Draft Self-Study Design

LaGuardia Community College

The City University of New York

Submitted to

The Middle States Commission on Higher Education

In preparation for the 2010-2012 Self-Study

June 2, 2010
LaGuardia Community College  
Draft Self-Study Design  

Table of Contents

1. Institutional Overview........................................................................................................... 1
2. Nature and Scope of the Self-Study...................................................................................... 3
3. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study.................................................................................. 5
4. Organizational Structure....................................................................................................... 5
5. Research Questions and Inventory of Documentation....................................................... 16
6. Timeline.................................................................................................................................. 37
7. Editorial Style and Format for Working Groups Reports................................................... 38
8. Preferred Profile of the Visiting Team.................................................................................. 39
I. **Institutional Overview**

LaGuardia Community College is one of twenty three institutions in the City University of New York (CUNY), the nation’s leading urban public university. LaGuardia annually serves more than 17,000 credit students enrolled in over forty professional and transfer majors, as well as more than 35,000 non-credit students seeking career and educational experiences outside of degree programs in more than twenty different categories of Adult and Continuing Education programs. LaGuardia offers associate degree programs in the liberal arts and sciences, business and computer science, as well as career and allied health programs, and offers full-time students career internships as part of their program of study. LaGuardia graduates transfer to four-year colleges at double the national rate, and graduates’ family income increases an average of 17% upon graduation.

Located in Queens, the most ethnically diverse borough in the City of New York, LaGuardia’s students represent 161 countries and speak 124 languages. Over two-thirds of LaGuardia students were born outside the U.S, and half of the college’s incoming students have lived in the U.S. for less than five years. LaGuardia Community College has been accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education since 1974 and is governed by the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York.

Since its founding in 1971, LaGuardia has developed an activist and progressive approach to higher education and community service that has made it a leader in post secondary education with a national and international reputation for teaching excellence. As a Federally designated Hispanic serving institution, it was recognized in 2009 by Excelencia in Education for its exemplary leadership in serving the needs of Latino and nontraditional students. In 2008, the college won CUNY’s inaugural Sustainability Award for environmentally friendly best practices on campus. LaGuardia was named one of two Community Colleges of Excellence in the United States by the MetLife Foundation in 2006, and was named an Institution of Excellence by the Policy Center on the First Year of College for developing one of the best college freshman programs in the nation in 2003. Additionally, the National Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) ranked LaGuardia as one of the top three large community colleges in the U.S. for meeting benchmarks of high academic standards and practices in 2002.

LaGuardia faculty is dedicated to student success. Our professors have more than twice the number of doctorates as faculty at most community colleges. In 2004, the college received the 2004 Hesburgh Certificate of Excellence for Innovative Faculty Training Programs. Our Center for Teaching and Learning works with faculty to explore and support pedagogical initiatives of the highest quality, linking technology and pedagogy to advance student learning.

The Division of Adult and Continuing Education serves more than 35,000 participants annually in a variety of educational and training programs for workforce, economic and
community development. The Division is one of the largest non-credit education efforts in the country and has a broad range of programs for adults, youth and special populations. The Division is an acknowledged leader in adult literacy and English as a Second Language instruction. The Center for Immigrant Education was rated an exemplary program by the New York State Department of Education for its pioneering work in providing services to immigrants. The Small Business Development Center has helped entrepreneurs obtain over $25 million in loans, investments and grants since opening its doors in 2001.

LaGuardia has fostered innovative approaches to education and a dedication to community development with a ground-breaking cooperative education program and imbedded high schools, including the first Middle College. Among the college’s many initiatives are learning communities, interactive academic career planning, ePortfolio organization of student work and reflection, assessment of core competencies, virtual interest groups, peer tutoring, critical thinking across the curriculum, Bridge GED, and College for Children. New programs for early intervention with students moving toward academic disruption are gearing up to use information from the online eAttendance system, while a second campus-wide task force begins implementing On-Track, an effort to assist students in modeling successful behavior.

LaGuardia Community College’s mission is to provide access to higher education to New Yorkers of all backgrounds, ages and means. The college is committed to:

- Offering career, as well as liberal arts and science curricula, developmental education and transfer preparation, cooperative education internships, continuing education classes, and training programs serving individuals, businesses and public agencies;
- Responding creatively to changes in student population, technology, and the global economy;
- Providing extensive support services and opportunities for the needs of a highly diverse student population;
- Upholding high standards that focus on program assessment and innovative approaches to teaching and learning;
- Maintaining a dedicated, high-quality faculty and staff;
- Preparing students to become full participants in the economic and civic life of the city, the nation, and the world; and
- Cultivating partnerships with business, community organizations, government, and public schools to enhance the economic, social, cultural, and educational development of Western Queens and New York City.

Consistent with its mission, three strategic goals set by the City University guide the college’s work and the development of its annual strategic plan. These are: raise academic quality, improve student success, and enhance fiscal and management effectiveness. Work within these three goals is focused on assessing institutional and learning outcomes and using the results to strengthen programs and services, improve retention and graduation rates, and increase external fundraising to support the college’s
mission. Though LaGuardia has one of the highest transfer and six year graduation rates among community colleges in the U.S., it would like to significantly increase these. As part of its efforts to meet this challenge, in 2009 LaGuardia joined the Achieving the Dream initiative, a nation-wide project that provides leadership and technical assistance to community colleges, helping them move toward the elimination of achievement gaps and greatly increased overall rates of student success. LaGuardia is currently focused on improving its graduation rate, increasing the percentage of students who successfully complete basic skills, and increasing the number of GED graduates who transfer to credit programs directly, without needing further basic skills instruction.

President Gail O. Mellow leads the college. Her Executive Council consists of six Vice Presidents (Academic Affairs, Administration, Adult and Continuing Education, Enrollment Management and Student Development, Information Technology, and Institutional Advancement), the Director of Organizational Development and Planning, and the Executive Director for Government Relations and Special Counsel to the President. The President also receives advice and counsel from the College Senate, the President’s Cabinet (which is comprised of the 65 senior leaders at the college), the Faculty Council, the Student Government Association, and an informal committee consisting of the Chair of the Faculty Council, the Chair of the College Senate, the Professional Staff Congress (PSC) and LaGuardia’s representative on the University Faculty Senate, which meets quarterly.

