

Honoring Our Past While Preparing for Our Future



DELAWARE STATE UNIVERSITY
SELF-STUDY DESIGN

Presented to the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Harry L. Williams
President

June 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction to Delaware State University.....	3
Delaware State University – Past.....	3
Delaware State University – Present.....	3
Delaware State University - Future	4
Mission Statement.....	6
Philosophy.....	6
Vision.....	6
Campus Community.....	7
Organization and Structure of the Self-Study.....	8
Self-Study Steering Committee.....	8
Design of the Self-Study.....	9
Research Groups.....	11
General Methodology.....	11
Template for Research Group Report.....	12
Accreditation Standards and Research Questions.....	12
Research Group 1 – Supporting Institutional Renewal	12
Research Group 2 – Organizational Leadership and Decision Making	15
Research Group 3 – Discovery and Improvement through Assessment	17
Research Group 4 – College Access and Opportunities for Students...	18
Research Group 5 – Promoting, Facilitating and Evaluating the	
Process of Learning.....	20
Research Group 6 – Data Informed Improvements for Student	
Learning.....	24
Support for Research Groups.....	25
Existing Committees.....	25
Supporting Documents Available.....	27
Brief Timeline for Self-Study Process.....	30
Suggested Profile of Visiting Reviewers.....	30
Peers in Middle States Region.....	30
Peers Outside of the Middle States Region.....	31
Aspirational Institutions.....	31
Organization of Self-Study Report.....	31
Editorial Style and Format for All Reports.....	32

Introduction to Delaware State University

Delaware State University - Past

The State College for Colored Students, now known as Delaware State University, was established May 15, 1891 by the Delaware General Assembly under the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1890 by which land-grant colleges for Blacks came into existence in states maintaining separate educational facilities. The 1890 Morrill Act provided the State of Delaware with \$25,000 of which one-third was used to initially fund the State College. In order to establish the college, a 100 acre tract two miles north of Dover that included the historic Loockerman family manor house which was occupied by the Loockermans until the late 1700s was purchased by the State. The Loockerman manor house became the Main College Building where agriculture, chemistry, classical, engineering and scientific courses were offered.

During the first 10 years of the College's existence, it struggled financially as the Morrill Act provided \$25,000 annually to the State but only a very small fraction of that was used to fund the College. Consequently, this presented a challenge for both students and faculty as growth was extremely difficult in those years. However, the College endured the hard times and today enjoys a legacy of perseverance and determination with a focus on providing equal opportunity to an affordable and excellent education for all students, especially Delaware residents.

In the midst of daunting challenges, the College began to evolve into its own campus community. In 1947, two years after the College earned its first accreditation as a four-year institution, the State approved the renaming of the institution to Delaware State College. In 1968, the College surpassed an enrollment of 1,000 students and continued to grow, reaching a 3,000 student enrollment by 1990.

Delaware State University - Present

In 1993, former Governor Thomas Carper signed legislation that changed Delaware State College's name to Delaware State University (DSU). With a self-contained campus, DSU sits on the historic plot of Delaware land that has grown with the times. What began as the 100-acre campus is now a picturesque 400-acre campus abuzz with growth that still takes pride in its older buildings such as Loockerman Hall, now a restored national historic landmark.

Indeed, DSU is a unique mixture of the past, present and future with a long and proud history as one of America's Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). The University exhibits both, long-standing traditions and growing diversity. It takes pride in its heritage as a land-grant educational institution, rooted early on in agriculture and education. Its current population includes a 76 percent African-American enrollment and an increasing number of Caucasian, Hispanic, Asian and other international students. Eighty-one percent of its undergraduate students are enrolled full-time and 56% live on campus.

Currently, the University consists of five Colleges and one School:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College of Agriculture and Related Sciences • College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences • College of Business 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College of Education, Health and Public Policy • College of Mathematics, Natural Sciences and Technology • School of Graduate Studies and Research
---	--

The University has grown over time and offers 65 undergraduate degrees, twenty graduate degrees, and five doctoral degrees. The school also offers several cooperative degree programs. Students receive instruction in classes with a 13:1 student-to-faculty ratio. About 83 percent of undergraduates receive scholarships, grants, loans or work-study income. Delaware State University has an Honors Program and its global connections include over twenty formal international partnerships with institutions in countries including China, Cuba, Egypt, France, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Serbia and Vietnam. These partnerships facilitate student exchanges, research and conference collaborations.

The institution has greatly increased its research endeavors over the past five years, as it has developed the research infrastructure needed to attract federal grants for projects in the areas of mathematics (Applied Mathematics Research Center (AMRC), numerical analysis of partial differential equations, analytical methods in solid mechanics, wavelet analysis, NURBs methods of computer geometric design, nonlinear PDEs, topology); optical science and laser physics (The Center for Applied Optics, as well as The Center for Research and Education in Optical Sciences and Applications (CREOSA), a National Science Foundation-Center for Research Excellence (NSF-CREST)); mathematical physics; plasma physics; theoretical physics; fluid dynamics; high pressure materials; semiconductor materials and devices; geophysics; chemistry (Hydrogen storage and Fuel cell Center, RNA sequencing, organic chemistry, biochemistry, analytical chemistry, synthetic chemistry, NMR spectroscopy, electrochemistry); biological sciences (Idea Network of biomedical research Excellence (NIH-INBRE), cell biology, microbiology, molecular mechanisms of neuronal function, neurobiology and behavior, nanobioscience, phospholipases); biotechnology; computer science and bioinformatics (Delaware Center for Scientific and Applied Computation (DeSAC), data mining and machine learning, combinatorics, spatial-temporal statistics, artificial neural networks); neuroscience; environmental sciences; among others.

Delaware State University - Future

Dr. Harry Lee Williams proudly serves the University as its 10th President and seeks to move DSU to the top tier among Historically Black Colleges and Universities. He states

that DSU will come together as a community, energized by its strengths, positive endeavors, and strong constituent support to embark on transformational change. President Williams recognizes DSU's value to the State's economic and workforce development and aims to make DSU a standard to which other HBCUs can aspire.

