Delaware College of Art and Design

Self-Study Design

Student Success

Submitted to:

Middle States Commission on Higher Education

in preparation for the

2014-2015 Self-Study

June 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Brief History of the College

Delaware College of Art and Design (DCAD) was founded in 1996 in Wilmington, Delaware as the result of an initiative by a business-government coalition, Wilmington 2000 (later the Wilmington Renaissance Corporation), to revitalize the downtown district of Delaware's largest city. In 1994, Wilmington 2000 sent a request for proposals to art schools across the country asking for their help in establishing the state's first professional art school. Dr. David Levy, then President and Director of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and Dr. Thomas Schutte, President of Pratt Institute, proposed a two-year college that would combine the reputations and expertise of their respective institutions in a joint venture. Combined, the Corcoran School of Art (now the Corcoran College of Art and Design) and Pratt Institute had over 250 years' experience in art education. Linking the two institutions was both a marketing strategy and an educational innovation.

In December 1996, Delaware College of Art and Design was incorporated in the State of Delaware as "The Pratt-Corcoran Association for the Delaware College of Art and Design." Curricula were developed and a catalog was prepared by staff at Pratt and the Corcoran who also began to recruit for the first entering class in the fall of 1997. A director of admissions and a director of financial aid were hired late in 1996, followed by the founding Director, then President, James P. Lecky, in January 1997. Wilmington 2000 assumed the responsibility for raising the necessary initial operating funds from private foundations and corporations. Renovation of the original 1932 Art Deco building at 600 North Market Street, once the headquarters of Delmarva Power and Light, was underway by the time the initial staff was in place.

Recognized by the Delaware Commission on Higher Education, DCAD originally operated as a branch campus of the Corcoran College of Art and Design, allowing the school access to Title IV funding. In 2007, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) and the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) granted DCAD initial independent accreditation. In July 2009, President Lecky retired, and Stuart Baron was appointed the second president of DCAD.

DCAD's Board of Directors has ultimate governing authority and is accountable for the academic quality, fiscal and academic integrity, assets, and financial health of the institution. It is responsible for ensuring that DCAD's mission is being carried out and that the mission statement provides a context to judge institutional performance. DCAD's organizational structure also includes a Board of Overseers. The Board of Overseers recommends actions to the Board of Directors but does not assume oversight or decision-making responsibilities on College matters. It extends the College's connections and support into a broader segment of the community, while representing and interpreting the views of the community within the structure of DCAD.

College Mission, Mission Goals, Vision Statement, and Strategic Plan

The College Mission, Mission Goals, and Vision Statement were reviewed and revised during the 2008-2013 Strategic Planning Process.

College Mission

DCAD's mission is to educate talented and dedicated students to become art makers, idea generators, problem solvers, and visual communicators who can redefine the way we perceive and experience the world around us. It also serves as a visible stakeholder, cultural anchor, and catalyst for the revitalization of downtown Wilmington.

Mission Goals

1. Offers comprehensive and rigorous associate of fine arts degree programs that emphasize structured, visually-based, hands-on studio experiences and a well-conceived liberal arts curriculum, enabling students to continue their undergraduate education through transfer to four-year professional colleges of art and design while providing a basic foundation for successful and satisfying careers.

2. Engages a faculty of accomplished professionals who are committed to serve as teachers, role models, and mentors, as well as qualified staff who understand, appreciate, and respond to the active and creative culture of DCAD.

3. Nurtures a vibrant, student-centered, college community served by state-of-the-art learning, working, and living environments that inspire personal expression and effective collaboration.

4. Participates in Wilmington's educational and cultural life through a variety of community-based programs and activities.

5. Manages its human, financial, and physical resources effectively and efficiently to advance DCAD's programs and services.

Vision Statement

Distinguished by an exemplary living/learning community that fosters visual creativity, DCAD will be well positioned for further growth, development, and leadership in educating artists and designers. DCAD will be a first choice for students in the Mid-Atlantic region beginning their art and design education, with distinguished, articulated baccalaureate options available for transfer. The quality of its programs will also attract students from the rest of the nation and abroad. Affirming that a strong cultural presence can be a powerful force for change, DCAD's downtown urban campus will be an area of vibrant activity at all times and increase the appeal of city life for students, faculty, staff, and visitors, as well as the local community.

Strategic Plan

In spring 2013, the College began the process of articulating the 2014 -2019 Strategic Plan. The first year of the new 2014-2019 Strategic Plan coincides with the MSCHE Self-Study process. In January 2013,

the College hired a consultant to assist in writing the new Strategic Plan. The Board of Directors at its June 25, 2013 meeting approved the 2014-2019 Strategic Plan, see Appendix A.

Educational Programs and Student Body

DCAD offers a two-year Associate of Fine Arts Degree Program (AFA) with majors in six areas: Animation, Fine Arts, Graphic Design, Illustration, Interior Design, and Photography. The AFA program emphasizes studio education in art and design with liberal arts courses. DCAD's first entering class enrolled 50 students in four areas: fine arts, graphic design, illustration, and photography. Animation and interior design were added in 2001 and 2005, respectively.

DCAD's curriculum is designed to prepare students to continue their education at a four-year art and design college. Although no formal articulation agreements are presently in place, the College is actively participating in articulation discussions with Philadelphia Academy of Fine Arts, Maryland Institute College of Art, The University of the Arts, Pratt Institute, and Corcoran College of Art and Design. Approximately 66% of the DCAD graduates transfer to Pratt, the Corcoran, or other art and design schools such as Rhode Island School of Design, Chicago Institute of Art, California Institute of the Arts, Maryland Institute College of Art, University of the Arts, School of Visual Arts, Ringling College of Art, San Francisco Art Institute, Boston Museum School of Fine Arts, Savannah College of Art and Design, and Moore College of Art.

