures as well as timelines for review.
4. Renewed emphasis on institutional renewal and sustainability, using assessment for continuous improvement.
5. Renewed focus upon student success.

#### **IV. Self-Study Approach**

The College has decided to select a Standards-Based Approach.

Considering the size of the institution and the programs it offers, the Leadership team (Dr. Sesime Adanu, Dr. Amy Brandt, and Dr. Andrew Haggerty) and the Steering Committee believe that a Standards-Based Approach offers the College an efficient means to clearly demonstrate compliance with all seven accreditation standards. This approach appears to us easier to explain to stakeholders, particularly to faculty, staff, and others interested in participating on the Working Groups.

#### **V. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups**

The president of the college, Dr. Kevin Drumm, in his reminder notice to the campus community of May 2018 regarding the impending Self-Study process, invited faculty and staff interested in serving on the Steering Committee or Working Groups to contact the co-chairs of the Self-Study process. Vice Presidents and Deans, shared governance bodies, and departmental chairs recommended individuals for service. The Board of Trustees appointed a representative to serve on the Steering Committee. The president made the official appointments to the Steering Committee and Working Groups based on these recommendations and the response of individual volunteers. The Steering Committee and Working Groups have representation from faculty, administrators, staff, and the Board. Student representatives to the Steering Committee were appointed at the start of the spring 2019 semester.

##### **Membership of the Steering Committee**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role with Steering Committee</b>	<b>Position and Responsibility at College</b>
Adanu, Sesime	Co-Chair	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness.
Brandt, Amy	Co-Chair	Associate Vice President and Dean of Health Sciences and Distance Learning.
Haggerty, Andrew	Co-chair	Associate Professor, English.
Ball, Sharon	Member	Board of Trustees Representative.
McLain, Kimberly	Member	Assistant Professor, Medical Assisting and Health Studies.

Wells, Jesse	Member	Executive Enrollment Management Officer.
Kinney, Mike	Member	Associate Vice President and Dean of Liberal Arts/Learning Assistance Services.
Mollen, Beth	Member	Associate Vice President and Dean of Business and Professional Studies/Academic Services.
Snyder, Michele	Member	Associate Vice President and Dean of STEM.
Battisti, Francis	Member	Executive Vice President and Chief Academic Officer.
Sullivan, Michael	Member	Vice President for Administrative and Financial Affairs.
Ross-Scott, Carol	Member	Vice President for Student Development and Chief Diversity Officer.
Berchtold, Danielle	Member	Senior Associate to Executive Vice President and Chief Academic Officer.
Hertzog, Janet	Member	Director of Continuing Education and Workforce Development.
Todd, Daniel	Member	Student Assembly Representative.
Van Horn, Amanda	Member	Student Assembly Representative.

### **Strategies to Ensure Interaction between the Steering Committee and Working Groups**

To enhance collaboration and interaction, a description of each standard and a full membership list were sent to each Working Group. A Google Drive folder was created containing links to common resources; key documents, such as minutes of Working Group meetings, are uploaded to this folder. The Steering Committee leadership regularly reviews this material to safeguard against redundant efforts, and to alert Working Groups to resources used by one Group that may be of use to another. Members of the Steering Committee leadership are invited to Working Group meetings, and at least one leadership representative is present for all meetings, with very few exceptions.

In instances of doubt, confusion or questions, Working Group members are encouraged to consult with any of the three lead team members. The lead team members meet weekly to discuss coordination, logistics, and planning.

### **Steering Committee Oversight Regarding Working Groups Receiving Appropriate Support for Evaluation and Assessment of Commission Standards**

The lead team coordinates the accreditation process, liaising with the Steering Committee, Working Groups, and the campus community. As part of the oversight process, the Steering Committee leadership scheduled a Self-Study kick-off training for Working Group members on

20 and 21 September, 2018. Three different time slots were offered on each day to provide flexibility for Working Group representatives. The training afforded Working Group members the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the *Standards of Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation*, the commonalities between some of the standards, and potential areas of collaboration between the Working Groups. Other material discussed at the training included an overview of the accreditation process, expectations of the Working Groups, the Self-Study timeline, and the oversight responsibility of the Steering Committee. The training documents from the kick-off are available for reference on the Self-Study Google Drive, which also contains links to other MSCHE publications and training materials (such as the videos associated with each Standard), particularly those emphasized at the Self-Study Institute in November, 2018.

