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I. INTRODUCTION

Atlantic Cape Community College is a comprehensive two-year public institution serving the residents of Atlantic and Cape May Counties. Founded in 1964, classes were first offered in fall 1966 in rented facilities in Atlantic City. In February 1968, the College moved to its present main campus location in Mays Landing. The College has been the main provider of community college education to residents of Cape May County since 1973. Since 1984, both credit and non-credit classes have been offered in Atlantic City at the Charles D. Worthington Atlantic City Center.

In January 1999, Atlantic Community College became a joint college encompassing both Atlantic and Cape May Counties and was renamed Atlantic Cape Community College in February 1999. After many political and environmental impediments, a full service Cape May County campus is under construction with anticipated opening in summer 2005.

The mission of the college reads

Atlantic Cape Community College is a comprehensive, student centered institution of higher education that prepares students to live and work in the 21st Century by providing superior academic, technical, and training programs in an increasingly culturally diverse society, characterized by a globally integrated economy, where technology is essential to most areas of life and where modern communication has brought the world’s citizens in close proximity. The college and its employees serve the community by offering educational and support services that encourage students to pursue academic excellence, professional growth, and high ethical standards throughout their lives. Accordingly, we offer the residents of Atlantic and Cape May Counties, and others, associate degrees, liberal arts transfer programs, certificate programs and a wide range of technical training and courses for professional and personal growth. We provide access to these courses and programs by maintaining a moderate tuition rate, pursuing open admissions and affirmative action policies, and offering developmental programs and other support services. We respond to the economic, social, academic, cultural, and work force needs of a diverse constituency by working in partnership with other schools, business and industry, and government.

In the fall 2003 semester, 2,702 full-time students and 3,475 part-time students were enrolled. Five hundred forty students were non-degree seeking.

Seventy-nine full-time faculty members hold master’s degrees, doctorate degrees, or both. Nearly all adjunct faculty members hold master’s degrees or higher.

The College offers 41 degree programs. Twelve A.A. degrees, thirteen A.S. degrees, and sixteen A.A.S. degrees are offered. In addition to these offerings, the College has 32 professional series courses that prepare students for entry-level positions.
ACCC’s proximity to Atlantic City necessitates program offerings that prepare students to work in the hospitality industry. To fulfill this need, the college has the Academy of Culinary Arts, a Hospitality Management program, and the Casino Career Institute.

II. PRELIMINARY PLANNING

In spring 2004, Dr. Agnes Armao, Vice President of Academic Affairs, appointed Daniel Thoren, Professor of Government and Business Administration, to the role of Middle States Steering Committee (MSSC) chair. Maryann Flemming-McCall, Director of Adjunct Instructor Support and Development, was appointed co-chair of MSSC. Administrative support would come from the office of the Dean of Academic Resources. The editing of the final document would be done by Vickie Melograno, Outcomes Assessment Program Coordinator.

Subcommittees of the MSSC were formed in early spring 2004. These subcommittees consisted of College stakeholders and a wide array of representatives from various divisions of the College: faculty, staff, Board members, and students. These subcommittees met for the first time in April 2004. During this initial meeting, they accomplished the following tasks:

- They reviewed and clarified the assigned standard(s).
- They established a schedule for continuing their work during the summer 2004.
- Some subcommittees divided in work groups to examine the specific components of the respective standards.

Since this initial meeting, these subcommittees have communicated either in person or via a WebCT discussion board and have created charge questions for their respective standards.

In addition to these subcommittees, a student focus group was formed. This group consists of present and former ACCC students. The first meeting of the student focus group was July 26, 2004. They discussed what facilitates and impels learning in the classroom.

III. NATURE AND SCOPE OF SELF-STUDY

Atlantic Cape Community College has chosen to undertake a comprehensive self study, with an emphasis on institutional assessment and particularly, student learning. The comprehensive self-study is the logical option for us in light of the following factors:

- Our new Cape May campus will be ready for classes in fall 2005. This addition will provide greater accessibility and increased opportunities for
Cape May County students. We are the first community college in the state to have multiple, self-contained, full-service campuses.

- Major renovations are underway at the Charles Worthington Atlantic City Center. This will improve the facilities for ACCC’s urban students.
- ACCC will be conducting a presidential search at the same time as going through the self-study process. Additionally, changes to the administrative structure have been made. An interim Vice President of Administration position has been established and someone has been appointed to that position by the Board of Trustees.
- Many tenured faculty members are retiring resulting in an influx of new faculty. We currently have forty-six tenured and thirty-three non-tenured faculty members.
- We serve a diverse population.
- We are an online learning leader. We have eight online degree programs, and fourteen percent of our students are enrolled in online classes. Also, we are one of thirty-six institutions in the country to be selected to offer courses to E-Army U soldier learners. Three Associate of Arts degree programs can be obtained through E-Army U: literature, psychology, and history.
- Our first 2005-2006 Strategic Priority is to provide education and training to the Cape May and Atlantic County communities by delivering high quality programming and instruction.
- Number four on our 2005-2006 Strategic Priority list is to “evolve to a progressive, collegial, and collaborative learning community committed to systematic improvement and operational effectiveness.” (10)

The breadth of our strategic priorities is evident, as is the all-encompassing influence of the new campus on our current campuses; both compel us to consider our institution comprehensively. Yet, many of our institutional priorities, including the new campus, have a direct connection with and impact on student learning; as such, a comprehensive model with a focus on student learning seems to be the most appropriate model.

