MUHLENBERG COLLEGE

Self-Study Design

June 11, 2014

Prepared by The Steering Committee, Dr. Giacomo Gambino and Dr. Kathleen Harring, Co-Chairs for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Table of Contents

Institutional Overview

Founded in 1848, Muhlenberg College is committed to the highest standards of academic integrity and excellence. It is an independent, undergraduate, coeducational institution related to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The College is located in Allentown, Pennsylvania, in the residential West End neighborhood, approximately 55 miles north of Philadelphia and 90 miles west of New York City.

As a liberal arts college, Muhlenberg offers programs in the humanities, the natural and social sciences, the performing arts, and in professional areas such as business, education, pre-medical, pre-theological, and pre-law studies. Flexibility is provided through course options and opportunities for independent study, research and internships, and through a plan for self-designed majors. Striving to keep its curriculum vital and current with the rapidly changing intellectual world, the College is now in the first year of implementing new general education requirements. The excellence and integrity of the Muhlenberg program have been recognized by Phi Beta Kappa and by some 13 additional national honor societies which have established chapters at the College.

In addition to its traditional liberal arts offerings, the College's Wescoe School serves adult students in the Lehigh Valley with a variety of innovative and educational opportunities. Wescoe School's academic programs enable adult learners to complete a degree, earn a certificate or take classes for enrichment. Students may also take classes as part of their preparation for graduate, law or medical school. Bachelor's degrees and certificates are offered in the traditional liberal arts in more than 25 fields of study. Associate's degrees are offered in Business Administration, Accounting, Computer Science, and Psychology.

Muhlenberg's academic program is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, the Department of Education of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the New York State Board of Regents. The College is on the approved list of the American Chemical Society. It is also a member of the American Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, Association of Governing Boards, the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, the College Entrance Examination Board, the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities, the National Collegiate Honors Council, the Council of Independent Colleges, and the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Pennsylvania.

Significant in the College's tradition are the historic ties between the College and the Lutheran Church. The name Muhlenberg College was adopted in 1867 – 19 years after the College was founded – in honor of the patriarch of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. The sons of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg made important contributions to the early life of our country. General John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg wintered at Valley Forge with George Washington; Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg was the first speaker of the United States House of Representatives; and Henry Ernst Muhlenberg was one of the most eminent early American scientists and the first president of Franklin College, now Franklin and Marshall College. All of these men were clergymen who symbolized the relationship of the church to the

life of the mind and the life of public service. Muhlenberg owes much of the distinctiveness of its character and the quality of its life to the historic and continuing relationship with the church.

The College is committed to nurturing a strong sense of community while developing greater diversity among its faculty, students, and staff. As part of its commitment to fruitful interaction between diverse traditions, and also acknowledging the significant Jewish presence that has long marked its life, the College established the Institute for Jewish-Christian Understanding in 1989 to promote deeper understanding between the two communities. Moreover, the Newman Center and the Muslim Students Association provide support and foster dialogue among other faith traditions. The College's new Diversity Initiative has initiated special strategies to recruit students, faculty, and staff, which will result in a greater diversity in the College community. These initiatives will build on the strong tradition of religious diversity within its community and provide greater opportunities for dialogue and understanding truly unique among church-related institutions.

Mission Statement

Muhlenberg College aims to develop independent critical thinkers who are intellectually agile, characterized by a zest for reasoned and civil debate, committed to understanding the diversity of the human experience, able to express ideas with clarity and grace, committed to life-long learning, equipped with ethical and civic values, and prepared for lives of leadership and service. The College is committed to providing an intellectually rigorous undergraduate education within the context of a supportive, diverse residential community. Our curriculum integrates the traditional liberal arts with selected pre-professional studies. Our faculty are passionate about teaching, value close relationships with students, and are committed to the pedagogical and intellectual importance of research. All members of our community are committed to educating the whole person through experiences within and beyond the classroom. Honoring its historical heritage from the Lutheran Church and its continuing connection with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Muhlenberg encourages, welcomes, and celebrates a variety of faith traditions and spiritual perspectives.

Statement on Diversity

Muhlenberg College believes that diversity, in many forms and expressions, is essential to its educational mission and to its success as a community. We believe that a broad range of human perspectives, experiences, backgrounds, and opinions enriches the academic experience, stimulates intellectual rigor, enhances the quality of life on campus, and prepares our graduates for lives of leadership and service in a democratic, pluralistic society and a diverse world. We believe that our academic program is not able to achieve the goals set in our mission statement unless each member of the community recognizes and understands the benefits, conflicts, tensions, and intersections that are inherent in diversity. Diversity is, therefore, a fundamental Muhlenberg value. To that end, we assume the responsibility of providing educational opportunities to students of talent and potential and professional opportunities to talented faculty and staff representing many different backgrounds and experiences. This reflects our College's commitment to principles of justice, equality, and democracy.

The College has already achieved an admirable degree of diversity in several important respects, such as religion, intellectual pursuits, socio-economic background, and sexual orientation. We recognize that these successes must not lead to complacency, but inspire us to continued effort. Muhlenberg must recommit itself with renewed energy to recruiting and retaining diverse students, faculty, and staff whose range of viewpoints, cultural perspectives, race, ethnicity, sexual orientations, gender identities, lifestyles, interests, political beliefs, nationalities, economic backgrounds, physical abilities, and religious and spiritual values will enrich our curriculum and campus life. We must also commit ourselves to persistent and vigorous efforts to confront and challenge prejudiced attitudes and behaviors that exclude, demean, or marginalize members of our community by breaking down existing barriers that prevent meaningful discussions about diversity. Finally, Muhlenberg College also commits itself to good citizenship in the wider, local community by supporting with our business those vendors and services that are operated by and fairly employ underrepresented groups. (Please note that the current Diversity Statement is under review and expected to be revised by the end of 2014.)