II. **Nature and Scope of the Self-Study**

The decennial self-study in pursuit of a reaffirmation of accreditation is being welcomed by the LaGuardia Community College campus community as an opportunity to examine the wide range of programs and approaches that have appeared in the atmosphere of invention and entrepreneurial freedom notable since its founding. With the initiation of the Achieving the Dream project in the summer of 2009, LaGuardia has taken its’ already strong reliance on data and analysis and began asking even more difficult questions:

1. What is really working here?
2. How can we make sure that all students receive our best support?
3. How do all these things fit together to make a whole?
4. How do we explain ourselves to students sensibly enough such that every student knows how to find what we offer for his or her own success?

For these reasons, LaGuardia has chosen to undertake a comprehensive report in the context of the standards in *Characteristics of Excellence*. LaGuardia welcomes the discipline that this approach provides, enabling the college to include all constituencies in an appraisal of every aspect of its programs and services against a yardstick of student and community outcomes, all framed by its mission, values and vision of the future.
The college will organize the self-study around the fourteen standards, presenting evidence on its compliance with each. As such, there are now fourteen working groups, each pursuing the development of evidence relevant to compliance with a standard.

Under President Mellow, LaGuardia has organized around a strategic planning system, integrating all other systems at the college within the administrative framework of the CUNY system of higher education for New York City. The strategic planning system is the focus of all efforts at the college which aim for organizational effectiveness through continuous improvement, based on evidence revealed in a system of assessment with implementation fostered by a system of resource allocation.

Each standard will be viewed through the lens of how the efforts within that standard are guided by the strategic planning system and how those efforts lead to organizational effectiveness, where the primary goal of the college is to produce student learning and success. Thus, we will first seek to demonstrate how the mission and visioning efforts of the college underlie the strategic planning endeavor (standard 1). Then we will examine the ways in which the strategic planning system ties together mission, vision, goal-setting, resource allocation and assessment (standard 2). Within standard 3 we will develop evidence showing how resource allocation is driven by the strategic planning system, and then how the governance system of the college gives effective formal voice to all college constituencies (standard 4). We will then examine the evidence on how the administration of the college listens and leads in many ways, but most directly within the strategic planning system (standard 5). We will next demonstrate how our mission, vision and values underlie all our work to ensure that we do every task with integrity (standard 6). In standard 7 we will give evidence that we assess what we do in a way that drives the strategic planning system. Under standard 8 we will examine the evidence that we develop students effectively because of the difference we make in their lives. In standard 9 we will show that we have the support systems in place necessary to foster student success. We will then present evidence that we have the accomplished and dedicated faculty necessary to be educationally effective (standard 10), showing that they have produced an effective curriculum (standard 11), and that the faculty have developed a sound process for ensuring that students learn core competencies (standard 12). We will then present evidence that we apply our effective learning processes to all our learning situations (standard 13), and in standard 14 we will show that we have an effective system to keep improving the ways in which our students learn.
III. **Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study**

The Middle States Self-Study process provides an opportunity for LaGuardia’s multiple constituencies to investigate and analyze how the college meets its mission and goals. The objectives of the self-study are to:

2. Construct a narrative that demonstrates the college's adherence to Middle States accreditation standards.
3. Describe successes, strengths, and opportunities, as well as challenges in meeting our institutional mission.
4. Educate LaGuardia’s constituencies about our strengths, making known the college’s contributions locally as well as nationally.
5. Critically analyze the college’s growth edges, and make recommendations for maximizing these opportunities where appropriate to meet our mission.
6. Examine and make visible the institution’s commitment to continuous improvement.

IV. **Organizational Structure**

The LaGuardia Community College self study will be guided by a Steering Committee and Core Team appointed by the President. The chair of the Steering Committee, a professor of English, will be supported by five administrators serving on the Core Team: the Executive Director for Organizational Development and Planning; the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment; the Associate Dean for Student Affairs; the Executive Associate to the Dean, Academic Affairs; and the Director of the CUNY Language Immersion and College Prep Programs. Three members of the Core Team also serve on the Steering Committee (Director of Institutional Research and Assessment; the Associate Dean for Student Affairs; the Executive Associate to the Dean, Academic Affairs; and the Director of the CUNY Language Immersion and College Prep Programs).

The Steering Committee consists of the chairs of the fourteen Working Groups created to address each Middle States standard. The members of the Steering Committee and Working Groups were drawn from a broad cross-section of the college and include over 120 faculty, administrators, and staff. A co-chair has been designated for each Working Group. The composition of the Working Groups was accomplished through a lengthy collaborative process involving input from many stakeholders, including the Academic Chairs and the Executive Council. In addition, students will be invited to serve on Working Groups in Fall 2010 when each group begins its research.
The Core Team and Steering Committee will also consult regularly with the Executive Council, the Academic Dean of the College (who also serves on the Standard 14 Working Group), and the Academic Chairs. In addition, a communications team has been established for the self study that will, among other things, help manage the college’s self study website. This website will complement the campus forums, focus groups, surveys and other events that will be organized to ensure that the self study is an inclusive, transparent process engaging the entire college community. The Steering Committee, Core Team, and Working Groups also have use of a Sharepoint site created to facilitate the sharing and revision of documents. Finally, the Core Team and Steering Committee receive support from staff in the President’s Office.

The college has designated E517 as the Middle States Resource Room. Self-study supporting documents will be housed in the resource room. Cataloging and maintenance of Middle States self-study documents will be the responsibility of the librarian, with oversight by the Office of Institutional Research. Members of the Core Team, Steering Committee, and Working Groups will have access to the documents in the resource room to conduct research necessary to complete their self-study charge. Access will occur via appointment with the librarian.
Organizational Structure of the LaGuardia Community College
Middle States Self-Study

Working Groups

- Standard 1
  - Mission & Goals

- Standard 2
  - Planning, Resource Allocation, Institutional Renewal, Institutional Resources

- Standard 3
  - Institutional Resources

- Standard 4
  - Leadership and Governance

- Standard 5
  - Administration

- Standard 6
  - Integrity

- Standard 7
  - Institutional Assessment

- Standard 8
  - Student Admissions

- Standard 9
  - Student Support Services

- Standard 10
  - Faculty

- Standard 11
  - Educational Offerings

- Standard 12
  - General Education

- Standard 13
  - Related Educational Activities

- Standard 14
  - Assessment of Student Learning
Steering Committee and Core Team

LaGuardia Community College’s Middle States Steering Committee is chaired by Gordon Tapper, Professor of English. He receives support in guiding the Steering Committee from the five administrators serving on the Core Team.