To further enhance interaction, a lead team member attends each Working Group meeting to answer questions and provide feedback and updates. The Steering Committee leadership team developed supporting resources, including a map of the old accreditation standards to the new standards as tied to the 2010 College Self-Study Report, and the 2016 Periodic Review Report. This was done to assist the Working Groups in their assessment and evaluation efforts regarding progress made by the College in meeting the *Standards of Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation*, and to provide historical and institutional context for their efforts. The Steering Committee is regularly briefed at its monthly meetings by the lead team on progress made by the Working Groups. The Steering Committee provides feedback on reports generated by the Working Groups. As with the Working Groups, Steering Committee agendas and minutes are available on the Self-Study Google Drive.

### **Steering Committee Approach to Analyzing Selected Priorities and the Commission's Standards**

The Steering Committee lead team developed a set of guiding questions for each Standard; these questions provide each Working Group the framework for analyzing the three priorities, Commission standards, and the Self-Study Report. These questions are laid out in a rubric, which asks the Working Groups to decide if the evidence they are gathering indicates that the college is in compliance with a specific aspect of their Standard. In the spring of 2019, Working Groups will apply these questions to the evidence they have found to determine the strength of the college's case for compliance with each of the criteria laid out in their Standard. Strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement will thus be identified. In addition to this rubric, the Steering Committee has taken the Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study material in Section III, above, to a meeting of each Working Group, and used this as a basis for each group to develop Operationalized Outcomes for their Standard – that is to say, each Working Group will write outcomes describing the specific evidence under review.

Each Working Group will rely heavily on the information that has been gathered in the annual assessments conducted by both academic and non-academic units. Such assessment findings provide evidence to help the College determine whether or not it is making progress on its priorities. Other activities, initiatives, and projects pursued by the College will be examined, such as published policies and procedures, minutes of key groups (such as the Board of Trustees), the catalogue, and opinion surveys of various college constituencies. These sources will constitute the evidence the College will use to assess its effectiveness in achieving its mission and identified priorities, and in meeting accreditation standards.

## Information on Working Groups

### Working Group 1- Mission and goals

Name	Role with Steering Committee	Position and Responsibility
<b>Adanu, Sesime</b>	<b>Chair</b>	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness.
McGuinness, Meghan	Member	Professor, Dental Hygiene.
Roma, Andrea	Member	Staff Associate for Fast Forward/Early College/P-Tech/Articulations.
Roma, Gian	Member	Professor/Chairperson of Business Programs.
Allala, Patrick	Member	Senior Staff Assistant- Research Analyst, Institutional Effectiveness.
Tierno, Danielle	Member	Senior Staff Assistant, Sponsored Programs.

### Working Group 2- Ethics and Integrity

Name	Role with Steering Committee	Position and Responsibility
<b>Strahley, Lisa</b>	<b>Chair</b>	Associate Professor, Teacher Education/Early Childhood Education.
Wells, Jesse	Member	Executive Enrollment Management Officer.
Donnelly, Mary	Member	Associate Professor/Chair of Teacher Education/Early Childhood Education.
Harkness, Lucy	Member	Assistant Professor, English.
Lenzo, Diana	Member	Secretary, Office of the President.
Kettering, Therese	Member	Staff Associate to the Dean of STEM Division.
Schuhert, Scott	Member	Dean of Students/Compliance Officer.

