

Community College of Philadelphia

Self-Study Design

Submitted to

Commission on Higher Education

Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools

October 2002

Dr. Stephen M. Curtis, President

Dr. Andrea Mengel, Chair, Steering Committee

Ms. Kathleen Smith, Co-Chair, Institutional Context Standards Committee

Dr. Sharon Thompson, Co-Chair, Institutional Context Standards Committee

Mr. Samuel Hirsch, Co-Chair, Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee

Ms. Margaret Niven, Co-Chair, Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee

Table of Contents

I.	Institutional Overview	1
II.	Nature and Scope of Self-Study	6
III.	Goals and Objectives.....	8
IV.	Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Subcommittees	9
V.	Charges to the Committees.....	21
VI.	Outcomes Assessment	38
VII.	Inventory of Support Documents	39
VIII.	Timetable.....	50
IX.	Editorial Style and Format.....	53
X.	Format of the Self-Study Report.....	55
XI.	Profile of the Evaluation Team	56
	Appendix	57

I. Institutional Overview

Community College of Philadelphia is an open-admission, associate degree granting institution that provides accessible, low-cost higher education for all who may benefit. The College's initial accreditation by Middle States Association was granted in 1968. Since it began operation, more than 482,000 students have enrolled at the College. Community College of Philadelphia is the only public institution of higher education in the City of Philadelphia, and is also the largest single point of entry into higher education for students of color in Philadelphia. The College's Main Campus is a 14-acre complex located in the heart of Center City Philadelphia. Three Regional Centers, situated at central points in Philadelphia's northeast, northwest, and western regions, combined with more than 30 different community sites, extend the College beyond Center City. The College's diverse locations enable the institution to serve more than 42,000 credit and non-credit students each year.

Student Body

Enrollment (2001-2002 academic year)	Approximately 42,000 students taking credit and non-credit courses
	Approximately 20,700 full-time equivalent students
	Approximately 28,400 students enrolled in credit courses
Student Characteristics	Median age is 27 years
	Majority (58%) are 25 years or older
	Majority are female (61%)
	Approximately 72% are minority students
	American Indian 0.5%
	Asian 7.6%
	Black 49.6%
	Hispanic 14.1%
	White 28.2%
	53% are enrolled in transfer or general education programs; 16% enrolled in career programs; 31% enrolled in non-credit, continuing education coursework

Faculty and Staff	420 Full-time faculty 807 Part-time faculty 431 Administrative and support staff
President	Dr. Stephen M. Curtis
Governance	15-member Board of Trustees appointed by the Mayor of Philadelphia
Admissions Policy	Admission to the College is open; however, admission to specific programs may be selective.
Academic Offerings	More than 70 career and transfer programs in Business, Humanities, Allied Health, Science and Technology, and the Social and Behavioral Sciences. Associate degree programs and Certificate programs. Day, evening and weekend classes for full-time and part-time students. Credit and non-credit courses are offered at the main campus, three regional centers and more than 30 neighborhood locations. Distance education courses available. Comprehensive academic support services and programs, services for students with disabilities and other support services available.
Degrees Granted	Associate in Arts (A.A.) Associate in Science (A.S.) Associate in Applied Science (A.A.S.)
2002-2003 Budget	\$95.9 million (\$90.4 operating, \$5.5 capital)
Tuition and Fees	\$96 per credit hour for Philadelphia residents \$2,304 per year for full-time study
Financial Aid	Approximately 66% of full-time students and 49% of all students receive some type of financial aid.

Funding

Operating costs are shared among the students, the City, and the State. This translates roughly into each group being responsible for one-third of the total cost.

Accreditation

Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools

Department of Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Specialized accrediting organizations accrediting or approving College programs:

- American Bar Association
- American Dental Association, Commission on Dental Accreditation
- American Dietetic Association, Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education
- American Health Information Management Association
- Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs
- Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology
- National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission

Locations

Main Campus	1700 Spring Garden Street Philadelphia, PA 19130
Northeast Regional Center	12901 Townsend Road Philadelphia, PA 19154
West Philadelphia Regional Center	4725 Chestnut Street Philadelphia, PA 19143
Northwest Regional Center	1300 W. Godfrey Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19141
Neighborhood Locations	More than 30 city wide

Historical Highlights

Founded 1964

The College opened for classes in 1965 in a former department store at 34 South 11th Street while a permanent campus was being sought.

In 1971, the College acquired from the federal government the building at 1700 Spring Garden Street that had housed the third Philadelphia Mint and would eventually become the centerpiece of its permanent campus.

With renovations of the Mint underway, the College began holding classes there in 1973. The College maintained both the 11th Street site and the Spring Garden campus until the spring of 1983 when all of the College's main campus facilities were consolidated into the permanent campus at 1700 Spring Garden Street.

The Winnet Student Life/Instruction Building and Gymnasium, 17th and Buttonwood Streets, was completed and formally dedicated in September 1991.

The current West Regional Center opened in 1992, the Northeast Center in 1994, and the Northwest Center in 1999.

A new Center for Business and Industry Building at 18th and Callowhill Streets is scheduled to open in 2003.

Educational Impact

The College is the largest institution of higher education in the Philadelphia region and the sixth largest in Pennsylvania.

The College has served more than 482,000 students since it began operation.

**Economic Impact
2001-02 Year**

\$55,136,000 annual payroll (2001)

\$2,362,000 in wage tax (2001)

\$12,300,000 in expenditures (2001) for goods and services

\$56,000,000 in federal and state revenues (2001)

The College receives \$3.10 of federal and state revenues for every dollar of city revenue it receives.

II. Nature and Scope of Self-Study

Community College of Philadelphia has identified the selected topics Self-Study approach as best meeting the institution's needs and priorities. A number of important considerations influenced the decision to use this approach.

As stated in *Designs for Excellence* (2000), instead of preparing a comprehensive Self-Study, "...if an institution recently conducted a thorough self-evaluation, such as during an institution-wide planning process, or if the institution has a regular program of institutional research that can provide comprehensive data, the institution might want to consider an alternate model for Self-Study" (page 5). The reasons for choosing a selected topics format are threefold: (1) directions established for the College in the 2000-2004 Strategic Plan; (2) the College's extensive and routine assessment program; and (3) the results of a College retreat to review progress since the 1993 Self-Study, as well as discussion about future priorities for the College.

Community College of Philadelphia employed an institution-wide process for developing its 2000-2004 Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan document and information about development of the plan and progress reports are available on the College's web site (<http://www.ccp.edu/strategicplan2000.htm>). The Strategic Plan, particularly Strategic Principle 4, is linked to the proposed Self-Study. Principle 4 requires the College to "...provide documented quality, innovation and effectiveness in the delivery of programs and services." Principle 4 further describes the development and implementation of a model for quality assessment that starts with the development of mission statements at the unit level that are linked to the institution mission.

The College is engaged in a continuous effort to assess institutional effectiveness. The following aspects of effectiveness are routinely assessed: educational effectiveness based on institutional expectations; educational effectiveness based on student expectations; financial effectiveness based on cost efficiency; resource usage and resource development; enrollment effectiveness based on the College's ability to achieve enrollment targets and the extent to which constituencies in the service area have easy access to College opportunities; community impact based on the College's economic impact and contribution to workforce development in the service area.

The President's Cabinet and selected campus leaders met in October 2001 to discuss options for the Self-Study. The retreat included an update on College progress since the 1993 Self-Study and the 1998 Periodic Review Report, a briefing on the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association (CHE/MSA) Institute for Self-Study Co-Chairs, review of the potential link between the Strategic Plan and Self-Study, and brainstorming using the draft of *Characteristics for Excellence in Higher Education*. The retreat led to a recommendation to prepare a selected topic Self-Study. Relevant Standards from *Characteristics for Excellence in Higher Education* were chosen and a list of goals for the Self-Study was created.

The three factors detailed above (i.e., recent Strategic Plan, ongoing assessment efforts, leadership retreat) support the use of a selected topics Self-Study as the ideal mechanism for integrating College needs and priorities with the Self-Study. Analysis of the relevant data points to the need for inclusion and a detailed study of the following standards as the major focus of the College's Self-Study: Standard 1 (Mission, Goals and Objectives); Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal); Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment); Standard 9 (Student Support Services); Standard 12 (General Education); and Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning).

Community College of Philadelphia has made progress in addressing issues identified in the 1993 Self-Study, including development of a Facilities Master Plan, redesign of the Library space, elimination of the General Studies Program, addition of degree options at the Regional Centers, improved City and State funding, development of a Childcare Center, enhanced effectiveness of the College Foundation and increased effectiveness in securing grants. Some issues from the 1993 Self-Study need additional attention, including assessing the effectiveness of general education and curricular reform efforts, implementing a comprehensive enrollment management plan and strengthening financial aid procedures.

In addition to continuing to improve the areas targeted in past institution reviews, the College's Strategic Plan emphasizes the need to create a culture of assessment within the institution, functional in every department. Community College of Philadelphia needs to use outcomes, particularly outcomes related to student learning and success, to create a series of activities that ensures continuous progress. The vision statement developed in conjunction with the Strategic Plan states that the College desires:

“...to serve Philadelphia as a premier learning institution where student success exemplifies the strength of a diverse, urban community college.”

III. Goals and Objectives

The Self-Study process affords the College a valuable and important opportunity to conduct a careful study and evaluation of the College's history, present status and goals for future directions. The creation of the Self-Study document is important, but its greater significance lies in the process of its creation that will enable the College to undertake extensive self reflection and assessment of strengths and goals. The following objectives describe the activities in which the College will engage during the Self-Study to achieve its goals:

1. Conduct a Self-Study that reflects the College's commitment to quality.
2. Establish a dynamic process that involves broad, diverse representation of all segments of the College community.
3. Review the College's mission as it relates to the evolving nature of the College.
4. Conduct a review and evaluation of the College's constituencies, programs and services with a particular emphasis on student learning.
5. Engage in a review of institutional outcomes and effectiveness.
6. Seek institutional consensus on a Self-Study Report which suggests recommendations for future change including key issues to be addressed in the College's next Strategic Plan.

A variety of activities comprise the approach used to collect and analyze data for the Self-Study. Both quantitative and qualitative data will be used.

All Committees will review institutional documents, including the Facility Master Plan, 2000-2004 Strategic Plan, past accreditation reports, Institutional Research reports, the *Annual Statistical Compendium*, annual budget reports, and academic program audits. Information will be reviewed and analyzed for inclusion in appropriate Standard Committee reports. The charge for each committee includes a list of potential resources that can inform committee discussions.

Individual and group interviews, including focus groups, may be used by some committees to gather information related to their charge that is not available elsewhere. Representatives from a variety of institutional constituencies, such as trustees, administrators, department heads, students, faculty and staff, could be included in the interview process.