College Governance

The College operates under a Charter granted it by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and under Bylaws adopted by the Board of Trustees as amended from time to time. Dr. Peyton Randolph "Randy" Helm, who has served as Muhlenberg's eleventh President since 2003, reports to the Board of Trustees, currently chaired by Mr. Richard C. Crist, Jr., '77 who took over leadership of the Board in 2013. In January 2014 President Helm announced his retirement from the College, effective June 30, 2015. The Board of Trustees initiated a national search for a successor that began in spring 2014.

Recent Developments

After engaging in a comprehensive review of the general education curriculum, the faculty approved the current Academic Program Goals in fall 2011. These goals highlight the skills, knowledge, and habits of mind that each graduate is expected to achieve by fulfilling Muhlenberg academic requirements. The faculty passed the new General Education program which emphasizes Academic Skills, Intellectual Exploration, and Integrative Learning in May 2012. With support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the new curriculum was implemented in AY 2013-2014 with the incoming class of 2017. In the past decade, the faculty also developed new majors in Jewish Studies, Film Studies, and Neuroscience, as well as minors in Africana Studies and Public Health.

In the years since our reaccreditation in 2006, the College has seen significant changes in the physical plant, the general education program, and the Senior Staff. In AY 2006 – 2007, Muhlenberg opened the new Multicultural Center located at 2252 Chew Street and a $31 million expansion and renovation of science facilities, including a new science building, and renovations of Shankweiler (life sciences) and Trumbower (chemistry, physics, math) Buildings. Other significant building projects include: 1) the completion of 2201 Chew Street Residence Hall and the Village, making a total of six new residence buildings that offer apartment-style housing for upper-class students; 2) the opening of the Rehearsal House, which includes an outdoor amphitheater, to provide rehearsal and performance space for the Departments of Theatre and

Dance and Music; 3) the renovation and addition to the Hillel House, which includes office and classroom space for the Sociology and Anthropology Department; and 4) the completion of renovations to Seegers Union and the addition of the Ilene and Robert Wood Dining Commons, which included new kitchens, servery, student club space, meeting rooms, performance space, and expansion of the Career Center, Academic Resource Center, and Disability Services Office. Currently, a comprehensive renovation is underway to East Hall, Muhlenberg's oldest residence hall and a model of Collegiate Gothic architecture.

Since 2006, the College has also welcomed several new members to the President's seven-person Senior Staff. Karen Green, Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, was appointed in 2006 and John Ramsay, Provost, took over leadership of Academic Affairs in 2009. More recently, Rebekkah Brown '99 joined the College as Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations and The Rev. Callista Isabelle was appointed College Chaplain.

The significant progress made by the College in recent years has laid the groundwork for the challenges and opportunities on the horizon. The College will complete implementation of its current strategic plan, *Momentum*, in the 2014-15 academic year, and the new president is expected to initiate a new strategic planning process upon his/her arrival. Muhlenberg is currently seeking to raise $11 million in endowment gifts for financial aid and educational programs as a bridge between its successful *Talents* campaign (completed in 2010 with $110.4 million raised) and an anticipated new campaign in support of the next strategic plan. The College will also complete and begin implementing a new Strategic Diversity Plan. Progress on these initiatives will help the College position itself for a smooth presidential transition in 2015.

Self-Study Model

In order to support a process that would be most useful to the current and future needs of the institution, the Steering Committee chose the Comprehensive Report as the model for our Self-Study and combined the 14 Standards of Excellence into seven chapters that align with our institutional structure and culture.

Chapter 1	Mission, Goals, and Integrity	Standards 1 & 6
Chapter 2	Planning, Resources, and Renewal	Standards 2 & 3
Chapter 3	Governance and Administration	Standards 4 & 5
Chapter 4	Admissions and Student Life	Standards 8 & 9
Chapter 5	Faculty	Standard 10
Chapter 6	Academic Programs, General Education and Related Educational Activities	Standards 11, 12, &13
Chapter 7	Institutional and Student Learning Assessment	Standards 7 & 14

Goals of the Self-Study

The self-study and supporting documents that Muhlenberg College submits to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) will show that we are in compliance with the fourteen Standards of Excellence and their fundamental elements. The results of our data collection and analysis will also inform college-wide assessment and planning and fulfill other related goals. The process of engaging in an institution-wide examination and reflection will allow us:

1) to take stock of who we are as an institution, to prepare for a presidential transition, to strengthen institutional identity and sense of community, and to plan for the future;

2) to identify, consistent with our mission, strengths and weaknesses and to develop recommendations to support institutional improvement and effectiveness;

3) to evaluate assessment processes across the institution and to share best practices in the design of assessment activities and the use of findings to improve effectiveness and to support student learning;

4) to provide a catalyst for the initial assessment of the recently implemented general education curriculum and

5) to demonstrate compliance with the MSCHE Standards.

Organizational Structure of Steering Committee, Working Groups and Liaison Groups

The Steering Committee is made up of two Committee Co-chairs, co-chairs of the seven Working Groups and the Executive Assistant to the President, who serves as the Process Assistant. A faculty member and an administrator are paired as co-chairs for each of the working groups. In order to make sure there would be effective flow of information between individuals involved in institutional decision-making and/or faculty governance, the Steering Committee includes members of the President's Senior Staff, of the Provost Senior Staff, and faculty who have or currently hold leadership positions as department chairs or committee chairs. Particular attention was paid to having faculty from across the divisions and to having faculty with expertise on assessment, personnel issues, and general education revision. To facilitate college-wide engagement in the self-study process, the Steering Committee will consult regularly with two liaison groups – one comprised of trustees and one representing the student body. The Chair of the Board of Trustees has appointed members to the Middle States Trustee liaison group composed of six members, including the Chair. The student liaison group includes the current Student Government President and five other students nominated by staff in Student Affairs and in Academic Affairs and by faculty members.