The design for the self-study will be structured around an analysis of the college’s strengths and will focus on areas of improvement. Each area of the college will be studied in relation to at least one of the Middle States standards. Our Middle States’ Committee has been charged with determining the institution’s effectiveness in meeting those standards. We intend to learn whether the college addresses those standards effectively. We are prepared to build upon what we have already accomplished and address any areas of needed improvement.
IV. GOALS

Our goals reflect the comprehensiveness of our self-study but focus on student learning:

1. **Re-examine and cultivate a culture of inquiry, debate, collaboration and learning.**

   Such a culture depends on the success of the college organization, and we hope our self study helps our institution to bend and change so that we can face the future even stronger than before. We expect to preserve our core values of teaching, learning and scholarship while at the same time question familiar routines and traditional practices. This accreditation process will examine our collegiate culture and ultimately strengthen the organization.

   By involving members from all departments and areas, we will examine to what extent our collective efforts support the common goal of improving student learning. Through this we will determine ways to capitalize on our strengths and address any weaknesses that may adversely impact our effectiveness.

2. **Re-examine the teaching- learning process so that our college affirms the enormous possibilities of transformative learning experiences and fosters those experiences for our students.**

   Central to our self study is the examination of assessment options for our general education and career programs. We have completed a year-long pilot project on assessment of student learning. Our efforts to re-evaluate student learning experiences that influence student behavior will be an ongoing goal of the college.

3. **Examine and cultivate a culture of diversity that promotes tolerance, mutual respect, and self-discovery.**

   This cultural variety is an important organizational asset. Our college represents a rich diversity of cultures. We want all the members of our college community to share a foundation of core values without having to sacrifice the uniqueness of their individual cultures.

4. **By reexamining our institution through the questioning and debate of the self-study, we will strengthen our organizational vitality and meet the level of trust and assurance of the Middles States accrediting team.**
V. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF STEERING COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

Steering Committee: One of the primary focuses of the self-study is student learning. Recognizing that faculty is the foundation for excellence in student learning, a senior member of the faculty was appointed chairperson of the Middle States Committee. The Director of Adjunct Instructor Support and Development was appointed as co-chair to assist in the coordination of the college-wide effort. Representatives from all areas of the college – faculty, administration, trustees, and students – are participating on the committee, representing the interests of all three college campuses. Nine of the steering committee members additionally function as chairpersons of the nine subcommittees. Their tasks include disseminating information about the self-study process and facilitating the progress of the subcommittees.

Chairperson: Daniel Thoren, Professor, Government and Business Administration
Co-Chairperson: Maryann McCall, Director, Adjunct Instructor Support and Development

1. Bobby Royal, Executive Assistant to the President
2. Jack Hufty, Manager, Grants Writing and Research
3. William Dougherty, Assistant Professor, Computer Information Systems
4. Otto Hernandez, Associate Professor, Computer Information Systems
5. Lydia Lehr, Assistant Professor, Art/ Loretta Dicker, Assistant Professor, Computer Information Systems
6. Marion Pool, Program Officer, Continuing Education
7. Joseph Rossi, Interim Vice President, Administration and Finance
8. Amy Shelton, Assistant Professor, Mathematics
9. Art Wexler, Associate Professor, Psychology and Education

Agnes Armao, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Josette Katz, Dean, Academic Resources
Joyce Grohman, Dean, Instruction
Nick Talavecchia, Trustee (Atlantic County)
Max Slusher, Ex-officio, Assistant Dean, Research
Tiffany Novack, President, Student Government Association

Sub-committees: Nine (9) subcommittees, with approximately 10 members each, were formed that represent a cross section of the College’s three campuses and represent various divisions of the college (e.g., faculty, student support, administration, continuing education, and students). The members are either individuals whose work assignments relate to the respective standard for that subcommittee or are individuals that have expressed an interest in that area.
Each subcommittee has been charged with addressing one or two of the fourteen (14) standards. To that end, the subcommittees were first responsible for developing charge questions related to their specific standards and then conducting a comprehensive evaluation of the college based on those questions. These questions were posted to WebCT, first in a working discussion area limited to each subcommittee and then eventually to the committee at large. As the expected outcome is to increase institutional effectiveness, evaluation will focus on how each standard is realized at our institution and what could be done to improve outcomes.

**SUB-COMMITTEE #1**
Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives  
Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Chairperson: Bobby Royal, Executive Assistant to the President
Janet Brenner, Director, Institutional and Academic Planning  
Tom Celandine, Assistant Professor, College Skills and Sociology  
Denise Coulter, Assistant Professor, English  
Michelle McGowan, Assistant Professor, Mathematics  
Rich Perniciaro, Associate Dean, Center for Regional/Business Research  
Jim Taggart, Assistant Professor, Computer Information Systems  
Jim Sacchinelli, Assistant Professor, Science  
Mary Yoa, Assistant Professor, Computer Information Systems  
Eric Reynolds, Trustee (Atlantic County)