On February 1, 2010, President Williams named a Blue Ribbon Commission that will create a new vision statement for DSU. Dr. Williams announced that the Blue Ribbon Commission would be led by two co-chairs – Dr. Dyremple B. Marsh, Dean of the DSU College of Agriculture and Related Sciences, and Wayne Gilchrest, an alumnus and a retired U.S. Congressman from Maryland. The entire Delaware Congressional delegation – U.S. Sen. Thomas R. Carper, U.S. Sen. Ted Kaufman and U.S. Rep. Michael N. Castle – have all agreed to serve as honorary co-chairs of the Commission.

President Williams has charged the Commission to develop a vision statement that speaks to DSU's journey toward becoming one of the best HBCUs in the country, thus defining the next generation of excellence for this institution. The vision statement is to be accompanied by a recommended set of values as well as recommended ways to integrate the vision with both internal and external constituents. All major stakeholders have been given the opportunity to provide input through a special website, as well as through focus groups and forums held through-out the state. The Commissions work will be completed by June 1, 2010.

The 14-member Commission includes:

- Kemal Atkins, Interim Vice President, Student Affairs, DSU
- The Honorable Brian Bushweller, State Senator, 17th District (North Dover)
- Kathleen Charlot, President, Student Government Association, DSU
- Bill Collick, former DSU football coach (1985-96) and athletics director (1995-2000)
- Tamara Crump, Executive Assistant to the President, DSU
- Carolyn Curry, Vice President, Institutional Advancement, DSU
- Dr. Randy Guschl, Director, DuPont Center for Collaborative Research & Education
- Dr. Reba Hollingsworth, Delaware State College, Class of 1949
- Dr. Josette L. McCullough, Principal, Fred Fifer III Middle School
- Dr. Steve Newton, DSU Professor, Department of History, Political Sci. & Philosophy
- Bernice Whaley, Deputy Director, Delaware Economic Development Office

- Dr. Calvin Wilson, Board of Trustees, DSU

Mission

Delaware State University is a public, comprehensive, 1890 land-grant institution. The mission of the University is to provide for the people of Delaware and others who are admitted, meaningful and relevant education that emphasizes both the liberal and professional aspects of higher education. Within this context, the University provides educational opportunities to all qualified citizens of this state and other states at a cost consistent with the economic status of the students as a whole. While recognizing its historical heritage, the University serves a diverse student population with a broad range of programs in instruction, service, and research, so that its graduates will become competent, productive and contributing citizens

Philosophy

Delaware State University is committed, foremost, to academic excellence and intellectual competence. Freedom of expression and inquiry, the exchange of ideas, cultural activities, intensive classroom instruction, and numerous informal events of the university community combine to ensure that each student receives a thorough and marketable education.

The University recognizes that education is attained, in part, through the activities of the students themselves. It strives to provide and maintain a corps of scholars, lecturers, and educators dedicated to the enlightenment of mankind.

To this end, the University endeavors to:

- Provide a well-rounded liberal arts education with a concentration in the sciences, the humanities, or the professions.
- Provide service to the citizens of the state by increasing their ability to make practical application of knowledge.
- Develop conceptual thinking ability and nurture the inquiring mind of each student
- Develop student skills in oral and written communication.
- Encourage optimum physical development and the safeguarding of health.
- Encourage students to serve their home, the community, the nation and the world.

Vision

Delaware State University will be a diverse, selective teaching, research and service university in the land-grant tradition, serving the people of the state of Delaware and the region. It will be a university of first choice for students from the state. It will:

- Excel in the education of undergraduates in the Liberal Arts and in the professional, technical and scientific development of the workforce.
- Attain a significant educational presence in all three Delaware counties, emphasizing services for adult learners and providing for the re-certification needs of professionals.
- Provide an important engine for research and economic development in Delaware, especially in Kent and Sussex counties.
- Offer an array of master's and doctoral programs in areas of importance to the social and economic development of Delaware. Through these programs, the institution will graduate leaders in areas such as Education, the Natural, Social and Health-related Sciences and professions, Agriculture, Social Work, Aviation and Business.
- Develop a community of scholars with talent and expertise that will garner regional and national recognition.
- Enhance competition in intercollegiate athletics at the NCAA Division I level, with an increasing emphasis on the participation of female student-athletes.
- Develop the Arts as an integral part of the University's programs and cultivate relationships in the Arts across the state and region.
- Continue to build a culture of global awareness through internationally focused teaching and learning activities and by cultivating collaborative relationships with international programs, higher education institutions and global communities.

Campus Community

Delaware State University has seen tremendous changes in the campus grounds, buildings and facilities over the past 10 years. In 2001 a student housing neighborhood consisting of three residential buildings was constructed. *University Courtyard* offers upperclassmen comfortably furnished two and four bedroom apartments. The neighborhood is served by a separate clubhouse that features a game room, fitness center and common areas as well as kitchen and picnic areas. This was followed by the opening of the *University Village* which includes four residential buildings and a 250 seat dining hall facility. This student housing neighborhood contains 300 units primarily designed to house upper classman and graduate students and feature, luxury one, two or four bedroom apartments. University Village features community areas, study rooms, picnic areas and ample green space for student living. During this expansion the campus became a "walking" campus; several roads within the campus were closed and made into attractive walkways for student pedestrians. The latest and probably the most significant change to the campus within the last decade is the opening of a new Student Complex. The newly constructed Wellness and Recreation Center ends a two-phase, 21.4 million dollar construction project. In 2009, phase one was complete with the opening of a 54,000 square foot Strength and Conditioning Facility that includes an indoor track and recreational swimming pool. Completing the complex is the new Martin Luther King Jr. Student Center. This new three-floor facility includes a 7,656 square foot auditorium which can be partitioned into three separate meeting rooms or used as a large auditorium for social or community events. The third floor includes office space for student

organizations such as Student Government Association and *The Hornet*, student newspaper. The completion of this new Student Complex has thrust the University into a new and exciting era of campus life. The diverse possibilities for activities and pursuits at DSU are light years from the rural beginnings of the institution.