Composition of Steering Committee

Co-Chairs
Dr. Jack Gambino   Professor of Political Science
Dr. Kathleen Harring   Dean of Institutional Assessment and Academic Planning and
                           Professor of Psychology

Steering Committee Members
Bruce Anderson   Chair & Professor of Chemistry
Mike Bruckner   Vice President for Public Relations
Michele Deegan   Chair & Associate Professor of Political Science
Kent Dyer P'07, P'10   Chief Business Officer & Treasurer
Laura Edelman   Professor of Psychology
Chris Hooker-Haring '72   Dean of Admission & Financial Aid
    P'09, P'10
Michael Huber P'14   Dean of Academic Life & Associate Professor of Mathematics
Christine Ingersoll   Director of the Faculty Center for Teaching & Professor of
                           Chemistry
Callista Isabelle   Chaplain
Elizabeth McCain   Chair & Professor of Biology
John Ramsay P'12, P'14   Provost
Mark Stein   Chair & Associate Professor of History

Composition of Working Groups

Like the Steering Committee, the working groups include a broad representation of the
Muhlenberg community. Members represent diverse positions with expertise directly related to
the charge of their working group. All working groups include at least one Muhlenberg alumnus
and/or parent.

Group #1: Standards 1 (Mission) and 6 (Integrity)
Co-chairs: Callista Isabelle, Mark Stein
Kelly Cannon   Outreach and Scholarly Communication Librarian
Lee Kolbe   Title IX Coordinator in the Division of Student Affairs
Tad Robinson   Associate Professor of Philosophy
Cynthia Amaya Santiago '01 Senior Associate Director & Coordinator of Multicultural
                           Recruitment

Group #2: Standards 2 (Planning) and 3 (Resources)
Co-chairs: Bruce Anderson, Kent Dyer
Rebekkah Brown '99   Vice President of Development and Alumni Relations
Don Dale   Associate Professor of Economics
Tina Hertel   Director of Trexler Library
Harry Miller   Director of Information Technology
Patrick Williams   Assistant Professor of Neuroscience and Biology

Group #3: Standards 4 (Governance) and 5 (Administration)
Co-chairs: Mike Bruckner, Jack Gambino
Melissa Falk '92	Associate Dean of Admission and Financial Aid
Susan Kahlenberg '93	Associate Professor of Media and Communication
Richard Romeo '79	Trustee
Anne Speck	Vice President of Human Resources
Bruce Wightman	Professor of Biology

Group #4: Standards 7 (Institutional Assessment) and 14 (Student Learning Assessment)
Co-chairs: Kathy Harring, Elizabeth McCain
Adam Clark	Associate Professor of Physics
Nicole Hammel '01	Director of Institutional Research & Records
Jen Jarson	Head of Public Outreach & Information Literacy Services Information Literacy and Assessment Librarian
Jan Schumacher	Director of Residential Services

Group #5: Standards 8 (Student Enrollment) and 9 (Student Services)
Co-chairs: Laura Edelman, Chris Hooker-Haring
Alana Albus	Director of the Career Center
Aaron Bova '00	Senior Associate Director of Housing Services
Wendy Cole	Director of the Academic Resource Center & Assistant Dean of Academic Life
Jane Flood	Chair & Associate Professor of Physics
Karen Green	Dean of Students & Vice President for Student Affairs
Robin Riley-Casey	Director of Multicultural Life
Jeremy Teissere	Associate Professor of Biology and Neuroscience

Group #6: Standard 10 (Faculty)
Co-chairs: Michele Deegan, John Ramsay
David Amdur	Assistant Professor of Economics
Krista Bywater	Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology
Amy Hark	Past Director of the Faculty Center for Teaching & Associate Professor of Biology
Chris Herrick	Professor of Political Science
James Peck	Professor of Theatre Arts

Group #7: Standards 11 (Academic Programs), 12 (General Education) and 13 (Related Educational Activities)
Co-chairs: Michael Huber, Christine Ingersoll
Curtis Dretsch	Professor of Theatre Arts
Beth Halpern	Director of Community Engagement
Jane Hudak	Dean of the Wescoe School of Muhlenberg College
Cathy Kim	Lecturer & Coordinator of Professional Programs
Donna Kish-Goodling	Dean of Global Education & Professor of Economics
Trevor Knox	Associate Professor of Accounting and Economics

Holmes Miller   Chair of Accounting, Business, Economics and Finance &
                                   Professor of Business
Lora Taub-Pervizpour   Associate Dean for Digital Learning, Chair & Associate Professor
                                   of Media and Communication

Trustee Liaison Group
Richard Crist, Jr. '77, P'05, P'09 – Board Chair
Lance Bruck '89
Linda Cenci '75, P'06
Julie Hamre '72
Rich Romeo '79
Donna Tyson '78

Student Liaison Group
Brandon Hamilton '16 – Student Government Association President, undeclared
Matt Dacher '16 - Political Science and International Studies major
Carly Lyon '16 - English major
Megan Nehila '16 - Media & Communications major
Jeff Funk '16 - Sociology major and Women Studies minor
Jessica Wilson '16 - Chemistry major and Music minor

Working Group Charge Questions and Information Sources

Working Group 1: Mission, Goals, and Integrity

Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives
The institution's mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and explains whom the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals and objectives, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission, goals, and objectives are developed and recognized by the institution with its members and its governing body, and are utilized to develop and shape its programs and practices, and to evaluate its effectiveness.