If needed, a questionnaire will be developed to gather information that is not presently available in other institutional sources. The Office of Institutional Research will work with the Steering Committee to develop and administer questionnaires and analyze the responses.

IV. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Subcommittees

The leadership structure developed to conduct the Self-Study complements the chosen Self-Study design: a Steering Committee representing institutional constituencies and led by a Self-Study Chair; a committee for Institutional Context Standards whose Co-Chairs serve on the Steering Committee; a committee for Educational Effectiveness Standards whose Co-Chairs serve on the Steering Committee; separate committees for Standards 1, 2, 7, 9, 12 and 14 whose Co-Chairs serve on the respective Institutional Context Standards Committee or Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee; a committee for identifying documentation to address Standards 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11 and 13 and whose Co-Chairs serve on the Institutional Context and Educational Effectiveness Standards Committees. The Documentation Committee has a dual responsibility: assemble data which supports how the College addresses the standards which are not a focus of the Self-Study and act as a resource for other Standard Committees.

The Co-Chairs of the Institutional Context Standards Committee and the Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee provide the vital link between the Steering Committee and the individual Standard Committees to facilitate communication of information about the progress of the Self-Study. In summary, Figure 1 identifies committees working to create the Self-Study.

Figure 1
Organizational Structure of the Committees

Steering Committee	
Institutional Context Standards Committee	Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee
Standard 1 Committee: Mission Goals and Objectives	Standard 9 Committee: Student Support Services
Standard 2 Committee: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal	Standard 12 Committee: General Education
Standard 7 Committee: Institutional Assessment	Standard 14 Committee: Assessment of Student Learning
Documentation Committee for: Standard 3: Institutional Resources Standard 4: Leadership and Governance Standard 5: Administration Standard 6: Integrity Standard 8: Student Admissions Standard 10: Faculty Standard 11: Educational Offerings Standard 13: Related Educational Activities	

A subgroup of several members of the Steering Committee designed the committee structure, selected members from a list of volunteers to serve on Standard Committees and prepared documents for approval by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee subgroup selected Co-Chairs for the Standard Committees and solicited volunteers for Standard Committee membership through a letter to all College employees. Although Standard Committees are populated primarily by faculty, administrators, students and classified staff are also included on committees.

In setting up the committees, diversity was sought. Factors considered in establishing diversity included gender, race/ethnicity, department or program affiliation, and full-time or part-time employment status. Committee membership was selected to bring fresh perspective to the issues under review. Committee size was limited to facilitate cohesion, communication and accomplishment of the group's task. A list of committee members follows in Figure 2 with each person's name and title.

Each Standard Committee is lead by Co-Chairs. The Co-Chair model allows expanded opportunities for leadership skill development and was selected because leadership development is important to the institution. In addition, the model provides opportunities for the Co-Chairs to facilitate task accomplishment within a diverse work group. The role and responsibilities of the Co-Chairs include:

- Using the Committee's approved charge, lead the Committee in performing an in-depth analysis of the major programs, services, and resources related to the Standard.
- Chair ongoing meetings of the Committee throughout academic year 2002-2003.
- Keep minutes of meetings and post on the web page.
- Post drafts of the Committee's report on the web page.
- Solicit and respond to comments on the Committee's work from the College community.
- Keep Co-Chairs of the Institutional Context Standards Committee and/or Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee apprised of the Committee's work.
- Participate in all meetings intended to update the College community on Self-Study activities and findings.
- Submit first draft of Committee's report by May 1, 2003.
- Revise and edit Committee's report in June 2003.
- Participate in CHE/MSA site visit in Spring 2004.

Standard Committee Co-Chairs, in consultation with either the Institutional Context Standards Committee Co-Chairs or the Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee Co-Chairs, will determine how each Standard Committee operates and functions. Periodic meetings of each Standard Committee, the Institutional Context Standards Committee and the Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee will be held to encourage a process of critical inquiry balanced with uniformity of purpose.

Figure 2
List of Committee Members

Steering Committee*	
Committee Member	Committee Member Department
Mengel, Andrea – Chair	Professor and Head, Department of Nursing
Bates, Jerrald	Alumnus
Brisbon, Delores	Board Member
Grosset, Jane	Director of Institutional Research
Hirsch, Samuel	Dean, Division of Educational Support Services
Massenberg, Eric	Technical Specialist, Information Technology Services
Niven, Margaret	Associate Professor, Dietetics
Smith, Kathleen	Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Social Sciences
Thompson, Sharon	Dean, Division of Liberal Studies
Curtis, Stephen – ex officio	President
Gay, Judith – ex officio	Vice President for Academic Affairs
Hawk, Thomas – ex officio	Vice President for Finance and Planning
Jones, Savannah – ex officio	Vice President for Student Affairs

*Student representative to be added during academic year 2002-2003.

Institutional Context Standards Committee	
Committee Member	Committee Member Department
Smith, Kathleen – Co-Chair	Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Social Sciences
Thompson, Sharon – Co-Chair	Dean, Division of Liberal Studies
Bowers, Donald	Professor and Head, Department of Behavioral Sciences
Davidson, Judy	Associate Professor, Counseling
DiRosa, Francesca	Director, Center on Disability
Faris, Ralph	Professor, Sociology
Gao, Ji	Professor, Mathematics
Jones, Stephen	Assistant Professor, English
McGrath, Dennis	Professor, Social Sciences
Spadaro, Barbara	Assistant Professor, English
Mengel, Andrea - ex officio	Professor and Head, Department of Nursing

Standard 1 Committee: Mission, Goals and Objectives*	
Committee Member	Committee Member Department
Davidson, Judy, Co-Chair	Associate Professor, Counseling
Jones, Stephen, Co-Chair	Assistant Professor, English
Alsis, Francis	Professor and Head, Department of Respiratory Care Technology
Coley, Deborah	Typist Clerk, Math, Science and Health Careers
Collick, Vivian	Clerical Specialist, Records & Registration
Holiday, Mardi	Instructor, Computer Information Systems
Hubbs D'Alessio, Judith	Adjunct Faculty, Psychology/Behavioral Sciences
López, Carmelo Miranda	Recruitment Coordinator, Admissions
Peterson, Susan	Associate Professor, English
Quillen, Mary Ann	Assistant Director, Contracted Training and Economic Development, Community Services
Stern, Michael	Instructor, Design Technologies
Smith, Kathleen – ex officio	Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Social Sciences
Thompson, Sharon – ex officio	Dean, Division of Liberal Studies

*Student representative to be added during academic year 2002-2003.

Standard 2 Committee: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal*	
Committee Member	Committee Member Department
Bowers, Donald – Co-Chair	Professor and Head, Department of Behavioral Sciences
DiRosa, Francesca - Co-Chair	Director, Center on Disability
Cannon, Betty	Manager, Information Technology Services
Garofola, Robert	Regional Center Director, Regional Centers Administration
Gould, Clinton	Professor, English
King Garwood, Victoria	Director, Recruitment and Admissions
Love, Constance	Assistant Professor, Medical Assisting & Office Management
Paige, Joseph	Academic/Tutorial Coordinator, Educational Support Services
Perlman, Barry	Associate Professor, Social Sciences
Sethbhakdi, Pairat	Professor, English
Simons, Steve	Adjunct Faculty, Marketing and Management
Watters, David	Director, Student Activities
Smith, Kathleen – ex officio	Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Social Sciences
Thompson, Sharon – ex officio	Dean, Division of Liberal Studies

*Student representative to be added during academic year 2002-2003.

Standard 7 Committee: Institutional Assessment*	
Committee Member	Committee Member Department
Gao, Ji – Co-Chair	Professor, Mathematics
Spadaro, Barbara - Co-Chair	Assistant Professor, English
Allen, Debbie	Director, Student Records & Registration
Blaine, Catherine	Associate Professor, Respiratory Care Technology
Buchheit, Linda	Assistant Professor, English
Dukes, Fred	Assistant Professor, Counseling
Flynn, Tara	Adjunct Faculty, Paralegal Studies
Hall-Karambe, Ardencie	Assistant Professor, English
McFadden, Joseph	Coordinator, Audiovisual Services
Murray, Joseph	Assistant Professor, Economics and Accounting
Sinnott, Dawn	Research Associate, Institutional Research
Tam, Kok-Cheung	Assistant Professor, Mathematics
Smith, Kathleen – ex officio	Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Social Sciences
Thompson, Sharon – ex officio	Dean, Division of Liberal Studies

*Student representative to be added during academic year 2002-2003.

Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee	
Committee Member	Committee Member Department
Hirsch, Samuel – Co-Chair	Dean, Division of Educational Support Services
Niven, Margaret – Co-Chair	Associate Professor, Dietetics
Faris, Ralph	Professor, Sociology
Giddle, Cynthia	Associate Professor, English
Lott-Harrison, Sonya	Associate Professor, Behavioral Sciences
McGorry, Marian	Associate Professor and Head, Department of Office Administration
McGrath, Dennis	Professor, Social Sciences
Ott, Thomas	Director, Developmental Education and Assessment
Rossi, Deborah	Associate Professor and Head, Department of Medical Assisting and Office Management
Speakman, Elizabeth	Associate Professor, Nursing
Mengel, Andrea – ex officio	Professor and Head, Department of Nursing

Standard 9 Committee: Student Support Services*	
Committee Member	Committee Member Department
Ott, Thomas – Co-Chair	Director, Developmental Education and Assessment
Speakman, Elizabeth – Co-Chair	Associate Professor, Nursing
Freeman, David	Assistant Professor, Social Sciences
Grady, Theresa	Instructor and Head, Department of Dental Assisting Hygiene
Harter, Kathleen	Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Chemistry
Jewett, Carol	Visiting Lecturer, Library Services
Mulray, Kathleen	Site Administrator, Regional Center Administration
Nagaswami, Girija	Instructor, English
Nelson, Cheryl Ann	Assistant Professor, English
Ren, Huizhen	Coordinator, ESL/Bilingual Program, Educational Support Services
Scoles, Pascal	Associate Professor, BHHS/Behavioral Sciences
Tsai, Theresa	Assistant Professor, Counseling
Hirsch, Samuel – ex officio	Dean, Division of Educational Support Services
Niven, Margaret – ex officio	Associate Professor, Dietetics

*Student representative to be added during academic year 2002-2003.