The Core Team members are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael A. Baston</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Blaber</td>
<td>Director, CUNY Language Immersion and College Prep Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Dickmeyer</td>
<td>Director, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary L. Romanello</td>
<td>Executive Associate to the Dean, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary A. Talmadge</td>
<td>Executive Director for Organizational Development and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Tapper</td>
<td>Professor of English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Also serving on Steering Committee

The Steering Committee members are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mission and Goals</td>
<td>Scott White</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal</td>
<td>Michael Napolitano</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Chair of Business and Technology Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Institutional Resources</td>
<td>Shahir Erfan</td>
<td>Exec. Director of Facilities Management and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leadership and Governance</td>
<td>Unn Hiddle</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Shannon Bryant</td>
<td>Director of Finance ACE VP Office, EMSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Stanley Gayle</td>
<td>Assistant to Vice President and Student Affairs Officer, EMSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Team Charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities of the Core Team include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serving as the policy-making body to establish the direction, goals, and activities of the self-study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishing agendas for Steering Committee meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finalizing the Self Study Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assisting the Steering Committee to establish the format and scope of working group reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewing and suggesting revisions of all texts submitted by the working groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steering Committee Charge

Responsibilities of the Steering Committee include:

- Determining the key issues for the self-study
- Recommending a self-study model
- Developing a self-study design
- Establishing, charging and coordinating working groups
- Ensuring the timetable is implemented as planned
- Assuring communication within the institution about the process
- Arranging for institution-wide review of, and responses to, a draft
- Overseeing the completion of the final self-study report and any other documents relevant to the process and team visit

The Working Groups

The Working Groups members are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1: Mission and Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Instructional Renewal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Michael Napolitano</th>
<th>Associate Professor, Chair, Business and Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Diane Darcy</td>
<td>Executive Director of Human Resources, Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Hladek</td>
<td>Executive Director of Finance and Business, Business Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cristobal Stewart</td>
<td>Director of Enrollment Management Services, ACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonya Evariste</td>
<td>Associate Director, Early Childhood Learning Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Lindner</td>
<td>Director of Information Systems, Computer Systems Manager, IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Hitt</td>
<td>Managing Director, LaGuardia Performing Arts Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon Crandall</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Mathematics, Engineering and Computer Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Standard 3: Institutional Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Shahir Erfan</th>
<th>Executive Director of Facilities Management and Planning, Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Janice Karlen</td>
<td>Professor and Director of Business Programs, Business and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natalia Arguello</td>
<td>NY Designs Director, NY Designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soloman Kone</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ted Dec</td>
<td>Director of Network Administration, IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claudette Gray</td>
<td>Associate Director of Human Resources, Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bosa Grgurevic</td>
<td>Assistant Architect, Facilities Design and Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gail Baksh-Jarrett</td>
<td>Senior Director of Enrollment/Student Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yvonne Flores</td>
<td>Associate Grants Director, Grants Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas A. Fink</td>
<td>Professor, English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Unn Hidle</th>
<th>Associate Professor, Health Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Nancy Berke</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Goldstein</td>
<td>Senior Director of Student Life, EMSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jose Orengo</td>
<td>Executive Director of Government Relations/Special Counsel to the President, President’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Mellon</td>
<td>Director of Strategic Initiatives, Office of VP of ACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa O'Donnell</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minely Ulloa</td>
<td>Assistant Budget Director, Budget Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francine Egger-Sider</td>
<td>Professor and Coordinator of Technical Services, Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur Simms</td>
<td>Professor, Humanities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standard 5: Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Shannon Bryant</th>
<th>Director of Finance, ACE VP Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Edward Goodman</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Business and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carmen Luong</td>
<td>Associate Business Manager, Business Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Saluga</td>
<td>Associate Director of Recreation, Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sreca Perunovic</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheryl Still</td>
<td>Human Resource Specialist, Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eneida Rivas</td>
<td>Associate Director of College and Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olga Calderon</td>
<td>Chief CLT, Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 6: Integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Stanley Gayle</th>
<th>Assistant to VP and Student Affairs Officer, Enrollment Management Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Sigmund Shen</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April Tucker</td>
<td>Associate Director for Affirmative Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Javier R. McKinley</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Mathematics, Engineering and Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Wynn</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis D'Amelio</td>
<td>Lecturer, Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Levine</td>
<td>Coordinator for Educational Programs, LaGuardia and Wagner Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jhony Nelson</td>
<td>Director of Disabled Student Programs, Student Services and Disabled Student Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Diaz</td>
<td>Admissions Counselor, Admissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Nathan Dickmeyer</th>
<th>Director, Institutional Research and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Kathleen Forestieri</td>
<td>Director of Accounting Program, Business and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loretta Capuano-Vella</td>
<td>Director of Student Information Services, Student Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nila Bhaumik</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Human Resources, Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natalia Mosina</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Mathematics, Engineering and Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Ovadia</td>
<td>Assistant Professor and Web Design Librarian, Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Een</td>
<td>Associate Director, The English Language Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michele Valdez</td>
<td>Director, Training Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dilrukshan Priyantha Wijesinghe</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jin Lee</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Building Operations, Building Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Burl Yearwood</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Tony Abreu</td>
<td>Associate Bursar, Bursar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Dalsimer</td>
<td>Director of Pre College Academic Programming, ACE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVora Desvigne</td>
<td>Director of Admissions Services, EMSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abram Bolouvi</td>
<td>Enrollment Management Coordinator, Student Financial Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Albrecht</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Humanities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Polnariev</td>
<td>Director of ASAP, ASAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Johnsen</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erez Lencher</td>
<td>Senior Research Analyst, Institutional Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Dedolvskya</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Mathematics, Engineering and Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Ianotti</td>
<td>Assistant Director of The English Language Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoko Toyama</td>
<td>Assistant Professor and Counselor, Counseling/College Discovery Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 9: Student Support Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Alphonsus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lee Baker, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bimbi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Durfey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Insalaco-Egan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Joffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura McGowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Weintraub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Eisenstadt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 10: Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judit Torok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Michello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajendra Bhika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Tanenbaum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalband Hussain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suma Kurien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Taylor-Haslip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Standard 11: Educational Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>John Shean</th>
<th>Associate Professor, Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Jessica Mendoza</td>
<td>CUNY Office Assistant II, VP of Academic Affairs Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Gallo-Silver</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Fernandez</td>
<td>Instructor, Humanities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis Frazier</td>
<td>Associate Professor, College for Children and Teen Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVergne Trawick</td>
<td>Professor and Counselor, Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Murasso</td>
<td>Associate Registrar, Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Fluk</td>
<td>Professor and Coordinator of Library Instruction, Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karim Sharif</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Natural Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shara Sand</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Social Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Standard 12: General Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Philip Gimber</th>
<th>Associate Professor, Health Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Victoria Badalamenti</td>
<td>Director, The English language Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaoping Yen</td>
<td>Professor, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Conyers</td>
<td>Instructor, Periodicals and Government Documents Librarian, Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionne Miller</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Natural Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong Wook Won</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Mathematics, Engineering and Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Dickinson</td>
<td>Professor, Humanities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Piso</td>
<td>Assistant Director for Professional Development, Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith O'Toole</td>
<td>Chemical Hygiene Officer, Natural Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Giordano</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Business and Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Marian Blaber</th>
<th>Director, CUNY Language Immersion and College Prep Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Kelly Connelly</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kurzyna</td>
<td>Lecturer, Communication Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryam Esfarayeni</td>
<td>Associate Director of Allied Health, Career Ladder Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Perez</td>
<td>Professor, Mathematics, Engineering and Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Kasprak</td>
<td>Program Associate, Center for Teaching and Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hunt</td>
<td>Associate Director, Center for Immigrant Education and Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Trapani</td>
<td>Lecturer, Business and Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Quish</td>
<td>Lecturer, Adult Learning Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sreedevi Ande</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Mathematics, Engineering and Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Mary Romanello</th>
<th>Executive Associate to the Dean, Academic Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Debra Engel</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Health Sciences, Physical Therapy Assistant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Arcario</td>
<td>Dean, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Elizabeth Clark</td>
<td>Professor, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marisa Klages</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bret Eynon</td>
<td>Assistant Dean for Teaching and Learning/Academic Affairs, Center for Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ros Orgel</td>
<td>Associate Director for Technology &amp; Pedagogy, Center for Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercedes del Rosario</td>
<td>Project Director, Center for Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Michalowski</td>
<td>Senior Research Analyst, Institutional Research and Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Working Groups Charge