New Initiatives

Several new initiatives – each resulting from the College's ongoing assessment process- have already had a notable impact on the institutional functioning and therefore serve as major areas of focus in the self-study. In fall 2012, the College created two standing committees as an impetus for shared governance, Student Success and Enrollment Management. The Student Success committee, co-chaired by the dean and the director of student services monitors, evaluates, and makes recommendations based on data decisions and best practices to strengthen and create optimal educational opportunities in student learning, student success, and retention. The Enrolment Management Committee, chaired by the director of admission monitors, evaluates data and best practices, and makes recommendations for a strategically enhanced recruitment plan. Another initiative, curricular innovation has resulted from the review and evaluation of the curriculum as well as one of the 2014-2019 Strategic Goal objectives - to investigate the feasibility of implementing new academic programs and internships. DCAD is also convening a Technology Master Plan Task Force, a recommendation from the October 2012 visiting team. Finally, DCAD is actively participating in articulation discussion and anticipates formal articulation agreements within the self-study period.

Enrollment Key Facts

DCAD's graduation rate is 55%; this is above the national average of two-year, not-for-profit schools (51%, 2007). DCAD's current retention rate is 82% from fall 2012 – spring 2013.

DCAD's enrollment for the 2012-2013 academic year was 231; the College's highest unduplicated head count was 262 in AY 2011-2012. The present enrollment facts for gender are 36% male and 64% female; for race/ethnicity: 58% white, 20% African American, 8% multiracial, 5% Hispanic, 5% unknown, 2% Asian American, 1% Native American, and 1% other.

In May 2012, DCAD graduated its largest class to date with 89 graduates. DCAD students predominately come from Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, and New York with a small percentage from other states and abroad. For the AY 2012-2013, 40% of the students were from Delaware; 47% were from Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, and New York; and 13% were from the other states and abroad.

The Continuing Education Department (CE) supports one of the Mission Goals: the "College participates in Wilmington's educational and cultural life through a variety of community-based programs and activities" by providing certificate and non-certificate programs in art and design for personal enrichment and professional growth in the Continuing Education Department. Established in 1997 with 19 course offerings, CE currently offers 75 classes with an enrollment of 365 students per year in fine arts, graphic design, interior design, web design, jewelry design, fashion illustration, and photography. Certificate programs are in Art and Design, Digital Design, Graphic Design, Interior Design, Photography, and Web Design; and a Web & Graphic Design combined certificate. Since 2008, CE has overseen a residential Pre–College Art Studio Program for high school students enrolling on average 45 students each summer. Since 2008, on average 18% of the students matriculate to a DCAD degree program.

Administration, Faculty and Staff

The College employs 20 full-time and two part-time staff members, and seven full-time and 22 adjunct faculty members in the degree programs. Area Coordinators are full-time faculty who, in addition to their administrative, advisement, and teaching responsibilities, are practicing professionals engaged in local and regional exhibitions and other creative activities.

Administrative Changes

The College began the 2012 academic year with new academic leadership. Ron Brignac, the present area coordinator of photography assumed an additional responsibilities as interim dean and Krista Rothwell, the present registrar assumed additional responsibilities as interim assistant dean. In January 2012, the College created and filled a new position, director of institutional research and assessment.

Facilities

The original building at 600 North Market Street houses most DCAD offices and all the College's classrooms. The main floor is dominated by the Toni & Stuart B. Young Gallery, which is open to the public and features exhibitions of national prominence, while also showing the work of DCAD students, faculty, and the local art and design community. In 2005, DCAD completed its second major building project, the expansion into previously unusable space on the third and fourth floors of 600 N. Market

Street. The new space, including five classrooms, four offices, a conference room, and an expanded library, allowed enrollment to expand significantly. DCAD purchased the adjacent property at 602 N. Market Street in 2010; the site was razed in 2012. Along with the second floor of 600 North Market Street, this site allows DCAD the potential to expand to meet future needs.

In 2006, DCAD acquired The Saville Apartments (formerly Mullins Department Store) with a 501(c) (3) bond that included initial funds for the building's renovation. The capacity to house 116 students directly across the street from the College turned DCAD into a primarily residential school. In 2008, the building's two vacant retail spaces on the corner of Sixth and Market were transformed into the Tatiana Copeland Student Center.

As part of the 2008-2013 Strategic Plan, the College purchased the property at 707 N. King Street (formerly the Brandywine Suites Hotel) at Sheriff's Sale in November 2011. The new dormitory, which opened in the fall of 2012, includes 49 rooms that can accommodate 95 students. DCAD's students requested on-campus housing, which resulted in the largest residential student population in the City of Wilmington. The 707 building also includes a retail space on the first floor of the Market Street side of the property, now leased to *Jerry's Artarama,* which will open August 1, 2013.

Accreditation History

MSCHE granted DCAD initial accreditation in 2007 and requested a monitoring report due on October 1, 2009 on Standards 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal; Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning; and Standard 7: Institutional Assessment.

At its March 2010 meeting, the Commission accepted the October 2009 monitoring report and warned the College that its accreditation may be in jeopardy because of a lack of evidence relevant to Standards 2, 7 and 14. The College acknowledged this problem and worked diligently to implement a strategic plan linked to budgeting and decision making with measureable outcomes; a comprehensive organized, and sustained process for assessment of institutional effectiveness; and an organized, systematic, and sustainable process for the assessment of student learning outcomes.

At its June 2011 meeting, the Commission accepted the February 2011 monitoring report, to note the visit by the Commissions' representative, and warned the institution that its accreditation may be in jeopardy because of insufficient evidence that the institution was in compliance with Standards 7 and 14. The Commission noted that the next evaluation team visit would be scheduled when warning was removed and accreditation reaffirmed. The College acknowledged the insufficient evidence and collaboratively worked to implement a comprehensive organized, and sustained process for assessment of institutional effectiveness, and an organized, systematic, and sustainable process for the assessment of student learning outcomes.

At its November 2011 meeting, the Commission accepted the September 2011 monitoring report to note the visit by the Commission's representatives and extended the period for demonstrating compliance by nine months, for good cause because the College was making a good faith effort to remedy existing deficiencies and a reasonable exception existed that such deficiencies would be remediated within the period of extension. The College appreciated the confidence expressed by the Commission in granting the "good faith" extension to demonstrate sound progress in addressing deficiencies and concerns identified in the February 2011 visiting team report. The February 2011 team concluded: "DCAD has

made progress in implementing a process for assessment of institutional effectiveness in the past year. Resources have been dedicated to meeting this standard including hiring a dean/director of institutional research and assessment. However, there remain several significant disconnects that prevent DCAD's institutional assessment from being comprehensive, systematized, and sustainable."