**Working Group 3- Design and delivery of student learning experience**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role with Steering Committee</b>	<b>Position and Responsibility</b>
<b>Haggerty, Andrew</b>	<b>Chair</b>	Associate Professor, English.
Brandt, Amy	Member	Associate Vice President and Dean of Health Sciences and Distance Learning/ Teaching Resource Center.
Berchtold, Danielle	Member	Senior Associate to Chief Academic Officer/Adjunct Instructor.
McLain, Kimberly	Member	Assistant Professor, Medical Assisting and Health Studies.
Hertzog, Janet	Member	Director of Continuing Education and Workforce Development.
Kettering, Therese	Member	Staff Associate to the Dean of STEM Division.

**Working Group 4- Support of the student experience**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role with Steering Committee</b>	<b>Position and Responsibility</b>
<b>Ross-Scott, Carol</b>	<b>Chair</b>	Vice President for Student Development & Chief Diversity Officer/Executive Director.
Breck, Maureen	Member	Staff Associate, Academic Affairs.
Chase, Gina	Member	Applied Learning & Career Specialist.
Lawson, Rebecca	Member	Staff Associate/Adjunct Instructor.
Corley, Scott	Member	Professor, History.
Rehak, Donna	Member	Staff Associate to the Dean of Liberal Arts and Coordinator of LAAA and Individual Studies.
Carnegie, Valerie	Member	Staff Associate - Bachelor Partnership Program.
Griffis, Richard	Member	Assistant Director of Financial Aid/Operations.
Taylor, Kathryn	Member	Academic Advisor/Adjunct Instructor.

### Working Group 5- Educational effectiveness assessment

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role with Steering Committee</b>	<b>Position and Responsibility</b>
<b>Haggerty, Andrew</b>	<b>Chair</b>	Associate Professor, English.
Malmberg, Stephanie	Member	Staff Associate/Adjunct Instructor and Faculty Professional Development Representative.
Seel, Mary	Member	Associate Professor/Coordinator of English Composition.
Adanu, Sesime	Member	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness.
Brandt, Amy	Member	Associate Vice President and Dean of Health Sciences and Distance Learning/Teaching Resource Center.
Moyer, Karyn	Member	Assistant Professor, English.
Allala, Patrick	Member	Senior Staff Assistant- Research Analyst, Institutional Effectiveness.

### Working Group 6- Planning, resources and institutional improvement

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role with Steering Committee</b>	<b>Position and Responsibility</b>
<b>Allen, Lawrence</b>	<b>Chair</b>	Budget and Institutional Effectiveness Specialist/FLAC Academic Coordinator.
Tillotson, Jeannette	Member	Associate Vice President and Controller.
Cordisco, Shelli	Member	Director of Sponsored Programs.
Hodel, Laura	Member	Director of Financial Aid.
Ligeikis, David	Member	Interim Director of Facilities.
O'Bryan, Patrick	Member	Associate Professor, Business and Professional Studies.



## Working Group 7- Governance, leadership and administration

Name	Role with Steering Committee	Position and Responsibility
Bergholtz, Angela	Co-chair	Senior Account Clerk.
Guzzi, Martin	Co-chair	Director of Enrollment Services.
Kelly, Diane	Member	Associate Professor, Biology.
Scaringi, Giovanni	Member	Associate Professor, Economics.
Haggerty, Andrew	Member	Associate Professor, English.
Lenzo, Diana	Member	Secretary, Office of the President.

### Charge and Specific Lines of Inquiry

Per MCHE guidelines, the Steering Committee will:

- Consult with institutional stakeholders and identify areas of strength and opportunity associated with the achievement of the institution’s mission;
- Work with institutional leadership to identify 3-5 institutional priorities to be addressed in the self-study;
- Select the organizational approach to the institution’s self-study;
- Develop the Self-Study Design;
- Establish, charge, and oversee the Working Groups and coordinate their work;
- Ensure that the institutional priorities are adequately addressed in the Working Groups’ analysis;
- Review interim reports that will be used to write the final Self-Study Report;
- Ensure that the timeline is implemented as planned;
- Employ a Communications Plan to effectively communicate within the institution;
- Identify the most important opportunities for improvement and innovation that will be included in the final Self-Study Report;
- Arrange for institution-wide review of and responses to a draft of the Self-Study Report;
- Oversee completion of the final Self-Study Report, including refinement of the Evidence Inventory and completion of the Verification of Compliance materials; and
- Oversee arrangements to host the Evaluation Team visit.