**SUB-COMMITTEE #2**
Standard 3: Institutional Resources

Chairperson: Jack Hufty, Manager, Grants Writing and Research
Linda DeSantis, Director, Financial Aid  
John Feldbauer, Director, Personal Computer Services  
Marcia Kleinz, Assistant Professor, Mathematics  
Jean McAlister, Director, City Center Administrative Services  
Klaus Muller, Dean, Academy of Culinary Arts  
Terry Sampson, Executive Director, Business Services  
Cathie Skinner, Executive Director, Finance  
Donna Vassallo, Instructor, Hospitality Management and Business  
Wendy Waisala, Assistant Professor, English

**SUB-COMMITTEE #3**
Standard 4: Leadership and Governance  
Standard 5: Administration

Chairperson: Joseph Rossi, Interim Vice President, Administration and Finance
Doug Hedges, Dean, Information Technology Services
Josette Katz, Dean, Academic Resources
Marilyn Keiner, Associate Professor, Legal Assistant Program
Will Parsons, Associate Professor, Biology
Ethel Russell, Professor, English
John Stratton, Assistant Professor, Chemistry and Physics
Charles Pessagno, Trustee (Cape May County)

**SUB-COMMITTEE #4**
Standard 6: Integrity

Chairperson: Bill Dougherty, Assistant Professor, Computer Information Systems

JoAnne Barbieri, Professor, Business
Godfrey Barlatt, Associate Professor, Science
Kathy Corbalis, Executive Director, College Relations
George Dailey, Assistant Professor, History
Bob Johnson, Director, Academic Computing & Web Programming
Bob Kachur, Assistant Professor, Accounting and Business
Elinor Mattern, Instructor, English as a Second Language
Ellen Parker, Librarian II
Nancy Porfido, Director, Student Programs/Athletics

**SUB-COMMITTEE #5**
Standard 7: Institutional Assessment
Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Chairperson: Art Wexler, Associate Professor, Psychology and Education

Linda DeSantis, Associate Director, Financial Aid
Dorothea Dunayer, Director, Grants Compliance
Richard Kalman, Assistant Professor, Computer Information Systems
Cheryl Knowles-Harrigan, Assistant Professor, Art
Marilyn Keiner, Associate Professor, Legal Assistant Program
Louise Kaplan, Professor, Anthropology
Kelly McClay, Assistant Director, Academy of Culinary Arts
Edward Marshall, Program Coordinator, Counseling and Support Services
Vickie Melograno, Program Coordinator, Outcomes Assessment
Max Slusher, Assistant Dean, Research
Regina Van Epps, Assistant Professor, English
Barbara Warner, Associate Professor, Nursing

**SUB-COMMITTEE #6**
Standard 8: Student Admissions
Standard 9: Student Support Services
Co-chairperson: Lydia Lehr, Assistant Professor, Art
Co-chairperson: Loretta Dicker, Assistant Professor, Computer Information Systems

Paula Davis, Director, Counseling and Support Services
Mike Kammer, Assistant Professor, English as a Second Language
Paula Manns, Assistant Professor, Business and Economics
Melissa Mufferi, Student
Carmen Royal, Dean, Students
Shirley Shields, Program Coordinator, Learning Assistance Center
Grant Wilinski, Director, Library Services

SUB-COMMITTEE #7
Standard 10: Faculty

Chairperson: Amy Shelton, Assistant Professor, Mathematics

Myra Caplan, Assistant Professor, Nursing
Susan DePhilippis, Assistant Professor, English as a Second Language
Neera Desai, Assistant Professor, Developmental Mathematics
Joyce Grohman, Dean, Instruction
Jim MacNair, Associate Professor, Sociology
Ron McArthur, Associate Professor, History and Government
Maryann McCall, Director, Adjunct Instructor Support and Development
Kelly McClay, Assistant Director, Academy of Culinary Arts
Lenora Sheppard, Assistant Professor, Mathematics
Bob Steinerd, Adjunct Instructor, Business
Karen Zaniewski, Assistant Professor, Nursing

SUB-COMMITTEE #8
Standard 11: Educational Offerings
Standard 12: General Education

Chairperson: Otto Hernandez, Associate Professor, Computer Information Systems

Richard Benner, Assistant Professor, Philosophy and Religion
Mark Camma, Assistant Professor, Accounting and Business
Paula Demarest, Manager, Budget, Curriculum, & Publications
Joe Jaloway, Associate Professor, Biology
Josette Katz, Dean, Academic Resources
Marty Marino, Professor, Psychology
Carol Mohrfeld, Assistant Professor, Nursing
Heather Peterson, Registrar
Electra Stulak, Counselor II
Grant Wilinski, Director, Library
SUB-COMMITTEE #9
Standard 13: Related Educational Activities – basic skills, experiential learning, non-credit, branch campuses, additional locations, distance education, contractual relationships

Chairperson: Marion Pool, Program Officer, Continuing Education

Lisa Apel-Gendron, Director, Cape May County Extension Center
Mark Corbalis, Director, Data Base Administration
Anne Erickson, Assistant Professor, English
Chris Gamboa, Director, Testing
Mark Jones, Assistant Professor, Criminal Justice
Linda Loughlin, Adjunct Instructor, Business
Jean McAlister, Director, City Center Administrative Services
John Mohr, Director, City Center Student Services
Pete Mora, Interim Vice President, Cape May and Continuing Education
Pat Owens, Associate Dean, Continuing Education Operations
Christina Cavage, (Basic Skills) Assistant Professor, English as a Second Language
Maryann Carol, (Basic Skills) Director, Instructional Technology
Angel Eguaras (Basic Skills), Professor, Mathematics and Developmental Studies
Lynn Lessie (Basic Skills), Professor, Psychology, Education and Child Development
Kip Rand (Basic Skills), Assistant Professor, Psychology, Education and College Skills
Mike Sargente, Program Coordinator, Learning Assistance Center