Organization and Structure of the Self-Study

Self-Study Steering Committee

On December 2, 2009 Interim President Claibourne D. Smith appointed a 19 member Self-Study Steering Committee to be Co-Chaired by Assistant to the Provost and the Director of the University’s Center for Teaching and Learning. The Committee includes representation from major areas of the university and eight full-time faculty members. Steering Committee membership is as follows:

CO-CHAIRS	
Genevieve Tighe, M.A., M.S. Assistant to the Provost Office of the Provost	Rebecca Fox-Lykens, Ed.D. Director Center for Teaching and Learning
MEMBERS	
Bradley Skelcher, Ph.D. Associate Provost of Academic Affairs Office of the Provost	Carolyn Curry, M.S. Vice President Institutional Advancement
Jeanel Lofland, M.B.A. Associate Controller Finance Administration	Michael Casson, Ph.D. Dean Graduate Studies
Marshall Stevenson, Ph.D. Dean College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences	John Austin, Ph.D. Vice President Research and Sponsored Programs
Phyllis Brooks-Collins, M.S. Executive Director Division of Academic Enrichment	Phyllis Edamatsu, Ph.D. Director Strategic Planning and Institutional Research
Marwan Rasamny, Ph.D. Associate Professor/ Chairperson Department of Computer and Information Sciences	Charlie Dean Wilson, Ph.D. Associate Professor Department of Biological Sciences Chairperson - Faculty Senate
Steven Newton, Ph.D. Professor Department of History, Political Science and Philosophy	Dewayne Fox, Ph.D. Associate Professor Department of Agriculture and Related Sciences

President of Faculty Association (AAUP)	
William McIntosh, Ed.D. Professor Department of Education	Warren Rhodes, Ph.D. Associate Dean College of Education, Health and Public Policy
Cynthia Mayo, Ph.D. Professor Department of Business Management	Amy Rogers, Ph.D. Associate Professor Department of Psychology
Clytrice Watson, Ph.D. Assistant Professor Department of Biological Sciences	Joan Williamson, Ph.D. Professor Department of Accounting and Finance
Kemal Atkins, Ph.D. Interim Vice President Student Affairs	

Design of the Self-Study

The first meeting of the Steering Committee took place on December 18, where Interim President, Claibourne Smith gave charge to the committee. A brief accreditation history and timeline was shared by Co-Chair Tighe and the committee members were instructed to access the Public Folders in Microsoft Outlook for any and all documents pertaining to the work of the Steering Committee. A brief overview of the types of designs described in the 2009 MSCHE Publication, *Creating a Useful Self-Study* was given and the committee was asked to review the different types of designs and to decide what type of design would be most useful to the institution. After some discussion, the committee agreed that because of the major changes in senior leadership, it might be best to use a comprehensive design so that each area of the University is examined with the same intensity and rigor.

At the second meeting of the committee, small groups were formed and committee members were asked to group the accreditation standards in whatever way they thought would be best and then to provide a rationale for their grouping. A document reflecting each group’s rationale and sample groupings was placed in the Outlook Public Folders for committee members to view and discuss. On January 26, the Steering Committee approved that a comprehensive design be used with the following group titles and grouping of standards:

MSCHE Standards	Research Group Titles
Standards 1, 2, and 3 1. Mission and Goals 2. Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal 3. Institutional Resources	<i>Group 1 Supporting Institutional Renewal</i>

Standards 4, 5 and 6 4. Leadership and Governance 5. Administration 6. Integrity	<i>Group 2 Organization Leadership and Decision Making</i>
Standard 7 7. Institutional Assessment	<i>Group 3 Discovery and Improvement through Assessment</i>
Standards 8, 9 and part of 13 8. Student Admission and Retention 9. Student Support Services 13. Related Educational Offerings (Developmental Support Programs)	<i>Group 4 College Access and Opportunities for Students</i>
Standards 10, 11, 12 and part of 13 10. Faculty 11. Educational Offerings 12. General Education 13. Related Educational Offerings (Distance Education ; Adult and Continuing Education)	<i>Group 5 Promoting, Facilitating and Evaluating the Process of Learning</i>
Std. 14 14. Assessment of Student Learning	<i>Group 6 Data Informed Improvements for Student Learning</i>

The committee felt that Standards 7 and 14 needed to be addressed separately and alone because of the amount of documentation and data collection that would be necessary to thoroughly address these standards. Standard 10 was discussed at length and the committee felt that the only way to address faculty qualifications would be to look at them as they relate to the University's educational offerings and programs and so standard 10 was grouped with standards that address educational programs. Standard 13 will be divided into two parts and two different groups will address this standard. The part of Standard 13 that addresses developmental support programs will be addressed as related to the type of student that is recruited and admitted to the university and thus it is grouped with Standards 8 and 9. The part of standard 13 that addresses Adult, Continuing and Distance Education was grouped with other standards that address educational programs. The committee felt that Standard 6 - Integrity would be best addressed in light of the governance and administration of the institution. Standards 1, 2 and 3 were grouped together as the institution is aligning its budget with the mission and priorities of the University. Impacting this alignment will be the budget cuts that the State of Delaware recently made and so standard 3 was grouped with these standards.

Research Groups

The Steering Committee's next step was to seek volunteers for each group. The committee had decided, early on, to not call the groups, "work" groups, but instead "research" groups since this is what they will be doing over the next year. An announcement was made to all the campus community asking members to volunteer for one of the six groups via E-News and at two major forums, where President Harry L. Williams encouraged individuals to sign-up for a Middle States Self Study research group. The response from across the university was overwhelming. Within a week, over 70 individuals had volunteered to serve. The Co-Chairs of the Steering Committee examined the membership of each group and began the process of reassigning volunteers based on the diversity of the groups. Once the groups were formed from those who volunteered, the Co-Chairs solicited some other members of the university community to be on groups where more members were needed. The Steering Committee was asked to approve those group members who were selected by the Co-Chairs to serve as co-chairs of each group and to approve a liaison from the steering committee assigned to each group.

On March 5, President Harry Williams gave final approval of the research groups' membership, co-chairs and steering committee liaisons. The co-chairs of each group were then contacted via e-mail and given written instruction regarding their group's first assignment of drafting research questions.

Students, alumni, and/or Board members will be added to the research groups.

