



1 Campus Drive Monaca, Pennsylvania 15061 • ccbc.edu • *Your road to your future!*





Community College of Beaver County

Self-Study Design

In Preparation for 2014 Reaccreditation

Associate Professor Katie L. Thomas, Self-Study Co-Chair

Assistant Professor Carl Dennis, Self-Study Co-Chair

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Brief Overview of Community College of Beaver County.....	5
Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals.....	5
Important Recent Developments.....	5
Expectations for the Future.....	7
Steps Taken to Prepare for the Self-Study.....	7
Nature and Scope of the Self-Study.....	8
Self-Study Issues.....	8
Self-Study Model.....	8
Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study.....	9
Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups.....	10
Leadership Charges.....	10
Organizational Structure of the Working Groups.....	12
Participant Lists.....	12
Charges to the Working Groups and Guidelines for their Reports.....	15
Working Group Charge.....	15
Working Group Assignments.....	15
Template for Working Group Reports	17
Research Questions	18
Inventory of Resources to be Used.....	24
Organization of the Self-Study Report.....	27
Editorial Style.....	30
Timetable for the Self-Study and Evaluation.....	31
Profile of Visiting Evaluation Team.....	32

Introduction

Brief Overview of Community College of Beaver County

Community College of Beaver County (CCBC) was founded in Freedom, Pennsylvania, in 1966. The College leased floors of the Freedom National Bank and seventeen vacant storefronts for classrooms and offices. In 1971, CCBC moved its headquarters to Monaca, PA, in rural Center Township, Beaver County.

The campus is now comprised of nine buildings that are situated on 100 acres of land amidst a blend of modern architecture and inviting green space. The Health Sciences Center was added in 1973, and the Athletics and Events Center, a geodesic recreational facility called the Dome, was completed in 1976. In 1990 an Aviation Sciences Center was added at the Chippewa Airport in Beaver Falls, PA. Construction of a Library Resources Center was completed in 1997. In 2010, a second off-campus center was created in Canonsburg, PA, the Community College of Beaver County Washington County Center. The College most recently completed a \$30 million dollar renovation that included the integration of cutting edge instructional technology in every classroom and laboratory on campus.

CCBC employs 150 full-time employees and 170 part-time employees and has a total student enrollment of approximately 2,700. It is the largest post-secondary institution in the county, offering 399 credit courses in the fall of 2011. The College offers degree, certificate, and diploma programs in the arts and sciences, aviation, business, health care, human services, education, and technology. Certificate programs, non-credit courses, and customized training are also available from the College's Continuing Education and Workforce Development Division.

The College offers a variety of services to support overall student success, such as admissions support, freshman orientation, academic support services, career and personal counseling, security service, computer labs, food services, and extracurricular activities—including organized sports and various student-led clubs. In addition, CCBC annually hosts a job fair and provides access to an on-site bookstore as well as a technology help desk.

CCBC currently operates on a budget of approximately \$22,706,000. The College obtains operating revenue from a number of sources, including Beaver County, state-appropriated higher education funds from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and student tuition and fees. The College also pursues public and private grants for specific education and service programming.

A nine-member Board of Trustees appointed by the Beaver County Commissioners, effective July 1, 2002, governs the College.

Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals

CCBC's slogan, "Your Road to Your Future," underscores the College's commitment to its mission "to be an active partner in expanding educational opportunities and shaping economic growth." CCBC maintains its mission by sustaining the following practices:

- Equipping individuals with knowledge and skills to further their education, acquire meaningful employment, and enhance the quality of their lives;
- Being a leader in developing partnerships which will promote community development and expand the economic potential of the region;
- Creating opportunities for lifelong learning and personal enrichment;
- Adapting to the needs of the region.

The College's goals, which emphasize student success, community and economic development, organizational development, and resource development and allocation, also highlight CCBC's desire to provide a pathway to bright futures for the members of its community.

The College's values, which were developed by the campus community and are detailed below, form the core beliefs that sustain the overall direction of the College as it navigates current and future "speed bumps" and strives to provide its community with educational and economic opportunities.

- The essence of education is to change lives.
- The growth of the individual is our primary focus.
- We are committed to the success of ALL students.
- Our role goes beyond the transmission of knowledge.
- Learning is demonstrated by the application of knowledge.
- An educated workforce is key to the economic growth and expansion of our region.
- Learning is life-long.
- Quality and integrity are essential for the success of our institution and our students.
- ALL employees contribute to the success of our students, making continued professional development critical to our employees.
- Critical thinking and technological literacy are essential for personal and professional success.
- Innovation enhances learning.
- Developing leaders throughout the organization will build the capacity of the College and the community.

Important Recent Developments

Vital and active colleges are continually in transition and under development; however, a number of recent developments affecting CCBC warrant noting as they may emerge as common

issues and ideas throughout the self-study document itself. These developments are characterized by demographics, enrollment, and funding.

Demographics and Enrollment

CCBC finds itself becoming the college of choice among recent graduates in Beaver County. In the fall of 2010, 14% of students who graduated from a local high school the previous spring enrolled with the College. This represents one in seven graduates, a significant number of students enrolling with a single college. In the fall of 2011, the number increased to one in six for students who graduated high school in the spring of 2011, a total of nearly 17% county-wide. For several high schools, the percentage of their graduates who entered CCBC in the fall was in the high teens. For one school district, the number reached 23%.

At the same time, the overall demographics of Beaver County present challenges for the future of the College. The thirty-year trend shows a population that continues to decline with the number of residents dropping from 186,000 in the 1990 census to 171,000 in the 2010 census. The decline in the number of high school students is particularly troubling since 75% of CCBC students are traditionally-aged, recent high school graduates. The total number of high school aged students is now below 7,300 spread across fourteen public school districts, two private high schools, and three local charter schools. Because high schools individually are becoming smaller and finances limit the breadth of the curriculum they are able to offer, student readiness is also an issue. Based on CCBC placement tests, an increasing number of entering high school graduates require some level of developmental study to be deemed college ready.