In January 2012, the College created a new position and hired a director of institutional research and assessment to ameliorate accreditation.

In 2012, the College submitted two monitoring reports to the Commission. At its June 28, 2012 meeting, the Commission acted to accept the April 1, 2012 monitoring report on Standard 14 and indicate that a small team visit would not be conducted at this time. The collective hard work of the faculty and staff was recognized, the College was found in compliance with Standard 14. During the next several months, the College acknowledged the deficiencies and concerns expressed by the Commission with regard to Standard 7 and engaged in a focused vision to achieve compliance for the September 1, 2012 monitoring report.

At its November 15, 2012 meeting, the Commission acted to accept the monitoring report and to note the visit by the Commission's representatives. The Commission acted to reaffirm accreditation and to note that the institution is now in compliance with Standard 7. The October 2012 evaluation team noted, " after long and serious effort, the DCAD community — in the September 1, 2012 Monitoring Report and in a day of fruitful interviews with the diverse and thoughtful faculty, staff and board members enumerated above — had demonstrated that it understands and is fully engaged in achieving and sustaining compliance with Standard 7. The recent appointments of a director of institutional research and assessment and an interim dean, as well as building a relationship with an experienced assessment consultant, have generated substantial progress in the short time available.

As a result of this emphasis and the effort of the College community, the activities during the past two years have put the College in a position to engage in this 2015 decennial comprehensive self-study.

PROGRESS OF THE SELF-STUDY

DCAD has made significant progress since the Self-Study process began in September 2012. President Baron appointed the 2014-2015 Self-Study co-chairs Ron Brignac, interim dean and the photography area coordinator, and Pamela MacPherson, director of institutional research and assessment and the College's Accreditation Liaison Officer. Pamela MacPherson has extensive Middle States experience at her previous institution, having served on Self-Study Steering Committees and written successful monitoring and periodic review reports. In addition, at her previous institution she was a member of the College Assessment Committee, which won the 2009 CHEA Award for Institutional Progress in Student Learning Outcomes. Both Self-Study co-chairs attended the November 2012 MSCHE Self-Study Institute. President Baron and Pamela MacPherson attended the MSCHE annual conference in December 2012.

In consultation with President Baron, Traci Parman, Chief Administrative Officer, and the self-study co-chairs, members of the Self-Study Steering Committee (SSSC) and the Working Groups were selected based on their experience, interpersonal skills, constituent focus, and collaborative nature. Members of the Self-Study Steering Committee serve dual roles as both Working Group co-chairs and members of their respective working groups.

The Self-Study Steering Committee members include full-time faculty and staff:

> Jane Campbell, Director of Continuing Education
> Elizabeth Gatti, Director of Admission
> Sara Ganter, Director of Development
> Bradley LaMere, Admission Counselor
> Alexi Natchev, Illustration Area Coordinator
> Traci Parman, Chief Administrative Officer
> Krista Rothwell, Registrar, and Interim Assistant Dean
> Ian Tornay, Interior Design Area Coordinator

Collaboratively, the SSSC has accomplished the following since November 2012:

- Facilitated a "Self-Study Communication Kick-Off" for the entire DCAD community, which provided an overview of the Self-Study process and an opportunity for the Working Group co-chairs to facilitate the communication and organizational process.
- Created a schedule for the Middle States Preparation Visit in April 2013
- Developed a Self-Study timeline
- Identified a theme for the Self-Study: Student Success
- Determined the bundling of standards into five groups for research by the Working Groups, see Table 1
- Developed a set of research questions for the Self-Study
- Identified College supporting documents and resources
- Met with their appropriate Working Groups

The Working Group Self-Study Committee members include full-time faculty & staff, 27% of DCAD's part-time faculty, three student leaders, and a board representative who will serve in an advisory position. Since the College is focusing on student success, it was important in the planning process to include students as members of the Working Groups. The College is committed to an inclusive self-study and has allocated a stipend for part-time faculty who participate in the process.

Table 1

Self –Study Organizational Structure

Delaware College of Art and Design Comprehensive Self-Study Model as of 6/30/2013	
Theme	Working Group Members
Theme 1, Working Group 1 Mission, Planning & Resource Allocation Co-Chairs: Traci Parman, Alexi Natchev	Gerry Deery, Admission Administrative Assistant Penni Gioffre, Adjunct Faculty Liberal Arts Teresa Haman, Director of Financial Aid Muriel Mhloyi, Bursar
Theme 2, Working Group 2 Leadership, Governance & Integrity Co-Chairs: Sara Ganter, Bradley LaMere	Lisa Baird, Adjunct Faculty Fine Arts Thorpe Moeckel, Board Chair* Advisory Member Dan Rios, Adjunct Faculty Photography and Alumni Connie Simon, Adjunct Faculty Foundation-Year & Fine Arts Sam Vaughan, Deputy Assistant to the President Student *
Theme 3, Working Group 3 Student Learning & Institutional Effectiveness Co-Chairs: Krista Rothwell, Pamela MacPherson	Randle Reed, Assistant Director of Student Services Tad Sare, Adjunct Faculty Foundations Stan Smokler, Adjunct Faculty Foundations Student *
Theme 4, Working Group 4 Student Success and Engagement Co-Chairs: Elizabeth Gatti, Ron Brignac	Bates Carter, Information Technology Coordinator Michael East, Foundation –Year & Fine Arts Coordinator Julia Mercier, Adjunct Faculty Liberal Arts Ruth Graham, Financial Aid Counselor Student*
Theme 5, Working Group 5 Teaching and Related Educational Activities Co-Chairs: Jane Campbell, Ian Tornay	John Breakey, Graphic Design Area Coordinator Bethany Roberts, Assistant Director of Admissions Helena Richardson, Library Director

Campus communication is essential for an engaged and successful self-study process. Materials for the self-study will be posted on the College's "outcomes assessment drive." Items on this site include agendas, meeting minutes, reports from the Working Groups, external links and other resource documents. To facilitate a more collaborative, dynamic, and efficient communicative process, the College is investigating using Google doc and/ or Smart sheet. Several other communication mechanisms have been established to augment cloud computing such as monthly email broadcasts and periodic open forums for the entire community.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE SELF-STUDY

DCAD is undertaking its second comprehensive self-study as mandated by MSCHE policy. The comprehensive self-study will enable DCAD to appraise every aspect of its programs, services, governing and supporting structures, resources, and educational outcomes in relation to the College's mission and goals, and its new 2014-2019 Strategic Plan. The self-study process will be an invaluable opportunity for seasoned and new faculty and staff to engage, understand, develop, and act upon opportunities for institutional renewal and student success.

INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE SELF-STUDY

The MSCHE Self-Study process provides the College with an opportunity for reflection, investigation, and analysis of how well the College is meeting its Mission and Institutional Goals while energizing an institutional commitment toward planning and assessment, accountability, and continued improvement.

The intended outcomes of the Self-Study are to:

- Engage the College in a process of institutional renewal producing a reflective document that demonstrates the requirements of MSCHE and NASAD and serves as a valuable tool for institutional planning, change, and growth.
- Assess the progress of recently implemented initiatives (student success, enrollment management, curricular innovation, technology master plan, and articulation agreements) including activities undertaken as part of the first year of the 2014-2019 Strategic Plan.
- Evaluate and determine the adequacy of institutional governance, policies, procedures, and guidelines and the processes by which they are established and communicated.

CHARGE OF THE SELF-STUDY CO-CHAIRS AND THE STEERING COMMITTEE

The self-study co-chairs oversee the self-study process in concert with the Self-Study Steering Committee (SSSC). In addition to overseeing the self-study process, the self-study co-chairs also serve as members of specific working groups.

Responsibilities of Self-Study co-chairs:

- Establish the general structure and timetable for the Self-Study
- Provide guidance for Working Groups
- Receive and review interim and final reports from each Working Group
- Ensure that there is active participation in the Self-Study process by various stakeholders
- Provide a communication mechanism for the DCAD community
- Serve as a point person for Working Groups, as assigned
- Assess Working Group draft reports to ensure that the research questions outlined for the Self-Study are addressed and meet the standards and fundamental elements
- Determine final recommendations for the College in consultation with the President based on the findings of the Working Groups
- Promote and communicate the Self-Study process to the College community

- Oversee the completion of the final Self-Study Report and coordinate the site visit
- Respond to the site-visit report

Responsibilities of Self-Study Steering Committee

The Self-Study Steering Committee's responsibilities include the following activities:
- Serve as co-chairs of the Working Groups
- Provide minutes of Working Group meetings
- Coordinate Working Groups to ensure that research, analysis, and recommendations are addressed
- Ensure the Self-Study timeline is implemented and followed
- Facilitate an open, honest, and inclusive Self-Study process
- Assist in compilation, analysis, and review of the Self-Study report and accompanying documents
- Ensure the reports address research questions and fundamental elements and demonstrate compliance

CHARGES TO THE WORKING GROUPS

The 14 MSCHE standards have been grouped into five themes; each theme provides the organizational structure for the Working Groups, see Table 1. The Self-Study co-chairs will serve as liaisons to specific Working Groups; Ron Brignac will be the liaison for Working Groups 1 and 5 and the co-chair of Working Group 4; Pamela MacPherson will be the liaison to Working Groups 2 and co-chair of Working Group 3. Members of the Working Group serve an important outreach function to the campus, communication, and inclusivity.

Responsibilities of Working Group:
- Develop a comprehensive understanding of the accreditation standards
- Provide an analysis of strengths and challenges by addressing each research question
- Assess compliance with the Standards assigned
- Use the MSCHE Document Roadmap to provide evidence that the College is in compliance with the MSCHE standards.
- Gather qualitative and quantitative information, ameliorating current assumptions and exploring new ideas
- Review, understand, and utilize the College's inventory of supporting documents and determine relevance to the assigned research questions
- Focus analysis on the degree to which programs, services, policies and practices support the Mission and Strategic Goals of the College
- Write both an interim draft and a final report summarizing findings using the self- study template and provide realistic recommendations
- Meet deadlines for assigned tasks and reports
- Communicate with Working Group co-chairs

GUIDING RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The Steering Committee developed draft research questions that 1) are aligned with the appropriate MSCHE Standards and fundamental elements, 2) are aligned with the Self-Study outcomes, and 3) will advance institutional self-improvement. These questions were then submitted to the Self- Study co-chairs who reviewed and revised the questions accordingly. The final research questions were again reviewed and approved by the SSSC and sent to President Baron for final approval.

Mission, Planning & Resource Allocation

Working Group One: Standard 1   Mission and Goals

                          Standard 2   Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

                          Standard 3   Institutional Resources

---

Purpose:

This working group will engage in research about how, and to what degree:

- All initiatives are aligned with the mission of the College.
- Assessment results are used for institutional renewal and quality through planning and budgeting.
- Human, financial, technical, and physical facilities resources are planned, allocated, and equitable in terms of achieving the Mission and the Mission Goals.

1. What evidence exists that demonstrates how the College communicates, assesses, and allocates resources to advance the Mission and Goals of the College? To what extent is this participatory and what is stakeholders input? What evidence exists that cogent and consistent policies and procedures are in place to determine allocation of the resources?

2. What evidence is there to demonstrate that institutional and departmental mission and planning goals are aligned and communicated to all constituents?

3. What are the most significant challenges facing the College relative to human resources, technology, and facilities over the next three years? What is the process by which specific and comprehensive plans for addressing these challenges are being formulated within the context of overall institutional planning? How does the College plan and prioritize resource allocation in light of enrollment and economic trends?

4. How does the College integrate the planning and resource allocation with various institutional plans and processes such as the facilities master plan, new technology master plan, replacement process, recruitment plan, and emergency and evacuation procedures? What evidence exists that these institutional plans and processes are periodically evaluated and communicated to all constituents? How do these institutional plans support the Mission and institutional goals?