Standard 12 Committee: General Education*	
Committee Member	Committee Member Department
Giddle, Cynthia. Co-Chair	Associate Professor, English
McGorry, Marian – Co-Chair	Associate Professor and Head, Department of Office Administration
Borlandoe, Janice	Assistant to Vice President, Student Affairs
Butler, Addie	Assistant to Vice President, Academic Affairs
Calabrese, Frank	Associate Professor, Behavioral Sciences
Cantafio, Elizabeth	Assistant Professor, English
Cowley, Alexandra	Associate Professor, Physics
Epstein, Nina	Coordinator, Health Desk Support, Information Technical Services
Fisher, Jae	Assistant Professor, Library Services
Gorchov, Robert	Assistant Professor, Paralegal Studies
Jones, Todd	Associate Professor, Counseling
Lynn, Rosemarie	Associate Professor, Dental Studies
Presjnar, David	Instructor, History/Philosophy
Hirsch, Samuel – ex officio	Dean, Division of Educational Support Services
Niven, Margaret – ex officio	Associate Professor, Dietetics

*Student representative to be added during academic year 2002-2003.

Standard 14 Committee: Assessment of Student Learning*	
Committee Member	Committee Member Department
Lott-Harrison, Sonya – Co-Chair	Associate Professor, Behavioral Sciences
Rossi, Deborah – Co-Chair	Associate Professor and Head, Department of Medical Assisting and Office Management
Baker, Ruth	Assistant Professor, Library Services
Berman, Warren	Assistant Professor, Biology
Epstein, Marcia	Associate Professor, Behavioral Sciences
Harting, Emilie	Associate Professor, English
Marcotte, Madeline	Instructor, English
McCasland, George	Adjunct Faculty, Electronics Engineering Technology
McCormick, Mark	Associate Professor, Social Sciences
Monroe, Joan	Assistant Professor, Learning Laboratory
Sutherland, Lynn	Project Director, TRIO Upward Bound, Educational Support Services
Tagliareni, Elaine	Professor, Nursing
Hirsch, Samuel – ex officio	Dean, Division of Educational Support Services
Niven, Margaret – ex officio	Associate Professor, Dietetics

*Student representative to be added during academic year 2002-2003.

Documentation Committee for:
Standard 3: Institutional Resources
Standard 4: Leadership and Governance
Standard 5: Administration
Standard 6: Integrity
Standard 8: Student Admissions
Standard 10: Faculty
Standard 11: Educational Offerings
Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

Committee Member	Committee Member Department
Faris, Ralph – Co-Chair	Professor, Sociology
McGrath, Dennis – Co-Chair	Professor, Social Sciences
Grosset, Jane	Director of Institutional Research
Hawk, Thomas	Vice President for Planning and Finance
Hirsch, Samuel– ex officio	Dean, Division of Educational Support Services
Niven, Margaret– ex officio	Associate Professor, Dietetics
Smith, Kathleen – ex officio	Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Social Sciences
Thompson, Sharon – ex officio	Dean, Division of Liberal Studies

V. Charges to the Committees

Detailed charges were created for the Steering Committee, the Institutional Context Standards Committee, the Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee, each Standard Committee, and the Documentation Committee. These charges were based on examination of guidelines from the CHE/MSA as well as documents related to the 1993 Self-Study and the 1998 Periodic Review Report. In addition, the charges were written considering the College's Strategic Plan and ongoing assessment efforts. The charges to the committees, developed by the subgroup of the Steering Committee, were reviewed and approved by the Steering Committee. To guide the committee in its work, each committee's charge provides a context for its assignment and a series of statements designed to encourage analytical responses. The charge to each committee follows.

Charge to the Self-Study Steering Committee

The Middle States Self-Study Steering Committee will provide leadership and assume responsibility for ensuring the quality of the College Self-Study. The Steering Committee Chair, appointed by the President, will be responsible for coordinating and monitoring the activities of the Steering Committee and creation of a Self-Study document that will reflect the College's commitment to fulfilling its mission.

A diverse team of faculty, administrators, staff, students and Board members working together through various Self-Study committees will carry out the Self-Study process. Support will be provided by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The responsibilities of the Steering Committee as a whole are:

1. Review and approve Self-Study committee charges.
2. Approve a timetable for the Self-Study process and assure the implementation of the timetable.
3. Approve the Self-Study design.
4. Ensure sufficient guidance for Self-Study committees.
5. Monitor progress of the Self-Study, including ensuring adequate communication within and between Self-Study committees.
6. Ensure sufficient communication of progress on the Self-Study to the College community.
7. Ensure that there are campus hearings so members of the College community may review and comment on drafts of the Self-Study.
8. Assume responsibility for the completion and quality of the final report.

Charge to the Institutional Context Standards Committee

The Institutional Context Standards Committee will provide leadership and assume responsibility for ensuring the quality of the Self-Study regarding the following Standards:

Standard 1: Mission, Goals and Objectives

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

Standard 5: Administration

Standard 6: Integrity

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment.

The Institutional Context Standards Committee Co-Chairs will be responsible for coordinating and monitoring the activities of Standard Committees and overseeing the preparation of drafts by the Standard Committees. Co-Chairs of the Standard Committees serve on the Institutional Context Standards Committee and are the conduit for communication between the Institutional Context Standards Committee and the Standard Committees.

The responsibilities of the Institutional Context Standards Committee are:

1. Ensure sufficient guidance for Standard Committees.
2. Monitor progress on the Self-Study, including ensuring adequate communication within and between Self-Study committees and the College community.
3. Assure the implementation of the timetable for the Self-Study.
4. Participate in campus hearings so members of the College community may review and comment on drafts of the Self-Study.
5. Ensure completion of the Self-Study concerning Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Charge to Standard 1 Committee: Mission, Goals and Objectives

As part of the 1992-1993 Self-Study Process, the Mission Statement became the subject of extensive review by the entire College community. This thorough examination of the College's philosophy, mission, assumptions, values and goals led to the drafting of the current mission statement, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees in Fall 1993. The adoption of the new mission statement led to the recommendation that the College undertake an on-going process to heighten awareness of the College's mission through activities such as orientation for new employees, curricular review and planning processes.

Essential to the concept of a vibrant and relevant educational institution is the on-going expression and evaluation of its mission, goals and objectives. The Strategic Planning Process undertaken in 2000 which resulted in the Strategic Plan 2000-2004 comprises the College's most recent statement of its goals and objectives. In particular, Strategic Principle 4 acknowledges that in order to assess and document the quality and effectiveness of programs and services, each unit must establish commitments, priorities and values that are consistent with the College's mission statement and which reflect a commitment to meaningful innovation.

1. Evaluate whether the goals set forth in 1993 have been met.
 - a. Is the mission effectively used to guide course and curriculum decisions?
 - b. Is the College community adequately aware of the College mission?
 - c. Has the College mission been successfully expressed to the outside community?
 - d. How does the College insure that its mission is evaluated through a review process that demonstrates its impact and currency?
2. Based on the results of the Fall 2002 Professional Development Week mission re-evaluation, determine whether additional mission review is warranted.
 - a. Does the mission statement reflect the College's role in the immediate geographic community, in the nation and in the world?
 - b. Are the mission, goals and objectives appropriate to the College's current place and for its present constituencies?
3. How does the College's Strategic Plan reflect the institution's mission, goals and objectives?
4. Evaluate the goal expressed by Strategic Principle 4 to engage the College community in unit mission review, to determine its current effectiveness and potential institutional impact.
5. Analyze how the College goals and objectives, as expressed in the Strategic Plan, effectively focus on student learning and outcomes for institutional improvement.

6. Are the College goals and objectives, as expressed in the Strategic Plan, sufficiently flexible to allow for the College to effectively respond to opportunities and change?
7. Are the College's annual operational and educational goals sufficiently articulated with the Strategic Plan and communicated to the College community?

**Charge to Standard 2 Committee:
Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal**

The ability to grow and respond thoughtfully to internal and external forces are the hallmarks of an effective planning process for a higher education institution. The College undertakes a wide range of extensive planning processes which incorporate all constituents of the College community. To be effective optimally, such processes must be coordinated to fully embody and facilitate the College's mission and vision. Recent planning efforts have included the development of a Facilities Master Plan, a Technology Plan, an Annual Operating Plan and the creation of a Strategic Plan which encompasses five major principles. The statement of principles, however, should not be the end of a successful planning process, rather an effective academic planning process leads to renewal, growth, thoughtful experimentation and development of continued, effective mechanisms for re-evaluation by the entire College community.

1. Describe and evaluate the use of the College's mission, goals and objectives in institution wide planning.
 - a. How does the College use data including environmental scans in the planning process?
 - b. Analyze the overall scope of the planning process to determine the level of congruence with College goals, mission and objectives.
2. Describe and evaluate how effectively the College uses its mission, goals and objectives in planning strategies and resource allocation.
3. Describe and evaluate whether the budget process adequately incorporates the actual needs of the College divisions and departments.
4. Analyze the recommendations resulting from the various planning efforts including the Strategic Plan to determine whether their objectives and outcomes are clearly stated and reflective of conclusions drawn from assessment results.
5. Assess the College's approach to planning to determine its effectiveness in reflecting the College's vision and in stimulating renewal.
 - a. Evaluate whether all College constituencies are effectively involved in the above process.
 - b. Evaluate whether the College's efforts in this area effectively respond to external forces.
6. Analyze whether the College utilizes an effective method for assessment of progress made toward objectives and goals defined in its planning effort.
7. Describe and evaluate the effectiveness of the College's mechanisms for establishing priorities in decision-making.

8. Describe and evaluate whether the College's planning processes are effectively communicated to the College community.

Charge to Standard 7 Committee: Institutional Assessment

Effective institutional assessment recognizes the importance of outcomes assessment as a means by which an institution seeks improvement. The determination of how well the College community accomplishes its goals and objectives and how effectively it re-evaluates its direction must center on the teaching and learning processes. Specifically, the College Strategic Plan incorporates the goals of developing effective ways of determining institutional effectiveness. Outcomes assessment should inform all of the College decision-making processes from resource allocation to ongoing planning. In the same manner, activities undertaken by the College to develop faculty and staff in creating an optimal atmosphere for student learning should be assessed for effectiveness. Similarly, the College's assessment processes must be appropriately accountable to external forces including the broader public.

1. Analyze the methodologies developed by the College for assessment to:
 - a. Determine whether it provides for effective systematic review and evaluation of the assessment process.
 - b. Determine whether its scope is sufficient to evaluate overall institutional effectiveness.
 - c. Determine whether it is sufficiently collaborative in engaging all appropriate members of the College community.
2. Review and assess the data collected by the College related to student outcomes assessment to determine:
 - a. Whether the data collected is appropriate to assess student outcomes.
 - b. Whether the data collected is utilized effectively in decision making.
3. Analyze the College's mechanisms for program and faculty evaluation to determine their effectiveness and use in College decision making and planning.
4. Describe and evaluate the College's plan for faculty and staff development to determine its effectiveness and whether sufficient mechanisms for assessment of faculty and staff development are in place.
5. Analyze whether the College's assessment process responds appropriately and is communicated to external constituencies.
6. Determine whether all College constituencies are effectively involved in planning assessment processes:
 - a. Evaluate the extent to which members of the College community accept responsibility for institutional renewal and improvement based on data and outcomes assessment.