VI. STUDENT FOCUS GROUPS

Atlantic Cape Community College recognizes the importance of student assessment of the teaching and learning process at the institution and recruited students to participate on the subcommittees. In addition, in recognition that the student population has multiple priorities and commitments that disallows many of the students from participating on committees, the MSSC decided to augment the involvement of students through the use of student focus groups. A diverse group of students representing all three campuses was recruited to meet for a question and answer forum. Various issues fundamental to understanding and improving student learning were identified and were or will be addressed. During the first forum, held on July 26, 2004, students were asked to consider the following questions:

1. What types of classroom strategies facilitate your own learning?
2. What types of classroom strategies specifically hinder your own learning?
3. What would be the characteristics of a perfect classroom environment that promotes learning?
4. Does the course-taking pattern you have chosen help or hinder your level of achievement in courses?
5. Do our courses at ACCC build on each other in a way that contributes to your overall learning or are the courses seen as "stand alone" courses and have little integration of learning across disciplines?
6. To what extent have you had an opportunity to practice the kind of learning you value?

Additional student focus groups will be held throughout the self-study period to garner student feedback on additional issues and topics relevant to the process.

VII. CHARGES TO SUBCOMMITTEES

Subcommittee 1: Middle States Standards 1 and 2

Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives
The institution’s mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and explains whom the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals and objectives, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission, goals, and objectives are developed and recognized by the institution with its members and its governing body and are utilized to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

Focus: In examining standard one, this subcommittee will consider such issues as the correlation between our goals and objectives and our mission statement, the system in place to examine achievement of goals and objectives, and the connection between the curriculum and the goals and objectives.

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission 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.

Focus: Among the issues concerning standard two that will be considered by subcommittee one are the support and retention systems in place to ensure success of under-prepared students, the resource allocation strategies that assure a nurturing environment to students, and how resource allocation categories relate to the economic, social, academic and work force needs of a diverse community.

These are some of the charge questions that subcommittee one will answer:

Standard 1: Mission, Goals and Objectives

1. Is the mission of the College clearly stated and understood internally and externally, by institutional leaders in the academic, continuing education, and administrative areas, including the Board of Trustees? Does each of these areas have goals and objectives which support the mission?
2. Is the planning function focused on the mission of the College? Does it prioritize programs in order to allocate resources where most needed?

3. Do the various departments of the College understand their roles in supporting the College mission?

4. Is success in achieving the mission and carrying out the goals and objectives assessed and outcomes reported?

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

5. Is there an annual planning process? If so, describe the process.

6. What is the budget process and how does it relate to planning? Describe this process.

Subcommittee 2: Middle States Standard 3

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.

Focus: Subcommittee two will be considering the adequacy of the resources on all campuses and will comment on whether allocation of resources helps the college achieve its mission and goals on all campuses. The issue of resource allocation will be of particular concern in the near future as Atlantic Cape Community College will be opening a third campus in approximately one year.

These are some of the charge questions that subcommittee two will answer:

1. Do rational and consistent strategies, policies and procedures exist to measure the level, allocation, and efficient utilization of institutional resources required to support the institution’s mission and goals.

2. Is there an allocation approach that ensures adequate faculty, staff, and administration to support the institution’s mission and outcomes expectations?

3. Is there a budget process aligned with the institution’s mission, goals, and strategic plan that provides for an annual budget and multi-year budget projections for at least three years, both institution-wide and among departments; utilizes planning and assessment documents; and addresses resource acquisition and allocation for the institution and any subsidiary, affiliated, or contracted educational organizations as well as for institutional systems as appropriate?

4. Is there a comprehensive facilities or infrastructure master plan and facilities/infrastructure life-cycle management plan that recognizes that facilities, such as learning resources fundamental to all educational and research
programs and libraries, are adequately supported and staffed to accomplish the institution's objectives for student learning, both on campuses and at a distance?

5. Is there an educational and other equipment acquisition and replacement process and plan, including provision for current and future technology, as appropriated to the educational programs and support services?

Subcommittee 3: Middle States Standards 4 and 5

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.

Focus: Subcommittee three will consider the leadership of ACCC. In doing so, they will examine such areas as the presidential search process, how assessments of effectiveness are ensured, and how conflicts are manifested.

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.

Focus: For standard five, subcommittee three will consider the effectiveness of the administrative structure and how this structure supports the governance of the college. The role of students in governance, the responsibilities of faculty and administration, and the effectiveness of written documentation are some of the other issues that will be considered by this subcommittee.

These are some of the charge questions that subcommittee three will answer:

Board of Trustees

1. What is the process for the presidential search and how will it involve students, faculty and staff?

2. How do the college's publics (students, faculty, staff) define the role of the Board of Trustees?

3. What procedures are in place to assure that the Board of Trustees is regularly assessing its own effectiveness?

4. Describe the mission and effectiveness of the respective Trustee subcommittees, such as the outcomes of their recommendations to the full Board.