Charge Questions

- What are the principal components of the mission statement?
- How has the mission statement changed as a function of strategic planning or other types of planning and what processes led to the change?
- What processes are used to revise and update the mission?
- How does the mission inform goals and objectives at all levels of the College?
- How are the College's mission, goals, and objectives communicated to students, faculty, and staff? How well do these constituents understand the College's mission, goals, and objectives?
- How do the College's mission, goals, and objectives make Muhlenberg distinctive as compared to other small liberal arts colleges?

Sources of Information

1. Document Review
   Fundamental Institutional Values
   The Talents Entrusted to Our Care: Muhlenberg's Strategic Plan 2004 – 2009
   2009 Progress Report on Strategic Plan
   Momentum: Muhlenberg's Strategic Plan 2010 – 2015
   2014 Progress Report on Strategic Plan
   Previous & Current Mission Statements
   Diversity Statement
   Diversity Strategic Planning Committee Report
   Student Guide
   Faculty Handbook
   Handbook for Managers
   College Bylaws
   Handbook for Support Staff
   Academic Program Goals
   New Curriculum
   College Catalog
   College Website
   Source Book
   Benchmarking of peer institutions' mission statements
   Reports of student survey data related to this standard
   Student Service offices goals and outcomes documents

2. Surveys and Focus Groups
   Internal surveys and focus groups to assess the College's mission and values, and how
   well the College is communicating these to students, faculty and staff

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 to academic and intellectual freedom.

Charge Questions

- How effective are the College's policies and practices in assuring equitable and
  appropriately consistent treatment of constituencies, including faculty, staff, and
  students?
- Are there fair and impartial processes, published and widely available, to address student,
  faculty, and staff grievances promptly, appropriately, and equitably?
- How clear are the statements about integrity and how breeches of integrity are handled,
  including the Social Code and Academic Integrity Code?
- How are such policies communicated to constituents?
- How do statements and practices of integrity reflect the mission statement?
- How does the College support and guarantee academic freedom?

Sources of Information

1. Document Review
    Mission Statement
    Diversity Statement
    Fundamental Institutional Values
    Academic Judicial Board minutes about Academic Integrity Code name change
    Academic Integrity Code and procedure documents (i.e. flowchart for dealing with academic integrity issues)
    R.A. training document about dealing with social code violations in the residence halls
    Faculty Handbook
    Non-Discrimination Statement
    Handbook for Managers
    Handbook for Support Staff
    Student Guide
    Sexual Harassment online training policy
    Federal mandates for sexual misconduct policy
    Training manuals and handbooks for social and academic judicial boards
    Intellectual property policies
    Benchmarking of peer institutions' key documents related to this standard
    College Employee Conflict of Interest forms

2. Surveys and Focus Groups
    Internal surveys and focus groups to assess the College's communication of policies, and if the constituencies perceive they are receiving equitable treatment, and if the College is fostering climate of mutual respect

Working Group 2: Institutional Planning, Renewal, and Resources

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission, and uses 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.

Charge Questions

- What process is in place for planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal and how well is it implemented? How effective are assessments of these processes?
- How are trustees, faculty, staff and students involved in the process and how is information communicated?
- What major successes have developed and what limitations have been encountered out of the process of planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal during the last 10 years?
- How does the process of planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal align with the mission of the College?
- How effectively do we utilize our existing resources including: financial, personnel, technical, and physical facilities? Who is responsible for assessing how well existing resources are utilized?
- To what extent is the current system for capital resource planning an effective one, and does it coordinate with long-term planning, new construction, renovations, maintenance, and fund-raising efforts?
- To what extent does the College integrate current technology into the work environment and empower its employees to effectively utilize it?
- How does the College compare resource-wise with similar institutions?

Sources of Information

1. Document Review
   Budget Summaries 2005-06; 2015-16
   2014 Peer Endowment Comparisons
   2014 Peer Endowment Comparisons – Value Per Student
   Total Financial Resources Per Student (FTE)
   Classroom Availability Analysis
   Office of Information Technology Board of Observers Report
   Library Board of Observers Report
   Human Resources: Employee/Student Data
   Faculty Salary & Endowment Dollars Per Student Data
   Human Resources Benchmarking – Spring 2014
   Treasurer's Office Benchmarking
   Library Benchmarking
   Office of Information Technology Benchmarking
   Momentum: Muhlenberg's Strategic Plan 2010 – 2015
   2014 Progress Report on Strategic Plan
   Funding allocation and connection with strategic initiatives
   Plant Operation facilities inspections
   Reporting Compliance Checklist
   Online Task Force Report
   Plant Operations Board of Observers Report

2. Surveys and Interviews
   HERI Faculty Survey
   Internal surveys to assess how faculty, department chairs, and managers believe they have sufficient resources to perform their job and the mission of their program
   Interviews of key administrators including the President, Vice President of Human Resources, Provost, and the Chief Business Officer and Treasurer.

Working Group 3: Leadership, Governance, and Administration

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.

Charge Questions

- What role do the Board of Trustees play in College governance and how is the Board's functioning assessed?
- How effective is the communications flow among the various constituencies involved in the College's governance (e.g., the Board, administration, faculty, students)?
- Does the Board have procedures for evaluating the President's performance? Are these procedures effective?
- Are there well-defined structures that delineate governing responsibilities of trustees, faculty, administration, and students?
- Does the current structure of faculty committees, department chairs, faculty observers to the Board, etc. allow for adequate, appropriate and effective faculty participation in college governance?

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.

Charge Questions

- What is the organizational structure of the administration? Is there a clear delineation of administrative responsibilities?
- How effective is the administrative structure in facilitating the mission of the College?
- Is there effective communication between administrative departments and the broader College community (e.g., faculty, students, and other administrators)? Are there methods in place for ensuring effective communication?
- How does the institution ensure that administrative leaders and staff have and maintain qualifications and skills necessary to carry out their responsibilities?