7. Strategic Principle 4 calls for the development of an assessment model at the unit level. Describe the effectiveness of the implementation of this process.

Charge to the Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee

The Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee will provide leadership and assume responsibility for ensuring the quality of the Self-Study regarding the following Standards:

- Standard 8: Student Admissions
- Standard 9: Student Support Services
- Standard 10: Faculty
- Standard 11: Educational Offerings
- Standard 12: General Education
- Standard 13: Related Educational Activities
- Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

The Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee Co-Chairs will be responsible for coordinating and monitoring the activities of Standard Committees and overseeing the preparation of drafts by the Standard Committees. Co-Chairs of the Standard Committees serve on the Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee and are the conduit for communication between the Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee and the Standard Committees.

The responsibilities of the Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee are:

1. Ensure sufficient guidance for Standard Committees.
2. Monitor progress on the Self-Study, including ensuring adequate communication within and between Self-Study committees and the College community.
3. Assure the implementation of the timetable for the Self-Study.
4. Participate in campus hearings so members of the College community may review and comment on drafts of the Self-Study.
5. Ensure completion of the Self-Study concerning Standards 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

Charge to Standard 9 Committee: Student Support Services

In keeping with the College mission to provide access to higher education for all who may benefit, a comprehensive, integrated program of student support services should be available to strengthen learning outcomes. These services need to be flexible and responsive to the needs of the diverse student population served by the College. Equally important is the protection of students' rights and the recognition by students of their responsibility in the educational process.

For the purpose of this study, student support services are divided into two key units: Enrollment Management (Recruitment, Admissions, Financial Aid, Orientation, Assessment Center, Retention); and Student Life (Counseling, Advising, Athletics, Co-curricular Activities, Health Services). The degree to which these services are comprehensive, integrated and designed to meet the needs of students is critical to the ultimate goal of strengthening institutional effectiveness.

1. For each of the two units of service described above:
 - a. Examine if and how the services provided are consistent with the College mission.
 - b. Describe and evaluate the extent to which the range of services provided by the College are comprehensive, integrated and designed to meet the needs of its diverse student body.
 - c. Describe and evaluate the accessibility and effectiveness of these services to students regardless of location (Main Campus, Regional Centers, Neighborhood/Corporate sites) or method by which students enroll (traditional classroom, distance education).
 - d. In what ways are the services provided flexible and appropriate to the needs of the various populations served by the College (older students, students with disabilities, international students, etc.)?
 - e. Describe and evaluate how the services are integrated with academic departments and academic support services (Library, Center on Disability, Advising).
2. Describe and evaluate policies designed to protect students' rights.
 - a. Are student grievance policies and procedures clearly defined?
 - b. How consistently are they applied?
 - c. How well are they disseminated to the student body?
 - d. Describe and evaluate policies and procedures for protecting confidentiality of student records.
3. Describe and evaluate how effectively assessment results are used for improvement of student support services leading to strengthened learning outcomes.

Charge to Standard 12 Committee: General Education

Since the last Middle States Association Self-Study, the College has been engaged in a significant effort of general education reform. This effort brought about a new way of conceptualizing the delivery of general education requirements through a “Dimension” schema. In addition, an American Diversity requirement was instituted. The College maintained its 18-credit general education course distribution requirement. Significant curricular modifications have been introduced as well. Consistent with its mission, a quality institution of higher education offers students the opportunity to achieve college-level proficiency in oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy.

1. Describe and evaluate the College’s efforts over the past ten to fifteen years to design and deliver a program of general education requirements that is consistent with the College’s mission.
 - a. Describe the faculty role and responsibility in the design and assessment of general education requirements.
 - b. Review and evaluate the College’s effectiveness toward reforming general education. Consider evidence of institutional support for a general education program (administrative structure, budget, faculty incentives).
 - c. How effective has replacing the General Studies Program with the AA degree programs been in helping students achieve the general education expectations set out in the current requirements?
 - d. Describe and evaluate the impact the “Dimension” reform effort has had on general education at the College.
2. Describe the College’s current general education requirements and assess the degree to which they ensure students achieve college-level proficiency in oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy. To what extent do the general education requirements incorporate study of values, ethics and diverse perspectives?
3. In what ways are general education knowledge, skills and abilities (as defined in number 2) effectively incorporated into students’ major programs of study? How is this assessed?
4. Describe and evaluate the ways in which the College assures student achievement of general education outcomes in light of the multiple ways course credit may be earned (courses completed at the College, transfer credits, or competencies demonstrated in ways determined by the College).

5. What is the relationship of the assessment of general education outcomes to the College's overall plan for assessing student learning? In what ways are the assessment results utilized for curricular improvement?

**Charge to Standard 14 Committee:
Assessment of Student Learning**

Essential to a quality institution is the clear delineation of expectations for student learning. The College mission promises students a foundation for employment, transfer and life-long learning. It further promises to prepare students to be informed and concerned citizens. In addition to fulfilling the College mission, accountability to transfer institutions, expectations of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and requirements of outside accrediting agencies dictates careful attention to assessment of student learning outcomes.

Expectations for student learning should be congruent at various levels (course, program, institution) and consistent with the institution's mission. With the recognition that courses are delivered by a variety of methods and at locations well beyond the College's Main Campus, assessment of student learning and outcomes should consider consistent expectations regardless of the location or methodology of delivery used.

The assessment of student learning is an essential component of determining educational effectiveness and in turn, institutional effectiveness. Assessment of student learning is therefore of limited value if the results of the assessment are not used as a basis for improvement.

1. Describe the process for defining student learning outcomes. Evaluate how student learning outcomes are defined at the College.
 - a. Are current course and program development models adequate for delineating expected course and program outcomes?
2. Evaluate the congruence of student learning outcomes at the various levels of the institution.
 - a. To what degree is there congruence at the course and program levels?
 - b. To what extent are defined student learning outcomes congruent with the mission and goals of the College?
3. Describe and evaluate current methods or procedures used for collection of student learning outcomes information.
 - a. Are current practices adequate for assessing course effectiveness?
 - b. Are current Academic Audit procedures adequate for assessing program effectiveness?
 - c. Does Institutional Research provide appropriate data for assessing effectiveness of learning outcomes?
4. To what extent is there a system or plan that encourages academic departments and programs to use outcomes assessment to improve courses and programs?
 - a. How effectively are assessment measures currently in place used to guide planning?

- b. Describe and evaluate the extent to which the current plan is ongoing rather than episodic.
- c. How well are the findings and recommendations in academic audits used to improve courses and programs?

Charge to Documentation Committee for:
Standard 3: Institutional Resources
Standard 4: Leadership and Governance
Standard 5: Administration
Standard 6: Integrity
Standard 8: Student Admissions
Standard 10: Faculty
Standard 11: Educational Offerings
Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

Since the last Self-Study undertaken by the College, the Middle States Association has revised and expanded its options for this process. In evaluating the fourteen standards of excellence delineated by the Middle States Association, it was decided that an in-depth focus on six of those standards would constitute the most effective allocation of College resources and provide the best opportunity to explore areas of concern while not overly duplicating the recent major self-reflective process undertaken which resulted in the College's Strategic Plan. The areas which are not the subject of individual committee review are, however, essential and the accumulation and consideration of the data which supports how the College addresses these standards is one of the primary functions of this committee. Additionally, given the overlap that occurs when attempting to view any entity simultaneously as a whole and in its component parts, the second major function of this committee is to act as a resource for the other committees.

1. Discern the fundamental elements of Standard 3, Institutional Resources, and review and assemble data which addresses this Standard.
2. Discern the fundamental elements of Standard 4, Leadership and Governance, and review and assemble data which addresses this Standard.
3. Discern the fundamental elements of Standard 5, Administration, and review and assemble data which addresses this Standard.
4. Discern the fundamental elements of Standard 6, Integrity, and review and assemble data which addresses this Standard.
5. Discern the fundamental elements of Standard 8, Student Admissions, and review and assemble data which addresses this Standard.
6. Discern the fundamental elements of Standard 10, Faculty, and review and assemble data which addresses this Standard.
7. Discern the fundamental elements of Standard 11, Educational Offerings, and review and assemble data which addresses this Standard.

8. Discern the fundamental elements of Standard 13, Related Educational Activities, and review and assemble data which addresses this Standard.
9. Provide information and support the other Institutional Context and Educational Effectiveness Standard Committees.

VI. Outcomes Assessment

Since the last CHE/MSA Self-Study, a significant amount of research has focused on assessing institutional effectiveness, including student learning outcomes. Much of what has been learned through this research appears in published institutional reports that are circulated in electronic and paper format throughout the College. Consequently, considerable information related to a wide range of student outcomes is available for the current Self-Study process. The College's assessment plan, which has guided institutional research efforts at the College, is described in *An Overview of Efforts to Understand Institutional Effectiveness at the Community College of Philadelphia* (2000). This report is appended to this document.

All Standard Committees will be responsible for evaluating the availability, quality and use of assessment information at the College and each committee will include appropriate assessment information in its report. Key questions related to outcomes assessment have been included in the charge to each committee. To facilitate the inclusion of assessment information in committee discussions, the Director of Institutional Research serves as a member of the Steering Committee, interacting directly with the Co-Chairs of the Institutional Context Standards Committee and the Co-Chairs of the Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee. This helps to ensure that the information needs of the Standard Committees will be addressed efficiently.

In anticipation of these needs, the Office of Institutional Research created a website (www.ccp.edu) dedicated to the CHE/MSA Self-Study process. Included as part of the website is an extensive information resource library that contains appropriate documents for each standard committee. Many of these documents are available in electronic form, thereby making the information easily accessible to committee members. Paper documents have been centrally located for ease of access as well.

Committee members will work closely with Institutional Research staff to identify existing documents and databases, analyze available data and incorporate outcomes assessment data into the Self-Study in a consistent and objective manner.

VII. Inventory of Support Documents

In support of the self-study process, the Office of Institutional Research has assembled a resource library that contains reports, databases, assessment tools, and self-study documents. In order to ensure the relevance of each information resource to the self-study process, the documents in the inventory have been mapped to appropriate Middle State's standards. Since both electronic and paper resources have been included in the inventory, either a URL or the originating department/office for the source document is available. The inventory of resources is on the College's Middle States website. Paper copies of appropriate resources are also available. The Resource Library follows.