5. How was the new 2014-2019 Strategic Plan developed? What evidence exists that it was participatory, future thinking, and can guide the College for the next five years? What evidence

demonstrates that the new 2014-2019 Strategic Plan was communicated to all constituents and integrated into departmental planning goals and resource allocations? To what extent are the Mission and Mission Goals and Strategic Goals consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, developed though collaborative participation, periodically evaluated and formally approved, and relate to external and internal contexts and constituencies?

6. What prompted recent initiatives in College's programs, services, and activities; and how do these initiatives guide and inform on-going institutional and departmental planning and assessment? How are these planning goals aligned with the Mission, communicated to the community, assessed, prioritized, and used for institutional renewal with the assurance of accountability?

Leadership, Governance & Integrity		
Working Group Two: Standard 4	Leadership and Governance	
Standard 5	Administration	
Standard 6	Integrity	

Purpose
This working group will engage in research about how and to what degree the:
- Leadership and governance-structure policies and procedures are transparent, ethical, accountable, and support decision-making.
- Administrative policies, structures, systems, and processes facilitate learning, foster quality, and support the mission and organizational governance.
- Programs, activities and their policies and procedures are ethical, transparent, communicated, equitable, applied, and serve all constituents.

1. What evidence exists that the Board conducts a review of its role, policies, and procedures and assesses its effectiveness? How is the Board transparent and accountable in its role to support the College in pursuit of its mission? What evidence exists that the Board is apprised and educated about accreditation, institutional effectiveness, the assessment of student learning, academic programs which are of appropriate quality and rigor, and issues about higher education from the Department of Education to make informed decision in support of the College?

2. How are governing structures accountable for academic quality, fiscal and academic integrity, academic planning, curricular innovation, assessment, articulation agreements, and the financial health of the institution? What evidence exists that these governing structures are participatory, transparent, and effective in support of the Mission? How effectively do governance structures function separately but serve complementary roles?

3. How and how effective is leadership (governance and administrative) selected, trained, supported, and evaluated? To what extent are these processes equitable, communicated, and transparent with documented policies and/or procedures to assure integrity?

4. What mechanisms are in place to assure fair, equitable, accountable, transparent, and impartial processes to address employee grievances, issues related to hiring and firing of employees and student grievances?

5. Describe external standards and regulations (HEOA, Transfer of Credit, Title IV Cohort Default Rate, Credit Hour, etc.) that the College must meet as well as internal policies and procedures that guide its function. What evidence exists that the College consistently and accurately applies the standards and regulations, communicates these standards and regulations to all constituents (published or electronic), and monitors and reviews these standards? How does a new employee learn and how are current employees and students updated on standards, policies, and procedures?

6. How have the leadership and administrative structures changed (since the last self-study) and what evidence supports the effectiveness of these changes? How do current administrative structures ensure institutional integrity and accountability?

7. How has governance structure changed (since the last self-study) and what evidence supports the effectiveness of these changes? How is the structure coherent and ensues institutional integrity, accountability, and autonomy? How is the governance process of decision-making communicated to all constituents?

8. To what extent are position descriptions for leadership, administrators, area coordinators, faculty, and staff clearly defined, communicated, and consistent with higher education good practice?

9. How does the College ensure integrity, intellectual and academic freedom while fostering, and ensuring respect for the diversity of ideas and perspectives for all students and employees? Are the policies and procedures for intellectual and academic freedom transparent, fair and equitable, and communicated to all constituents?

10. What policies, procedures, and practices exist to ensure that required offerings are available, communicated, updated, and evaluated to enable students to graduate within the published program length?

Institutional Effectiveness, General Education, and Student Learning
Working Group Three: Standard 7 Institutional Assessment Standard 12 General Educations Standard 14 Assessment of Student Learning

Purpose

This working group will engage in research about how and to what degree:

- Institutional assessment is used to evaluate effectiveness in achieving the Mission of the College.
- The curricula demonstrate college-level rigor and proficiency in general education.
- Assessment of student learning is consistent with the Mission and used to strengthen learning, pedagogy, and the curriculum.

1. What evidence is there and how effectively does the College utilize and communicate to all constituents the interrelationship of institutional, student learning, co-curricular, and general education assessment data to advance the institution? What evidence exists that the assessment process is monitored and evaluated for improvement?

2. What evidence exists that assessment results are aligned with departmental and institutional planning and resource allocation and guide the College in support of institutional renewal? Is the process effective, equitable, communicated, and transparent?

3. What methodologies and strategies are used for institutional, student learning, and co-curricular assessment and are these effective? What methodologies and strategies are used for the assessment of student learning, general education, and co-curricular activities that ensure vertical and horizontal transference of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (introduced, emphasized, and advanced)? How effective are these methodologies? To what extent are these methodologies and assessment results communicated to all constituents, transparent, quality assessments, and informed by best practices?

4. What evidence is there that the assessment process and assessment results have led to improvements in programs, services, and processes? How and to what extent do curricular audits inform curricular innovation? How and to what extent are the assessments processes monitored, communicated, and evaluated for institutional effectiveness?

5. How effectively are course student learning outcomes, including their inter- and intra-relationships to general education outcomes (core competencies) and program competencies communicated in course syllabi and materials? How does the College ensure that institutional, course, and program learning outcomes are appropriate for the mission, communicated to students, enhance students' intellectual experience, and meet student goals: are reviewed and owned by faculty, and used for curricular improvements?

6. How does specialized program accreditation contribute to student learning and the interrelationship among content, time, and competencies? What is the relationship between operations (goals, objectives, resources, policies) and programs?

7. To what extent does the allocation and expenditure of institutional and departmental resources promote and provide evidence of improvement and institutional quality in support of student learning? How effectively does the College communicate these allocations and are they sufficient to support student learning? How does the College ensure accountability for institutional quality? What evidence is there that demonstrates academic and student support planning goals inform resource allocation?

Student Success and Engagement

Working Group Four: Standard 8   Student Admission and Retention
                      Standard 9   Student Support

Purpose
This working group will engage in research about how and to what degree the:

- College admits students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with the Mission.
- College retains students in pursuit of their educational goals.
- College provides student support services to enable each student to achieve institutional goals.