Responsibilities of the Working Groups include:

- Studying materials of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education
- Holding regular meetings
- Drafting research questions and identifying documentation for the Self Study Design
- Developing methods to respond to research questions
- Researching data
- Producing interim reports and other materials related to the self-study process
- Collaborating if necessary with other working groups
- Participating in college forums
- Writing a final draft of a chapter for the Self Study Report
V. Research Questions and Inventory of Documentation

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

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

1.1 How does the current Mission Statement reflect the purpose and goals of LaGuardia Community College?

1.2 How effectively does the college integrate CUNY’s goals into its own mission and goals?

1.3 What evidence do we have that the college has a process for reviewing its mission and goals and that the college’s different constituencies are well informed of its mission and goals?

1.4 What evidence do we have that the college’s mission drives academic and administrative decision-making at the college, including decisions about what internal initiatives and external opportunities are pursued?

1.5 What evidence exists that the college’s mission and goals support scholarly and creative activities that are appropriate and correspond to the institution’s purpose?

1.6 How well does the college’s mission statement enable us to adapt to changes in the external environment?

Documentation:

- Mission Statement (http://www.lagcc.cuny.edu/about/mission.aspx)
- Strategic Plan (https://web.laguardia.edu/president/content/)
- 2002 LaGuardia Middle States Self-Study Report
- 2007 Interim Self-Study and responses
- CUNY Goals (http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/chancellor/performance-goals/FINAL_University_PMP_Goals_and_Tags_for_2010-2011.pdf)
- LaGuardia Community College/CUNY Catalog
- Institutional Profile
- Departmental Strategic Plan Reports
• Division Strategic Plan Reports
• Departmental Mission Statements
• The CUNY Budget Request (annual publication, includes one page on LAGCC with college highlights and major budget amounts for coming year)
• In Transit
• LiveWire (internal newsletter)
• Vision Summit Web Page (http://www.lagcc.cuny.edu/visionsummit/)
• LaGuardia’s Allied Health Affiliated Contracts

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

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

2.1 How have LaGuardia Community College’s planning processes changed over the past five years? What processes and controls are in place to assure that resources are allocated in a manner consistent with the college’s mission and goals?

2.2 What evidence do we have that the processes of allocating resources improves the college’s ability to fulfill its mission?

2.3 What is the evidence that the relationship between the Strategic Plan and the budget development process (both operational and capital) are effectively reviewed and analyzed? What evidence do we have that this review process is effectively communicated to the college community?

2.4 What evidence do we have to demonstrate that the college is effectively planning today for its future?

2.5 What evidence do we have to demonstrate that the college reviews the planning and resources allocation processes to ensure that the results will promote improvement and institutional quality? How have we assigned responsibility for this improvement and for the assurance of accountability? What evidence do we have to demonstrate institutional and unit improvement efforts and their results?

Documentation:

• Strategic Plan (last 5 years)
• Business Office Budget Reports
• Tax Levy Reports
• Budget Planning Processes
• Executive Council Minutes related to budget and planning
Standard 3: Institutional Resources

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

3.1 How does LaGuardia Community College ensure that it has resources adequate to meet the mission and goals of the college? What processes are in place to ensure transparency and input by all stakeholders?

3.2 How does the college develop its long term financial projections and financial planning to include changes in the economic and educational environment of the college? What is the process for revising and updating these projections? How do the financial projections incorporate stakeholders' input? How does the college evaluate the adequacy of the financial plan?

3.3 How effectively do the college’s human resources processes ensure and maintain high professional standards for existing, new and replacement employees across all functional areas? Are the processes sufficient and adequate to respond to the requirements set out in the institutional mission, planning and assessment processes?

3.4 What is the evidence that the college’s facilities master plan aligns with the mission and goals of the college?
3.5 How does the college ensure that space is appropriately allocated to meet the mission and goals of the college?

3.6 What is the evidence that the college possesses a technology infrastructure that is flexible, scalable, and provides the ability to manage, retrieve and disseminate vital information necessary to meet planning and operational needs?

3.7 Are the college’s policies and procedures for documenting and recording financial transactions monitored through auditing processes? Does the college respond to recommendations from auditing bodies?