Resource Library

Information	Standard(s)	Website or Originating Office
Designs for Excellence	1 - 14	http://www.msache.org/msadesig.pdf
Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education	1 - 14	http://www.msache.org/charac02.pdf
CCP Institutional Self-Study - 1993	1 - 14	Academic Affairs Office M2-34
Middle States Evaluation Team Response - 1993	1 - 14	Academic Affairs Office M2-34
Periodic Review Report - 1999	1 - 14	Academic Affairs Office M2-34
CCP Institutional Self-Study - 1983	1 - 14	Academic Affairs Office M2-34
Office of Institutional Research Website	1 - 14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/VPFIN-PL/ir/
2000-2004 Strategic Plan and Progress Report External Scan Internal Scan Steering Committee and Sub-committee minutes	1,2,3,7,9,11,13,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/strategicplan2000.htm
Environmental Scan Library	2,7	http://tango3.ccp.cc.pa.us/tango3/docs/html/ir/index.htm
2002 Facility Master Plan Meeting minutes	1,2,3	http://www.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/fmp2002/
2000-2003 Technology Plan	2,3,9 - 13	http://www.ccp.cc.pa.us/tcc/index.htm
Marketing Plan	2,8	Office of Communications - M1-24

Clarus Market Research Report	2	Division of Communications and Government Relations - M2-5
Assessment Plan	1,2,3,7 - 14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/VPFINPL/ir/Assessment_Plan.pdf
Fact Book (Annual Statistical Compendium)	2,3,7,8,10,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfinpl/factbook/factbook.htm
CCP Mission Statement	1,2,3,8,9,11,14	http://www.ccp.cc.pa.us/home/about/mission.html
Organizational Chart	4,5	Human Resources Office - M2-3
Catalogue 2002-2003	1 - 14	http://www.ccp.cc.pa.us/home/programs/catalog.html
Course offerings	11,12	http://www.ccp.cc.pa.us/home/programs/offerings.html
Collective Bargaining Agreements	3,4,6,10	Human Resources Office - M2-3
Community College of Philadelphia Employee Handbook	2,3,4,6,8,9,10	Human Resources Office - M2-3
Enrollment Statistics	2,3,7,8,9	Office of Finance and Planning - M2-6
Student Activities Schedule	8,9,13	Student Activities Office - S1-10
Vanguard	4,5,6,8,9,13	Student Affairs Office - M2-37
Student Handbook	4,5,6,8,9,13	Student Affairs Office - M2-37
Other Student Publications	4,5,6,8,9,13	Student Affairs Office - M2-37
CCP Marketing Publications/Brochures	1,6,8,9,11,13	Office of Communications - M1-24
Admissions reports	8,9	Admissions Office - M1-17
Application and information packets for students	8,9	Admissions Office - M1-17
Academic Program Audits	1,2,3,7 - 14	Academic Affairs Office - M2-34
Chapter 335 documentation	1,2,3,7,11,12,14	Curriculum Development Office - BR-74
Grade Distribution reports	7,10,11,12,14	Office of Finance and Planning - M2-6
In-Service Programs	5,7,10	Academic Affairs Office M2-34
Professional Development Programs	5,7,10	Academic Affairs Office M2-34
Articulation Agreements	1,6,7,9,11,13	Academic Affairs Office - M2-34
CCP 2002-2003 Fiscal Year Budget	2,3	Office of Finance and Planning - M2-6

Other Financial Reports	2,3	Office of Finance and Planning - M2-6
Institutional Effectiveness 2001 A College Report Card (March 2002) - IR Report #125	7,8,11,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_125.pdf
Transfer Outcomes of Graduates in 1999 and 2000 (January 2002) - IR Report #124	11,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_124.pdf
Distance Education at the Community College of Philadelphia A Profile of Participants and Course Outcomes Fall 1998 Through Spring 2001 (January 2002) - IR Report #123	7,11,13,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_123.pdf
Short-Term Transfer and Career Outcomes of Community College of Philadelphia's Graduating Class of 2000 (January 2002) - IR Report #122	11,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_122.pdf
Career Outcomes for 2000 Career Program Graduates (November 2001) - IR Report #121	14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_121.pdf
Student Attrition at CCP - When Students Leave, Why They Leave, and Their Academic Success at Departure (June 2001) - IR Report #120	7,8,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_120.pdf
Institutional Effectiveness 2000 - A College Report Card (January 2001) - IR Report #119	7,8,11,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_119.pdf
Temple University Persistence Rates for the Community College of Philadelphia Transfer Students (December 2000) - IR Report #118	14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_118.pdf

Impact of the Allied Health Programs on the Philadelphia Region (November 2000) - IR Report #117	7,11,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_117.pdf
Student Preferences for Alternative Course Delivery Options (November 2000) - IR Report #116	11,13	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_116.pdf
Career Outcomes for 1999 Career Program Graduates of Community College of Philadelphia (November 2000) - IR Report #115	14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_115.pdf
A Profile of Summer 2000 Guest Students at Community College of Philadelphia (November 2000) - IR Report #114	13	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_114.pdf
Profiles of Students Who Enroll at Single and Multiple Community College of Philadelphia Sites (August 2000) - IR Report #113	7,13,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_113.pdf
A Comparison of Community College of Philadelphia Student Outcomes With Those of Other Pennsylvania Community College Students (August 2000) - IR Report #112	7,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_112.pdf
The Economic Impact of Community College of Philadelphia (February 2000) - IR Report #111	7,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_111.pdf
Student Satisfaction with Student Services, Academic Services and Campus Climate - 1996-1999 (January 2000) - IR Report #110	7,8,9	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35

Transfer and Career Activities of the 1998 Graduates of Community College of Philadelphia (December 1999) - IR Report #109	11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Why Do Students Drop Out of Community College of Philadelphia? Reasons for the Attrition of Black and White Students (September 1999) - IR Report #108	7,8,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_108.pdf
Career Outcomes of 1997 Graduates and Former Students (September 1999) - IR Report #107	14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_107.pdf
Transfer Outcomes of 1997 Graduates and Former Students (September 1999) - IR Report #106	11,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_106.pdf
Barriers to the Persistence of Students with Freshman and Sophomore Status (July 1999) - IR Report #105	7,8,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_105.pdf
Highlights of Institutional Research Findings from the Last Five Years (May 1999) - IR Report #104	7,8,9,11,12,13,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Developmental Education Outcomes Three Years After the Developmental Education Task Force (April 1999) - IR Report #103	7,8,9,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
A Comparison of Community College of Philadelphia Student Outcomes with the Outcomes of Other Pennsylvania Community College Students - An Update (January 1999) - IR Report #102	14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35

A Comparison of Community College of Philadelphia Students Outcomes with the Outcomes of Other Pennsylvania Community College Students (August 1998) - IR Report #101A	14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
A Profile of Fall 1997 ESL Students (April 1998) - IR Report #101	8,9,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
1996 Graduate Survey: Career Outcomes of College Graduates (February 1998 - IR Report #100)	14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
A Profile of Community College of Philadelphia Transfer Students Enrolled at SSHE Universities During the Fall 1996 and Spring 1997 Semesters (January 1998) - IR Report #99	11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
An Evaluation of the Achievement of the Developmental Education Mission - An Update (January 1998) - IR Report #98	7,8,9,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
A Profile of General Education Development (GED) Students (December 1997) - IR Report #97	7,11,13	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Graduate Assessment of Technological Preparation for Transfer and Employment (December 1997) - IR Report #96	9,11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
An Evaluation of the Achievement of the Developmental Education Mission (November 1997) - IR Report #95	7,8,9,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35

Community College of Philadelphia 1996 - Graduate Survey - Transfer Paths of College Graduates (December 1997) - IR Report #94	11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Beating the Odds: Reasons for At-Risk Student Success at Community College of Philadelphia (September 1997) - IR Report #93	7,8,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_093.pdf
An Assessment of Community College of Philadelphia's Effectiveness in Preparing Students for Transfer and Employment (December 1996) - IR Report #92	11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
A Profile of Community College of Philadelphia Transfer Students Enrolled at State System Higher Education Universities During the Fall 1994, Spring 1995 and Fall 1995 Semesters - IR Report #91	11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
The Impact of the Ten Week Course Session During the Fall 1995 Semester (February 1996) - IR Report #90	11,13,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Potential Administrative Barriers to Student Enrollment (January 1996) - IR Report #89	7,8,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_089.pdf
Middle States Self Study Survey Results - IR Report #69	1 - 14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_069.pdf
The Community College Goals Inventory - IR Report #68	1 - 14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_068.pdf

Acceptance Outcomes of Former CCP Students Who Applied to Thomas Jefferson University (January 2002) - IR InBrief #91	11,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/Inbrief_91.pdf
West Chester Academic Achievement and Persistence Outcomes Associated With Former CCP Students Who Enrolled At West Chester University in 1999 and 2001 (December 2001) - IR InBrief #90	11,14	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/Inbrief_90.pdf
Acceptance Patterns for Former Students Who Applied to West Chester University (May 1999) - IR InBrief #89	11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Personal and College-Related Factors that Contribute to Student Attrition (May 1999) - IR InBrief #88	7,8,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
How Well Prepared Are Students to Handle the Computer Technology Demands Encountered in the Workplace and Higher Education (April 1999) - IR InBrief #87	9,11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Characteristics of Fall 1998 Students Who Completed the Application Process Compared with Those Who Actually Enrolled First Day (May 1999) - IR InBrief #86	7,8	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Community College of Philadelphia's Impact as a Receiving and Feeder College (April 1999) - IR InBrief #85	11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35

Do We Provide a Welcoming and Supportive Environment for Students? (February 1999) - IR InBrief #84	7,8,9	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Fall 1998 Admission Rate at Beaver College (December 1998) - IR InBrief #83	11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Admissions and Matriculation Rates at Thomas Jefferson University (December 1998) - IR InBrief #82	11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Community College Students' Reasons for Leaving College the First Three Weeks of Class (October 1997) - IR InBrief #81	7,8,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Profile of Community College of Philadelphia Students Who Enrolled in TV Courses in Fall 1996 and Spring 1997 Compared with Those Who Enrolled in Fall 1995 and Spring 1996 (May 1997) - IR InBrief #80	8,13	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Grade Distributions in TV Courses Compared with Traditionally-Taught Courses Total Fall 1994, Spring 1995, Fall 1995 and Spring 1996 (February 1997) - IR InBrief #79	8,13	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Acceptance Patterns for Former Students Who Applied to West Chester University (December 1996) - IR InBrief #78	11,14	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35