1. How do the College's admissions policies, procedures, and decisions assure that it recruits and admits students whose goals, interests, and abilities are congruent with the Mission of the College? How effective are the recruitment goals and objectives in meeting enrollment of targeted populations? How effective and what assessment metrics within the admission funnel are used to inform planning?

2. What changes to the admission and financial aid processes have resulted from assessment data? What processes are in place to increase yield? How does admission data inform program and student support services and predict persistence and degree completion? Describe the changes to the admission and financial aid process that have been made or are anticipated as a result of ongoing assessments. How does the College assess the effectiveness of these decisions to anticipate changing student demographics and trends and incorporate best practices?

3. Discuss the purpose and function of the newly formed Enrollment Management Committee? What evidence exists to show that the committee uses assessment data to inform admissions and retention? How do assessment results inform a strategically enhanced Recruitment Plan? What evidence is there that the information is communicated vertically and horizontally for departmental and institutional planning? What is the College's market position and how is this conveyed in recruitment?

4. Discuss the purpose of the newly formed Student Success Committee? What evidence exists to show that the committee uses assessment data to inform retention and student success initiatives? What evidence is there that the information is vertically and horizontally communicated for departmental and strategic planning? To what extent does the First Year Experience strengthen retention and student success; what assessment data supports this best practice; and is it effective? How does Student Services support the FYE?

5. What evidence exists that indicates students' interests and educational goals and personal and social development are supported by Student Services; and are they sufficient? What changes have resulted from assessment that informs planning and resource allocation to support students' interests, personal and social development, and educational goals? To what extent have these changes increased student satisfaction?

6. How does the College know students are appropriately advised regarding academic programs, academic advisement, financial aid, course of study and transfer preparation? How does the College identify at risk students, and how effective and sufficient are the support services for these students? What evidence does the College gather to determine if academic and financial advisement and other institutional support activities and programs strengthen persistence for at risk students?

7. How does the College communicate and assess the effectiveness of financial aid, scholarships, student support services, co-curricular activities, student learning outcomes, placement procedures, evaluation of transfer credit, and policies and procedures to prospective and current students? How effective and consistent are these communications to all constituents?

8. To what extent does the College ensure all admitted students have adequate financial support for two years? What is the evidence that internal assessment data and external benchmarks are used to plan and prioritize financial aid? To what extent has the financial aid department incorporated best practices and Department of Education's higher education   affordability agenda to articulate and ameliorate external economic and demographic trends in support of the Mission?

9. How do enrollment goals reflect demographic trends and other external trends? Are the goals realistic and effective to support the institution's financial projections? If there is a gap, how does the College use assessment and planning goals to close the gap? How effective is the College in awarding financial aid and merit awards to meet enrollment goals?

Teaching and Related Educational Activities

Working Group Five: Standard 10   Faculty
                              Standard 11   Educational Offerings
                              Standard 13   Related Educational Activities

Purpose

This working group will engage in research about how and to what degree:

- Instruction and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified faculty.
- Educational programs identify student learning goals and display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate for the Mission.
- College programs and activities are characterized by particulate content and focus and meet appropriate standards.

1. How effective is the College in ensuring that it hires and retains qualified faculty (full-time and part time)? How effective is the College in mentoring faculty and communicating policies, procedures, and assessment results to faculty? To what extent does the College provide professional development activities, engage faculty in scholarship and service, and orient faculty to the Mission and Goals of the College? Are these activities sufficient, transparent, and equitable to support student learning?

2. What processes and procedures are in place to ensure the continuous improvement of academic programs that are designed, maintained, updated, and assessed by faculty and appropriate to the Mission? To what extent do these programs have adequate college-level rigor, breadth, and depth of content appropriate to the Mission? How are these documented and communicated to all constituents to ensure vertical and horizontal linkage of all outcomes. To what extent are they responsive to new research and best practices?

3. How does the College utilize adjunct faculty? To what extent does the College's teaching load ensure student learning and success?

4. To what extent does the availability and accessibility of learning resources (such as library and technology services) support educational activities for students, faculty, and staff? If gaps exist, what is being planned to fill these gaps? To what extent do the facilities and the equipment support students and ensure a sustainable environment for health and safety?

5. Describe the processes, policies, and practices in place to ensure that non-credit courses, programs, and certificate programs are appropriate with relevant student learning outcomes. To what extent are they periodically evaluated and assessed to meet the diverse educational goals of the constituents? How are these supported with institutional resources and aligned with the Mission? To what extent does the College ensure academic oversight of non-credit courses?

6. In what ways does the College support underprepared students? What are the processes, procedures, and policies communicated in the admission process that inform underprepared students to help them reach their educational goal? Does the retention rate mirror the retention rate of all students?

7. To what extent are the policies and procedures regarding exhibitions aligned with the scope and learning outcomes in support of learning for all constituents? What evidence is there that demonstrates that the exhibitions are appropriate and effective for all constituents?

TEMPLATE FOR WORKING GROUP REPORTS

Working Group #   Fundamental Element(s) (FE)
Research Question (RQ)

Background
- ✓ Provide a historical context: institutional history, MSCHE/NASAD Self-Study, MSCHE monitoring reports.

Resources
- ✓ List all resources and how the resource(s) is used to analyze the question

Fundamental Element
- ✓ Analyze compliance with the fundamental elements, use MSCHE Document Roadmap
- ✓ Indicate the specific FE compliance that the research question supports
- ✓ Follow analysis narrative below

Analysis narrative
- ✓ Provide the analysis and indicate the source(s) of the analysis
- ✓ Provide documented evidence
- ✓ What is the question analyzing:
  - o Issue, policy, communication, or process
  - o Participation
  - o Technology, human or fiscal resource
- ✓ Do we need to conduct a focus group or survey to answer this question?
- ✓ Include relevant data, trends, policies, and procedures.
- ✓ What was learned about the College, the students, academic programs, faculty, etc.?
- ✓ How is the evidence used to promote institutional change?
- ✓ Why is this question important to DCAD?
- ✓ Does this question support another standard?
- ✓ Is there assessment data to support the analysis?
- ✓ Provide justification that links the research question to the self-study outcomes and the College Mission
- ✓ Use tables whenever possible to convey evidence and analysis

Major Findings
- ✓ Indicate major findings supported with relevant data
- ✓ What are the implications for the College present or future
- ✓ Are we achieving what we want to accomplish?
- ✓ What opportunities exist to improve effectiveness and efficiency in achieving our mission and strategic goals?