Documentation:

- Mission Statements since 2006
- College/CUNY strategic plans since 2006
- Annual Operating budget since 2006
- Financial Statements (audited)
- Non-tax levy budgets and allocation including gift/grants/auxiliary enterprise
- Strategic Goals Initiative and budget
- Documents that illustrate the process for mid-year adjustments
- Surveys of Faculty, Students and staff
- Space Utilization Reports
- Facilities Conditions Assessment Reports
- Facilities Master Plans
- Conditions Assessments plan
- New York City Capital Cash Flow
- CUNY Capital Budget allocations and Requests since 2006
- Financial documents illustrating long term financial projections
- Investments portfolios for college
- Tuition policies and collection rates
- Documents that illustrate the budget development process
- Enrollment Projections and simulations for the management of enrollment
- Collective Bargaining Agreements
- CUNY Personnel Rules and Regulations
- Employment contracts
- Faculty and Staff Handbook
- Hiring Procedures
- Title IX compliance
- Personnel and Budget Committee Minutes
- CUNY Staff guidelines
- CUNY job descriptions and minimum job requirements by payroll title
- Labor contracts (security, cleaning, building operations)
- Affirmative Action policy
- Search process documents
• College-wide sample of completed search results (including resume ranking sheets, interview reports, recommendation for hire)
• Documents illustrating capital planning and budget process.
• Technology Plan (to be updated)
• Analyses of space utilization and simulations (College and CUNY)
• Space Committee Minutes
• College Senate Minutes
• Interviews with members of R-25 Implementation Committee
• Faculty/Staff surveys
• Student Tech Fee and Expenditures
• Recent financial audits including financial aid
• CUNY’s internal audits
• Report on ACE Registration and billing system
• Responses to audit

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

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

4.1 How does LaGuardia Community College’s governance system define appropriate roles in the decision-making process and ensure participation for all constituents? How transparent is the governance system to the larger college community?

4.2 How has the college’s governance system changed in the last five years and how have these changes impacted the institution?

4.3 To what extent does the college periodically assess its governance system to ensure that it is consistent with CUNY’s and LaGuardia’s mission and goals?

4.4 How does the CUNY and LaGuardia governance system interpret student governance to accurately represent the interest and concerns of the student body within the context of the institutional mission?

4.5 What is the evidence that there is an effective selection and orientation process for new members of the college’s governance system, and ongoing professional development for existing members?

Documentation:

• CUNY. Council of Faculty Governance Leaders. Bylaws.
Standard 5: Administration

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

5.1 How does the Executive Council assess its effectiveness, including its ability to promote and monitor projects that cross divisional boundaries? In what ways has the Executive Council used these assessments to make changes in the way they coordinate their work?

5.2 What is the recruitment and credentialing process for senior administrative personnel at the college? To what extent does CUNY’s Central Office oversee the process, and does the process ensure an administration with the appropriate background, training and skills to guide the college toward achievement of its mission?
5.3 How has the administration defined effectiveness, and what evidence does it use to assess its effectiveness? How has the administration responded to these assessments in ways that improve its delivery of services?

5.4 How effective is communication between the administration and internal and external college constituents such as faculty, students and community stakeholders? Does this communication effectively inform the decision-making and planning process?

Documentation:

- Executive Council Minutes
- Executive Council retreat data
- Strategic Plans
- Strategic Initiative Documents (requests as well as funded amounts)
- Executive Council Charge
- Affirmative Action policy
- Search process for executive personnel
- Board of Trustees review process
- CVs of senior administration personnel
- Definitions of effectiveness as might be inherent in the strategic plan goals and targets measurements
- Interim strategic plan progress reports
- CUNY Performance Management Process Reports
- Measurement tools for Executive Council performance
- Evidentiary support of using results of existing measurement tools to change and improve service delivery
- Visioning summit information
- Satisfaction surveys
- Ad hoc strategic planning committee
- List of events to which external stakeholders may have been invited
- Student Advisory Council and Student Government Association representation
- Cabinet makeup

Standard 6: Integrity

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

6.1 To what extent are members of the LaGuardia Community College community given fair and equal opportunity to obtain employment, training, and promotion without regard to their personal status?
6.2 What evidence is there that the college adheres to fair and equitable processes for the recruitment and admission of students, including applicants to competitive degree programs? To what extent are students given fair and equal consideration for financial aid and access to student services?

6.3 How does the college ensure that employee and student grievance and appeals policies are effective, consistent, impartial, and fair? To what extent have analyses of these processes informed and changed college policies and practices?

6.4 To what extent does the college handle student disciplinary cases in a consistent and equitable manner?

6.5 What is the evidence that the college’s policies and procedures regarding the academic integrity of students are equitable and effective?

6.6 Does the college have effective methods to inform the college community of updated factual information about the college, including reports from regulatory and accrediting bodies?

Documentation:

- Instructional Staff Handbook
- Affirmative Action Policy
- College Catalog – Section on Office of Student with Disabilities – ADA Regulations
- Grievance Policy and Procedures
- Collective Bargaining Agreements
- Academic, Fiscal and Personnel Matters for the Chancellor’s Report; Errata and Addendum Reports to the Chancellor’s report.
- Faculty Workload Report
- Affirmative Action Report
- Ethnicity and Gender Report
- Equal Employment Opportunity Report
- CUNY First Payroll Management System Discrepancy Report
- Personal Vacancy Notice (PVN)
- Consolidated CUNY Advertisements
- LaGuardia Community College Advertisements
- Human Resources Website
- Curriculum Committee Policies and Procedures
- College Catalog
- Documented Criteria for Recruitment and Admission
- LaGuardia Community College Student Handbook
- Financial Aid Audit Report and Management Letter
- Records of outcomes of student and staff filed grievance and subsequent appeal cases.
• CUNY Bylaws – Article 15, §15.3 (Student Disciplinary Procedures)
• Collective Bargaining Agreement Grievance Process
• NYS Higher Education Law – Article 129-A (Henderson Rules)
• CUNY Procedures for Handling Student Complaints about Faculty Conduct in Academic Settings
• CUNY Bylaws – Article 15, §15.3 (Student Disciplinary Procedures)
• CUNY and LaGuardia Community College Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures
• LaGuardia Community College Student Handbook: Rights and Responsibility of Students
• Statistical outcomes of cases filed and decided (if available)
• LaGuardia Community College Web Site
• LaGuardia Community College Plasma Screens
• CUNY and LaGuardia Community College policies and guidelines, and other State and Federal documents, regarding campus security and workplace violence prevention policy and procedures

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

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

7.1 How does LaGuardia Community College’s leadership demonstrate support for and foster a culture of assessment: college-wide, divisionally, departmentally, and programmatically? What is the level of college commitment for assessment in terms of guidance (e.g., templates and timelines) and resources (e.g., staff time, administrative support, technical assistance, and financial support)?

7.2 Within the strategic plan, how is success defined and measured for each CUNY goal? What evidence is there that divisional assessment outcomes contribute to the achievement of the college’s targets, which in turn integrate into a broad assessment of institutional effectiveness?