General Methodology

Through campus-wide engagement the university will utilize a variety of mechanisms for ensuring the collection of representative, rich and informative data needed to adequately address each research question. Each research group has been assigned a liaison from the Steering Committee who will assist the group in gathering and accessing the appropriate data, the Steering Committee will meet periodically throughout the data collection process to ensure that internal and external constituents are providing rich and robust data. Contained in this report is a listing of current data available, its location and usefulness in addressing specific accreditation standards.

Although each research question will direct methodology, research groups will connect qualitative and/or quantitative data to the self study's research questions and ultimately to any conclusions made. Sources of data may include any of the University's official documents, archival records, interviews, focus groups, assessment results, direct observations and/or surveys.

Template for Research Group Report

Research group final reports are due on or before April 1, 2011. Deadlines for drafts will be developed by the groups in consultation with the liaison. The following template is from “Self-Study – Creating a Useful Process and Report” (Figure 8)

- An overview of the group’s charge, and the questions it addressed
- An analytical discussion of the inquiry undertaken and the outcomes of that inquiry, including strengths and challenges
- An explanation of how the group’s findings and conclusions related to the Commission’s standards
- Discussion of the connection of the group’s topic with those of others groups, and of any collaboration between groups that took place
- Recommendations for improvement

Accreditation Standards and Research Questions

RESEARCH GROUP 1

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL

Addressing MSCHE Standards 1, 2 and 3:

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

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

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

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

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

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

(Standards at a Glance, *Characteristics of Excellence*, page ix)

Group 1 – Research Questions

1. How effectively does the institution communicate its Mission and Goals to internal and external constituents, potential donors, surrounding community at large and other major stakeholders when determining:
 - a. The development of new academic programs;
 - b. The assessment, effectiveness, and adjustment of existing and new programs;
 - c. The allocation of resources;
 - d. The processes and priorities used to determine resource utilization;
 - e. The recruitment, orientation and retention of faculty and staff?
2. How does the institution assure representation and meaningful engagement of all stakeholders in transparent institutional processes and decisions related to planning, resource allocation, and renewal?
3. From the Mission statement, what does the institution do to achieve and measure a ‘meaningful and relevant education’, and ‘competent, productive, and contributing citizens’ and “recognize its historical heritage”?
4. What processes and priorities are used to verify that the allocation of resources across the institution is directly related to its Mission?
 - a. How are the Mission and the Institutional Goals used to develop and assess effectiveness in every area of the institution?
 - b. How does the institution measure its effectiveness in serving the student population through its planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal?
5. Quantitatively, to what extent does the planning and assessment of the annual and long-term budget process maintain, support, and improve the institution’s programs and services in accordance with its Mission and Strategic Plan?
6. What evidence is there that strategic initiatives have been sufficiently resourced to achieve the institutions’ Mission?
7. How effective is the integration of the plans of various operational units (long-range strategic plan, enrollment plan, facilities master plan, technology plan, strategic advancement plan, marketing plan, budget development, and overall financial plan) to provide for the implementation of the Mission, Vision, and Strategic Goals of the institution?
8. What procedures are currently in place and how are they utilized to improve the institution’s financial health so that it can meet its Mission?

9. How do documentation, evaluation, and progress towards previous goals effect the development and adjustment of new strategic initiatives and goals?
10. What are the alignment, effectiveness, and priority determination process used for evaluating opportunities for change within the institution's Mission, Vision, Goals and in allocating resources?
11. How does the institution use the Mission, Vision, and Strategic Plan to identify a solution to major challenges such as changes in student population relative to human resources, student learning resources, technology resources, etc?
12. How effectively does the institution realigned resources and priorities to support new programs (e.g., more graduate level degree programs) that are consistent with its Strategic Plan without negatively impacting the other components of its Mission?
13. How has the institution identified strengths and weaknesses in the area of planning and resource allocation, including the budget, and with such identification, what actions have been taken?
14. How effectively does the institution address and resolve issues related to:
 - a. Human resources that include hiring and retention of quality faculty, administration and staff? Address salary and benefits issues?
 - b. Structural resource challenges that include the upkeep and expansion of facilities?
 - c. Technical resources challenges that include keeping up-to-date with the technological advances for student learning, communication, and daily office operations?
15. How does the institution determine if financial resources are sufficient to support its Mission? How does the institution evaluate the effectiveness (e.g., reduction of paperwork and signatures) utilization of resources in the various campuses, online education initiatives, and measure the efficacy of outsourced operations, in relation to its Mission?

Group 1 Members

Norma Clark - Faculty, Education
 Leonard Davis – Faculty, Biology (Co-Chair)
 Asgede Hagos - Faculty, Mass Communication
 Samuel Hoff - Faculty, Political Science
 Emmanuel LaLande - Staff, Student Affairs
 Cheryl Lolley - Staff, Finance and Administration
 Akwasi Osei - Faculty, History
 Donald Parks – Staff, Schwartz Center for the Arts
 Vita Pickrum - Staff, Institutional Advancement (Co-Chair)

Harry Sanchez - Staff, Academic Support for Student Athletes
Gwendolyn Scott-Jones - Faculty, Psychology
Steve Speed - Faculty, Aviation
Sheila Winfrey- Brown - Staff, Finance and Administration

RESEARCH GROUP 2 *ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND DECISION MAKING*

Addressing MSCHE Standards 4, 5 and 6

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

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

Standard 5: Administration

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

Standard 6: Integrity

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

(Standards at a Glance, *Characteristics of Excellence*, pages ix and x)

Group 2 – Research Questions

1. How do existing structures for decision making advance the institution’s Mission and Goals and foster shared governance?
 - a. How have the changes in senior level leadership fostered shared governance and advanced the decision making process? To what extent is existing structures utilized or circumvented for shared decision making and/or shared governance?
 - b. To what extent have changes in the membership of the Board affected its operations and effectiveness? In what ways and for what reasons have the institution’s governance system changed over the past 5 years and what has been the impact of those changes?
 - c. To what extent does the board spend time on strategic planning and generating resources for the University? How does the Board contribute to

