

## FRIDAY, December 8, 2017

7:00 am - 11:30 am **Conference Registration**

7:30 - 8:45 am **Breakfast with Exhibitors**

Open to all conference registrants. Continental breakfast, exhibits, and MSCHE Booth. **Exhibits open until 11:30 am.**

7:45 - 8:45 am

**Accreditation Liaison Officers Breakfast**

**PRE-REGISTRATION REQUIRED. NO ON-SITE REGISTRATION.**

*Open to institution-designated ALOs only.*

Join other ALOs as well as the Commission staff for breakfast and a brief program focused on significant accreditation topics.

9:00 - 10:00 am **Plenary Session**

**10:00 am - 10:15 am**

**Exhibits**

## Using Cloud Computing Resources for Assessment and Accreditation

Accreditation is an evidence-based process. The presenters will offer ways to use cloud-based systems to manage the supporting evidence for meeting accreditation standards and for documenting academic program assessment. As part of the MSCHE Collaborative Implementation Project, Queens College (CUNY) was part of a cohort of 15 institutions chosen in 2014 to be the first to use MSCHE's new Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation to prepare their self-studies. During the process, members of the Queens staff developed a model for the Documentation Roadmap that aligns with MSCHE's "living document" intent. Queens also developed an assessment repository to manage and explore the documents associated with academic program assessment. The presenters will describe the structures of their Documentation Roadmap and assessment repository and show how those structures provide for ongoing maintenance of the evidence related to accreditation and assessment at the College, leveraging cloud-based resources for economical document management and coordinated report development.

### Learning Objectives:

- ◆ Understand the role of the Documentation Roadmap in the accreditation process and learn one way that it has been tailored to facilitate the drafting process of the self-study report;
- ◆ Learn how a cloud-based approach can efficiently integrate the Documentation Roadmap with collaborative development of the self-study report;
- ◆ See how a common model can be applied both to the development of a repository of assessment documents and to the Documentation Roadmap for long-term management of institutional data sources.

**Audience:** Intermediate

**Presenters:** Christopher Vickery, *Director of General Education and Assessment*; and Eva Fernandez, *Acting Assistant Provost, Queens College of The City University of New York*

## Developing Academic Leaders for Effective Governance, Leadership, and Administration

Academic leaders with different titles, roles, and responsibilities often receive little formal training when they transition from faculty roles into administrative ones within the academy. Professional development, support from colleagues, and networking opportunities improve the effectiveness of these "deans." The same professional activities emphasize the importance of shared governance, transparency, and communication to improve "regular engagement with faculty in advancing the institution's goals and objectives" (Standard VII). Attend this panel of academic leaders serving in different roles at different types of institutions to hear suggestions and be more effective in institutional governance. Participants will also learn about leadership, networking, and professional development opportunities to consider as they plan and navigate their own career path in higher education. This session will be of particular interest to aspiring, new, current, and former academic leaders.

### Learning Objectives:

- ◆ Reflect upon one's current position, career path, and future aspirations in academic leadership;
- ◆ Develop a career and professional development plan to attain career goals;
- ◆ Leave with strategies to be a more effective academic leader in one's own institution.

**Audience:** Intermediate

**Presenter:** Michelle Kiec, *Interim Dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania*; Thomas Meyer, *Vice President of Academic Services and Student Development, Lehigh-Carbon Community College*; and Peter Skoner, *Associate Provost, Saint Francis University*

## Reframing the Distance Education Review

For many years, Middle States accreditation self-study committees focused on distance education were guided by Standard 13: Related Educational Activities, which was broadly defined to include a host of other topics such as experiential learning, certificate programs, and branch campuses. The revised standards represent a departure from the notion of distance education as an ancillary activity to one that is more fully integrated into an institution's academic offerings and operations. In this session, a panel of experienced MSCHE reviewers will share their experiences in addressing the shifting perception of distance education as a "related educational activity" to an increasingly important strategic priority. They will discuss the relationship of distance education programs to Standard III (Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience) in public and private non-profit universities and community colleges, and the nature of the distance education accreditation review relative to the standard.

### Learning Objectives:

- ◆ Develop knowledge of the relationship of the revised MSCHE accreditation standards to the review of distance education;
- ◆ Explore key elements of review for distance education by MSCHE evaluation teams in public and private non-profit universities and community colleges;
- ◆ Apply knowledge in these areas at one's home institution to better prepare for the review of distance education across the seven new Middle States standards.