5. What procedures are in place to illuminate potential or actual conflicts of interest?

6. How does the Board of Trustees assure that outside political influences are not interfering with governing body duties?

Chief Executive Officer (President)
7. How has the new administrative organization been structured and how will it impact the institution?

8. How does the new administrative organization respond to the needs of the Cape May County campus, Worthington Atlantic City Center, and Mays Landing campuses?

9. What criteria and mechanisms are used in evaluating the president?

10. Are the procedures for determining long-range planning, spending priorities, personnel actions and curriculum development understood by the college community?

11. Does the president effectively communicate the mission, resource management and academic issues of the institution to internal bodies?

12. Where is the role of the outreach among the myriad of presidential duties?

**Administration (Senior Staff)**

13. How does the organizational communication flow bi-directionally between the president and senior staff?

14. Is there a clearly defined mechanism for the performance evaluation of senior staff?

15. Is there an environment to promote collegiality and teamwork among senior staff?

16. How do senior staff members incorporate the multiple perspectives of faculty, other departmental operations and student concerns?

17. Does the current organizational structure allow for institutional efficiency and effectiveness?

**Faculty Roles in Governance**

18. Does the faculty understand its role in academic governance at the college?

19. Is there an effective communication procedure to assure adequate two-way information with college administration regarding faculty proposals or advice?

20. Does the current Collegiate-Faculty Assembly organization provide an adequate vehicle for faculty participation in academic governance?

21. How does the Assembly leadership monitor its own year-to-year transition and how does the Assembly leadership track the disposition of the Assembly’s prior initiatives or proposals to college administration?

**Subcommittee 4: Middle States Standard 6**

**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 to academic and intellectual freedom.

Focus: In considering institutional integrity, subcommittee four will examine several areas. Among these are an evaluation of the systems in place to ensure students and employees have access to information about institutional policies, the process to address violations of policy, and the programs in place to ensure that a climate of academic inquiry, respect, and honesty are encouraged.

These are some of the charge questions that subcommittee four will answer:

**Academic / Intellectual Freedom**
1. Are there publicly stated policies that reflect the college’s mission statement, supporting academic and intellectual freedom?
2. How is it ensured that stated policies are being applied and are effective?
3. What methods are used to ensure that an atmosphere of respect for diverse ideas and cultures is encouraged on campus?

**Student Policies**
4. Are the college policies and resources for students accessible, comprehensive, clearly written, fair, and impartial? How do we know?
5. What procedures address student concerns, and how are they assessed and improved?

**Employees**
6. Are the procedures for hiring, evaluating, and dismissing employees fair and effective? How do we know?
7. How are employees' concerns addressed? Are employees satisfied with this procedure?

**Public Relations**
8. How is it ensured that College publications are reflective of the realities of the College?
9. What is the process for determining what information about the College will be shared with the public?

**Subcommittee 5: Middle States Standards 7 and 14**
Subcommittee five is comprised of members of the College’s Assessment Committee.

**Standard 7: Institutional Assessment**
The institution has developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in: achieving its mission and goals; implementing planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes; using institutional resources efficiently; providing leadership and governance; providing administrative structures and services;
demonstrating institutional integrity; and assuring that institutional processes and resources support appropriate learning and other outcomes for its students and graduates.

**Focus:** Among the issues of standard seven with which subcommittee five will concern itself are the way in which outcomes of planning and evaluation efforts are used, the evaluation of the institutional research activities, and the assessment of various divisions of the institution.

**Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning**
Assessment of student learning demonstrates that the institution’s students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional goals and that students at graduation have achieved appropriate higher education goals.

**Focus:** For standard fourteen, subcommittee five will examine such issues as how student learning is measured, the way the institution uses those measurements, the means for evaluating the education effectiveness of distance learning programs, and how student learning assessment information is shared with pertinent college constituencies.

These are some of the charge questions that subcommittee five will answer:

**Standard 7**
1. To what extent and in what ways are the procedures to evaluate the institution’s progress toward its stated purpose/mission in place and implemented by the institution?
2. To what extent and in what ways does the institution demonstrate that it uses the results of its planning and evaluation efforts?
3. How is institutional research evaluated to determine its efficiency and effectiveness within the overall institutional planning and evaluation process?
4. To what extent and in what ways are other dimensions of the institution such as library, student services, educational programs, physical facilities, and the general organization evaluated?
5. How often and in what way is the library evaluated to ensure it is meeting the needs of its users and progressing toward its stated goals and objectives?
6. How does the college assess the policies and procedures that directly affect students and employees? Have any policy or procedural changes been made based on these assessments?
7. If part-time faculty are used to teach off campus courses, how are they selected and how are they evaluated?
8. Has the institution developed a reasonable plan for evaluating the effectiveness of its distance learning activities? Is there continuous systematic evaluation? Is this evaluation plan part of a broader institutional plan?

**Standard 14**
9. How are outcomes evaluated in the institution’s academic programs?
10. What actions have been taken based on assessments?
11. How does the institution gather and use the results of feedback from its constituents regarding the quality and performance of instructional services?
12. How does assessment take place, and how is it measured?
13. How are goals, objectives, and outcomes for courses and programs determined?
14. How is information on student learning assessment shared with appropriate college constituencies?