In light of such demographic and enrollment trends, a significant challenge for the College has been to find ways to more effectively serve both underprepared and non-traditional students.

Recently, CCBC made major strides in addressing the needs of its underprepared students. In 2011, CCBC was recognized as an Achieving the Dream Leader College for establishing pathways to success through policies and intervention strategies that largely affect the success rates of students underprepared for the college classroom. For instance, at CCBC a mandatory three-credit College Success Strategies course is now required of all students who place into two or more developmental classes; MyMathLab, MyReadingLab, and MyWritingLab, self-paced, web-based learning resources, are now incorporated into all developmental math, reading, and writing courses; and policies like Certification of Enrollment (faculty identification of students who have not attended any classes within the first three weeks of the semester) create opportunities for students to seek support before the end of the semester.

However, the College is still working to find ways to meet the educational needs of non-traditional students, those 25 and older. At a time when nearly 70% of jobs nationally are requiring some level of education beyond high school, approximately 52% of those individuals within the incumbent local workforce, ages 25-64, have a high school diploma or less as their highest level of educational attainment. Finding ways to assist in closing this educational gap

will be a key element in the College's ability to effectively meet the needs of the community it serves.

Funding

While innovation is necessary to better meet the needs of the current population, community colleges in Pennsylvania are experiencing a continuing decline in levels of funding at a time when enrollments are soaring. The total state appropriation for community colleges did not increase between 2008-2009 and 2010-2011. During this time period, CCBC posted record levels of enrollment for two consecutive years, meaning the College had less money per student to deliver instruction and services. In 2011-2012, state funding was reduced by approximately 10%, a loss of nearly \$500,000 for CCBC, while enrollment reached its second highest level in the history of the College. The Governor's 2012-2013 budget flat-funded the College.

CCBC is fortunate its local sponsor has been willing to increase support in both 2010-2011 and in 2011-2012. Still, the increases have been less than the amount of the reductions from the state. For 2012-2013, the local sponsor has indicated an inability to again increase funding. The combined result of these funding factors is an increasing reliance on student tuition and fees to fund the operations of the College. While a public institution, the College has reached a point where approximately 55% of the annual operating budget is derived from student revenue. This is an undesirable trend and hopefully one that can be reversed.

Expectations for the Future

Beaver County is located on the fringe of a major gas production formation called the Marcellus Shale, which is in the early stages of development. In the long term, the County is physically located in the middle of another formation called the Utica Shale, for which development has yet to begin. As these formations are developed, the potential for significant economic impact is great. At present, Beaver County is the preferred site for the development of a multi-billion dollar petro-chemical processing plant called a "cracker." There is also the potential for smaller cracker plants to be developed in the area, and such development would create a major economic boom within the County. The cracker facility would add many new jobs in construction and in chemical processing, and it would create secondary demands as related chemical processing plants came into the area as well. Should this level of development occur, the demands on the College for implementation of new, industry-specific training programs will be significant. At the same time, such development could spur population and economic growth, reversing the current levels of decline in the region.

Steps Taken to Prepare for the Self-Study

In 2004, Community College of Beaver County prepared a self-study for reaffirmation of accreditation. The MSCHE evaluation team report concluded that four standards (2, 7, 12, and 14) were not met. Subsequently, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted to

reaffirm the College's accreditation and requested numerous monitoring reports and a small team visit, which was later changed to one MSCHE representative. The monitoring reports were all accepted. In 2009, the College submitted a periodic review report reflecting an institution that had undergone revitalization as evidenced in campus buildings, employee participation, processes and procedures, technology improvements, budget stability, and involvement in national initiatives. The report was approved without the need for further documentation.

Since that time, CCBC has continued as an enhanced and revitalized campus and community, completing a \$30 million dollar renovation in 2010, being designated a Leader College by the national Achieving the Dream Initiative in 2011, and practicing the continual refinement of processes and procedures. Within this new-found spirit of revitalization, CCBC approaches its 2014 reaccreditation.

In August of 2011, the Chief Executive Officer selected a self-study chair, and self-study preparations began in earnest following the Middle States Self-Study Institute in November of 2011. The Self-Study Executive Committee along with Self-Study Steering Committee and working group members attended the Middle States Annual Conference in December 2011 to further self-study plans.

During faculty convocation in January 2011, self-study co-chairs initiated a campus-wide self-study "kick-off," followed by a presentation to the Board of Trustees detailing the self-study process. By February, the executive committee, steering committee, working groups, and editorial team were established and preparations for both the Middle States staff liaison's visit to campus and the self-study design document were underway.

Currently, the steering committee is preparing for working group research and reports that will be submitted during the fall and spring of the 2012-2013 academic year.

Nature and Scope of the Self-Study

Self-Study Issues

As noted, CCBC is in the midst of a complicated era—one of record enrollments, especially of traditionally-aged high school students, but of decreased funding and community population. Therefore, issues of demographics, enrollment, and funding are of serious concern to the College and will most likely influence the self-study. In addition, the College community views the issues of assessment, accountability and organization, strategic planning, enrollment management, and student engagement and success as important self-study considerations.

Self-Study Model

In light of these issues, the Self-Study Executive Committee, with administrative approval, selected the comprehensive model for self-study. Standards will be reordered and thematically grouped during the research process, but individual reports will be submitted for each standard. This model allows the College to meet the following external and internal objectives:

- Investigate and demonstrate its compliance with each of the Middle States fourteen characteristics of excellence individually;
- Explore each standard thoroughly, especially in light of changes the College has undergone since its previous self-study;
- Maximize time and human resources, especially important at a small institution, by eliminating, to a great extent, the overlap of work likely to occur through the investigation of individual standards by individual working groups;
- Successfully manage and navigate the self-study process by eliminating the submission of draft reports from numerous working groups;
- Utilize a method of self-study generally familiar to College faculty, staff, and administration employed during previous self-studies;
- Identify common areas of concern across standards and College areas and work to plan and implement effective solutions that will move the College towards its future goals;
- Identify specific areas of concern in regards to specific standards and College areas and work to plan and implement effective solutions that will move the College towards its future goals;
- Highlight the importance of planning and assessment to the institution and the processes of teaching and student learning.

Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

The consideration of self-study issues and outcomes was taken very seriously by both self-study leadership teams and the campus community. To determine key self-study issues and outcomes, members of the steering committee met with standing committees, councils, and other College groups, including the Board of Trustees, President's Staff, Planning Council, Academic Council, Student Government Association, Promotion and Tenure Committee, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Development Committee, and the Institutional Assessment Committee. In addition, all self-study working groups were asked to submit a list of issues and outcomes in light of their assigned standards. After compiling all issues and outcomes received from these various constituencies, the steering committee created a list of outcomes representative of themes common across groups. Important issues that emerged through this process are noted under the subtitle "Self-Study Issues." The intended outcomes of the current self-study are as follow:

- To compose a concise, constructive document that not only meets the needs of the Commission on Higher Education but also serves as a valuable tool for institutional planning, change, and growth;
- To further institutionalize a culture of assessment;
- To improve processes regarding organization, implementation, and accountability;
- To revisit strategic planning;
- To improve both internal and external perceptions of the College;
- To develop an enrollment management process that facilitates student engagement and success.

Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

In the fall of 2011, Dr. Joe Forrester named Katie Thomas, associate professor of English, and Carl Dennis, assistant professor of computer forensics, as self-study co-chairs. President Forrester also appointed three administrators, Dr. Melissa D. Denardo, vice president for learning and student success/provost, Linda Gallagher, associate vice president of assessment and director of nursing and allied health, and Brian Hayden, executive assistant to the president and director of institutional research, to the Middle States Self-Study Executive Team. The executive team is responsible for the oversight of the entire self-study process, specifically the steering committee.

Following approval by both the president and executive team, memos were sent during the late fall of 2011 to individuals selected to participate at a leadership level in the self-study process as either steering committee members, working group chairs, or working group editors. Individual charges for each leadership position are described below.

In selecting individuals to participate as steering committee members and working group chairs, every attempt was made to balance faculty, staff, and administration from various areas across campus to accurately represent the campus at the leadership level. Individuals with a strong background in writing were selected as working group editors.

Leadership Charges

Steering Committee

The Middle States Self-Study Steering Committee will provide leadership to the entire self-study process. To accomplish this goal, committee members will be expected to fulfill the following duties:

- Determine the key issues for self-study;
- Aid in the creation of self-study outcomes (pg. 18, *Self-Study*);
- Develop a self-study design;
- Establish and charge working groups and coordinate their work on the various issues to be studied (pg. 16, *Self-Study*);
- Review all self-study assignments, progress reports, and drafts, and arrange for an institution-wide review of and response to a draft of the self-study report (pg. 15, *Self-Study*);
- Receive and consider all working group questions, concerns, suggestions, and issues and try to find answers and/or solutions;
- Ensure the self-study timeline is implemented as planned;
- Assure communication within the institution about the self-study process;

- Oversee the completion of the final self-study report and any other documents relevant to the self-study process and team visit;
- Ensure that all relevant perspectives have been considered and that the institution is accurately portrayed through the self-study;
- Work closely with existing committees to avoid duplication or conflict and to ensure that the steering committee's work is continued and implemented after the study;
- Assist in the planning, preparation, and accommodations necessary for all MSCHE initiated visits: staff liaison, evaluation team chair, and evaluation team.

Working Group Chairs

Self-study working group chairs will provide leadership to their working groups. To accomplish this goal, chairs will be expected to fulfill the following duties:

- Serve on the Middle States Self-Study Steering Committee as a liaison between the committee and their working group;
- Establish and implement, in conjunction with group members, the overall organization of their working group, including meeting times and frequency, roles and responsibilities, timeline, etc.;
- Report group questions, concerns, and issues to the steering committee as well as communicate steering committee feedback, suggestions, and direction to their group, or vice versa;
- Ensure the self-study timeline is implemented as planned;
- Assure communication within the institution about the self-study process;
- Oversee the completion of all group assignments and reports in close conjunction with working group editors;
- Ensure that all relevant perspectives have been considered and that the institution is accurately portrayed through the self-study;
- Work closely with existing committees/working groups to avoid duplication or conflict;
- Assist in the planning, preparation, and accommodations necessary for all MSCHE initiated visits: staff liaison, evaluation team chair, and evaluation team.

Working Group Editors

Self-study working group editors will provide editorial guidance to their working groups and be responsible for composing all working group assignments as well as aiding in the drafting and revision of both the self-study design and self-study report. To accomplish this goal, editors will be expected to meet the following objectives:

- Be active members of their working groups;

- Submit working group assignments via Blackboard according to deadlines established in the electronic self-study timeline;
- Work with K. Thomas, self-study co-chair, to compose and edit both the self-study design and self-study report;
- Oversee the completion of all group assignments and reports in close conjunction with working group chairs;
- Ensure that all relevant perspectives have been considered and that the institution is accurately portrayed through the self-study and the reports it produces;
- Work closely with existing committees/working groups to avoid duplication or conflict;
- Assist in the planning, preparation, and accommodations necessary for all MSCHE initiated visits: staff liaison, evaluation team chair, and evaluation team.

Organizational Structure of the Working Groups

During and following faculty convocation in January of 2012, self-study co-chairs invited campus-wide participation in the self-study process at the working group level. Through formal presentations, informal Q&As, and campus-wide emails, working group interest surveys were distributed and volunteers were assigned, based on interest, to one of five thematically organized working groups: Mission (standards 1-3), Leadership (standards 4-6), Students and Faculty (standards 8-10), Education (standards 11-13), and Assessment (standards 7 and 14). Every effort was made to balance number of participants, experienced and new employees, faculty, staff, administrators, students, and alumni within groups to accurately represent the College.