Recommendations:
- ✓ Propose one or two recommendations, based on the analysis
- ✓ Categorize recommendations, high priority that benefit the College and are aligned with the 2014-2019 Strategic Plan
- ✓ Propose recommendations that stimulate discussion and action

EDITORIAL STYLE AND FORMAT OF THE REPORT

Word Processing: Microsoft Office ©

Font: Times Roman
- 14-point Bold for Main Headings Centered
- 12-point Bold for second level
- 12-point Italic for third level
- 12-point for fourth level
- 12-point font for prose

Page Layout: Single-spaced
                       Left justification only
                       One blank line after headings
                       One blank line between paragraphs
                       Page numbers on bottom right

Page Limit: 3-5 pages per research question

Written Style Guidelines: Write the document in third person

ORGANIZATION OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

Self-Study Report Format:

I.   Table of Contents
II.   Certification of Eligibility Statement
III.   Executive Summary
IV.   Introduction
         A.   History and Overview of the College
         B.   Description of the Self-Study Process
         C.   Accreditation History
V.   Mission, Planning & Resource Allocation: Standards 1, 2, and 3
VI.   Leadership, Governance & Integrity: Standards 4, 5, and 6
VII.   Assessment of Student Learning & Institutional Effectiveness: Standards 7, 12, and 14
VIII.   Student Success & Engagement: Standards 8 and 9
IX.   Teaching, Related Educational Activities: Standards 10, 11,and 13
X.   Conclusion and Recommendations
XI.   Appendices

INVENTORY OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment will assist the Working Groups with collecting all appropriate documents. The College utilizes the DCAD Data Source Warehouse file that documents all DCAD data sources and documents interconnectivity and cross functionality of data collection with analysis.

All/Multiple Standards

     2014-2019 Strategic Plan and Strategic Planning Committee minutes
     Accreditation
         MSCHE Monitoring Reports
         2007 NASAD & MSCHE Self-Study
     Benchmark Data, including reports
     College Catalogue
     Department Mission and Goals
     IPEDS
     Report to State of DE
     Minutes of relevant and important meetings
     MSCHE Institutional Profiles
     NASAD Reports
     View Book

Academic *

Academic Calendar

Academic Progress Reports

Academic Policies: Copyright, Plagiarism, Peer-to-Peer, Academic Freedom, etc.

Curriculum Guidelines

Curricular Audits

Curricular Tables

Graduation Rates

HEADS Report

IPEDS

New Faculty Orientation

Registrar Reports

Room Usage

Satisfaction Academic Progress

Student Course Evaluations

Student Success Committee minutes

Syllabi

Transfer and Credit Hour Policy

Admissions

Admissions Packet

Admissions Profile

Campus Visit Reports

Comparative Reports

Clearing House Reports

Demographic Reports

Enrollment Management Committee minutes

Institutional Aid

Merit Scholarship Report

Assessment of Student Learning

Academic Program Reviews

Assessment Progress Reports

Curriculum and Assessment Council minutes (CAC)

Curriculum Hierarchy

Educational Assessment Plan (EAP)

Framework for Institutional Effectiveness

Student Learning Outcomes, Core Competencies (General Education)

Continuing Education

Constant Contact Reports

Course Evaluations
Google Analytics
Young Artist Conversion Rates

Communications
Communication Reports
Exhibition Attendance and Calendar
Media Mentions
Social Media Tallies
Web Visitors

Development
Donor Reports
Institutional Development Plan
Alumni Surveys

Financial
Audited Financial Statements
Budget and Financial Reports
DCAD Institutional Aid Yield
Financial Plans
Financial Aid Default Rates
Facilities Master Plan
Facilities, equipment, health, and safety
Operating and Revenue and Expense Report
Student Housing Reports

Governance
Board Reports
Board Minutes
Board Policies, Conflict of Interest
Job description and qualifications of the President
Governing documents, charter and by-laws
List of Board Members, with job titles
Orientation Materials from the Board

Human Resources
Faculty and Staff Handbook
DCAD Personnel Policy Manual
Faculty staffing plans
Job Descriptions

New Employee Orientation

Faculty Data

Institutional Research*

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)

CCSSE 2012 Report

Grade Distribution

Graduation Rates

Fact Book

HEOA Consumer Information

Institutional Framework, Benchmark Reports

Kansas Study

Instructional Costs

Employee Satisfaction

College Student Selection Questionnaire (CSSQ)

Retention Studies

HEOA Compliance Report

Student Surveys

Curriculum Audits

Library

Collection Report

Resource Plan

Student Services

Clery Report

Fire Report

Health and Safety Report

Policies and procedures for student grievances

Student Satisfaction Surveys

Student Handbook

* Collaborative Reports

TIMELINE FOR SELF-STUDY

2012

November   Attend MSCHE Self- Study Institute
        Select Self- Study Model
        Provide dates to Middle States for spring 2013 Self- Study Preparation Visit

December   Appoint Steering Committees & Working Groups
        Attend Communications Self- Study Kick Off
        Steering Committee Information Session
        Develop Draft Self-Study Timeline
        Begin identifying existing resources and data to be utilized by the Working Groups
        Finalize schedule for Self- Study Preparation Visit
        Appoint Working Groups and determine structure in relation to standards

2013

January   Develop intended outcomes for Self-Study
        Identify preferences for Team Chair and Evaluators
        Continue to identify existing resources and data to be utilized by Working Groups
        Create Self- Study Design template
        Finalize Self- Study Timeline
        Develop research questions for Working Groups
        Continue identifying existing resources and data to be utilized by Working Groups
        Begin writing Self -Study Design