The Working Groups will assume responsibility for the following:

- Appointment/selection of chairs or co-chairs for each Working Group to coordinate meetings, meeting schedules and dates for the respective Working Groups. Working Group chairs ensure that their Group has a secretary who documents meeting proceedings and forwards them to the Steering Committee

leadership. Also, chairs will determine and assign responsibility for each member per the criteria associated with each standard.

- Reviewing sections of the prior Self-Study Report, Monitoring Report, Follow-Up Reports, and Periodic Review Report aligned with their standard to identify any shortfalls that may need attention and to understand the institutional and historical context of their endeavors.
- Reviewing their accreditation Standard and exploring relevant resources, such as the videos produced by MSCHE for each Standard and available on the web.
- Gathering evidence associated with their Standards to determine whether or not the College is in compliance, and using the relevant assessment rubric developed by the Steering Committee.
- Identifying all gaps that may need to be addressed.
- Composing a draft Self-Study Report based on findings tied to each of the criteria, which the Steering Committee will review and use to compile the final Self-Study Report.
- Reviewing the draft Report, making any needed changes and submitting them to the Steering Committee for review.

The Working Groups were formed in alignment with the seven Standards of Accreditation. Each Working Group is guided by a set of questions which are to be used to assess the evidence for compliance, and for composing reports of respective Working Groups tied to the Standards. The Working Groups and associated guiding questions are as follows:

**Working Group 1-** Mission and Goals (Standard 1). This group is guided by the following questions:

- Q1. Is the College mission statement expressed within the context of its higher educational setting and the students it serves?
- Q2. Are the mission and goals developed and reviewed in collaboration with all key campus constituencies?
- Q3. Do the mission and goals cater to the success parameters of students with varied learning modalities and backgrounds?
- Q4. Are the institutional Strategic Goals aligned with the College Mission Statement?
- Q5. Is the institution able to demonstrate evidence of progress in the attainment of its mission and strategic goals?

**Working Group 2-** Ethics and Integrity (Standard 2). This group is guided by the following questions:

- Q1. Does the institution promote an academic environment that fosters academic freedom, intellectual freedom, freedom of expression, and respect for intellectual property rights?
- Q2. Does the College have policies and procedures that are fair and impartial, and provide avenues for grievances to be addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably?

Q3. Does the College have fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation, promotion, discipline, and separation of employees?

Q4. Does the College demonstrate honesty in its public relations announcements, advertisements, recruiting and admissions materials, as well as in its internal communications?

**Working Group 3-** Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience (Standard 3). This group is guided by the following questions:

Q1. Does the College offer certificate, undergraduate, and/or professional programs that lead to a degree or other recognized higher education credential, with appropriate curricula?

Q2. Does the College provide support services that ensure student success?

Q3. Are academic programs and professional courses taught at the College publicized comprehensibly and accurately?

Q3. Does the College have the faculty and supporting staff necessary to maintain effective teaching and learning?

Q4. Are faculty and staff provided sufficient and appropriate professional development resources to enhance student success?

Q5. Do academic programs at the college undertake periodic assessment of their effectiveness in student learning and overall student success, including General Education, with the view towards ensuring continuous improvement?

**Working Group 4-** Support of the Student Experience (Standard 4). This group is guided by the following questions:

Q1. To what extent are the college's admission policies and processes, and student support policies, consistent with its institutional mission and geared towards student success?

Q2. To what extent are processes in place to cater to students with developmental educational needs?

Q3. How effective are the following services in supporting the student experience and success: financial aid, student orientation, academic advisement, the Learning Assistance Department, disability support services, and counseling programs?

Q4. Does the college have policies and procedures regarding the evaluation and acceptance of transfer credits, as well as credits awarded through experiential learning, prior non-academic learning, competency-based assessment, and other alternative learning approaches?