The organizational structure of each working group was left to the discretion of working group chairs, but a formal outline of each group's organization was submitted to the steering committee for review.

During a working group orientation held in February of 2012, working group members from all five working groups were introduced to the self-study and their role in the process as described in "Charges to the Working Groups and Guidelines for Their Reports."

Participant Lists

As stated, every attempt was made to adequately populate and balance the executive and steering committees as well as the working groups to best reflect the diversity of CCBC. The following lists include both names and titles of all self-study participants.

Executive Committee

Dr. Melissa D. Denardo, vice president of learning and student success/provost
 Linda Gallagher, associate vice president of assessment/director of nursing and allied health
 Brian Hayden, executive assistant to the president/director of institutional research
 Katie Thomas, associate professor, English/self-study co-chair

Carl Dennis, assistant professor, computer forensics/self-study co-chair

Steering Committee

Katie Thomas, associate professor, English/self-study co-chair

Carl Dennis, assistant professor, computer forensics/self-study co-chair

Dr. Melissa D. Denardo, vice president of learning and student success/provost

Linda Gallagher, associate vice president of assessment/director of nursing and allied health

Jeff Farley, vice president of human resources/working group chair, mission

Paul Rogers, assistant professor, business/working group chair, leadership

Chris O'Leary, associate professor, nursing/working group chair, students and faculty

John Gall, director of liberal arts and sciences/working group chair, education

Brian Hayden, executive assistant to the president/director of institutional research/working group chair, assessment

Leslie Tennant, director of communications/working group editor, education

Mark Deitrick, professor, education

Diane Loverich, program manager, continuing education

Angela Vedro, director of enrollment

Debra Winkle, learning lab facilitator

Sue Avolio, coordinator, data mining

Walter Lukhaup, vice president of information technology

Working Groups

Working Group #1: Mission

Standards 1, 2,3: Mission and Goals, Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal, Institutional Resources

Working Group Chair, Jeff Farley, vice president of human resources

Working Group Editor, Amy Sicuranza, publications coordinator

Erica Wachtel, president, Beaver County Chamber of Commerce

Steve Danik, vice president of finance and operations

Kathy Hinchberger, professor, nursing

Sally Fitzgerald, assistant professor, nursing

LaDonna Dmitsak, professor, nursing

Gloria Jacobs, manager, human resource development

James Robbins, adjunct faculty, computer technology

Lynn LaMantia, accountant, business office

Nicole Tripp, alumnus

Dusty Campbell, student

Working Group #2: Leadership

Standards 4, 5, 6: Leadership and Governance, Administration, Integrity

Working Group Chair, Paul Rogers, assistant professor, business

Working Group Editor, Nancy Dickson, vice president of community relations and development

John Goberish, dean of workforce development and continuing education
Vicki Suehr, manager, human resource development/payroll information systems
Cheryl Herrington, manager, learning/library resources
Carolyn Kupperman, professor, criminal justice
Patty Andrews, assistant professor, nursing and allied health
Scot Rutledge, graphic arts specialist
Joyce Cirelli, director of medical imaging programs
Cody Bailey, student

Working Group #3: Students and Faculty

Standards 8, 9, 10: Student Admissions and Retention, Student Support Services, Faculty
Working Group Chair, Chris O'Leary, associate professor, nursing
Working Group Editor, Cynthia Marshall, professor, English
Jan Kaminski, dean of academic support services
Donna Bogle, assistant professor, business
Lorraine Rorick, assistant professor, CIS/technologies
Kelly Todd, career services specialist
Frank Albert, professor, English
Hugh Gallagher, career coach

Working Group #4: Education

Standards 11, 12, 13: Educational Offerings, General Education, Related Educational Activities
Working Group Chair, John Gall, director of liberal arts and sciences
Working Group Editor, Leslie Tennant, director of communications
Chuck Bigelow, manager, network
Leila Mandel, associate professor, reference librarian
Maryanne Frabotta, associate professor, math
Kim Etzel, assistant professor, nursing
Diane Loverich, program manager, continuing education
Linda Lockett, adjunct faculty, education
Katie Talerico, adjunct faculty/KEYS
Joe Ligato, alumnus
Kristin Reda, student ambassador

Working Group #5: Assessment

Standards 7 and 14: Institutional Assessment and Assessment of Student Learning
Working Group Chair, Brian Hayden, executive assistant to the president/director of
institutional research
Working Group Editor, Fran Sifers, staff assistant, activities
Elaine Strouss, associate professor, nursing
Karen Ganska, professor, counseling
Fran Schweinberg, clinical instructor, radiologic technology
Sue Allen, adjunct faculty, liberal arts
Beth Jansto, assistant professor, math

Jacque Black, associate professor, early childhood education
Cheryl Shively, adjunct faculty, humanities
Cheryl Webb, associate professor, nursing
Dan Klaus, professor, psychology
Debra Winkle, learning lab facilitator

Charges to the Working Groups and Guidelines for Their Reports

Working Group Charge

The overall charge of the working groups is to gather and analyze evidence to demonstrate CCBC's compliance with the standards for accreditation as well as to identify emerging institutional issues and opportunities for improvement and make recommendations to address those areas. Research questions, developed by the working groups, will guide group inquiry.

Working groups are not expected to discover definitive solutions for every problem. Working groups should endeavor to identify critical issues for the institution and propose possible courses of action that might lead to improvements.

To meet this charge, working groups will be expected to establish group organization, determine key issues and outcomes of self-study, develop research questions, and submit progress and draft reports. Details and directions for each assignment are provided below.

Working Group Assignments

Establish Group Organization (Spring 2012)

Working groups should develop a working outline of meeting dates and times, responsibilities, deadlines, etc. In general, groups should begin to lay out the overall organization of the group. Outlines should be submitted by working group editors according to self-study style guidelines via the Middle States Blackboard Collaboration site.