Subcommittee 6: Middle States Standards 8 and 9

Standard 8: Student Admissions
The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission.

Focus: Among the issues that subcommittee six will consider for standard eight are the connection between the College’s mission statements and its admission criteria, how admission policies are developed and disseminated, and whether persistence and degree completion can be predicted with current admissions criteria.

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.

Focus: Some of the issues for standard nine that subcommittee six will consider are how student services contribute to student learning, the connection between support services and the College’s academic mission, the effectiveness of the student advisement process, and how student grievance procedures are communicated.

These are some of the charge questions subcommittee six will answer:

Student Admissions
1. How does the college’s admissions criteria support the mission of the institution?
2. How are admissions criteria practiced by the staff and communicated to the students?
3. How does ACCC provide accurate and comprehensive information and advice to students concerning cost and affordability?
4. How does ACCC collect, process, and interpret data about its students from admission through graduation in order to insure student success?
5. How is technology used to improve / facilitate/ support access to college enrollment services?

Student Support Services
6. How does ACCC’s student services support the mission of the institution?
7. What are the needs of ACCC’s student body are they satisfied with the support services available to them?
8. What are the ways in which ACCC provides access to diverse and/or underrepresented groups and insures a campus environment free of prejudice?
9. How does the student advisement process enable students to meet their academic goals?
10. How do we encourage student involvement in campus life?
11. What are ACCC’s procedures for equitably addressing student complaints and grievances?
12. What measures does ACCC take to protect the integrity of student records?

Subcommittee 7: Middle States standard 10

Standard 10: Faculty
The institution’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

Focus: Since faculty are central to student learning, this subcommittee will examine such issues as the appointment processes for adjunct and full-time faculty, the institution’s support of professional development for faculty, and how instructor evaluations are used to ensure effective teaching.

These are some of the charge questions subcommittee seven will answer:

1. How does the college ensure that the faculty and other professionals are appropriately prepared and qualified for the positions they hold, with roles and responsibilities clearly defined, and sufficiently numerous to fulfill those roles appropriately?
2. How are educational curricula designed, maintained, and updated by faculty and other professionals who are academically prepared and qualified and is there appropriate cooperation and support across academic fields and across types of professionals?
3. How do faculty and other professionals, including teaching assistants, demonstrate excellence in teaching and other activities, and demonstrate continued professional growth?
4. How does the college demonstrate institutional support for the advancement and professional development of faculty?
5. How does the institution recognize, evaluate and support the proper balance and linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, research and service?
6. How has the institution published, distributed and implemented standards and procedures for all faculty and other professionals, for actions such as
appointment, promotion, tenure, grievance, discipline and dismissal, based on principles of fairness with due regard for the rights of all persons?

7. How does the institution use carefully articulated, equitable, and implemented procedures and criteria for review of all individuals who have responsibility for the educational program of the institution?

8. Are the criteria for the appointment, supervision, and review of teaching effectiveness for part-time, adjunct, and other faculty consistent with those for full-time faculty?

Subcommittee 8: Middle States Standards 11 and 12

Standard 11: Educational Offerings
The institution’s educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

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 oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy.

Focus: This subcommittee will examine the institution’s curricula to ensure they are aligned to our mission and that they allow students to acquire essential skills.

These are some of the charge questions subcommittee eight will answer:

STANDARD 11 – EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

1. How do the institution’s educational offerings reflect and promote its mission? Provide evidence that educational offerings offer appropriate areas of academic study of sufficient content, breadth and length, and conducted at levels of rigor appropriate to the programs and degrees offered.

2. How are the formal undergraduate programs, leading to a degree or other recognized higher education credential, designed to foster a coherent student learning experience and to promote synthesis of learning? Show evidence that program goals are stated in terms of student learning outcomes.

3. What is the institutional process for the periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of any curricular, co-curricular, and extra curricular experiences it provides its students? How does the institution utilize evaluation results as a basis for improving its student development program and for enabling students to understand their own education progress?
4. Are the learning resources, facilities, instructional equipment, library services and professional library staff adequate to support the institution’s educational programs? How do professional library staff and faculty collaborate in teaching and fostering information literacy skills relevant to the curriculum? How does the institution promote student use of information and learning resources?

5. How does the institution ensure comparable quality of teaching/instruction, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness of its courses and programs regardless of location or delivery mode?

6. Show evidence of published and implemented policies and procedures regarding transfer credit. Do those policies recognize that the acceptance or denial of transfer credit will not be determined exclusively on the basis of the accreditation of the sending institution or the mode of delivery, but rather, will consider course equivalencies, including expected learning outcomes, with those of the receiving institution’s curricula and standards? Are these policies fair, consistently applied, and publicly communicated?

7. What institutional policies and procedures assure that the educational expectations, rigor, and student learning within any accelerated programs are comparable to those that characterize more traditional program formats?

8. Consistent with the institution’s educational programs and student cohorts, demonstrate that the institution has practices and policies that reflect the needs of adult learners.

STANDARD 12 – GENERAL EDUCATION

9. How does the institution structure and deliver general education? Is the program of sufficient scope and quantity?

10. Are general education skills and abilities applied in the major or studies in depth?

11. Consistent with the institution’s mission, how does the program of general education incorporate the study of values, ethics and diverse perspectives?