Q5. Are policies, procedures, and services regularly assessed for continuous improvement?

**Working Group 5-** Educational Effectiveness Assessment (Standard 5). This group is guided by the following questions:

Q1. Does the College have an organized, systematic, assessment process used by faculty to evaluate academic program goals and student learning outcomes?

Q2. Does the College have defensible standards for evaluating whether or not students are achieving their academic goals?

Q3. To what extent are assessment findings used in decision making, budgeting, and resource allocation?

**Working Group 6-** Planning, Resources and Institutional Improvement (Standard 6). This group is guided by the following questions:

Q1. To what extent are student learning outcome assessments and unit goals linked to the college's institutional mission, and are assessment findings used for planning and resource allocation?

Q2. To what extent are units' and departments' financial planning and budgeting processes aligned with the institution's mission and strategic goals/objectives, and to what extent are resource allocation requests and decisions based on the results of assessment, especially student learning assessment?

Q3. Does the College have the fiscal and human resources, as well as the physical and technical infrastructure, needed to support its operations?

Q4. Does the College have a comprehensive planning process for facilities, infrastructure, and technology that includes consideration for sustainability and deferred maintenance, and that is linked to strategic and financial planning processes?

Q5. Do the college's annual independent audit findings provide evidence of the financial viability of the institution? If not, what steps are being taken to ensure financial sustainability?

**Working Group 7-** Governance, Leadership and Administration (Standard 7). This group is guided by the following questions:

Q1. Does the College have a clearly articulated and transparent governance structure that outlines roles, responsibilities, and accountability for decision making by each constituency, including its governing body, administration, faculty, staff, and students?

Q2. Does the College have a legally constituted governing body that ensures the College fulfills its mission and goals, has fiduciary responsibility for the institution, and is accountable for academic quality, institutional planning, and fiscal well-being?

Q3. To what extent does the Board of Trustees oversee the development and approval of policies and procedures, approval of degree programs, and the awarding of degrees?

Q4. Does the Board have a written conflict of interest policy designed to ensure the impartiality of the governing body?

Q5. Do the Chief Executive Officer, administrators, faculty, and staff have the requisite credentials needed to serve in their positions at the College?

Each of the Working Groups will use the rubric developed by the accreditation lead team with the approval of the Steering Committee to assess the evidence for compliance. Appendix 1 shows a sample of the assessment rubric.

## **Assessment of Information by Working Groups**

After the Working Groups undertake the responsibilities enumerated under section V, the information gathered and reviewed will be developed into a summary report that will form the basis of the Self-Study Report. The identified strengths associated with each standard will constitute evidence of compliance with the Standards and Requirements of Affiliation. Identified gaps will constitute areas of improvement for the College.

Working with the Steering Committee leadership team, the Working Group chairs will submit interim, draft summary reports by May 2019 based on their findings. Composition of the draft Self-Study report will start after that. At that time, the lead team will complete the Document Inventory based on input received from the Working Groups in addition to evidence gathered by the Steering Committee.

## **Interaction between Working Groups**

The list of Working Group members has been shared with each of the Working Groups. They are encouraged to work with each other on common areas of interest. Further, the leadership team attends Working Group meetings and serves as the conduit between groups in ensuring collaboration.

## **VI. Guidelines for Reporting**

The Working Group responsibilities and expectations outlined under V form the basis upon which the work of the Working Groups will be assessed. The Working Groups will submit interim, draft reports by the end of May, 2019. These reports will include identification of the evidence demonstrating compliance with the Standards, gaps needing attention, and recommendations for improvement. The lead team will compile submitted reports from Working Groups into a stylistically consistent Self-Study Report. The final draft of the Self-Study Report will be done by February 2020. The draft report will then be sent to the Steering Committee and campus community for review and input.