Determine Key Issues and Outcomes of Self-Study (Spring 2012)

Create a list of key issues the campus should focus on as it commences the self-study process. It may be helpful to limit the list to those issues directly related to assigned standards. Create a second list enumerating desired outcomes of the self-study (see pg. 18 *Self-Study*). Both lists should be submitted by working group editors according to self-study style guidelines via the Middle States Blackboard Collaboration site.

Develop Research Questions (Spring 2012)

Using the provided examples (pgs. 33-39 *Self-Study*; pgs. 10-23 *HCC Self-Study Design*) as well as the information regarding "Developing Effective Self-Study Research Questions" in *Self-Study*:

Creating a Useful Process and Report (pgs. 30-32), compose self-study research questions that necessitate the analysis and information needed for a thorough and effective self-study of the institution. Remember, the provided examples are intended to stimulate thought. The suggestions are not directions to be followed rigidly, and the sample questions are not models to be copied unreflectively. All questions should allow the self-study to address the standards through the lens of specific institutional traits, developments, or issues. In addition, simple yes/no or descriptive questions should be avoided in favor of research questions that focus on analysis and evidence. Remember, research questions may change as work progresses. Initial research questions should be submitted by working group editors according to self-study style guidelines via the Middle States Blackboard Collaboration site.

Progress Reports (Fall 2012/Spring 2013)

Progress reports are intended to track self-study progress and will be due once a month according to the dates established in the Self-Study Timeline. Progress reports should include an overall summary of progress as well as an outline documenting the research associated with each assigned standard. The use of narrative within the body of the outline is encouraged. When creating progress reports, it will be most helpful to align the outlines and summary with the information required to complete draft reports (see the Self-Study Design for draft report template; see "Completed Assignments" on Blackboard for a progress report template). In addition to the summary and outlines, a brief annotated bibliography should be submitted with the progress report. The annotated bibliography should be organized by standard and include the titles of any documents used/consulted during the research process as well as a brief summary of each source and its location. When possible, please submit an electronic copy of sources and/or link to sources with the progress report. All reports should be submitted by working group editors according to self-study style guidelines via the Middle States Blackboard Collaboration site.

Draft Reports (Spring 2013)

The majority of the final self-study report will be comprised of working groups' reports. The entire self-study report may be no more than 100 single-spaced pages in length. Reports on an individual standard should be about five pages in length. Some standards may require fewer or additional pages. A concise, content-rich report is the goal. Each working group report will be organized as follows:

- A heading reflecting the standard under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Template for Working Group Reports

Individual reports should be submitted for each assigned standard. The following is the template for working group draft and final reports.

Chapter 2: Standard 1 – Mission and Goals

Introduction

The introduction provides a succinct, narrative description of the standard under examination in the chapter within the context of Community College of Beaver County. Critical background of the standard at CCBC is to be included in the introduction.

Methodology and Evidence

This portion of the chapter demonstrates the methodology and evidence that was used to study the standard under examination as well as an analysis of the evidence. This portion of the chapter may be narrative in nature and/or may include tables and bulleted information. Please utilize the format that presents the evidence most effectively.

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

Strengths

- Based on the evidence examined, each working group will identify strengths and opportunities for improvement for each standard.
- There is no set number of strengths or opportunities for improvement to be identified.
- Don't hesitate to promote the College's strengths.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Each strength or opportunity for improvement should be presented in bullet form.
- Each strength or opportunity for improvement should be a complete sentence.

Recommendations

- Recommendation 1.01: Recommendations should be presented in bullet form.
- Recommendation 1.02: Recommendations should be succinct and written in sentence form.
- Recommendation 1.03: Recommendations should be numbered to reflect the standard, followed by a period, followed by the recommendation number, 1.01, 1.02, 1.03 and so on.
- Recommendation 1.04: Recommendations should be concrete and realistic.

Research Questions

Working groups were required to create research questions to guide the tasks of research, analysis, and reporting. Effective questions are vital to a successful self-study and may evolve as research develops. Below is a list of research questions developed by each working group.

Working Group #1: Mission

Standard #1: Mission and Goals

- How does the College's vision, mission, values, and goals guide faculty, administration, staff and governing bodies in making decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curriculum development, and definition of program outcomes?
- How effective is the process used to develop goals and objectives? Would achievement of the goals lead to fulfillment of the mission or should goals be brought into line with the mission? How effective is the process for the periodic review of the mission, goals, and objectives?
- What kind of changes might affect the current mission, goals, and objectives to serve current or future needs? What contingencies are in place to assess and evaluate these changes in order to establish priorities? Could these changes affect the institution's survival and growth?
- What evidence is available that indicates that the vision, mission, values, and goals were developed through collaborative participation by those who are responsible for institutional improvement and development?

Standard #2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

- How do employees participate in the planning process? In what ways is the planning process (strategic plan) consistent with the College's vision, mission, values and goals?
- How was Planning Council created? What is Planning Council accountable for? What is the process to evaluate the effectiveness of Planning Council?
- Describe the process to develop the strategic plan. How is the strategic plan implemented? How is the strategic plan evaluated? What are the steps to improve this process?
- Indicate ways that the strategic plan directs development of other functional plans such as financial, enrollment, academic, facilities and technology and how the strategic plan helps guide significant changes in the College's programs, services, and structures.
- How are these changes and improvements related to the mission of the College? How were these changes and improvements prioritized based on the resources available?
- For what changes should the College plan? How will planning and resource allocation address those changes as the College continues to fulfill its mission?

Standard #3: Institutional Resources

- What strategies are used to determine efficient utilization of institutional resources needed by the College to fulfill its mission, vision, values and goals?
- How does the College assess its use of human, technological, and physical plant resources?
- Describe how the College acquires and allocates technical resources and equipment? How does the College ensure the process is timely and efficient and provides support for instructional programs and support services?
- How does the College identify future challenges? Describe the process for addressing those challenges.
- Describe the College's facilities' master plan. How is it aligned with the College's vision, mission, values and goals?
- Describe the College's financial planning and budgeting process. How does the financial planning and budgeting process align with the institution's vision, mission, values, and goals to provide for an annual budget both institution-wide and among departments?