February   Determine data still needed to conduct Self-Study and develop plans to obtain
        Identify and develop Self-Study Communication methodologies
        Write Self-Study Design

April   Submit Self- Study Design for approval by President
        Send Self- Study Designs to Middle States V.P.
        Share Self -Study Design with Campus
        Send Self -Study Design to Board

April 25   Host Middle States Preparation Visit

June   Integrate new 2014-2019 Strategic Plan into the Self-Study Design

April –   Conduct research to answer guiding questions and demonstrate compliance with standards
December   Oversee research and reporting by Working Groups
        Implement plans to gather additional data needed for Working Groups

2014

January-   Compile and submit Working Group draft reports to Steering Committees
March   Revise Working Group Reports and submit to Self-Study Co-chairs
                  Provide feedback on selection of Evaluation Team Chair(s) sent by Middle States
                  Select dates for Chair(s)' preliminary visit and Evaluation Team Visit
                  (*recommend selecting Oct/Nov 2014 date for Chair's preliminary visit and March 15 -April*
                  15, 2015 date for Evaluation Team Visit)
                  Send copies of Self-Study Design to Evaluation Team Chair(s)
                  Review Working Group Report and determine any additional areas for study and analysis
                  Compile and submit Working Group Final Report to Steering Committees

April –   Write Draft Self-Study Report
August   Provide feedback on selection of Evaluation Team members sent by Middle States

September   Provide Draft Self-Study Report for review by campus community
                  Incorporate feedback from College and finalize Draft Self-Study Report

September   Submit Draft Self-Study Report for approval by President
                  Send Draft Self-Study Report to Board
                  Send Draft Self-Study Report to Evaluation Team Chair for review

October   Host Middle States Team Chair(s) for preliminary visit and receive recommendations about
                  Draft Self-Study Report

October–   Prepare final version of Self-Study Report
December   Submit Self-Study Report for review by the President

December 1,   Provide Self-Study Report for review by campus community
2014   Incorporate feedback from campus and finalize Self-Study Report

2015

January   Send Final Self-Study Report to the President for review
                  Secure signatures of President and Board Chair for Certification Statements
                  Bind Self-Study Report
                  Finalize online Self-Study support resources and appendices

January 30   Submit final Self-Study Report to Evaluation Teams and Middle States
                  Send final Self-Study Report to Board members

March 15- April 15	Host Evaluation Teams for Reaccreditation Visit
April – May	Receive Evaluation Team Report Compile responses to Evaluation Team Report
May June	Convene Steering Committee to review Evaluation Report and results of visits Communicate action by Commission to institutions regarding reaccreditation

PROFILE OF VISITING TEAM

The College would like MSCHE to consider evaluation team members who can provide feedback generated through the self-study process that will benefit the College. These are the suggested characteristics:

- Chairperson, an established administrator with experience at an art school of similar size and scope and with recent MSCHE Self-Study experience
- Chairperson and/or one member of the Evaluation Team who has been a change-agent for enrollment growth, curriculum redesign, student success, and diversified revenue stream at his/her institution
- Evaluation Team who have in depth knowledge of best practices and expertise in
    - Admissions
    - Institutional Effectiveness
    - Planning and Assessment
    - Resource Allocation

The College would like MSCHE to consider evaluation team members from peer institutions:
> Maryland Institute College of Art, Baltimore, MD
> More College of Art and Design, Philadelphia, PA
> Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, Philadelphia PA
> University of the Arts, Philadelphia PA

Appendix A

2014 – 2019 Strategic Plan

Strategic Goals

1. Grow Existing Programs
2. Enhanced Support of Academic and Social Needs of Students
3. Build on an Infrastructure that Supports Excellence
4. Strengthen the Institution's Sustainability and Strategic Effectiveness

Strategic Goals and Objectives

1. GROW EXISTING PROGRAMS

1. Stabilize annual enrollment at 240 to 245 students.
   - Determine market position.
   - Investigate the feasibility of implementing new academic programs and internships.
2. Demonstrate rising annual first-to-second year retention.
   - Utilize annual student satisfaction surveys.
   - Strengthen academic and financial aid advisement.
3. Increase post-graduation acceptance opportunities to four-year institutions.
   - Formalize articulation agreements with B.F.A granting institutions.
   - Improve transfer advisement.

2. ENHANCED SUPPORT OF ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL NEEDS OF STUDENTS

1. Use curricular maps to integrate student-learning outcomes at the course, program, co-curricular and institution-wide levels.
   - Maintain a series of annual reports describing how assessments of student learning outcomes are being implemented.
2. Develop a mandatory First Year Experience (FYE) for new students.
   - Investigate and initiate curricular and co-curricular activities.
3. Increase library holdings.
   - Seek outside funding.
4. Explore additional student support services.

   - Develop strategies to support underprepared students.
   - Investigate strategies to meet the mental and physical health needs of students

3. BUILD ON AN INFRASTRUCTURE THAT SUPPORTS EXCELLENCE

1. Meet accreditation and federal standards regarding the College's governing board.
   - Revise the College's by-laws, committee structures, and policies and procedures.
2. Develop systematic academic and administrative program review cycles for each constituent unit and use the data from these reviews as a basis for planning and resource allocation.
   - Develop a performance appraisal system that annually ties the performance goals of each employee to one or more of the institution's strategic initiatives.

- Improve Academic Program Review reporting.
- Ensure budgeting and human resource decisions are dictated by best practices.

3. Maximize use of technology.

- Develop an Institutional Technology Plan.
- Research and implement Learning Management System software.
- Research and implement Customer Relation Management software.
- Move to software system services (the Cloud) for Adobe Creative Suites.

4. Maximize use of current facilities.

- Complete renovation of the second floor to create additional office and classroom space.
- Expand physical library space.

4. **STRENGTHEN THE INSTITUTION'S SUTAINABILITY AND STRATEGIC EFFECTIVENESS**

1. Align the institutional planning process, the budgeting process, and strategies for assessing institutional effectiveness.
   - Revise institutional and educational effectiveness plans.
2. Communicate decision-making processes that are defined and inclusive of external and internal constituents.

- Update handbooks and department policies and procedures.