7.3 How are assessment results shared with appropriate constituencies? How is the information made accessible, and what information is provided on the potential application and use of collected data?

7.4 What assessment results/data indicate that certain modifications and/or improvements are needed at various institutional levels (curricula and pedagogy, programs and services, and so forth)? What exactly was done or what is being done in the designated directions?
7.5 Where are the gaps in assessment and what challenges do these reveal? How often are existing assessment processes reviewed to determine the correlation between the results collected and the goals of the college? Have the reviews led to changes in the assessment process?

Documentation:

- Proposed Assessment Guidelines
- Interviews with Executive Council members
- Online Assessment Template (in process)
- Center for Teaching and Learning organization documents
- CUNY Performance Management Process Report
- Strategic planning documents
- Achieving the Dream Data subcommittee reports
- Grant Reports
  - ePortfolio
  - Academic Peer Instruction Statistics
- ACT Student Opinion Survey Cover
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement Report (online)
- SIR Reports
- Performance Management Process Online
- Achieving the Dream website
- LiveWire article
- Strategic Plan Final Reports
- Adult and Continuing Education (ACE) Outcomes studies for all 22 cost centers
- ACE Cohort studies for students going from ACE into degree programs
- ACE Fiscal assessment reports
- Achieving the Dream Directions paper and rubric
- Academic Division Periodic Program Review Reports

**Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention**

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

8.1 How effective have LaGuardia Community College’s efforts been to address student retention? How are the college’s retention programs guided by institutional assessment outcomes?

8.2 How effectively does the college communicate to and help retain students who have applied to candidacy programs and/or competitive majors and are not accepted?

8.3 How do the college’s financial aid and other related institutional policies promote or hinder student enrollment and retention?
8.4 How successfully has the college taken into account student attributes in the planning of appropriate changes in policies and practices (for example, enrollment management, skills assessment, remediation, advisement, etc) that affect student admission and retention?

8.5 How has the college managed the demand from potential students within the CUNY system in a way that recognizes the limited resources of the college?

8.6 How does the college ensure that current and prospective students have accurate and comprehensive information about academic programs and policies, basic skills, financial aid, and transfer?

Documentation:

- Annual special programs reviews (such as ASAP, College Discovery, GED Bridge program)
- Departmental Self Studies
- Studies on Retention conducted by EMSD and Academic Affairs
- Studies that examine how the college achieved retention goals outlined in the present and past Strategic Plans
- Qualitative Leavers Study conducted by J. Weintraub and N. Dickmeyer (Institutional Research and Assessment) from students leaving LaGuardia, and students switching from full time to part time
- Financial Aid study (Retention and Unmet Financial need)
- Study carried out by the Bursar Office on students that canceled reports.
- Student Profile on Institutional Research and Assessment website
- Integrated Post Secondary Education Data System information and/or summary reports
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement Summary Reports

**Standard 9: Student Support Services**

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

9.1 What is the evidence that student support services are effective at meeting the wide-ranging needs of LaGuardia Community College’s student population? What is the evidence that these services are helping the college fulfill its mission and goals?

9.2 To what extent has the college been successful at informing students, faculty, and staff about the wide range of student support services offered by the college?

9.3 What changes has the college made in the student advisement process over the past five years? What prompted these changes and what data has been collected to assess the outcomes and effectiveness of these initiatives?
9.4 To what extent are students aware of the procedures for filing a grievance or complaint? How does the institution provide information on these procedures? How well do students understand the procedures for filing a grievance and how effective is the institution's mechanism for handling student’s complaints or grievances?

9.5 What on-line support services exist? How effective is that support? What support does the college offer to facilitate students’ use of these services?

9.6 What policies and systems exist to ensure the security of student records? How is the college community made aware of those policies? How is compliance with those policies monitored?

Documentation:

- LaGuardia Community College Advisement Websites
- Developmental Advising Model Report
- College-wide Advisement Day
- ACE reports of GED students who have enrolled in credit programs
- ESL Advisement Day Assessment report
- DegreeWorks (by advisors and peers) Assessment
- DegreeWorks Ticketing System Report
- eTools (Live@LaGuardia, CUNY Portal, DegreeWorks, eSIMS) Assessment
- Education Majors’ Workshop Assessment
- First Year Institute Re-advisement Assessment (Vincent Bruno)
- Intent to Graduate Workshops Assessment
- Learning Styles & Study Skills Assessment
- Making the Most of Academic Advisement Summary
- Note-taking Guide
- "Plan B" Workshops (for Allied Health majors) workshop materials
- Undergraduate Success Initiative (offered when all FSMs are filled as stop-gap measure)
- Official Withdrawal Intervention Notice
- Surveys from all faculty trainings done since October 2008
- Surveys from faculty who participated in College-Wide Advising Day
- Surveys from Art of Advising Seminar (semester-long professional development program)
- Use and Usability Survey for DegreeWorks (to be sent to all faculty who ask if they have received training and whether or not they would like additional training.)
- Counseling Periodic Review - 2007
- Evaluation of Academic Advisement Services
- Academic Screening Day Evaluation Form
- New Student Seminar Syllabus
- New Student Seminar Pre-Post Test -- Spring 2009
• New Student Seminar Course Evaluation -- Fall 2009
• Faculty contact forms-data collected from departments on how many students they advise per semester
• PASS assessment report
• NSAR Plan and tracking report
• Student handbook
• College Website
• Public Safety Manual
• Orientation Sessions Brochures (available on a flashdrive)
• Student Complaints and Grievances Report form
• Career Central - Faculty/staff survey; student survey
• Call Project Results Reports
• Prospective Student Information
• EMSD Feedback Web Form
• LIVE@LaGuardia
• Web Page Analytic
• FERPA Notification of Student Rights
• CUNY Directory Information Non-Disclosure Form
• Freedom of Information Law Notice (FOIL)
• Freedom of Information Law Request
• Records Retention and Disposition Schedule
• Public Access to Records - Students
• Records Access Policy 7:11
• LaGuardia's Data Warehouse (The Blue Book)
• Student Handbook
• CUNY Website

**Standard 10: Faculty**

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

10.1 Are LaGuardia Community College’s standards and procedures for the evaluation of faculty (including appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and dismissal) equitable and clearly articulated? Are these standards and procedures applied consistently for all faculty members, including part time, tenure track, and non-tenure track positions?