- advancing the University's Mission and Goals through the decision making process and shared governance?
- d. How has student governance (including for graduate students) been changed or strengthened in the last 5 years? How have these changes advanced the University's Mission and Goals through the decision making process and shared governance?
 - e. To what extent are faculty and staff satisfied with the decision making process and shared governance of the institution?
2. How well do current communication systems and tools facilitate communication among campus constituencies and add transparency to facilitate shared governance?
 - a. How effective is the communication for distributing information about the University's policies and events to the campus community?
 - b. How satisfied are faculty and staff with the level of communication? What changes in communication systems would improve the overall cohesiveness of the campus community?
 3. How effective are the evaluation procedures for improving administrative performance and accountability. Are these procedures clear and tied to the University's mission and goals?
 4. What policies help facilitate "succession planning" by helping the University retain and reward its most productive faculty and help them develop toward filling leadership roles?
 5. How has the University invested in gathering data to allow for good administrative decision making? What is the process for reviewing, changing and/or improving the administrative structure of the institution? For example: How is fundraising success tracked? How are media exposures tracked? What staff & reporting tools are used within the Office of Institutional Research to provide timely information for the President, Provost, Trustees, admissions etc?
 6. To what extent have existing structures, policies and procedures ensured that high ethical standards are followed by all members of the University community? What policies support academic and intellectual freedom? How have these policies evolved?
 - a. How effective are existing policies at ensuring integrity throughout the University? For example, harassment, timely warning, research integrity and misconduct, staff integrity and misconduct.
 - b. How effective are the University's policies concerning academic freedom and intellectual property?
 - c. In what ways are the academic honesty and research integrity policies communicated to students and faculty? How are these policies reviewed and updated?

- d. In what way are the employee relations policies communicated to faculty and staff? How are these policies reviewed and updated?
7. How effective are the systems that are in place to ensure that the University meets the highest ethical standards in its treatment of student athletes, in its relationships with competitor schools, and in the behavior of the athletes themselves?

Group 2 Members

Cecil Clark - Faculty, Education
Troy (Mrs.) Darden - Staff, College of Agriculture and Related Sciences
Harry Downes - Staff, Sussex County Site
Dolores Finger-Wright - Faculty, Social Work
Melissa Harrington - Faculty, Neuroscience (Co-Chair)
Eric Hart - Staff, Academic Services for Student Athletes
Lisa Hopkins - Staff, College of Agriculture and Related Sciences
Kamillah Lewis - Staff, First Year Programs
Lorene Robinson - Staff, Alumni Affairs
Frances Rogers - Staff, Academic Enrichment (Co-Chair)
Rayton Sianjina - Faculty, Education
Stephen Taylor - Faculty, Philosophy
Nancy Wagner - Staff, Community Relations
Debra Wilson - Faculty, Nursing
Aisha Young- Staff, Financial Aid

RESEARCH GROUP 3

DISCOVERY AND IMPROVEMENT THROUGH ASSESSMENT

Addressing MSCHE Standard 7

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

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

(Standards at a Glance, *Characteristics of Excellence*, page x)

Group 3 – Research Questions

1. What evidence exists that the institution’s assessment procedures and evaluation instruments are effective in creating change and/or improvement across all campus entities? How effectively are assessment results used in informing institutional planning to include strategic planning? To what extent are assessment activities systemic and sustainable?
2. To what degree are the results of assessment activities being shared and communicated with relevant stakeholders including the use of assessment results

- to guide new initiatives, inform major improvements that might be needed and identify areas that might need special emphasis?
3. How effective is the institution in communicating its expectation for an organized, ongoing and sustainable assessment system across its total range of programs and services? To what degree has the institution ensured that assessment efforts are tied to budgets?
 4. How are administrators, faculty, staff and all relevant stakeholders engaged in the overall assessment of institutional effectiveness? How effectively does the institution integrate planning and assessment activities?

Group 3 Members

Anjan Biswas – Faculty, Mathematics
Cherita Brown – Staff, Education (Co-Chair)
Veronica Ernst - Staff, Biology
Thomas Mennella - Faculty, Biology
Gulnihal Ozbay - Faculty, Natural Resources
Andrea Pettyjohn – Staff, Distance Education
Divyesh Raythatha - Faculty, Mass Communication
Ana Marie Reid - Staff, DAFB Programs
John Rich – Faculty, Psychology (Co-Chair)
Connie Williams - Faculty, Education
Jordin Williams – Staff, Wellness and Recreation

RESEARCH GROUP 4 *COLLEGE ACCESS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS*

Addressing MSCHE Standards 8, 9 and part of 13 (Developmental Support Programs).

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

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

Standard 9: Student Support Services

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

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

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

(Standards at a Glance, *Characteristics of Excellence*, pages x and xi).

Group 4 – Research Questions

1. How effective are the University's admissions policies and recruitment efforts at recruiting students that align with the overall mission of the institution? How does the flow of services initiated in Admissions follow seamlessly to other offices such as Registrar, Student Records, Student Accounts, Financial Aid, etc.?
2. How effectively are enrollment goals and initiatives communicated to all campus constituents including faculty? How are enrollment goals reflective of demographic/population trends and the changing external environment? How are the enrollment goals sufficiently realistic to support the institution's financial projections? From a budget perspective how does the institution prepare for enrollment goals that fall short?
3. How effective is the institution in communicating student-related policies and procedures such as accurate and comprehensive information regarding financial aid, scholarships, grants, etc.?
4. How does the university's enrollment management process including marketing and advertisements enable it to reach its enrollment goals? How does the process align with the university's strategic plan?
5. To what degree are the characteristics of students most likely to be retained and earn degrees from the institution congruent with the mission and values embraced by the institution? How conducive are admission policies at attracting students with these characteristics?
6. How successful is the university in awarding of financial aid and the leveraging of scholarships to reach enrollment goals and to aid in student retention?
7. What evidence exist that the programs and services in place ensure that admitted students who marginally meet or do not meet the institution's qualifications persist and achieve expected learning and higher education outcomes? How effective are assessments of student support services in making improvements to programs and services?
8. What evidence exist that placement exams assign students to courses at the appropriate levels? How effective are student advisement procedures and process in helping students to persist in achieving learning and higher education outcomes? How does the university know students are appropriately advised regarding academic programs, course of study and career preparation?