Working Group #2: Leadership

Standard #4: Leadership and Governance

- How do the county commissioners appoint new members to the College's Board of Trustees? Describe the recruitment and selection process and list individual member responsibilities. Do current governing members provide guidance for new members?
- What measures are taken to ensure that the Board of Trustees represents different points of view, interests, and diverse characteristics of the student population and community it serves?
- Describe the process that is in place to evaluate/assess the Board of Trustees?
- What is the process for communicating governing body decisions with the College community?

Standard #5: Administration

- What is the role of the president to ensure the organization achieves the mission, vision, values, and goals of the College?
- What qualifications and qualities are expected of the president and how does the current president meet those criteria?
- What are the qualifications for the President's Staff members and their qualities for their leadership positions? By what process are members of the President's Staff hired and how is diversity of the President's Staff ensured and maintained?

Organizational Structure

- What is the organizational structure that ensures the effective management and leadership of all the divisions and groups of the College? What is the document that describes that structure?

Review Process

- Specifically and by what method are administrators evaluated, and how do the results of this evaluation ensure the continued success of the College?

Administrative Structure; Other

- What assistance and technology and information systems are available to administrative leaders to enable them to effectively perform their jobs?

Standard #6: Integrity

- Provide evidence that policies and procedures are in place to address student grievances, such as violations of institutional policies, in a prompt, appropriate and equitable manner.
- How does the College demonstrate fair and impartial hiring as well as evaluation and dismissal of employees?
- Does the College follow sound ethical practices and demonstrate respect for individuals in regards to teaching, scholarship/research, service and administrative activities, and among all constituents?
- Demonstrate how the College fosters a climate of academic inquiry and engagement.
- What are the College policies and procedures that support academic and intellectual freedom?
- How does the College ensure the accuracy and integrity of its public relations announcements, advertisements, and recruiting and admissions materials and practices?
- How effective is the institution's mechanism for handling complaints from outside the institution?
- How does the College ensure required and elective courses are sufficiently available to allow students to graduate within the program length?
- How does the College communicate changes in institutional mission, goals, operations, policies, programs, and sites accurately and in a timely manner to the community, the Pennsylvania Department of Education, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, and other accrediting bodies?
- How does the College make factual information, such as the results from accreditation and assessment activities, available to employees, students, and the public?
- How does the College periodically assess the integrity of its institutional policies, processes, and practices as well as the manner in which they are implemented, and how

are recommendations that result from these periodic assessments implemented?

Working Group #3: Students and Faculty

Standard #8: Student Admissions and Retention

- What is the relationship between admission criteria and student success?
- What is the relationship between developmental courses and student success?
- What is the relationship between attributes of admitted students, the College's mission, and academic programs and student success?

Standard #9: Student Support Services

- What evidence exists that the College provides support services that meet the needs of a diverse student population and are available throughout the campus?
- What is the relationship between student support services and academic success?
- How do student support programs uphold the mission and goals of the College?

Standard #10: Faculty

- What is the process used by the provost and human resources to ensure faculty are appropriately qualified for initial appointment?
- How does the process for promotion and tenure promote quality teaching, scholarship, and service?
- How does the College support faculty continuing education on campus and off site?
- Are the criteria for evaluating faculty clearly defined and consistently applied among full-time, part-time and adjunct faculty?
- Are the respective processes for tenure, promotion, discipline, and dismissal of faculty effective in ensuring program goals are achieved?
- What is the relationship between student evaluations and faculty appointment and advancement?
- What evidence exists to validate instructional, research, and service programs are designed, maintained, and updated by qualified faculty and other professionals?

Working Group #4: Education

Standard #11: Educational Offerings

- How clearly does the College make student achievement of course objectives available in print and online to various constituencies?
- How are students advised of policies and procedures concerning transfer credits? What safeguards are in place to ensure that evaluated transfer credits are comparable and applicable to the programs?

- Does the College identify and incorporate adult learners in a manner that successfully accommodates their needs?
- What evidence exists to ensure program recommendations are supported by data and goals? What is the relationship among program goals and student learning and job acquisition?

Standard #12: General Education

- In what ways do professional library staff, faculty, and administrators collaborate to foster information literacy and technological competency skills across the curriculum?
- Are the current official publications of the College sufficient, clear, and accurate depictions of general education requirements?
- How are students able to demonstrate acquired college-level proficiency in all general education outcomes in a manner that assures the College of general education effectiveness?

Standard #13: Related Educational Activities

- Are program objectives, requirements, and curricular sequence made known in a clear and accessible fashion?
- How does the College ensure students in all learning environments, including off-campus centers, are held to the same academic standards and integrity?
- What policies and/or steps are in place to verify faculty are qualified to teach electronically? How does the College measure the effectiveness and make changes to distance learning offerings based on the results of this measurement?
- How well does the College's program of support and structured training result in an online faculty who demonstrates understanding and application of best practices in distance education?