10.2 How does the college ensure that the faculty and other professionals are appropriately qualified?

10.3 To what extent are student outcomes (as defined by course pass rates, programmatic outcomes and core competencies) affected by whether courses are taught by part time or full time faculty?
10.4 To what extent are teaching assessments effective in promoting teaching excellence and professional growth?

10.5 How effective and available are professional development opportunities in assisting faculty with their teaching, research, and scholarship?

10.6 How have professional development activities for faculty contributed to improved student outcomes?

10.7 To what extent does the college prepare faculty to provide students with academic advisement?

10.8 To what extent have qualified faculty been responsible for program development and curricular revisions at the college?

10.9 How has the distribution of teaching, scholarship, and service changed over the past ten years for tenured and untenured faculty, both full time and part time?

10.10 How does the college encourage and support academic freedom and what measures are taken to ensure that the college’s policy on academic freedom is effectively communicated and adhered to?

Documentation:

- Human Resources Faculty Handbooks
- PSC/CUNY Collective Bargaining Agreement
- CUNY Legal Affairs web site (http://www.lagcc.cuny.edu/legalaffairs/)
- Affirmative Action Policies
- CUNY Academic Freedom Statement (http://library.laguardia.edu/webguide/academicfreedom)
- CUNY University Faculty Senate Statement on Academic Freedom (http://cunyufs.org/academicfreedom.pdf)
- CUNY Bylaws
- Curriculum Committee minutes and documents
- Human Resources new faculty orientation materials
- New Faculty Colloquium materials
- Departmental orientation materials for part-time faculty
- Center for Teaching and Learning documentation of faculty development seminars, including data on success rates of classes taught by faculty who participate in professional development seminars
- Human Resources Leadership Program
- Human Resources PATH program
- In Transit
- IR study of the performance of part time faculty against full time faculty as measured by the test success rates of students in their basic skills courses
• Programs of President’s reception to celebrate the accomplishments of faculty and staff who have published
• Faculty and Staff Notes
• Surveys from all faculty advisement trainings done since October 2008
• Surveys from faculty who participated in College-Wide Advising Day
• Surveys from Art of Advising Seminar (semester-long professional development program)
• DegreeWorks training materials including introductory demonstrations
• Use and Usability Survey for DegreeWorks
• Peer observation form and SIR questions

**Standard 11: Educational Offerings**

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

11.1 How does LaGuardia Community College ensure that its educational offerings are consistent with the institutional mission?

11.2 To what extent are student learning outcomes incorporated into program goals and course syllabi?

11.3 How does the college develop new degree programs in response to potential student needs and demands in a way that promotes transfer and/or job success of graduates, sufficient resources for program effectiveness, and conformance to associate’s degree rigor?

11.4 What is the evidence that graduates are well prepared academically for transfer to baccalaureate programs?

11.5 What is the evidence that graduates are well prepared for employment in the areas of their majors? How has that evidence been used to change the college curriculum?

11.6 What resources are available to support students in achieving the learning goals of each program? How adequate and effective are the resources? How has this evidence been used to improve learning resources?

11.7 To what extent does the college communicate policies and procedures regarding transfer credit?

**Documentation:**

• Alumni Surveys
• Institutional Profile
• Sample syllabi
• Interviews with academic chairs and program directors
• Curriculum Committee Guidelines
• Handbook of Policy and Procedure on Curriculum
• Curriculum Committee Archives
• Interview with Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs for Program Development and Evaluation
• Periodic Program Reviews
• Chancellor’s Reports
• College catalog
• New program proposals
• Articulation agreements with senior CUNY colleges
• Data from the Office of Transfer Services
• CUNY Central reports on transfer
• National Clearinghouse (report from CUNY Central)
• Data provided by LaGuardia’s Employment and Career Services Center
• Employers Survey
• Coop Internship Evaluations
• Review of Clinical Internships
• Reports to state accrediting agencies
• CUNY Central Reports (College Now, ASAP)
• Early College Graduation Reports
• Nursing Placement and Performance Data (other allied health)
• Studies on Learning Communities

Standard 12: General Education

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

12.1 How are LaGuardia Community College’s curricula designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in our general education core competencies?

12.2 Who is responsible for developing the core competencies through the college curricula? What is the evidence that core competencies are well integrated into each curriculum? What activities have been developed within those courses to reflect core competencies?

12.3 In what ways are the goals of general education communicated to the students? Have these communication strategies been effective in demonstrating to students the importance and necessity of core competencies?

12.4 How does the Urban Studies Program contribute to the core competencies?
Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

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

13.1 Basic Skills

13.1.1 What procedures exist at LaGuardia Community College for identifying students who are not fully prepared for college level study and referring these students to relevant courses? How effective are these procedures?

13.1.2 How well do the Basic Skills programs and related support services in Writing, Mathematics, Reading, and ESL help students transition to credit bearing courses and remain on track to receive degrees?

13.1.3 To what extent have the college’s innovations over the last five years improved the rate at which students progress from Basic Skills to gateway courses?

Documentation:

- Institutional Profile
- College Catalogue
- Reading – Periodic Program Review
• Writing – Periodic Program Review
• Math – Ongoing Research Reports
• ESL (as developmental studies) – Periodic Program Review
• Basic Writing Handbook
• CUNY Placement Exam Website and Instructions
• Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes/ Reports
• Retention Report
• Achieving the Dream Reports
• Gates Foundation Reports
• Critical Junctures Reports (LaGuardia Institutional Research)
• Quantum Leap Reports

13.2 Non-Credit Offerings

13.2.1 What evidence exists that non-credit offerings are aligned with the college’s missions and goals?

13.2.2 What measures ensure that non-credit courses are consistently created, reviewed, administered and evaluated with clear goals, objectives, and expectations of student learning?

13.2.3 When applicable, what procedures ensure that non-credit courses are compatible and transferable to degree programs?

13.2.4 How has the college’s increasing integration of the non-credit and credit areas of the college affected its ability to evaluate the impact of non-credit offerings on institutional resources?

Documentation:

• Mission Statement
• Institutional Profile
• Strategic Plan
• LaGuardia Organizational Chart
• Adult and Continuing Education (ACE) Catalogue
• Student Evaluation Surveys
• ASISTS (NY State database for Adult Literacy)
• PeopleWare Reports
• The Mega Study: From ACE to Credit Studies
• The ACE Cohort Study
• College Transition Initiative Reports
• Achieving the Dream Reports
• ACE Grant Reports
• ACE Grant Committee Minutes
• ACE Curriculum Committee Minutes/ Archives
• ESL Levels Rubric
• Student Progress and Outcomes Report
• Counting the Hidden Assets- (Macomb Community College)
• LaGuardia Space Committee Minutes/ BPR Minutes
• LaGuardia Master Plan

13.3 Certificate Programs

13.3.1 Are certificate programs at the college consistent with its institutional mission? Do these programs have clear and published goals, objectives, expectations of student learning, and curricular sequences? Are they administered and periodically evaluated under established institutional procedures?