Working Group reports will be structured as follows:

- Each group will complete an internally developed rubric by February 2019, and then again in May 2019; this rubric will be used to assess each standard for compliance with accreditation standards. A gap identified on the rubric in February should be addressed in May.
- Each Report will begin with an Overview that (1) summarizes the extent to which the college can demonstrate compliance with the Standard; (2) provides a narrative of the Working Group's procedures, actions, and methods; (3) provides clear answers to each guidance question; and (4) lists the Group's Chair and Membership.
- Each Report will then identify specific Strengths, to be supported by clear evidence supporting all relevant criteria.
- Each Report will then identify Challenges that need to be addressed, to be supported by an explanation of the origin and nature of these specific Challenges in regards to relevant criteria.

- Each Report will then provide clear suggestions for action needed to sustain or enhance Strengths, as well as to meet Challenges.
- Each Report will close with an Inventory of specific, relevant evidence.

## **VII. Organization of the Final Self-Study Report**

The final Self-Study Report will be organized as follows:

Table of Contents:

Section 1: Executive Summary

Section 2: Introduction and Institutional Background

Section 3: Mission and Goals

Section 4: Ethics and Integrity

Section 5: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

Section 6: Support of the Student Experience

Section 7: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Section 8: Planning, Resources and Institutional Improvement

Section 9: Governance, Leadership and Administration

Section 10: Conclusion/appendices

The Report will be formatted as follows:

- The Report will be written in Microsoft Word and a PDF version will be submitted.
- The font will be Times New Roman at 12 points.
- The Report will be centered and single spaced.
- Heading and sub-headings will be bolded.
- Spacing will be provided between paragraphs with no indentation.
- Sub-categories under each section may be numbered.
- Data tables, charts, and pictures may be embedded in the report and numbered when appropriate.
- Page numbers will be placed at the bottom of the report.

## **VIII. Verification of Compliance Strategy**

The Verification of Compliance process will be completed by the leadership team of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will utilize MSCHE resources to identify areas where evidence provided by the Working Groups satisfies the requirements of the Verification of Compliance. The leadership team will compile a cross-reference to map where evidence for the Verification of Compliance process appears in the Self-Study Report. If any element of the Verification of Compliance Process does not appear in the Self-Study, the leadership team will



provide this information. This cross-reference and supplemental evidence will appear in an appendix to the Self-Study Report.

Under the leadership of the Working Group chairs, the Working Groups will consult with offices across campus that may have evidence relevant for the report. Working Group chairs are advised to contact the lead team if they encounter any difficulty accessing data or information. The Working Groups and Steering Committee have regularly scheduled meetings where updates are provided regarding progress made in report writing as well as issues that may need to be addressed.

A Google Drive folder has been created for the Working Groups to document progress made on assessment of standards as well as to deposit evidence gathered for reference and report writing. The lead team regularly attends Working Group meetings to track progress. The Steering Committee is updated regularly about Working Group activity.

## IX. Self-Study Timetable

### Timetable for SUNY Broome Community College Spring 2021 Middle States Evaluation Visit

Date	Activity
May, 2018	Appointment of Self-Study Co-chairs
September, 2018	Assembly of Steering Committees
September, 2018	Assembly and Training of Working Groups
November, 2018	Self-Study Institute
January, 2019	Commencement of work on Self-Study Design
February, 2019	Remote meeting with commission staff liaison (2nd or 3rd week)
February - May, 2019	Working Groups complete gathering data and conducting analysis, and submit progress report to Steering Committee
April, 2019	Submission of Self-Study Design to MSCHE Liaison
April, 2019	Self-Study preparation visit by MSCHE Liaison
May, 2019	Approval of Self-Study Design by MSCHE
September, 2019 – January 2020	Steering Committee and Working Groups complete Self-Study draft report; campus stakeholders continually updated as to progress of the report
February - June, 2020	Team Chair chosen
	Visit dates decided
	Self-Study Design sent to Chair