Sources of Information

1. Document Review
   College Charter
   College Bylaws
   New Board Member Orientation and Assessment Document
   Evaluation of the President (Process Document)
   Report of the Muhlenberg College *ad hoc* Trustee Recruitment and Qualification
   Committee
   Report of the Muhlenberg College *ad hoc* Trustee Governance Committee
   Conflict of Interest Policy
   Student Government Documents, including the process for selecting students to serve on
   faculty and college committees
   Source Book
   Managers Job Descriptions
   Manager Handbook
   Faculty Handbook
   Documents on Governing Board Structure and Members
   Governance Committee 2004 Final Report
   AAUP's Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities
   Documents pertaining to the Process of Performance Evaluations of Managers
   Faculty Meeting Minutes and Year End Committee Reports
   Momentum: Muhlenberg's Strategic Plan 2010 – 2015
   2014 Progress Report on Strategic Plan

2. Surveys and Interviews
   Internal survey of managers (a short survey based on the AAUP's Evaluation of Shared
   Governance questionnaire) to be administered during the Fall Semester, 2015
   HERI Faculty Survey
   Workplace Dynamics Survey
   Reports on other existing College surveys addressing governance issues
   Interviews with President, Provost, Chief Business Officer and Treasurer, Vice President
   of Human Resources, selected faculty department chairs, past and present Faculty
   Observers to the Board, select faculty committee chairs, and student government leaders

Working Group 4: Institutional and Student Learning Assessment

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment
The institution has developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates its
overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation
standards.

Charge Questions

- What processes are in place to support the assessment of institutional effectiveness? How
  do assessment results inform program revision, resource allocation (i.e., human and

financial), and future planning? What type of support does the College provide to sustain and develop assessment programs?

- How is assessment embedded into institutional strategic planning? How are strategic planning initiatives assessed? How do strategic planning assessment results inform resource allocation (i.e., human and financial) and future planning?
- How have results been used to inform revisions to assessment processes and instruments? How can the institution improve its assessment procedures?
- How does the institution share institutional assessment findings with both internal and external stakeholders to provide evidence that supports mission and goals?

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 goals and appropriate higher education goals.

Charge Questions

- Are there clearly articulated student learning outcomes at the institutional, program, and course levels?
- What methods do we use to assess student learning at the institutional, program, and course level?
- What types of information do we collect at the institutional, program and course level to assess student learning?
- How is this information used to improve teaching and learning outcomes and to inform resource allocation?
- How does the institution share student learning assessment findings with both internal and external stakeholders to provide evidence that supports mission and goals?
- How effective are current student learning assessment practices?
- How can the institution improve its student learning assessment practices?

Sources of Information

1. Document Review
   Academic Department Annual Assessment Reports
   Administrative Department Annual Assessment Reports
   Enrollment Projection reports
   Source Book
   Program/Department Websites
   Sample Syllabi
   Link to Institutional Research/ Assessment Website
   Assessment Resources
   Faculty Center for Teaching Program Information
   Board of Observers Reviews(guidelines, schedule, reports and summary of recommendations) for Administrative and Academic Departments
   Momentum: Muhlenberg's Strategic Plan 2010 – 2015
   2014 Progress Report on Strategic Plan
   Strategic Diversity Plan and reports

Reporting Compliance List
Assessment Workshops (agendas)
New Course Approval Process and Forms
General Education Assessment Plan (proposal)
MSCHE 2011 PRR and reviewers' report
MSCHE 2006 Self-Study and Team Report

2. Surveys and Analysis
   CIRP First Year Survey
   NSSE Survey
   HEDS Senior Survey
   CIRP CSS
   Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ)
   Exit Survey
   HERI Faculty Survey
   IPEDS Data
   Common Data Set

Working Group 5: Student Admissions, Retention, and Support Services

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.

Charge Questions

- To what extent are students selected for admission in a way that is consistent with institutional values and goals as articulated in the Mission Statement and within the context of institutional resources?
- To what extent are admissions selection criteria clearly stated and easily accessible? How well do current admissions criteria predict student progress and degree completion?
- To what extent does Muhlenberg provide accurate, comprehensive information about academic and co-curricular programs, financial aid, scholarships, loans, refunds, etc. to prospective students? To what extent does Muhlenberg provide accurate, comprehensive information about job placement, graduate school placement, graduation rates, etc.?
- How are policies related to transfer admission, transfer credit, and part-time adult education programs communicated?
- Are there common characteristics among students who fail academically or who do not persist at Muhlenberg? How are the academic success rates of different student populations tracked and assessed? How are "at risk" students identified in the admissions process and supported once enrolled at Muhlenberg?
- How have admissions strategies changed or adjusted to the changing demographics? What strategies are used to attracted students beyond the tri-state area and how successful are those strategies? Are there strategies to attract and support religious diversity at Muhlenberg?

- What strategies are used to attract minority students and how successful are those strategies? How are minority students supported once they enroll at Muhlenberg?
- How do different sub-groups of admitted students compare in terms of academic outcomes, major choice, etc. (i.e., Early Decision vs. Regular Decision; Test-Optional vs. Test-Submitters, etc.)?
- Are there strategies to attract and support religious diversity at Muhlenberg?