13.3.2 Where relevant, are these programs comparable and transferable to degree programs and consistent with national criteria?

13.3.3 What support services are available for students enrolled in certificate programs and how effective are they?

13.3.4 How are student skills, knowledge and competency levels measured in certificate programs?

Documentation:

• Mission Statement
• College Catalogue
• ACE Catalogue
• AA and ACE Curriculum Committee Minutes/ Reports
• ACE Passing Rate Reports from Individual Programs
• Student Handbooks for Certificate Programs
• Individual Program Audit Reports
• Industry Standards & Certification Requirements
• New York State curricula for allied health certificates

13.4 Contractual Relationships and Affiliated Providers

13.4.1 Are programs and services offered at LaGuardia through contractual relationships and affiliated providers consistent with its institutional mission? What measures are in place to protect the college’s integrity and assure proper oversight for programs and services?

Documentation:

• Academic Affairs Veterinary Technology Program- Contracted Services
• Academic Affairs -Allied Health- Contracted Services
13.5 **Experiential Learning**

13.5.1 To what extent has assessment of student learning been used to improve curricula in Cooperative Education studies at the college?

13.5.2 What services exist for granting credit for experiential learning? What evidence do we have that students given experiential credit have achieved all the learning goals of their programs?

Documentation:

- College Catalog
- Dept. of Cooperative Education Periodic Program Review
- LaGuardia website on Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)
- ACE Catalogue
- CLEP offerings
- Annual Assessment Reports on CPL
- College-Wide Exemption List from Institutional Research
- Curriculum for Portfolio Development Course

**Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning**

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

14.1 What is the evidence that LaGuardia Community College measures student achievement of core competencies and programmatic competencies?

14.2 How effectively does the college communicate each program’s learning objectives and the college’s core competencies?

14.3 How is the ePortfolio process supporting and facilitating outcomes assessment?

14.4 What impact does the college’s academic assessment process have on curriculum development and revision, pedagogical strategies, and student learning?
14.5 To what extent are the results of student assessment information shared and discussed with appropriate constituencies?

14.6 To what extent are faculty involved in the outcomes assessment process, including closing the loop?

Documentation:

- LaGuardia Community College Outcomes Assessment Plan (other policies that relate to assessment)
- Core Competencies Assessment Rubrics
- Completed Periodic Program Review Reports
- Programmatic Assessment Grids and Implementation Plans
- Approved Program Curriculum Documents
- Official Course Proposal
- Course Syllabi
- Deposited Student ePortfolio artifacts
- Institutional Research Reports and Data Sets as outlined in Outcomes Assessment Plan
- Agendas and/or Minutes of events where educational program outcomes are discussed and disseminated to the LaGuardia CC community (program directors meetings, instructional staff meetings, department meetings, etc)
- Core Competency Assignments
- Communication materials
- Faculty Development Center program documentation – mini grant reports
VI. Timeline

Spring 2010

- Formation of Steering Committee
- Formation of Working Groups
- Draft of Research Questions
- Identification of existing documentation and potential requirements for additional evidence
- Draft of Self Study Design
- Middle States liaison preparation visit
- Establishment of work plans for Working Groups

Summer 2010

- Revision and approval of Self Study Design
- Assembly of Evidence

Fall 2010-Spring 2011

- Working Groups collect and analyze evidence to address research questions
- Surveys, focus groups, and campus forums conducted
- Working Groups submit interim progress reports to Steering Committee and Core Team
- Working Group Meeting to Share Findings
- Working Groups draft preliminary reports
- Steering Committee and Core Team provide feedback on preliminary reports

Summer 2011

- Steering Committee and Core Team complete first draft of report

Fall 2011

- Draft report shared with Executive Council, CUNY Central, and campus constituencies
- Steering Committee and Core Team revise report
- Revised Draft report submitted to MSCHE Evaluation Team Chair (December)

Spring 2012

- Preliminary Site Visit by Chair of MSCHE Evaluation Team (January)
- Steering Committee and Core Team finalize report
- Final draft of Self Study submitted to MSCHE Evaluation Team (March)
- Final MSCHE Evaluation Team Site Visit to LAGCC (April)
VII. Editorial Style and Format for Working Groups Reports

The editorial style for all Working Group reports is 1.5 inch margins, left justified, 12 point Times New Roman font, and single spacing. Headings as shown in template will be in bold.

MSCHE Standard:
Co-Chairs:
Overview of Working Group Charge: 2-3 Sentences

Research Question Addressed:

Brief Description of “Point in Time”: 1-2 short paragraphs about the current situation, issues, trends, etc. related to specific research question

Inventory of Documents and Evidence: Data studied

Data Analysis Discussion:

Findings and Conclusions (including relationships to standard):

Relationship to Other Standards: Discussion of how findings on this question are related to topics addressed by other working groups and nature of any collaborative efforts.

Recommendations for Improvement:
VIII. Preferred Profile of the Visiting Team

Several aspects of LaGuardia’s distinctive structure and setting should be considered when recruiting members for the visiting team. As has already been mentioned, LaGuardia is part of a very large public university, which includes graduate, four year, and two-year institutions and where many functions, including board oversight, are highly centralized. It is also set in a uniquely diverse urban community with a large percentage of students who were born in other countries. LaGuardia Community College has made a substantial commitment to creating a culture of evidence and using technology to support teaching and learning, as well as student services. It is also a leader in economic and workforce development and has built effective partnerships locally, nationally and internationally. LaGuardia has been extraordinarily successfully in acquiring grant funding to support its mission and goals and is currently strengthening its capacity to secure greater external funding.

The Visiting Team should include members who understand these important aspects of the campus, and can challenge LaGuardia to strengthen its performance. Therefore, from the College’s perspective, the visiting team should be very diverse and include members with experience in:

- systems that integrate two-year, four-year and graduate institutions;
- highly structured management systems where budget and curricula have to be approved centrally;
- large urban institutions;
- using data to follow student progress and articulate the ways in which student information systems can be mined to help faculty and staff;
- information technology to support administrative functions and teaching strategies;
- economic development, including an understanding of the relationship of a community college to its community;
- grants and fundraising; and
- community organizations.