**Audience:** Intermediate

**Presenters:** Elizabeth Ciabocchi, *Vice Provost for Digital Learning/Executive Director of Online Learning and Services, St. John's University*; Cristi Ford, *Associate Provost, Center for Innovation in Learning and Student Success, University of Maryland University College*; and Rhonda Spells Fentry, *Interim Vice President and Chief Information Officer, Prince George's Community College*

## Implementing Guided Pathways: The Experience of Three Community Colleges

In 2015, the Community College Research Center published *Redesigning America's Community Colleges*, which urges community colleges to move from a "cafeteria-style" organization to one of "guided pathways" as a strategic way to increase student success. The Guided Pathways model is an integrated college-wide approach that challenges colleges to rethink how they operate from a systemic level. This approach calls for a redesign of major institutional operations, including degree requirements, advising, intake processes, developmental education delivery methods, and technology monitoring systems. How an institution engages in this body of work varies. This session will focus on the journey of three community colleges in designing and implementing the Guided Pathways model.

### Learning Objectives:

- ◆ Learn how redesign efforts have progressed at each of the three community colleges;
- ◆ Examine the challenges and lessons learned at the three institutions;
- ◆ Gain a better understanding of the Guided Pathways model.

**Audience:** Beginning

**Presenters:** Victoria L. Bastecki-Perez, *Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost, Montgomery County Community College*; Carolyn Bortz, *Vice President for Academic Affairs, Northampton Community College*; and Samuel Hirsch, *Vice President for Academic and Student Success, Community College of Philadelphia*

10:15 am - 11:00 am

Concurrent Sessions

## Reexamining Evidence to Comply with New Standard VI—Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

MSCHE's new Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement, expects that "the institution's planning processes, resources, and structures are aligned with each other and are sufficient to fulfill mission and goals, to continuously assess and improve its programs and to respond effectively to opportunities and challenges." Panelists, with complimentary backgrounds in planning and finances, will share examples from peer reviews of evidence that institutions have previously utilized—effectively and at times less effectively—to demonstrate compliance with former Standards 2, 3, and 7, and will consider transferability of existing documents and assessments to meet the new Standard VI.

### Learning Objectives:

- ◆ Determine transferability of evidence from the former MSCHE Standards to the new Standard VI and recognize needs for new evidence;
- ◆ Differentiate the quality of evidence to comply with Standard VI;
- ◆ Attendees will assess their own institution's ability to demonstrate compliance with Standard VI and consider ways to improve performance.

**Audience:** Intermediate

**Presenters:** Virginia Bender, *Special Assistant to the President for Institutional Planning, Saint Peter's University*; and Chuck Mann, *Vice President and Treasurer, Hood College*

11:00 am - 11:15 am

Exhibits

Take advantage of your last opportunity to visit the Exhibit Hall

11:15 am - 12:00 pm

Concurrent Sessions

## How to Successfully Navigate the Substantive Change Process

The Commission receives numerous substantive change requests each year, and they have been growing in complexity. The presenters will brief attendees on the Commission's substantive change process and the basic requirements of substantive change proposals. They will also address ways to succeed with the process and to make the process more meaningful for overall institutional quality.

### Learning Objectives:

- ◆ Understand MSCHE expectations for substantive change proposals;
- ◆ Learn tips about how to succeed with the substantive change process;
- ◆ Become acquainted with the substantive change process from submission, to peer reviewer, to Commission subcommittee, to Commission visits (if required).

**Audience:** Intermediate

**Presenters:** Carmella Morrison, *Assistant Director for Substantive Change*; and Kushnood Haq, *Vice President, Middle States Commission on Higher Education*

## A Guide to Accreditation Preparation and Institutional Improvement

Montclair State University was one of the 15 participating institutions in MSCHE's Collaborative Implementation Project (CIP), the first cohort of institutions to work with the new accreditation standards. Montclair State has now successfully concluded its self-study and team site visit, and the Commission has reaffirmed the University's accreditation. This panel will address how to align preparation efforts across three distinct phases of the accreditation process to maximize the potential for institutional improvement: (1) the self-study design preparation phase; (2) the self-study and compliance report preparation phase; and (3) the organizing the campus and hosting the team visit phase. The session will also share planning steps, tools, and templates from Montclair State's accreditation experience and summarize corresponding best practices from other participating institutions in the CIP. The three panelists are members of the executive leadership team for Middle States accreditation at the University.