Working Group #5: Assessment

Standard #7: Institutional Assessment

- What is Community College of Beaver County's institutional assessment plan?
- How is the institutional assessment plan integrated with the other thirteen standards for accreditation? How does the plan clearly articulate the alignment among the goals of the board, institutional strategic goals that encompass all programs, services, and initiatives?
 - How does the institution implement assessment findings to improve faculty/staff knowledge regarding areas of concern to enhance student success? What resources are made available for developmental improvements? (Relationship to other Standards)

- What are key institutional and unit-level goals? What are the intentional objectives/strategies to achieve these goals? What is the assessment of these key goals? How are the results used to improve programs/services?
- Provide evidence that the institutional assessment plan has clear, realistic guidelines and a timetable. How is the plan supported by the appropriate investment of institutional resources?
- Provide evidence that assessment results are shared and discussed with appropriate constituents and used in institutional planning, resource allocation, and renewal to improve and gain efficiencies in programs, services, and processes, including activities specific to the institution's mission?
- Demonstrate implementation of the comprehensive institutional strategic plan that links long-range planning to decision-making and budgeting processes?
- What areas has the institution changed because of assessment findings and what follow through was provided concerning the success of those changes? (Assessment)

Standard #14: Assessment of Student Learning

- What are the clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes at all levels (institution, degree/program, and course) and for all programs that foster student learning and development?
- How are expected student learning outcomes consistent with the mission of the College and appropriately integrated with each other within and across disciplines?
- How does the College utilize an organized, sustained, and thorough assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning?
- How does the College systematically, sustainably, and thoroughly use multiple quantitative and/or qualitative measures to (include evidence of student learning):
 - Maximize the use of existing data and information?
 - Clearly and purposefully relate to the goals they are assessing?
 - Achieve sufficient quality that results can be used with confidence to inform decisions?
- How do the faculty and administration of the College collaborate with and support each other in the assessment of student learning?
- Demonstrate that the College provides adequate resources to support the assessment of student learning.
- Demonstrate that the process for assessing student learning is of sufficient simplicity, practicality, detail, and ownership to be sustainable:
 - Is the system for assessment and reporting simple enough?
 - Do all participants understand their role?
 - Is there ownership from all levels for assessment of learning?
- How does Curriculum Committee ensure/monitor assessment of student learning?
 - Does the review of curriculum include review for clearly articulated written statements in observable terms of key learning outcomes?

- Do the course/program reviews include review of knowledge, skills, competencies described as learning objectives?
- Are the assessments appropriate for course/academic program/general education?
- How does Curriculum Committee document its work regarding assessment of learning?
- Is the co-curricular (student services) program a part of the assessment for learning?
 - What steps are in place to support the statement of learning objectives and the assessment of those objectives?
 - Is the co-curricular program consistent with the institution's vision, mission, values, and goals?
 - Does the co-curricular program respond to the results of the assessment?
- Does e-folio serve the purpose of recording evidence of learning assessment for both general education and program goals?
- Are both faculty and students knowledgeable of assessments and how they are used to assess? (Relevance)
- Have results of assessments been provided to students with options for improvements, and are students aware of student service resources? (Relationship to other Standards)

Inventory of Resources to be Used

The following reflects a preliminary list of potentially helpful, College-specific resources for working group research. Middle States provides a more comprehensive list of resources on pgs. 41-44 of *Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report*.

Standard #	Information/Documents Needed (location)	Persons/Offices to Be Interviewed
1	• Vision, Mission, Values, and Goals statement (college website/ president's office) • Board minutes	• Dr. Joe Forrester, president • Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost • Steve Danik, vice president finance and operations/director of athletics • Linda Gallagher, associate vice president assessment/director of nursing and allied health • Planning Council • President's office
2	• Annual planning documents (Planning Council) • Board of Trustees retreat packet (president's office)	• Dr. Joe Forrester, president • Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost • Steve Danik, vice president finance and operations/director of athletics • Linda Gallagher, associate vice president assessment/director of nursing and allied health • Planning Council

3	- Budget process : sources of funding, equipment acquisition and replacement process, institutional controls for financial operations (Steve Danik) - Perkins Grant: equipment/personnel (Jan Kaminski) - Annual independent audit (Steve Danik)	- Steve Danik, vice president finance and operations/director of athletics - Jeff Farley, vice president human resources - Walter Lukhaup, vice president information technology - Jan Kaminski, dean academic support services
4	- Board of Trustees minutes/membership - Planning Council minutes/membership - Academic Council minutes/membership (Dr. Denardo/Judi Butchki) - SOF minutes/membership (Lana Podolak) - Agreement between County and Board of Trustees (president's office) - Governance policies and procedures (website)	- Dr. Joe Forrester, president - Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost - Brian Hayden, executive assistant to president/director of institutional research - Leslie Tennant, director of communications - President's Staff - Academic Council (Dr. Denardo) - Planning Council - Board of Trustees (Helen Kissick, chair) - SOF (Lana Podolak, president)
5	- Administration/staff job descriptions (president's office) - Organizational chart (president's office) - Administration/staff evaluations (human resources)	- Dr. Joe Forrester, president - Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost - Jeff Farley, vice president human resources
6	- Integrity Plan (Institutional Assessment Council) - Promotion and tenure information (Dr. Denardo) - Student grievance information, handbooks, contracts (Dr. Denardo) - Hiring policy (human resources) - Public relations policies and procedures (Leslie Tennant)	- Dr. Joe Forrester, president - Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost - Jeff Farley, vice president human resources - Brian Hayden, executive assistant to president/director of institutional research - Linda Gallagher, associate vice president assessment/director of nursing and allied health - Leslie Tennant, director of communications - Institutional Assessment Council
7	Institutional assessment plan (student engagement, employee satisfaction, National Community College Benchmark Project, PA Community College Benchmark report, student learning outcome assessment, 5-year	- Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost - Linda Gallagher, associate vice president assessment/director of nursing and allied health - Brian Hayden, executive assistant to