12. How does the institution assure that, upon degree completion, students are proficient in oral and written documentation, scientific and quantitative reasoning, technological capabilities appropriate to the discipline, and information literacy, which includes critical analysis and reasoning?

13. Are general education requirements clearly and accurately described in official publications of the institution?

14. What is the institutional process for the assessment of general education outcomes within the institution’s overall plan for assessing student learning? How have assessment results been utilized for curricular improvement?

Subcommittee 9: Middle States Standard 13
**Standard 13: Related Educational Activities**

*Institutional programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.*

**Focus:** For this standard, subcommittee nine will focus on the following areas: basic skills, certificate programs, experiential learning, non-credit, branch campuses and additional locations, distance education, and contractual relationships. Seven subgroups were formed, and each subgroup will consider one of the aforementioned categories.

These are some of the charge questions that subcommittee nine will answer:

1. How does the institution ensure parity in the process to develop, approve, market, and evaluate non-credit and distance education offerings to ensure that they are responsive to the needs of the community, citizens, business and industry? Areas to consider include, but are not limited to, course and program requirements, course offerings, academic rigor, program evaluation, access to faculty outside of class, ADA compliance in distance education offerings, and standards for quality of instruction.

2. How are intellectual property and copyright laws and regulations complied with? What processes are in place for evaluation, approval and determination of success of outside material, and how are faculty involved? What procedures are in place to ensure compliance across all educational channels?

3. What process is used to determine how contracts and grants are identified as restricted versus unrestricted? Are impacted areas involved in the discussions?

4. What internal standards are in place to ensure adequate compliance of grant requirements?

5. Are distance education, E-Army, NJ Virtual Community College, non-credit, and English as a Second Language programs complementary to or replacements for the institutions traditional course and program offerings? How do these programs support ACCC’s mission and goals? Are non-credit offerings efficiently designed, implemented, and priced to market with a reasonable return on investment of resources? Are quality and performance standards addressed in the contracts for these offerings?
VIII. INVENTORY OF SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

Our preliminary list of support documents is listed below. These documents are from various College departments and committees. Support documentation ranges from that which is disseminated to the public (catalogs, student handbooks, etc.) to surveys created by the Office of Institutional Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents to be Reviewed</th>
<th>“M” = Multiple years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement of Atlantic Cape Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Catalogs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicator (faculty/staff newsletter)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Update (part-time faculty newsletter)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Review (student newsletter)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Handbook</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Scan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Evaluations of Classroom Performance</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review Documents</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluations of Faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Handbook</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Site</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes to be Reviewed</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Academic Standards Committee</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Advisory Councils</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Assessment Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Basic Skills committee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Board of Trustees</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Collegiate Assembly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Department (academic) meetings</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Instructional Resource Council</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: International/Multicultural Education Committee</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Policies and Procedures Committee</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Scholarship Committee</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Student Government Association</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: Technology Committee</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documents from Human Resources/Personnel
### Organizational Charts

| Policies and Procedures: Hiring and Promoting Faculty |
| Policies and Procedures: Hiring and Promoting Staff |
| Salary and Wage Administration Guidelines |

### Reports from Office of Institutional Advancement

### Reports from the Office of Planning

### Reports from the Office of Research

| Alumni Data Base 1968-2003 |
| Clearing House Transfer Schools Voc Ed M (‘87-’00) |
| Developmental Classes Grade Distribution Analysis M (‘00 –’02) |
| Exit Survey M (FY ’01-FY ’03) |
| Exit Survey FY 2002 |
| Exit Survey FY 2003 |
| Faces of the Future (Student Survey) M (‘99-’03) |
| Fast Facts (brochure of ACCC Stats) 2000-2001 |
| Fast Facts (brochure of ACCC Stats) 2003-2004 |
| Grad Survey 1997-1999 |
| Grad Survey M (FY ’00- FY ’03) |
| High School Enrollment Projection Analysis 2000 |
| High School Enrollment Projection Analysis 2003 |
| High School Enrollment Projection Analysis 2004 |
| Public Employee Charitable Campaign (report) M (’02-’03) |
| Retention Analysis M (not registered Fall ’01, ’02, ’03) |
| Retention Analysis M (not registered Spring ’01, ’02, ’03) |
| Student Success in Classes 1997-2003 |
| Students by Zip Code 2003 |

### Reports from Office of Student Services
IX. SELF-STUDY WEBCT SHELL

A fully operational WebCT shell is available for the Middle States Steering Committee and subcommittees. This shell contains information on Middle States subcommittees, including members’ names, charge questions under development, and meeting minutes. It also is a quick reference to such basic information as explanation of each Middle States standard and the timeline for ACCC’s self-study.
X. Timeline

Steering Committee & Subcommittees Formed
May 2004

Self-Study Draft Commenced
June 2004

Subcommittees Meet & Begin Work
Dr. Robert Schneider from MS visits campus
September 28, 2004

Various Opportunities for Input
October 2004 – March 2005

Subcommittees Submit Initial Findings to MS Chair
Report of Initial Findings to College Community
March 2005

Subcommittee Findings Refined by Assessment
Coordinator & Middle States Chair and Submitted
to Steering Committee for Review
May 2005

First Draft Self-study Completed by Assessment
Coordinator & Middle States Chair
Information Shared with College Community
September 2005

Draft submitted to Board of Trustees & President
November 2005

Self-study Submitted
February 2006

Scheduled Team Visit
Spring 2006

College Community:
- Faculty Assembly
- Collegiate Assembly
- The Communicator
- Student Newspaper
- Department Meetings

- Collegiate Assembly
- Student Focus Group
- Faculty Assembly
- Department Meetings
XI. EDITORIAL STYLE AND FORMAT

In determining the format of the reports from the subcommittees, we recognized the importance of three factors: 1) consistency in the type of information each subcommittee will submit; 2) clarity; 3) the importance of the final Self-Study document being in one voice.