February, 2020	Self-Study draft report shared with campus for input
May, 2020 – September 2020	Revisions made to draft report
October, 2020	Self-Study draft report sent to Team Chair (two weeks before visit)
November, 2020	Team Chair preliminary visit
January, 2021	Self-Study report finalized based on Team Chair's feedback
January, 2021	Report shared with campus for final input
April, 2021	Final Self-Study report uploaded to MSCHE portal (six weeks before visit)
	Evaluation Team on campus
	Institutional response
June, 2021	Commission meets to determine action

## X. Communication Plan

### Communication Plan to Campus Community on Middle States Re-accreditation Process

Purpose	By Who	Audiences	Methods	Timing
Announcement to campus community about impending re-affirmation of accreditation.	College President	Entire campus community	Email	Spring 2018
Appointment of Co-chairs for accreditation process.	College President	Entire campus community	Email	Spring 2018
Identification of Working Group members.	Co-Chairs and Steering Committee	Entire campus community	Email	Fall 2018
Identification of Steering Committee membership.	Co-Chairs	Entire campus community	Email	Fall 2018

Training for Working Group members on the accreditation process.	Lead Team	Working Group membership	Presentation	Fall 2018
Presentation to Board of Trustees about accreditation process.	Co-Chair	Board of Trustees	PowerPoint presentation	Monthly updates until visit
To update campus community about Self-Study process.	Co-Chairs	Steering Committee	Monthly meetings	Monthly until visit
	Lead Team	Students	Student government meetings, Middle States webpage, flyers, posters, postcards, Town-halls.	
	Lead Team	Faculty and staff	Divisional and department meetings, Middle States webpage, flyers, posters, postcards, town-halls.	
	Co-Chairs	Administration	Executive Council weekly meetings, Middle States webpage.	
	Lead Team	Board of Trustees	Email, monthly updates and presentations at board meetings, Middle States webpage.	
		Shared Governance Bodies (College Assembly(CA), Council on Academic Issues (CAI), Council on Operational Issues (COI)	Monthly meetings, Town-hall,	

Gather Input from across campus on Self-Study report.	Lead team	Students	Feedback from student government upon review of draft Self-Study report as well as updates provided.	May - October, 2020
		Faculty and staff	Feedback from faculty on draft report at town-halls, divisional and departmental meetings, Council on Academic Issues (shared governance body).	May - October, 2020
		Administration	Feedback from Executive Council on draft Self-Study report review.	May - October, 2020
		Board of Trustees	Feedback from board members after review of draft self-study report.	May - October, 2020
		Shared Governance Bodies: CA, CAI, COI		

## **XI. Evaluation Team Profile**

We recommend that the Team Chair come from a public two-year Community College that offers programs in the Liberal Arts, Business, Health Sciences and STEM. He/she should also be from a mid-size community college, if possible, who understands the dynamics of the Community College environment. The College is open to having either a chief executive officer or a chief academic officer as chair of the visiting team.

**Institutions that are considered comparable peers, preferably within the Middle States region:**

- Frederick Community College, Frederick MD
- Bucks County Community College, Newtown PA
- Cumberland County College, Vineland NJ
- Reading Area Community College, Reading PA

**Institutions that are considered aspirational peers, preferably within the Middle States region:**

- Delaware County Community College, PA
- Lehigh Carbon Community College, PA
- Borough of Manhattan Community College, NY

**Institutions with Possible Conflict of Interest:**

Employees from any of the SUNY system schools may present a conflict of interest and should be excluded from visiting teams coming to evaluate the college.

**SUNY Broome Community College Top Programs by Enrollment**

Below are the top seven most enrolled programs at the College as of Fall 2018:

- Individual Studies in Liberal Arts
- Health Studies
- Liberal Arts
- Business Administration
- Human Services
- Liberal Arts Sciences
- Criminal Justice

**XII. Evidence Inventory- Institutional Strategy for Completion**

This section of the document will be completed by the Working Groups. Each Working Group will use evidence relating to the accreditation criteria of its standard to provide evidence of compliance. Upon completion, the Evidence Inventory will be shared with the Steering Committee for review and input. Based on input received from the Steering Committee, the lead team will make needed changes and share the inventory with the campus community for comment before submission.