A Profile of Community College of Philadelphia Students Who Enrolled in TV Courses in Fall 1995 and Spring 1996 (October 1996) - IR InBrief #77	8,13	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Reasons Why Spring 1996 CCP Applicants Did Not Matriculate (February 1996) - IR InBrief #74	7,8	Office of Institutional Research - M2-35
Pennsylvania Commission for Community Colleges Statewide Database Reports	1 - 14	Office of Finance and Planning - M2-6
Viewpoints / Journal of Developmental Education	2,4	Division of Educational Support Services - W1-1
Annual Operating Goals	1,2,5,7,13,14	Office of the President - M2-2
External Reports 1.Perkins Local Plan 2.OCR 3.IPEDS 4.ACT 31 5.GRS 6.Student Right-to-Know	1 - 14	1.Division of Educational Support Services 2.Affirmative Action Office 3.Office of Finance and Planning - M2-6 4.Academic Affairs Office - M2-34 5.Office of Institutional Research - M2-35 6. http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/Security_Reporting.htm#RIGHT_TO_KNOW
NACUBO reports	2,3	Office of Finance and Planning - M2-6
Facilities Management Evaluation Program	1,2,3	Facilities Management Office - MG-17
Board of Trustee minutes	1,3,4	Office of the President - M2-2
Academic Affairs Council minutes	4	Academic Affairs Office - M2-34
Cabinet minutes	4	Office of the President - M2-2
Financial Aid Reports	8,9	Financial Aid Office - BG-3
Institutional Policies and Procedures	3,4,6	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/vpfin-pl/policies/policies.htm
President's Annual Report	5,7,14	Office of the President - M2-2
VP for Student Affairs staff meeting minutes	8,9	Student Affairs Office - M2-37
Counseling Department Service Reports	8,9	Counseling Department - W2-3

Student Systems Coordination Committee minutes	8,9	Office of the Dean of Student Systems
Enrollment Management Communications Event Database	8,9	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/enrmngt/
Distance Education Website	11,13	http://faculty.ccp.cc.pa.us/faculty/MSAKS/ccpde/index2.html
2002 Internet Multicultural Resource Calendar	5	http://inet.ccp.cc.pa.us/eeoaa/2002cal/index.html
Sexual Harassment Training Program	6	http://www.newmedialearning.com/ps/h/ccphila/index.shtml

VIII. Timetable

October 2001

Appoint Self-Study Leadership

November 2001

Develop major themes for Self-Study
Identify significant institutional issues
Select format for Self-Study

February 2002

Identify Self-Study Committee chairs and other members of the Steering Committee
Establish subgroup of the Steering Committee

April 2002

CHE/MSA Liaison visit – Dr. John Erickson, CHE/MSA

Spring/Summer 2002

Regular meetings of Steering Committee subgroup

May 2002

First meeting of Standard Committees Co-Chairs

- Committee structure
- Overview of process
- Activities to date
- Overview of 1993 Self-Study and 1998 Periodic Report
- Overview of assessment plan and institutional effectiveness
- Availability and types of resources
- Timeline

Steering Committee Meeting

- Committee structure
- Charge to Steering Committee
- Overview of process
- Activities to date
- Overview of 1993 Self-Study and 1998 Periodic Review Report
- Overview of assessment plan and institutional effectiveness
- Availability and types of resources
- Timeline

June 2002

Steering Committee Meeting

- Charges to Standard Committees
- Review elements of Self-Study Design

August 2002

Members appointed to Standard Committees
 Progress report to College community
 College wide forum on mission
 Steering Committee Meeting

- Review of Self-Study Design

 Meeting of Institutional Context Standards Committee
 Meeting of Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee
 Meeting of Institutional Context Standard Committees
 Meeting of Educational Effectiveness Standard Committees

September 2002

Web site accessible
 Approval of Self-Study Design

October 2002

Report to College community
 Submit Self-Study Design to CHE/MSA

September - December 2002

Periodic meetings of Committees

December 2002

Steering Committee Meeting

- Progress reports from Institutional Context Standards Committee and Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee

January 2003

Progress report to College community
 Meeting of Institutional Context Standards Committee
 Meeting of Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee
 Meeting of Institutional Context Standard Committees
 Meeting of Educational Effectiveness Standard Committees

January - May 2003

Periodic meetings of Committees
 Progress report to College community

May 2003

Steering Committee Meeting

- Review First Draft of Self-Study
- College feedback

June/July 2003

Revise and edit Self-Study

August 2003

Progress report to College community
Meeting of Steering Committee
Meeting of Institutional Context Standards Committee
Meeting of Educational Effectiveness Standards Committee

Fall 2003

Mail team chair list of resources for review for Standards 3,4,5,6,8,10,11,13

November 2003

Steering Committee Meeting

- Review Final Draft of Self-Study

January 2004

Submit Self-Study

Spring 2004

Evaluation Team Visit

IX. Editorial Style and Format

The College's Self-Study report is being prepared for many audiences. The entire College community will have many opportunities to review and comment on the Self-Study. To varying degrees, students, faculty, administrators and the Board of Trustees have the background and knowledge to understand the issues being discussed. The CHE/MSA evaluation team members will be knowledgeable about community colleges and issues they face.

The goal is to produce a Self-Study report that is concise, readable and substantial with a maximum length of 200 double-spaced pages. Standard Committees are urged to "present findings, conclusions, and recommendations in a coherent, concise, and objective manner..." (*Designs for Excellence*, 2000, page 39). It is important to be honest, clear and straightforward. Each Committee should assess carefully the College's areas of concern and place them in the appropriate context. Each Committee should acknowledge the College's strengths with equal candor.

In order to create a coherent Self-Study report and to reduce the amount of editing, the Steering Committee requests that all Standard Committees use the following outline to prepare reports.

Introduction to the Standard

- Set the stage.
- Take into consideration the introductory paragraph in the charge.
- Highlight the changes that have occurred since 1993.
- Highlight major resources used.
- Describe the methodology the committee used.

Suggested limit: one page

Analysis

- Develop topic headings drawn from key elements of the charge.
- Highlight strengths and concerns observed.
- Respond to questions raised in the charge. Please bear in mind that questions do not have to be addressed in the sequence asked. The questions are meant to be thought provoking. They provide the basis for beginning the inquiry.
- Keep description to a minimum.
- Support and substantiate views and conclusions with data.
- Carefully consider outcomes and institutional effectiveness as it relates to the Standard.
- Use tables whenever possible to condense analysis.

Suggested limit: 15-17 pages

Recommendations

- Follow topic headings established in the Analysis section.
- Relate recommendations to the conclusions reached in the Analysis section with strong, implicit connections.
- Do not feel compelled to suggest specific solutions to every problem identified.
Suggested limit 2-3 pages

Appendix

- Include a bibliography of all documents referenced in the Committee's report.
- Include copies of supporting data which may not be readily available including questionnaires, summaries of interviews and special area documents.

When submitting drafts of the Committee's report, the Committee is asked to:

- submit one hard copy and a copy on disk.
- work in Times New Roman font, size 12, double-spaced.
- date every draft.
- keep an up-to-date back-up version of each draft.
- write in the third person.
- refer to people by title, not name.

X. Format of the Self-Study Report

Introduction

Part One: Executive Summary

Part Two: Institutional Context Standards

Overview of Institutional Context

Focus of the Self-Study

Mission, Goals and Objectives

Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Institutional Assessment

Major Recommendations

Part Three: Educational Effectiveness Standards

Overview of Educational Effectiveness

Focus of the Self-Study

Student Support Services

General Education

Assessment of Student Learning

Major Recommendations

Part Four: Summary of Conclusions and Major Recommendations

Appendices

XI. Profile of the Evaluation Team

The Steering Committee requests that the CHE/MSA consider the following suggestions when preparing an accreditation evaluation team for the Community College of Philadelphia.

1. Diverse membership familiar with a large, urban, commuter community college.
2. Membership with expertise in outcomes assessment and institutional effectiveness measures.
3. Membership with expertise in each of the selected topics:
 - Standard 1: Mission, Goals and Objectives
 - Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
 - Standard 7: Institutional Assessment
 - Standard 9: Student Support Services
 - Standard 12: General Education
 - Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning
4. Membership familiar with the community college structure in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Appendix

**ASSESSMENT PLAN: AN OVERVIEW
OF EFFORTS TO UNDERSTAND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF PHILADELPHIA**

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a conceptual overview of the approaches that the College has chosen to use to understand and describe institutional effectiveness. While efforts to understand and report on institutional effectiveness have been coordinated by the Office of Institutional Research, the collection of information and assessment of effectiveness is a College-wide effort. In addition to providing a description of the conceptual base from which the College's approaches to assessment have been developed, this report also summarizes the current strengths and deficiencies that exist with respect to the College's ability to describe and understand its effectiveness. While the primary purpose of this report is not to describe the institutional planning processes, the use of effectiveness data in institutional planning and management decision-making is described briefly.

Principles Which Have Guided the College's Effectiveness Assessment Process

In a variety of institutional research studies over the past 15 years, the Office of Institutional Research has presented and advanced an approach that would be used to guide efforts to examine the College's effectiveness.¹ The following principles have served to guide institutional efforts to understand its effectiveness:

- (1) Effectiveness information will be presented in formats that easily support institutional planning and decision-making efforts. Where appropriate, reports and data have been prepared in a way that supports and informs current strategic planning priorities and facilitates decision-making with respect to key issues. The College's efforts to understand its effectiveness have been based upon the College's mission goals and current planning priorities.
- (2) Institutional effectiveness must be assessed within the context of student goals for enrolling at the institution. To the extent possible, the College has resisted applying global performance standards such as graduation and multi-year retention rates monolithically across all student cohorts. Effectiveness has been judged, in part, based upon the students' expectations and goals at the time they enrolled at the College, and whether or not these expectations and goals were achieved.

¹ See Institutional Research Reports #42 (*Institutional Effectiveness Indicators: A Report on Institutional Effectiveness in the Areas of Student Academic Performance, Student Retention, and Student Progress to Goal Achievement (Summer, 1988)*) and #43 (*Institutional Effectiveness: A Three-Year (1985-88) Status Report – September 1988*).

- (3) Where possible and desirable, institutional effectiveness studies have attempted to control for entering student abilities, both to understand and explain the differences in outcomes that are experienced by different student subpopulations, and also to understand the extent to which the College is able to successfully remediate the deficiencies with which students enter the College.
- (4) A commitment has been made to looking at effectiveness at both the institutional and campus level, as well as at the program, department and classroom level. Assessment strategies have been developed to respond to the information and research issues associated with each level within the organization. Assessment efforts at the institutional level have been coordinated with those taking place at the department and program level to ensure that complementary information focused on the most critical issues is collected.
- (5) In describing and assessing institutional effectiveness, both internal and external standards are utilized. The College has used a wide range of benchmarking strategies to develop an understanding of institutional effectiveness relative to peer institutions. At the same time, the use of well-designed longitudinal studies has allowed the College to assess the impact of programmatic and service-delivery changes over time and to easily monitor evolving patterns in institutional effectiveness with respect to the many different subpopulations served by the College.
- (6) The College has a long history of rich databases to support institutional inquiry into its effectiveness. Wherever possible, the Office of Institutional Research has used existing databases. This has helped to ensure consistency of measurement over time. The Office has made cross-validation of findings a high priority. The reliability and validity of assessment outcomes are reviewed on an on-going basis.
- (7) A broad range of campus constituents has been involved in the process of data collection and interpretation in order to promote ownership of institutional effectiveness data and help to ensure the full use of effectiveness data in institutional decision-making. Through the use of such strategies as creating a Data Quality Task Force, an effort has been made to ensure that there is a College-wide commitment to consistent, accurate information in all key areas needed to assess effectiveness.
- (8) Multiple reporting formats are used to try to ensure broad-based institutional understanding of the effectiveness information and its potential implications for the College. In recent years, accessibility to institutional information has been enhanced through the utilization of on-line resources.