9. How do student affairs initiatives align with strategic enrollment and retention goals of the university? How effective have been the attempts made to integrate academic and student life in extending learning beyond the classroom?
10. What evidence exists that the university has reasonable procedures that are widely disseminated for equitably addressing student complaints and/or grievances? How does the university ensure that appropriate policies and procedures are developed and implemented regarding the safety and security of student records?

Group 4 Members

Donald Becker - Faculty, Art
 Dianne Bogle - Staff, Mentoring and Advising
 Daytonia Campbell - Staff, Financial Aid
 Mary R Durk - Staff, Library
 Francine Edwards - Faculty, Mass Communications
 Erin Hill – Staff, Admissions (Co-Chair)
 Jacquelyn Jones - Staff, Applied Optics Center
 Raquel Lang - Staff, Accounting and Finance
 Pegjohngy Moses - Staff, Athletics
 Bernadette Ruf – Faculty, Accounting (Co-Chair)
 Charity Shockley - Staff, Institutional Advancement
 Susan West - Faculty, Philosophy

RESEARCH GROUP 5

PROMOTING, FACILITATING AND EVALUATING THE PROCESS OF LEARNING

Addressing MSCHE Standards 10, 11, 12, and part of 13 (Adult, Continuing and Distance Ed)

Standard 10: Faculty

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

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

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

Standard 12: General Education

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

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

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

(Standards at a Glance, *Characteristics of Excellence*, pages x and xi).

Group 5 – Research Questions

1. How effective are search and selection processes to ensure that the institution develop and/or maintain the following?
 - a. Diversity of regular and adjunct faculty
 - b. Recruitment and retention of quality faculty (i.e. start-up packages, release time, professional development opportunities, etc.)
 - c. Adequate academic qualifications of regular and adjunct faculty to include terminal degree congruent with content areas they will be responsible to teach
 - d. Adequate work and/or life experiences of regular and adjunct faculty in relation to the position they are applying for

2. How does the institution evaluate its promotion and tenure policies and procedures to ensure?
 - a. That faculty are supplied with the resources, infrastructure and collegiate/administrative support to include mentoring in order to achieve tenure
 - b. That standards for promotion and tenure are consistent across the institution
 - c. That the expectations for faculty scholarship are clearly communicated and consistent across the institution
 - d. That a sufficient number of faculty achieve tenure.
 - e. That decisions regarding promotion and tenure are without bias and are clearly communicated to the faculty member applying for promotion and/or tenure.
 - f. That promotion and tenure decisions that are appealed by faculty will be given serious consideration for upholding or overturning the decision.

3. What evidence is there that professional development opportunities are sufficiently resourced to develop and/or maintain the following:
 - a. Faculty effectiveness in teaching, research, scholarly activities, patents, copyrights, etc.
 - b. Proper orientation of regular and adjunct faculty to DSU
 - c. Faculty self-renewal (sabbaticals, engagement)
 - d. The ability of faculty to engage in professional development activities as related to teaching loads, student-teacher ratios, and advisement responsibilities

4. How does the institution evaluate the impact of adjunct versus regular faculty on:
 - a. Student learning and satisfaction
 - b. Advisement
 - c. Academic support
5. How does the institution ensure that the number of regular and adjunct faculty is sufficient to support projected student enrollment? How does it determine appropriate student-teacher ratios?
6. How effective is the institution in receiving faculty participation in governance, leadership, academic program development, collecting and utilizing assessments for improvement and other service opportunities? Are there obstacles to faculty participation?
7. How effective are current evaluation instruments and procedures for improving teaching, research and service for regular and adjunct faculty and graduate teaching assistants?
8. How do the program development and assessment processes foster periodic consideration of academic content and rigor? What is the involvement of faculty in this process? What is the impact of discipline-specific accreditation agencies on this process? What is the involvement of outside constituents such as professional advisory boards?
9. What evidence demonstrates that the institution's educational offerings have academic content and rigor appropriate to the degree levels? What outside sources/agencies/reports have ranked our programs, and at what levels? How are internal and external program reviews used to improve and budget academic programs?
10. How effective are the processes used by the institution in determining:
 - a. The development, clear articulation (written) and assessment of expected learning outcomes across all programs and courses (syllabi reflect student learning outcomes)
 - b. The level to which students understand the expected learning outcomes and how they will be measured
 - c. The level to which classroom learning experiences and activities provide students the opportunity to achieve stated learning outcomes
 - d. That program and course learning outcomes are aligned to the institution's expectations for student learning.
11. What evidence exists that DSU graduates meet acceptable levels of competence in oral and written communication, science and mathematical reasoning, information and technological literacy and critical thinking skills to include departmental assessment of graduate competency levels?

12. How does the institution ensure that its General Education Program is effective in:
 - a. Assessing learning outcomes and using that data in curricular reform
 - b. Identifying and earmarking resources for General Education Program
 - c. Supporting the learning needs and interest of DSU students
 - d. Providing students with the skills and knowledge necessary for them to be successful in their academic programs
 - e. Incorporating the study of ethics, diversity and values
 - f. Clearly communicating the requirements and rationale for the program

13. How effective is the institution in:
 - a. Developing and maintaining the academic quality and integrity of distance education courses
 - b. Assuring that students are achieving the same learning in courses that are offered, both, face-to-face and in distance education
 - c. Assuring that students enrolled in distance education courses have access to the same level of administrative and support services as those enrolled in face-to-face courses.
 - d. Supporting and recruiting faculty for the development and maintenance of rigorous course offerings through distance education
 - e. Supporting faculty in the acquisition of technological and information literacy skills
 - f. Assessing and meeting the needs of its technological infrastructure to develop and maintain quality distance education course offerings

14. How have the technology and information resource needs of both face-to-face and distance courses been assessed? What actions have been taken to meet these technology and resource needs? In particular, how has faculty and library professional staff collaborated to enhance student information literacy and technological competency? What assessment procedures are in place to monitor the outcomes of these collaborations?

15. How effective is the institution's process for identifying, assessing and incorporating regional needs into the strategic planning for additional locations? What process is used to maintain quality instruction and student support services at the institution's other locations? How successful have programs and courses offered at other sites been in supporting DSU's mission?