With these three factors in mind, we determined that an outline format would be best. Each subcommittee’s outline will be structured as follows:

I. Brief introduction in which the writer describes the standard(s) and the functions of the College relevant to the standard

II. Six to eight questions per standard, grouped into broad themes
   • Underneath each question should be an objective summary of the findings for that question. Opinion and/or analyses of the findings should not be presented in this section. The documentation used to arrive at the findings should be cited in this section as well.
   • After the findings are summarized in an objective narrative (as explained above), an analysis of the answer should be included and presented in these categories: 1) Accomplishments 2) Challenges 4) College’s Response to the Challenges (this should be a subdivision of the “Challenges” category); 4) Relation to Assessment

These outlines must be formatted as follows:
   • Submitted electronically
   • Saved as a Microsoft Word document
   • Using Arial 12-point font
   • Double-spaced
   • Standard one-inch margins on all sides
   • Approximately 15 pages maximum

Like the outlines themselves, graphs and charts should be submitted electronically and be compatible with Microsoft Word.

XII. ORGANIZATION OF SELF-STUDY REPORT

Following our visit from Dr. Robert Schneider, we began considering additional organization methods for our final self-study report. Our initial idea was to organize the self-study document by devoting a chapter to each standard. If we organize it this way, our Self-Study Table of Contents will look like this:

1. Introduction
a. Overview of the College  
b. Overview of the Self-Study Process  
c. Eligibility Requirements  
d. Annual Institutional Profile

2. Executive Summary  
a. Highlights and resulting emphases  
b. Major Findings and Recommendations

3. Mission, Goals, and Objectives

4. Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

5. Institutional Resources

6. Leadership and Governance

7. Administration

8. Integrity

9. Institutional Assessment

10. Student Admissions

11. Student Support Services

12. Faculty

13. Educational Offerings

14. General Education

15. Related Educational Activities

16. Assessment of Student Learning

17. Summary of Major Findings and Recommendations

18. Inventory of Support Documents

19. Appendices

Each chapter would include a descriptive overview, an analysis of the major issues, a list of the key findings, and recommendations.

After some discussion of other possibilities, however, we decided that the following may also be a viable way to organize the Self-Study:

Introduction  
a. Overview of the College  
b. Overview of the Self-Study Process  
c. Eligibility Requirements  
d. Annual Institutional Profile

Executive Summary  
a. Highlights and resulting emphases  
b. Major Findings and Recommendations

Part 1: Collegiate Structure  
  Mission & Goals  
  Planning, Institutional Resources  
  Leadership and Governance, as appropriate  
  Administration  
  Student Admissions
Student Support Services
Related Ed Activities, as appropriate (CM and Atlantic City)
Institutional Assessment, as appropriate (surveys, demographic information, etc.)

Part 2: Teaching and Learning
Educational offerings
General education
Faculty
Integrity
Related Ed. Activities, as appropriate (online and basic skills)
Governance, as appropriate (faculty assembly, etc.)
Institutional Assessment, as appropriate (transfers and graduation rates).

Each standard would be considered in terms of achievements and challenges. Institutional assessment and assessment of student learning would be the common thread running through all the chapters.

A final decision on the organization of the Self-Study report will be made by March 2005.

XIII. PROFILE OF EVALUATION TEAM

General Qualities and Expertise in Evaluators

We would like the Evaluation Team generally to have the following qualities:
- Familiarity with the culture of a medium-sized, diverse community college
- Knowledge of the state policies for New Jersey community colleges
- Expertise in measures of institutional effectiveness

In addition, we would like evaluators
- Familiar with the delivery of an online programs
- Experienced with the opening of a branch campus
- Experienced in working with bi-county governances
- With some expertise in international programs
- With some experience in hospitality programs, including hotel management, culinary operations, and gaming

When selecting the members of the Evaluation Team, the following criteria, based on the US Department of Education Peer Analysis system, may be useful:

1) public, 2-year institution
2) degree granting
3) associates degree
4) open to the public
5) percentage of Black students in fall 2002 between 10% & 20% - ACCC = 15%
6) percentage of Asian students in fall 2002 between 4% & 10% - ACCC = 7%
7) percentage of Hispanic students in fall 2002 between 5 & 11% - ACCC = 8%
8) FTE enrollment between 2,677 and 4,677 - ACCC = 3,677

Using the IPEDS Peer Analysis System, the following institutions were identified as being of similar size and scope:

MANCHESTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE       Manchester, CT
MASSACHUSETTS BAY COMMUNITY COLLEGE  Wellesley Hills, MA
ROCKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE           Suffern, NY