- (9) A continuing effort has been made to anticipate the institution's future information needs. For example, the College maintains an active environmental scan process which is intended to sensitize the College to emerging external issues that will require an institutional response and may alter the standards by which institutional effectiveness is judged.
- (10) The College has been committed to current technology in data collection and delivery. Through the evolving use of computer technologies, the College has been able to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its limited Institutional Research staff.

Effectiveness studies have been constructed within recognized theoretical constructs and frameworks. The Office of Institutional Research has encouraged the use of scholarly research from other settings to formulate the hypotheses and methods of inquiries that are employed by the College. The following section provides an overview of the theoretical models and methods that have guided the College's research efforts.

Theoretical Framework for Assessment Research

The models that have shaped assessment research undertaken at the College have their roots in persistence models developed by Tinto, Bean, and Pascarella.² While the models were originally developed to understand persistence, they have been useful in understanding dynamics associated with a broad range of educational outcomes including student learning. Since the principle focus of these models is on the interaction between students and the college environment rather than student pre-entry characteristics, they imply that college practices and pedagogical methods can be influenced by educational institutions in directions that lead to improved achievement by students. This focus is congruent with the open access aspect of the community college mission.

Specifically, the theoretical framework that guides much of the assessment research at the College posits that student growth and development results from a longitudinal process of interaction between an individual with certain attributes, abilities, intentions, and commitments and other members of the academic and social systems of the college. Positive experiences lead to increased intellectual and social integration, which positively impact intentions and commitments to the learning process and the College. Conversely, negative experiences within the College lead to disengagement from the intellectual and social life resulting in reduced commitment to the learning process and the College.

This approach to assessment accommodates the College's diverse mission. This diversity is reflected in the College's heterogeneous student body, which is characterized by a wide range of educational and career objectives, educational backgrounds, college-readiness and personal backgrounds. In addition to contributing to a heterogeneous

² IR Report # 77 (dated June, 1994), titled *A Review of the Higher Education Literature Related to Student Outcomes*, contains a detailed description of these models.

student body, the broad mission has resulted in an equally broad range of educational experiences carefully planned to respond to students' needs.

Assessing educational quality against this complex backdrop runs a risk of producing invalid conclusions if student pre-entry characteristics and educational experiences are not incorporated into assessments of student academic achievement. As a result, the assessment model used at the College is sensitive to differences among student groups and flexible enough to be applied across a diverse set of student and institutional interrelationships such as those possible at the College.

Indicators that Support Assessment Research

A set of procedures has been developed to enable evaluation of the extent to which goals and objectives, both the institution's and the students', are being achieved. Information is systematically gathered about students from the time they apply for admission to the College to nine months following their departure from the institution.

Institutional documents, such as *The CCP Mission Statement*, *The 2000-2004 Strategic Plan*, *The Facilities Master Plan*, and *The Academic Computing Plan*, have served as sources for defining appropriate measures of student learning and growth. Since outcome information is intended to address the goals and objectives of students, the *Student Goal Statement Survey* has served as an important source document for assessment information.

Outcome data that are routinely available for examining and assessing institutional effectiveness fit into five broad areas: 1) workforce development; 2) student achievement; 3) college transfer; 4) community outreach; and 5) college financial and operating effectiveness. Workforce development measures include job placement rates, starting salaries, license and certification pass rates of graduates, and student assessment of the preparation received for employment at the College. College transfer measures include: transfer rates, indicators of academic performance and persistence at transfer institutions, student assessment of transfer preparation, and transfer opportunities based on articulation agreements. Examples of student achievement measures include: GPA, grades in capstone courses, successful completion of a sequence of courses in a particular subject matter, graduation rates, short-term persistence rates, and student assessment of goal completion and personal growth. Community outreach measures include indicators of responsiveness to community needs and participation rates in the service area. Operational effectiveness includes measures in the areas of cost efficiency, and resource usage.

The measures that are presently part of the assessment process have evolved as a result of ongoing evaluation activities designed to ensure the quality of assessment findings. Some outcome measures have been custom designed in-house while others were purchased externally and standardized. In order to ensure reliability and validity, outcome information is represented by multiple measures gathered through multiple methods.

The assessment measures are not static. In order to ensure a measure's internal consistency with the mission and present institutional direction as specified in the Strategic Plan, the decision to include it as part of the assessment process has generally been a participatory exercise involving representative faculty members, administrators and, at times, students and members of community organizations and the business community. Measures are reviewed routinely to determine if they are effectively measuring the achievement of college goals and objectives. Based upon this review, measures are accordingly eliminated, changed and added.

Data Collection Approaches That Support Assessment Activities

Qualitative and quantitative data collection methods have informed assessments at the College. Focus groups have typically been used to explore new areas of inquiry that may contribute to student learning and growth. They have also been helpful in the design of questions that subsequently have been included on student questionnaires. Survey techniques rely heavily on mailed questionnaires but have occasionally included telephone interviews.

Annual surveys of graduates and non-graduates elicit from former students' information concerning their short-term transfer and career experiences and their judgments of the efficacy of their educational experience at the College in helping them to achieve their educational goals. In order to be able to assess change over time, similar methods have been used to gather the annual survey of graduates and former students from year to year and a core set of questions have been asked consistently. The survey process is flexible and has been adapted to address newly emerging critical issues.

In addition to using surveys to gather information concerning students' post-CCP experiences, surveys are used to gather data from students at the front end of their college experience. Students complete two questionnaires at the start of their first semester, *The Student Goal Statement Questionnaire* and *Student Data Form*, both of which are valuable sources of assessment measures.

There are many other institutional data sources that contain a rich assortment of measures useful for assessment purposes. Examples include: grade distribution, transcripts, admissions application, placement test, budget and financial records, and transcript requests. Examples of external data sources that have been used for assessment purposes include the U.S. Census, State System of Higher Education transfer information, Pennsylvania Commission for Community Colleges, NACUBO CFS data, and National Student Clearinghouse databases.

In order to efficiently respond to assessment requests, most of the student information described in the preceding paragraphs has been merged into a generalized assessment database. The file structure, which is longitudinal, contains records that track students through their enrollment at the College. It is possible to supplement student records on this file with additional assessment information from internal and external databases to create a student record that can track a student from entry to the College to

nine months after departure. In addition to accommodating whole-institution assessments, the file can easily be adapted to meet the data needs for programmatic assessments.

The extensive historical information that is available on this longitudinal database provides reference points for assessing student change over time. Additionally, access to external databases provides a means to assess the College's performance relative to peer institutions.

The Nature and Scope of Assessment

Several dimensions of institutional effectiveness are reflected in the College's assessment efforts. The following aspects of effectiveness are routinely assessed at CCP.

- Educational effectiveness based on institutional expectations. These assessment efforts focus on institutional standards for student academic performance and persistence while at the College and the post-CCP transfer and career outcomes of the College's graduates and former students.
- Educational effectiveness based on student expectations. These assessments attempt to incorporate the student's educational objectives into the analysis of the institution's effectiveness. These assessment efforts focus on the degree to which students leaving the College have achieved the educational and personal goals the set for themselves while enrolled at the College, their level of usage and satisfaction with academic and student support services, and satisfaction with institutional processes and facilities.
- Financial and operating effectiveness based on cost efficiency, resource usage and resource development.
- Enrollment effectiveness based on the College's ability to achieve enrollment targets and the extent to which constituencies in the service area has easy access to the opportunities provided by the College.
- Community impact based on the College's economic impact and contribution to work force development in the service area.

Assessment efforts at the College are far-reaching and are integrated throughout the campus environment. The following list represents key initiatives undertaken by the College as a foundation for self-study, planning, the assessment of institutional effectiveness and institutional improvement.

- Office of Institutional Research Initiatives
- Academic Program Audit Process
- Financial and Operating Effectiveness
- Classroom Based Assessment

Office of Institutional Research

Much of the assessment research undertaken by the Office of Institutional Research is intended to improve instruction and learning; facilitate the achievement of the institution's mission; and demonstrate the educational and economic impact of the College in the service area. Key institutional documents, such as the Strategic Plan, Mission Statement, President's Vision, and Annual Divisional and Departmental Goals/Objectives, shape the research agenda for the Office. The expectations and needs of external constituencies, such as Middle States, State and National Departments of Education, specialized accreditors and funding sources, also provide direction concerning research priorities for the Office.

Since the last Middle States self- study, a significant amount of research has focused on assessing institutional effectiveness. These evaluations have been both summative and formative and have included longitudinal and cross-sectional analyses. Effectiveness evaluations have been based on comparisons across time, across subgroups of students within the College, and against benchmarks.

A number of assessments are systematic undertakings that are part of the annual goals for the Institutional Research Office while other assessments based on ad hoc requests occur sporadically and are less formal. An annual undertaking for the Institutional Research Office is a College- wide Institutional Effectiveness study which serves as a report card for the College. The study, which directly supports Strategic Planning Principle IV, *to provide documented quality, innovation and effectiveness in the delivery of programs and services*, contains a set of institutionally sanctioned performance indicators related to five areas of institutional effectiveness: 1) workforce development; 2) transfer preparation; 3) student persistence; 4) community outreach; 5) cost efficiency, resource usage and resource development. Effectiveness indicators are monitored overtime in order to identify areas of strength and weakness. In some cases, comparative measures for peer institutions are available thereby providing another basis for evaluation.

On a parallel track, a set of performance measures has been developed by the IR office to inform programmatic assessments. These indicators include measures related to enrollment, student demographics, graduation rates, academic performance, and persistence. Performance measures, which are presented as time series data, are updated annually for each of the academic programs at the College. This allows program assessments across time and/or across peer programs.

The Annual Statistical Compendium/Fact Book provides a snapshot of institutional operating characteristics. This resource, along with the performance measures and the *Institutional Report Card* provide a fairly broad set of assessment information for the College, as a whole and for academic programs.