### Learning Objectives:

- ◆ Understand key considerations for effectively planning each phase of the self-study process;
- ◆ Review a range of tools (templates, progress rubrics, calendars, communication plans, meetings) that can be used to facilitate each phase of the self-study;
- ◆ Identify best practices to ensure the accreditation process is a positive and meaningful experience that strengthens the institution.

**Audience:** Intermediate

**Presenters:** Joanne Coté-Bonanno, *Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Assessment*; Christine Lemesianou, *Associate Director and Associate Professor, School of Communication and Media*; and Joan Basing, *Professor, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Montclair State University*

## Follow-up Reports: What, Why, and How?

The number of follow-up reports requested by the Commission has been steadily rising over the past several years. In fact, at this point, every Middle States institution would benefit from understanding how to prepare and submit evidence-based reports in response to Commission concerns. Institutions may be asked to prepare progress reports, monitoring reports, or supplemental information reports, and they may also need to host focused evaluation team visits in order to maintain their accreditation. This presentation will help institutions understand the Commission's guidelines for the preparation and submission of follow-up reports and will describe the procedures involved in the review of such reports. Institutions will learn how to meet the Commission's expectations and avoid common pitfalls. Time will be set aside for answering questions from session participants.

### Learning Objectives:

- ◆ Understand the concerns that trigger follow-up reports and visits;
- ◆ Develop a clear understanding of Commission expectations for follow-up reporting;
- ◆ Learn how the Commission reviews and makes decisions about the quality of follow-up reports.

**Audience:** All levels

**Presenter:** Christy L. Faison and Stephen J. Pugliese, *Vice Presidents, Middle States Commission on Higher Education*

## An Integrated Approach to Academic Program Development and Evolution

All too often the planning and development of new programs occurs in an academic silo in which only academic departments, colleges, and curricula committees are involved, followed by a handoff of the fully formed curricula to the admissions and marketing teams. This process ensures academic integrity in the design of student learning and the faculty role in governance. However, it misses out on the opportunity to engage other relevant perspectives, fully ensure mission alignment and maximize institutional planning and resource allocation. Maryland University of Integrative Health (MUIH) has developed an integrated program development process designed to accomplish these goals from the initial stages of program ideation, to program launch, to the ongoing evolution of programs through collaboration of the academic, admissions, and marketing teams. This presentation will provide a framework that attendees may adapt for use at their own institutions. Examples will be presented of how the framework has ensured success at MUIH.

### Learning Objectives:

- ◆ Gain an integrated program development framework for use at one's own institution;
- ◆ Identify the roles of academic, admissions, and marketing teams in program development;
- ◆ Understand the impact of collaborative program development on institutional planning

**Audience:** Intermediate

**Presenters:** Christina M. Sax, *Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs*; and Chad Egresi, *Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management, Maryland University of Integrative Health*

## Coupling a Retention-Driven Predictive Analytics Initiative with MSCHE Standards

As institutions look to new ways to recruit, retain, and graduate students while complying with MSCHE Standard IV (Support of the Student Experience) they need to rethink the approaches to advisement and interactions with students, particularly students identified as being "at-risk." Efforts to improve the academic and social experiences of the University of Albany undergraduate population are in part driven by the notion that a student who is engaged with the campus community is more likely to be successful, and a successful student is more likely to persist to graduation. To address these challenges, UAlbany invested in a robust, predictive analytics engine that is, at its nexus, simultaneously an early warning system to identify students at-risk, and a data-informed advising model. These operational changes have also had the unintended consequence of breaking down campus silos to facilitate and collaborate towards institutional goals for retention and student success across campus.

### Learning Objectives:

- ◆ Discuss and understand a retention-driven predictive analytics model;
- ◆ Understand the challenges of retaining students and engaging them in the campus community;
- ◆ Identify ways to facilitate achievement of campus goals for retention and student success.

**Audience:** Intermediate

**Presenters:** Jack Mahoney, *Assistant Vice Provost for Academic and Resource Planning*; and Steven Doellefeld, *Director of Assessment, SUNY University at Albany*