16. What policies and procedures exist in regard to transfer credits? How effectively are they communicated to transfer students? How does the institution identify programs that transfer students may be coming to DSU for? How do they determine if students leave DSU in favor of another program offering at another institution? How does the institution determine work-experience credit for adult learners?

17. What evidence exists that non-credit programs offered by Adult and Continuing Education have clearly articulated program goals, learning objectives and

assessments? How are they developed, approved and periodically updated? What impact do these programs have on the institution's resources and its ability to fulfill its mission? How effective is the institution in meeting the needs of adult learners?

Group 5 Members

Padmini Banerjee - Faculty, Psychology
Peter Cookson - Staff, Distance Education
Roberta Durrington - Staff, Academic Enrichment
Joseph Falodun - Faculty, Education
Amystique Harris-Church - Staff, Office of Testing
Andrew Lloyd - Faculty, Biology
Elaine Marker - Faculty, Education
Sabrina McGary – Faculty, Biology (Co-Chair)
Vanessa Nesbit - Staff, College of Mathematics, Natural Sciences and Technology
Gretchen Starling - Staff, Library
Kimberley Sudler - Staff, Adult and Continuing Education, Institutional Research (Co-Chair)
James Whitaker - Staff, Office of Testing

RESEARCH GROUP 6

DATA INFORMED IMPROVEMENTS FOR STUDENT LEARNING

Addressing MSCHE Standard 14:

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

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

(Standards at a Glance, *Characteristics of Excellence*, page xi).

Group 6 – Research Questions

1. How effective is the process for developing and defining appropriate student learning outcomes throughout campus? How do these definitions compare with external benchmarks, such as those identified by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS)? How does this information get incorporated into University level assessments and to what extent are the outcomes accomplished?
2. How effectively do all academic and support programs document student learning to assure that students are achieving key learning outcomes? How effectively do academic, support and administrative offices communicate to ensure students are reaching their academic goals?

3. What evidence exists to ensure that the university use assessment results to systematically evaluate programs, services, etc. to inform practice, to establish new goals, to allocate resources, and to improve teaching and learning? What is the process for linking the university mission, unit missions, and individual program goals? What improvements to the process are warranted?
4. How and to who are student learning goals and their results communicated and what evidence exists that they are understood by the university community?
5. How well does the university measure student learning outside the classroom for example in co-curricular activities?
6. How effectively does the university utilize technology in the assessment and tracking of student learning outcomes?

Group 6 Members

Bridget Anakwe - Faculty, Accounting
 Odun Balogun - Faculty, English
 Ron Davis - Staff, Library
 Lisa Dunning – Staff, College of Business
 Carol Giesecke - Faculty, Human Ecology
 Terrell Holmes – Staff, Registrar (Co-Chair)
 Lynn Iocono - Staff, Financial Aid
 Sandria Johnson - Staff, Academic Support for Student-Athletes
 Young S. Kwak – Faculty, College of Business
 Sylvia Scheffler - Faculty, Nursing
 Cynthia van Golen- Faculty, Biology (Co-Chair)
 Charmaine Whyte - Staff, Education
 Kathleen Wilson - Faculty, Management

Support for Research Groups

Existing Committees

The table below lists some existing committees that will serve as resources for the research groups.

Research Group	Standard	Existing Committees/Subcommittees
One	1. Mission & Goals	
	2. Planning, Resource Allocation,	Strategic Planning Implementation Committee

	and Institutional Renewal	
	3. Institutional Resources	Finance Committee
Two	4. Leadership and Governance	Board of Trustees
	5. Administration	Administrative Council
	6. Integrity	Academic Affairs Committee
Three	7. Institutional Assessment	Institutional Assessment Committee
Four	8. Student Admissions and Retention	Enrollment Management Team; Retention Committee; Admissions Committee
	9. Student Support Services	Advising Com.; Student Affairs Com; Academic Climate Subcommittee
Five	10. Faculty	Faculty Affairs Committee; Center for Teaching and Learning
	11. Educational Offerings	Deans Council; Chairs Council; Curriculum Committees
	12. General Education	General Education Committee
	13. Related Educational Activities	Academic Climate Committee; Continuing Education Sub-Committee; Distance Education Sub-Committee
Six	14. Assessment of Student Learning	Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee; Teaching Effectiveness Committee

Supporting Documents Available

Document	Standards														Location
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
Mission/Philosophy/Vision Statement	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	https://www.desu.edu
University's Strategic Plan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	https://www.desu.edu Provost's Page
University's Action Plans	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Provost Office
Unit's & Program's Annual Reports	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	WEAVE Online
Current and Projected Budgets		✓	✓		✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Finance and Administration
Distance Education Task Force Report	✓						✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Distance Education
Facilities Master Plan		✓	✓				✓								Finance and Administration
University's policy and procedures for allocating budget		✓	✓	✓			✓								Finance and Administration
Collective Bargaining Agreements		✓		✓	✓					✓					Human Resources
Faculty Senate Bylaws				✓	✓	✓				✓					https://www.desu.edu Faculty Senate Page
Audited Financial Statements		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								Finance and Administration
Endowment fund-raising plans, policies and procedures	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓		✓		Institutional Advancement
List of Board Members	✓			✓	✓										https://www.desu.edu Administration Page
Orientation materials, handbooks, etc. for administrators, faculty and employees					✓		✓			✓					Human Resources
Governing Board Minutes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		President's Office
Job descriptions and qualifications for governing board and administrators		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓							Human Resources
Conflict of interest policies for employees						✓				✓					Human Resources

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
Drug and Alcohol use policy for employees				✓	✓	✓				✓					Human Resources
Organization chart	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Provost's Office
Faculty and Adjunct Orientation Manual										✓					Center for Teaching and Learning
Board of Trustees Orientation Manual	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓									President's Office
Student Government Association Bylaws				✓		✓		✓					✓		Student Affairs Office
Affirmative Action policies	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓			✓					Human Resources
Hiring and Performance Review policies and procedures		✓		✓	✓		✓			✓					Human Resources
Academic freedom, intellectual property rights, copyright policies						✓				✓					American Assoc. of University Professors Collective Bargaining Agreement
Results of surveys (students including SSI and CSI, faculty, staff, alumni)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Institutional Research Academic Enrichment
Results of financial audits	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓								Finance and Administration
Reports from other accreditation processes (i.e. NCATE)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Provost Office
Admissions policies, procedures, processes	✓			✓	✓			✓	✓		✓		✓		University Catalogs Admissions Office
Academic rules and procedures for satisfactory completion of program						✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			University Catalogs
Diagnostic testing requirements & results							✓	✓						✓	Admissions, Office of Testing
Financial aid, scholarship, loans information		✓	✓					✓							Financial Aid Office
Retention Plan and Retention Committee Minutes		✓					✓	✓	✓					✓	Academic Enrichment