The annual survey of graduates is an assessment strategy that has a long history at the College. The Institutional Research Office also conducts a similar survey of non-

graduating, former students approximately every three years. The results of these surveys are used extensively. They inform program audits and have been used to assess institutional progress related to Strategic Planning objectives focused on strengthening the College's higher education partnerships; supporting workforce development in the City; improving the quality of alternative course delivery options; and incorporating computer technology into instructional programs. Several reports on transfer and career outcomes; student progress along a variety of general education dimensions; and student satisfaction with in- class and out-of- class experiences, are issued annually by the IR office.

In addition to providing a coherent foundation for college transfer and employment, the Mission Statement includes a commitment to providing *access to higher education* to all residents of Philadelphia *who may benefit*. A Strategic Planning objective *to develop and expand the use of alternative course-delivery strategies* supports this aspect of the Mission. As alternative strategies for teaching courses are developed and implemented, they are assessed along several dimensions of effectiveness. In recent years, the IR office has issued several reports related to television courses and, as on-line courses have been introduced, they too have been assessed. Less formal studies of 10 week courses and courses with once a week meeting schedules have also been the focus of assessment research conducted by the IR office.

Since the last self- study, a large amount of institutional research has examined aspects of student persistence. Comparative studies of persistence rates have been made over time, across programs and special projects, across students with degree intentions and those without, and across Pennsylvania community colleges. Graduates have been asked to describe personal and institutional barriers they perceived to interfere with their progress toward earning a degree at the institution. Former students have been asked to describe the circumstances surrounding their decision to discontinue their enrollment at the College. Current students have identified administrative barriers they encountered during the enrollment process that had the potential to interfere with their eventual enrollment at the College. The impact of the College's course cancellation policy on short-term persistence has been explored as well as the association between when a student registers for a course and their persistence in the course. The most compelling findings from these studies were the basis for a comprehensive persistence report recently issued by the IR office³.

Beyond the benefits that the College provides to the many individuals it serves is the economic impact that the College has on the City and the region as a whole. The IR office documented some direct and indirect economic benefits that accrue to the City and to the State as a result of the College's educational programs and economic activities. In addition to issuing a report that highlighted the economic outcomes of the College's operations as a whole, the IR office also compiled a report that documented the impact of the College's nine Allied Health programs on the Philadelphia region.

³ See *Institutional Research Report # 120 titled Student attrition at CCP – When students leave, why they leave, and their academic success at departure (June 2001)*.

The assessment of student services is not as straightforward as academic program evaluation since goals for student support services are not as well articulated as program goals. Nevertheless, since the last self-study there have been a number of evaluation activities associated with the services provided by the Student Affairs Office.

One approach the IR office has used for the evaluation of student services has focused on quantifying the level of student usage and general student satisfaction with a variety of services provided by the Office of Student Affairs. Additionally, focus groups of new students have been convened to identify institutional barriers encountered by students as they work through the course registration process at the College.

Another approach to assess student affairs involved a detailed process assessment of all enrollment activities from point-of-inquiry through the payment process. Representatives from all College offices and departments involved in the processes participated in the discussions which focused on describing current activities; assessing weaknesses; and brainstorming ways to improve the process. Another study explored the relationship between the time of issue of financial aid balance checks and student academic performance and persistence.

Several market research studies have been conducted in support of enrollment management and the development of a marketing plan for the College. Penetration studies have helped to determine geographic areas and subpopulations within the service area that are presently underserved by the College. An extensive data set containing 1990 and 2000 Census data related to demographics and socio-economic information for each City zip code has been assembled and is being used to assess program access strategies in the City's neighborhoods and develop cost-effective approaches to communicate with and enroll current and potential students.

The Office of Institutional Research works closely with directors of grant-funded special projects to develop assessment models that address the specific objectives of the projects. Among others these projects have included a welfare-to-work initiative; partnerships with area four-year colleges and universities to encourage minority enrollments in math and the sciences; a partnership with the Archdiocese of Philadelphia to educate elementary school students of the value of good nutrition; a project designed to encourage low-income, first generation college students to persist to achievement of the baccalaureate degree. These customized assessments have resulted in the availability of information that demonstrates the strengths and weaknesses of these special projects. In addition to providing project directors with a sense of the extent to which project objectives are being achieved, the information from these assessments frequently satisfy the funding sources accountability expectations.

Academic Program Audit Process

Institutional effectiveness data at the program level are essential to making informed decisions about institutional priorities. Institutional research studies, such as alumni surveys, the Annual Statistical Compendium, program performance indicators,

and the program audit process have contributed to an understanding of programmatic strength and weakness.

The assessment of the relative effectiveness of degree programs can be accomplished in a relatively straightforward fashion. Guidelines exist for conducting program feasibility studies and course and program development and revision. These guidelines require the articulation of philosophy and goals for the courses and programs and the explanation of the relationship of the program goals to the College's Mission.

Academic deans oversee the audit process to ensure that institutional as well as programmatic perspectives are maintained during the evaluation and that the final product reflects a realistic assessment of programmatic strengths and need for the next several years. The goals and principles upon which the programs are established provide the framework within which program assessment occurs. Faculty and staff within a programmatic area address each of the following: curriculum history; course coherence; instructional methodologies and facilities; description of faculty credentials and accomplishments; enrollment, retention, and academic performance measures; student transfer and career outcomes; demand and need for program; operating cost and efficiency; and findings and recommendations for improvement.

Financial and Operating Effectiveness

Maintaining a low cost per student and making effective and efficient use of available resources are critical goals for the College. Half of the College's credit students do not receive any form of direct financial aid. For these students keeping costs and therefore tuition and fees as low as possible is essential. Funding from the State is low relative to national standards for community colleges adding to the pressure to make optimal use of available resources.

The College has tracked and assessed its financial and operational effectiveness using two key methodologies: tracking key internal resource usage measures over time, and benchmarking college performance to external standards, e.g. those in place at similarly sized two-year colleges. Examples of internal measures that are tracked range from average class size and faculty productivity measures to facility and capital use measures to program and discipline cost data. Many of these key indicators are reported in the Annual Statistical Compendium and annual financial reports. Others are reported in Institutional Research reports, are available in the College's facility planning databases and/or are reported in the College's planning reports.

The College has availed itself of a wide-range of informational opportunities that permit benchmarking with public two-year colleges and other representative organizations. The Pennsylvania Community College Commission Data Base Task Force publishes an annual fact book with a wide range of information on operating characteristics of each of the Pennsylvania Community Colleges. The college participates in NACUBO's Comparative financial Statistics Project and for several years was a participant in NACUBO's Benchmarking Project. National standards developed by the

Association of Higher Education facility Officers as well as local building owners (BOMA) are used to assess facility costs and operations. KPMG has developed financial ratios and standards, which are used as a tool to assess the college's financial health. Key business partners such as Marsh (insurance broker) provide helpful resources for assessing the College relative to industry and regional standards.

Several administrative departments have engaged in assessment activities since the last Middle States self-study. One of the most extensive self-evaluation processes was undertaken by the Facilities Management Department. The evaluation of the College's facilities operation was made in relation to the criteria and guidelines of APPA's (The Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers) Facilities Management Evaluation Program. The Facilities Management Department was evaluated with respect to its clarity and adequacy in the following areas:

- Purpose and Goals
- Organization and Resources
- Policies, Procedures, and Processes
- Personnel Training and Development
- Fiscal Planning and Management
- Campus Condition and Appearance
- Communications and Quality of Relationships
- Campus Planning

In addition, the department's key functional services areas were reviewed with respect to their operation and their support of the department's primary role and responsibilities. A team of senior facilities management professionals who visited the College provided insights as to the strengths of the institution and, when appropriate, offered suggestions and recommendations for improvement of performance.

As part of the Strategic Plan, an institution-wide effort is underway to create quality assessment plans in all areas of the College. Each plan is to start with a careful statement of the mission and goals for each organizational unit and the development of quality standards to address achievement of organizational unit goals. The quality assessment model is intended to create an expectation of accountability and a commitment to institutional and organizational unit effectiveness. This assessment effort figures prominently into the self-study process.

Classroom-Based Assessment

Course assessment is built into several ongoing institutional processes. The current process for developing a new course or revising an existing course, which is outlined in the document titled *Guidelines for Course Development and Revision at Community College of Philadelphia*, requires a course description and rationale and examples of course activities that demonstrate how students are actively involved in the learning process. The course development model encourages activities that assist

students to analyze and interpret course materials and enable them to participate in academic and professional discussions. As part of the evaluation plan to assess course effectiveness, which is also part of the model, faculty are encouraged to include strategies for determining the impact of assignments and exams on student learning outcomes and for determining the effectiveness of the course design. Methods that are suggested for this purpose include ethnographic approaches; peer observation; standardized instruments; and inter-team critiquing.

Existing courses are reviewed through program audits that are undertaken every five years. The audit requires the articulation of philosophy and goals for the courses and an explanation of the relationship of course goals to program goals. Descriptions of instructional methods used by faculty are also part of this process. Many existing courses use apprenticeships, portfolios, field placements, and clinical training to promote and assess the level of student involvement in the learning process. New State standards for courses, effective for the 1997-98 year, have resulted in the College developing new standards and procedures for course evaluation.

Recently, course assessment plans have been systematically included as part of the grant proposal process. Several courses that have been developed under the auspices of grant funded projects have formalized assessment plans in place which include the systematic collection of pre- and post- measures to evaluate the nature and extent of student change throughout the semester.

Course assessment also occurs independent of these formal institutional processes. Many faculty routinely engage in course assessment activities of their own design. A recent faculty roundtable explored the impact of classroom based technological instructional approaches on student learning. Much of the described course assessment has been formative so that instructional approaches can be shifted if deemed by faculty to be ineffective in promoting student learning. Faculty members employ a variety of assessment approaches including oral and written student feedback, observations, case studies, and quasi-experimental designs to determine student's mastery of course content.

Additionally, course and program guidance and validation are provided by specialized program accreditation and Program Advisory Committees that are comprised of representative external constituencies with broad-based knowledge and backgrounds in related program areas.

Continuing Challenges in Assessing Institutional Effectiveness

While the College has built a solid foundation for a comprehensive and meaningful institutional assessment program, there are deficiencies with respect to the College's ability to describe and understand its effectiveness. The following challenges need to be resolved to ensure the successful implementation of an institutional effectiveness assessment effort.

- College-wide commitment to complete and accurate data as a standard by-product of administrative processes.
- Continuing to strengthen effective incorporation of data in institutional decision-making.
- A general education outcomes assessment model.
- College-wide commitment to administrative-area evaluations.
- Development of institution-wide data related to employer assessment of student preparation for the workforce.
- Successful implementation of Chapter 335 procedures for credit and non-credit course evaluations.