Sources of Information

1. Document Review
   Knocking at the College Door: Projections of High School Graduates
   College Catalog
   Admissions publications
   Admissions Website
   Admissions strategies (for recruitment of differentiated populations (i.e., multicultural students, geographically distant students, international students, religiously diverse students, etc.)
   Financial Aid publications
   Financial Aid Website

2. Surveys, Analysis, and Focus Groups
   Admitted Student Questionnaire
   Exit Survey
   Career Survey
   CIRP CSS
   Graduation and Retention Rates (overall and disaggregated)
   Analysis of academic performance and graduation rates of test-optional vs. test-submitter students for the past five years
   Analysis of academic performance and graduation rates and major distribution of Early Decision vs. Regular Decision students for the past five years
   Analysis of patterns of success and persistence over the past five years
   Document "Pink Sheet/Gold Sheet" process, as well as other support mechanisms for "at risk" students
   Analysis of data on how successful the support mechanisms are
   Focus Groups with students to assess major admissions messages, web presence, financial aid information, etc.

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.

Charge Questions

- What services are available to support students' academic and social life, and how do these services reflect the mission of the college?

- How is information regarding services communicated to students and how effective are our current on-line resources that support student services?
- How are support services personnel (professional and student) recruited, supervised, and evaluated?
- How are students' needs, use, and satisfaction with services assessed and how do we plan for appropriate support services for an increasingly diverse student population?
- How well does the college provide effective support services for a diverse undergraduate student body, including domestic students from racially and ethnically different backgrounds, international students, students with disabilities, commuters, transfer student, and students from other underrepresented groups?
- What is the role of peer support in student services? How do we train students to be successful in their involvement in peer support and how do we assess the success of students involved in peer support?
- How do we maintain our sense of community in an increasingly diverse student population?

Sources of Information

1. Document Review
   Annual Reports from each service area
   Annual assessment reports from each service area
   Board of Observer reports from each service area
   Mission statements from each service area
   Source Book
   HR policy information about job descriptions, hiring, supervision, and evaluation
   Annual performance evaluations
   AACU task force study guide
   College FERPA Policy
   Fitness and Athletics Committee policies and reports
   Knocking at the College Door: Projections of High School Graduates

2. Surveys, Analysis, and Focus Groups
   NSSE Survey
   HEDS Senior Survey
   NCAA Survey
   IPEDS Data
   Academic Performance data (disaggregated by subgroups of students)
   NCAA graduation rate data
   Academic performance by Athletic Team
   Focus Groups with directors of each service area to assess their planning process for appropriate support services for an increasingly diverse student population

Working Group 6: Faculty

Standard 10: Faculty
The institution's instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

Charge Questions

- What standards and procedures are used in hiring, supporting, and evaluating tenured and tenure eligible, contract and adjunct (including Wescoe) faculty? Are these clearly defined and consistently applied?
- How does our distribution of tenure eligible and adjunct faculty across disciplines and programs support the College's mission?
- What are the academic qualifications of the faculty and other staff who are responsible for the College's curriculum?
- In what ways are faculty and other professionals meeting and exceeding and demonstrating the College's high standards for teaching and professional growth in their fields?
- What opportunities for professional growth in the areas of teaching, research, scholarship and service are available from the College and utilized by faculty and other professionals?
- How does the Faculty Handbook describe the links between scholarship, teaching, student learning, research, and service in the annual, 2nd, and 3rd year reviews, tenure, and promotion evaluation processes? How often are these procedures and those governing grievances, discipline and dismissal procedures reviewed and revised?
- What is the process for implementing College standards and procedures for faculty and other professionals for actions such as appointment, promotion, tenure, grievance, discipline and dismissal?
- How are these linkages supported in the approval of grants for research and professional development and sabbatical applications?
- Are the procedures for evaluating department chairs and program directors clearly defined and consistently employed?
- What standards and procedures are used in hiring, supporting, and evaluating professionals who support the College's programs and how are the procedures assessed?
- Are the procedures and processes for student advising clearly defined and consistently employed?

Sources of Information

1. Document Review
   Hiring protocols including ads, diversity principles, interview protocols, and contract letter systems
   Review of Faculty Center for Teaching support and programs
   Faculty Handbook
   Description of recent student scholarship; recent examples of professional conferences and publications that featured student scholarship mentored by faculty
   Wescoe school documents on hiring and evaluation of faculty;
   Provost's Office statement on key considerations in faculty evaluation process;

Source Book
Faculty Awards and Recipients
Faculty Professional Activity Reports
Faculty Participation in Council on International Education Exchange programs

2. Surveys
   HERI Faculty Survey
   HEDS Senior Survey
   NSSE Survey
   Disabilities Services Survey of student use and rating of services

Working Group 7: Academic Programs, General Education, and Related Educational Activities

Standard 11: Educational Offerings
The institution's educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

Charge Questions

- How do the content, coherence, and rigor of the curriculum align with the academic learning goals and the College's mission statement?
- What opportunities exist for engaging and challenging our highest achieving students?
- In what ways do the educational offerings provide support for all students to realize their potential for academic achievement?
- In what ways and for what reasons have the educational offerings changed in the past ten years?
- What is the procedure for changing educational offerings (e.g., new majors/minors, changes in majors/minors, removal of majors/ minors)?
- How is this process related to the College's mission statement?
- What procedures exist for evaluating the effectiveness of educational programs?
- How do the use of technology (e.g., web resources, Blackboard, classroom equipment, online courses, e-portfolios), technology support, and library resources support learning outcomes?
- How do we encourage the integration of learning at the institution, program, and course levels?

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.

Charge Questions

- In what ways, and for what reasons, has the general education program changed over the past ten years?
- What processes are used to maintain and support the general education program?
- What is the relationship between the general education program goals and the College's mission statement?
- How are the purpose, goals and requirements of the program communicated to students?
- What is the institution's plan to determine whether the goals of the general education program (e.g. interdisciplinarity, integration, diversity) have been met, and for assessing the specific elements of the general education program (i.e., First Year Seminar, Human Difference and Global Engagement, Clusters, and Culminating Undergraduate Experiences)?
- What evidence demonstrates that general education skills (e.g., written and oral communication, reasoning, information literacy, technological competence) are achieved at the appropriate level? How is this evidence used to improve student learning?
- To what extent is the general education program related to and integrated with academic major programs?