	program review, retention/graduation)	president/director of institutional research Assessment Council (Brian Hayden)
8	- Enrollment management policies/procedures (Angela Vedro) - Student Handbook (website) - College Catalog (website) - Achieving the Dream initiatives (Dr. Denardo/Brian Hayden)	- Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost - Brian Hayden, executive assistant to president/director of institutional research - Angela Vedro, director of enrollment services-special term administrator
9	- Learning Center credentials (human resources) - Learning Center services (Jan Kaminski) - Organizational Chart (President's Office) - Athletic policies (Steve Danik/Lauren Carfagna) - College Catalog (website) - Faculty advising policies/procedures (website)	- Dr. Joe Forrester, president - Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost - Steve Danik, vice president finance and operations/director of athletics - Jan Kaminski, dean academic support services - Cheryl Herrington, manager, learning/library resources - Leslie Tennant, director of communications
10	- Faculty credentials (human resources) - Faculty appointment policies and procedures (human resources) - Faculty evaluations: full- and part-time (Dr. Denardo) - Faculty development (Dr. Denardo) - Faculty handbook - Promotion and tenure contract information (Dr. Denardo)	- Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost - Jeff Farley, vice president human resources
11	- Syllabi (Dr. Denardo) 5-year program evaluations (Dr. Denardo) - TAOC (TAOC website) - Articulation agreements - High Demand Programs (Dr. Denardo) - Information literacy classes - Library staff qualifications (human resources; Cheryl Herrington)	- Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost - Linda Gallagher, associate vice president assessment/director of nursing and allied health - Angela Vedro, director of enrollment services-special term administrator - Karen Ganska, professor, counseling - Cheryl Herrington, manager, learning/library resources
12	General education program: competencies, graduation portfolio (Dr. John Gall)	- Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost - Dr. John Gall, director of liberal arts and sciences

13	Documents pertinent to the institution's specific activities, such as curriculum plans and evaluations; assessment results for basic skills, certificate, experiential learning, and distance learning programs; data and plans for additional locations; and contracts with affiliated providers	- Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost - Ray Schweinberg, Blackboard coordinator/educational technologies coordinator - Dr. John Gall, director of liberal arts
14	- Syllabi (Dr. Denardo) - Student learning outcomes (TracDat; Linda Gallagher) - Student assessment of course instruction (Dr. Denardo)	- Dr. Melissa Denardo, vice president learning and student success/provost - Linda Gallagher, associate vice president assessment/director of nursing and allied health - Brian Hayden, executive assistant to president/director of institutional research - Jan Kaminski, dean academic support services - Curriculum Committee

Organization of the Self-Study Report

The final self-study report will be organized as follows:

Executive Summary and Eligibility Certification Statement

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

- Brief Overview of Community College of Beaver County
- Overview of the Self-Study Process and Goals
- Organization of Self-Study Report

Chapter 2: Standard 1: Mission and Goals

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 3: Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 4: Standard 3: Institutional Resources

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 5: Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 6: Standard 5: Administration

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 7: Standard 6: Integrity

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 8: Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination

- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 9: Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 10: Standard 9: Student Support Services

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 11: Standard 10: Faculty

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 12: Standard 11: Educational Offerings

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 13: Standard 12: General Education

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence

- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 14: Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 15: Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

- A heading reflecting the standard(s) under examination
- A description of the topic(s) being examined within the institution's context
- Summary of the methodology used and analysis of evidence
- Findings of the examination, including strengths and opportunities for improvement
- Recommendations

Chapter 16: Conclusion

- Summary of Significant Conclusions and Recommendations

Editorial Style and Format of all Reports

To facilitate the compilation of information and ensure the final self-study report reflects a consistent style, the steering committee and working groups will use the following editorial guidelines to produce all working group assignments, including chapters for the self-study report. To ensure the understanding and use of established style guidelines, an editorial team has been established and includes a report editor and an editor from each working group.

Editorial Team

Katie Thomas, report editor/self-study co-chair
Amy Sicuranza, working group editor, mission
Nancy Dickson, working group editor, leadership
Cynthia Marshall, working group editor, students and faculty
Leslie Tennant, working group editor, education
Fran Sifers, working group editor, assessment

Style Guide	APA Style Book
Word Processing Application	Microsoft Word 2010
Font	Calibri
Font Size	12-point for body of report, 10-point for tables
Line Spacing	Single-spaced for body of report, two-line return under headings and between paragraphs and sections
Indentation	None
Margins	Standard 1-inch margins on top, bottom, left and right
Header and Footer Margins	.5 inch
Justification	Left-justified
Bullets	• Black bullet, flush left
Spacing between Sentences	Two spaces
Numbering	Use Microsoft Word 2010 automatic numbering, with period after number
Chapter Headings	Bolded, flush left
Chapter Sub Headings	Not bolded, but underlined, flush left
Headings Under Sub Headings	Italicized, flush left
Acronyms	Acronyms for organizations, offices, etc. may be used in the body of the document. The first time an acronym is introduced, it must accompany the full name and be set off in parentheses. Thereafter, the acronym may stand alone. Ex. Community College of Beaver County (CCBC).
Person	Third person
Voice	Active voice whenever possible
Tense	Present tense in general; other tenses may be used when appropriate

Timetable for the Self-Study and Evaluation

The following timeline highlights major events for the self-study and evaluation. Specific dates and deadlines will be established throughout the self-study process and a detailed, up-to-date, electronic version of the timeline will be available and updated monthly on the Middle States Blackboard Collaboration site.

- Year 1: Fall-Spring 2012
 - Self-study model selection, self-study design draft, MSCHE staff liaison visits campus
- Year 2: Summer 2012-Summer 2013
 - Self-study design approved, working groups compile research and reports
 - Evaluation team Chair selected, self-study design sent to Chair
 - Evaluation team members selected, draft self-study report
- Year 3: Fall 2013-Summer 2014
 - Self-study report draft reviewed, Chair visits College
 - Final self-study report sent to MSCHE and evaluation team
 - Team visit and report, institutional response
 - Commission action

Profile of the Visiting Evaluation Team

Community College of Beaver County requests a majority of visiting team members have experience at a community college of similar size, location, demographics, and economics. The College recommends the visiting team understand issues related to those discussed in the “Introduction” and “Nature and Scope” sections of this document. The College asks that visiting team members include a blend of faculty and administrators who reflect the following areas of expertise:

- President-level (as visiting team chairperson)
- Academic Affairs
- Workforce Development and Continuing Education
- Planning, Research and Organizational Development
- Outcomes Assessment
- Quality Initiatives (Process Management, Achieving the Dream)
- Administration and Finance
- Student Services
- Instructional and Information Technology
- Trustee perspective and experience