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
Enrollment Management Action Plans		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							Institutional Advancement
Undergraduate Academic Advising Handbook							✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		Provost Webpage
Faculty Profiles, Vita, Resumes										✓	✓				Provost Office
Adjunct Profiles, Vita, Resumes										✓	✓				Provost Office
Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	https://www.desu.edu
NCAA Reports	✓	✓	✓						✓				✓		Athletics Office
External and Internal Program Review Reports		✓	✓				✓				✓			✓	Provost Office
General Education Website											✓	✓			https://www.desu.edu General Education Page
Connected Degree Programs and other Articulation Agreements								✓	✓						Admissions, Provost Office
Board of Trustees Bylaws	✓			✓	✓	✓									President's Office
Senior Capstone Assessment Data							✓							✓	Assessment Office
Across-the-Curriculum Assessment							✓							✓	Assessment Office
NSSE, FSSE, CLA, and Wabash Study data							✓							✓	Assessment Office, Academic Enrichment

Brief Timeline for Self-Study Process

Nov 2009	Self-Study Co-Chairs attend the Self-study Institute
Dec 18, 2009	Self-Study Steering Committee formed
Jan/Feb 2010	Comprehensive timetable developed; self-study design developed; research groups constituted; research questions drafted
Apr 2, 2010	Self-study design submitted to MSCHE for approval
Apr 20, 2010	Luis Pedraja, MSCHE VP, meets with President, Board, University Community and Steering Committee
June 2010	Self-Study design approved
Jan 2011	MSCHE selects evaluation team Chair; DSU approves selection. Dates are selected for team visit and for Chair's preliminary visit.
Apr 1, 2011	Reports from research groups submitted
May 20, 2011	Draft self-study completed by steering committee
May 20 - Sept 15, 2011	Draft self-study reviewed by University community
Sept. 29, 2011	Draft revised by the Steering Committee based on feedback
Fall 2011	Evaluation team Chair visits campus
Fall 2011	Self-study submitted to Evaluation Team and MSCHE
Mar/Apr 2012	Evaluation team visit
June 2012	MSCHE acts on Evaluation Report
2017	Periodic Review Report

Suggested Profile of Visiting Reviewers

- Faculty Member/ Dean from an institution which has experienced increasing research/grant activities
- Administrator/ Faculty from an HBCU peer group
- Student Affairs and/or Enrollment Management professional from an institution which has had success improving retention/graduation rates
- Institutional Research/Assessment professional
- Representative from an institution that has similar demographics (i.e. first generation college students with lower economic status, suburban or urban students rather than rural, etc.)

Peers in the Middle States Region

University of Maryland Eastern Shore – Master's, Smaller Programs

Ramapo College of New Jersey – Master's, Smaller Programs

Richard Stockton College of New Jersey - Master's, Smaller Programs

Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania - Master's, Smaller Programs

Mansfield University of Pennsylvania - Master's, Smaller Programs

SUNY College at Oneonta - Master's, Smaller Programs

Peers Outside of the Middle States Region

Fayetteville State University - Master's, Smaller Programs

Savannah State University - Master's, Smaller Programs

University of Arkansas at Monticello – Master's, Smaller Programs

Aspirational Institutions

Morgan State University – Doctoral Research

Howard University- Research, High Research Activity

Temple University- Research, High Research Activity

The College of New Jersey- Master's, Larger Programs

West Chester University - Master's, Larger Programs

Hampton University – Master's, Medium Programs

North Carolina A&T University- Research, High Research Activity

Organization of the Self-Study Report

I. Executive Summary and Eligibility Certification Statement

II. Introduction

III. Supporting Institutional Renewal (Standards 1, 2, 3)

IV. Organization Leadership and Decision Making (Standards 4, 5, 6)

V. Discovery and Improvement through Assessment (Standard 7)

VI. College Access and Opportunities for Students (Standards 8, 9 and part of 13- Developmental Support Programs)

VII. Promoting, Facilitating and Evaluating the Process of Learning (Standards 10, 11, 12, and part of 13- Adult, Continuing and Distance Education)

- VI. Data Informed Improvements for Student Learning (Standard 14)
- IX. Comprehensive Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal
- X. List of References
- XI. Appendices

Editorial Style and Format
(Adapted from Shippensburg University's design)

Word Processing Program

Microsoft Word for text; Microsoft Excel or SPSS for spreadsheets and graphs but send as separate files

Fonts

Times New Roman, 12 point

Margins

1 ½ inch left margin; all other margins will be 1 inch, Left-justified

Pages

Use page numbers, bottom right-hand side
No indentations for paragraph put extra space between paragraphs

Spacing

Single spacing

Information Required in Report

Maximum number of pages for research group reports – 10-20 pages (self-study 100 pages excluding any graphs)
The Steering Committee reserves the right to edit for integrity, readability and page limitation

Acronyms

Write out in full upon first usage, indicating the acronym in parentheses.
Thereafter use the acronym.

Writing Tips

Write in active, narrative style, avoid passive voice.
Avoid abbreviations and contractions
Avoid beginning sentences with “there is/are”
Check that demonstrative pronouns have a complement. This shoe.

Documentation of Sources

Use APA Style citation in the text body (parenthetical by author and date of publication) with a section at the end entitled —List of References where the full reference is noted.

Editing Process

All reports will be combined to produce the self-study document which will be approximately 100 pages long. Therefore, there will be editing of content from the six individual research group reports to produce the self-study. A single writer/editor will be used to give the report one voice. As the final self-study document is being produced, there will be opportunity

for input so that the editing process retains large conceptual themes and recommendations that are deemed important by the campus community.