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities
Institutional programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.

Charge Questions

- What additional opportunities, experiences and activities are available for students to learn (e.g., study abroad, including Muhlenberg International Programs; student exhibits, performances, and research presentations; independent study; faculty-student collaborative research; internships; service-learning; accelerated degree programs; certificate programs)?
- To what extent do these experiences relate to the institutional mission and connect theory and practice?
- What are the student learning goals and outcomes for related educational activities?
- How do these opportunities contribute to the intellectual climate on campus?
- Who takes advantage of these opportunities?
- Are there barriers to access for those who do not?
- How is participation in these educational activities encouraged by and integrated into the educational culture of the College?
- How does the College support these initiatives?

Sources of Information

1. Document Review
   College Mission Statement
   Wescoe School Mission Statement
   Academic Program Goals

Source Book
College Catalogs from last ten years
Muhlenberg College General Education Assessment Plan (proposal)
Registrar's Office documents on students' completion of General Education
Requirements (to include transfer courses)
Academic Policy Committee Documents on new curriculum and Implementation plan
Curriculum Committee Documents on new curriculum and Implementation
Curriculum Task Force I and II documents
Faculty Development Workshops on New Curriculum (content and agenda)
Faculty Development Workshop on Clusters (content and agenda)
Curriculum Committee process documents
Curriculum Committee documents to apply for Human Difference and Global
Engagement, distribution requirement, cluster, new course
Internship Manual
Post graduate/Presidential Award Documents
Writing Across the Curriculum & First Year Seminar Program (Assessment and Content)
Information Literacy (Assessment and Content)
Language Program (Assessment and Content)
Effectiveness of cluster courses (Assessment and Content)
Internal and external reviews of academic departments and programs, such as the Board
of Observers reports
Board of Observer reports for Wescoe School, Office of Community Engagement, Office
of Global Education
Service-Learning Guide
Advising Manual & Materials – June advising and on-going advising
Educational Technology Plan
Representative samples of articulation agreements with LVAIC colleges and other
programs (e.g., Maastricht, Goldsmith, engineering program, Muhlenberg-Med School
cooperative programs, etc.)
Online Task Force Report
Honors program requirements and course lists (Dana, RJ, Muhlenberg Scholars, Phi Beta
Kappa, and Alpha Sigma Lambda)

2. Surveys and Analysis
NSSE Survey
HEDS Senior Survey
CIRP CSS
Education Abroad Re-entry Survey
IPEDS Data
Grade analysis reports from Registrar
Registrar data on student completion of General Academic Requirements (e.g., overlap
with majors/minors, cluster enrollments, Human Difference and Global Engagement
fulfillment).
Registrar data on course offerings (e.g., Human Difference and Global Engagement,
clusters, reasoning)
Faculty Survey on Use of Technology

Summary of student evaluations
Career Center Alumni Survey (six months after graduation)

Format for Working Group Reports

Working Group reports will be organized in the following manner:
- An overview of the Working 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 Working Group's findings and conclusions relate to MSCHE standards
- Discussion of the connection of the group's topics with those of other groups
- Suggestions and recommendations for improvements

Working Group Reports submitted to the Steering Committee will be:
- Posted on Blackboard and in hard copy
- Written in MS Word and Excel
- Single spaced with double spacing between paragraphs
- In Times New Roman font size 12
- No more than 15 pages per MSCHE Standard
- Submitted with a page number at the top right of every page and a date at the end of the document
- Keyed to the charge question being asked
- Written in clear, succinct, jargon-free prose

Time-Table for Self-Study

Summer 2013	President Peyton R. Helm received letter from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, informing him that the College will undergo its Decennial Review in 2016.
September 2013	President Helm appointed Dr. Jack Gambino, Professor of Political Science, and Dr. Kathleen Harring, Dean of Institutional Assessment and Academic Planning, as Co-Chairs of the Middle States Steering Committee.
November 2013	Dr. Harring and Dr. Gambino attended the 2013 Middle States Self Study Institute in Philadelphia.
December 2013	Members of Steering Committee and Working Groups were appointed.
January 2014	Steering Committee met for the first time; meetings continue throughout the semester.
February-April 2014	Working groups draft research questions. Steering Committee drafts Self-Study Design document.
April 24, 2014	Dr. Sean McKitrick, the College's MSCHE Liaison, visits the College for a day to meet with constituencies and plan with the Steering Committee. Dr. McKitrick reviews the Self-Study Design.
June 2014	Steering Committee finalizes Self-Study design for MSCHE review and approval.
Fall 2014	Working groups collect data/ evidence to address charge questions, interpret data, and draft conclusions and suggestions/recommendations.
Spring 2015	Working groups continue to collect data/ evidence as necessary, interpret data, and draft conclusions and suggestions/ recommendations. Working groups submit draft reports to Steering Committee before spring break. Steering Committee reviews drafts and provides feedback to Working Groups. Working Groups submit revised drafts by end of semester. MSCHE selects team chair for institution's approval.

Spring 2015 (cont.)	Team chair and institution select dates for the Chair's visit to campus and for the team visit.
	Institution sends team chair a copy of the Self-Study design.
Summer 2015	Steering Committee reviews drafts.
	Co-Chairs combine working group reports into integrated document.
	MSCHE selects team members and institution approves selection.
Fall 2015	Steering Committee finalizes draft of Self-Study document.
	Campus Community reviews Self-Study draft.
	Self-Study draft is sent to team chair.
	Team chair visits the College (at least four months before team visit).
	Details for team visit are finalized.
	Steering Committee completes final draft of Self-Study document.
Spring 2016	Institution sends Self-Study to MSCHE and evaluation team members at least six weeks before team visit.
	Team Visit (four day visit begins Sunday afternoon and ends on Wednesday after the Team's oral report to the campus community).
	Visiting Team issues its report.
	Muhlenberg College responds to Visiting Team report.

Profile of Visiting Team

We welcome colleagues from other institutions to enter into conversation with us about our methodology and conclusions. Preferably, the chair of the visiting team would be a president from a peer institution with a similar mission and student demographics. We request that team members be familiar with the goals, aspirations, fiscal realities and culture of residential liberal arts colleges. We are particularly interested in colleagues who understand the integration of the social sciences, humanities, sciences, and performing arts in liberal arts curriculum, and are knowledgeable about the role of undergraduate research and scholarship, service learning, diversity planning, and honors programming in the advancement of student learning. Ideally, the visiting team will have at least one member knowledgeable about current practices in educational technology and another with expertise in integrating academic programs with students' residential experience. We would like the team to include an administrator with experience in

student affairs and co-curricular programming. We also request that the visiting team be familiar with the balance of faculty teaching, scholarship and service in our type of institution. Colleges and universities considered by Muhlenberg as peer institutions that are not direct competitors include: Allegheny College, Skidmore College, St. Lawrence University, Susquehanna University, and Washington and Jefferson College. This information may be helpful as the Commission seeks the chair and members of the visiting team.

Appendix
Institutional Information Sources

Information	Description	Source
Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ)	Data are collected for all students admitted to Muhlenberg prior to their first semester in college.	Dean of Admission and Financial Aid
Beginning College Student Survey of Engagement (BCSSE)	This is the NSSE First Year Student Survey. Collects data from first year students regarding their academic and co-curricular experiences in high school. Examines their expectations for the first year of college, especially those behaviors related to "good practices" in undergraduate education-those that engage students in the learning process.	Dean of Institutional Assessment and Academic Planning
Career Survey	Data are collected from graduates one year after graduation. Information collected concerns current activities (i.e. employment, graduated school, travel, etc.)	Dean of Admission and Financial Aid
Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey	Data are collected from first year students. Assesses demographic characteristics, expectations of the college experience, secondary school experiences, degree goals and career plans, college finances, general attitudes, values, life goals, and reasons for attending college.	Dean of Institutional Assessment and Academic Planning
Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) College Senior Survey (CSS)	Data are collected from senior students. Assesses demographic characteristics, academic achievement and engagement, satisfaction, cognitive and affective development, student values, attitudes, and goals, career and further education plans.	Dean of Institutional Assessment and Academic Planning
Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Diverse Learning Environments Survey (DLE)	Data are collected from sophomore and junior students. Examines student perceptions of the campus climate, as well as, experiences and interactions with faculty, staff and peers.	Dean of Institutional Assessment and Academic Planning
Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Senior Survey	Data are collected from seniors. Assesses future career and education plans, importance of various career factors. Allows for the evaluation of educational experience (what knowledge and skills were obtained). Measures performance in college programs and clubs/activities. Assesses number of hours spent on a variety of academic, co-curricular, and extra-curricular activities.	Dean of Institutional Assessment and Academic Planning

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	Data are collected from first year students and seniors. The survey assesses classroom and co-curricular student behaviors that are related to "good practices" in undergraduate education – those that engage students in the learning process. Questions focus on students' educational experiences (e.g., reading, writing, oral presentations, research with faculty, discussions with individuals who differ from them). Other items focus on educational outcomes such as levels of thinking (i.e., Bloom's Taxonomy) and other skills and perspectives.	Dean of Institutional Assessment and Academic Planning
Integrated Postsecondary Education Date System (IPEDS)	Data are required to be reported from all degree granting institutions annually in the following components: 12 Month Enrollments, Completions, Fall Enrollments, Finance, Graduation Rates (both 150% & 200%), Human Resources, Institutional Characteristics and Student Financial Aid.	Director of Institutional Research
Common Data Set (CDS)	Annually collected data that are considered commonly reported in higher education, it is used for both internal and external reporting. The data parameters are universal for ease of sharing among institutions. Data categories include: enrollment and persistence, admission (first year and transfer), academic offerings and policies, student life, annual expenses, financial aid, instructional faculty & class size and degrees conferred.	Director of Institutional Research
Source Book	Published annually in the fall with both current and historical data in the following categories: description of the College (Mission and Diversity Statements, centers and institutes, academic programs), facilities, academic resources and technology, finance, organization, faculty, employees, admissions, enrollments, majors, minors and degrees, career plans and awards, student life, student costs, alumni, parents, friends, historical highlights and governance.	Director of Institutional Research
Snap Shot Data (Census Date Data)	Enrollment and demographic data collected once per semester at the conclusion of the add/drop period. Provides a breakdown of enrollment data by administrative college, class year, gender and status.	Registrar
Enrollment Projections (annually and weekly)	Produced annually base on institutional methodology using historical retention data. During the summer months a fall semester projection is produced weekly based on enrollments and admission deposit data.	Dean of Admission and Financial Aid & Director of Institutional Research

Varsity Athletics Data (Mellon Sports Project, Skidmore Reports, and NCAA reporting)	Data collected regarding athletes' academic performance and graduation rates.	Dean of Institutional Assessment and Academic Planning & Athletics Office
Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey	Data are collected from all current faculty. Examines pedagogical practices, expectations for students, research and public service engagement, and satisfaction. The campus climate module focuses on faculty perceptions of the current campus climate.	Dean of Institutional Assessment and Academic Planning
Faculty Salary Projections	Historical data based on rank.	Faculty Policy and Procedures Committee