

HAGERSTOWN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

2025 SELF-STUDY DESIGN SPRING 2023



SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY,
BUSINESS & MATHEMATICS
BUILDING

HAGERSTOWN
COMMUNITY COLLEGE



Hagerstown Community College

Self-Study Design

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Institutional Overview.....	3
II.	Institutional Priorities to be Addressed in the Self-Study.....	10
III.	Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study.....	12
IV.	Self-Study Approach.....	12
V.	Organizational Structure of Steering Committee and Working Groups	12
VI.	Guidelines for Reporting	25
VII.	Organization of the Final Self-Study Report.....	27
VIII.	Verification of Compliance Strategy	27
IX.	Self-Study Timetable	28
X.	Communication Plan	29
XI.	Evaluation Team Profile	31
XII.	Strategies for Managing the Evidence Inventory.....	32
	Appendix A Request for information/data for self-study work group.....	34
	Appendix B Working group timetable	35

I. Institutional Overview

History

Founded on September 10, 1946, Hagerstown Community College is the oldest community college in Maryland. The college was founded in part to educate returning veterans from World War II. Classes were originally offered at Hagerstown High School in the late afternoons and evenings. In 1956, the College moved to a building on the South Hagerstown High School campus affectionately called “The Cracker Box” because of its unique design and appearance. As the College continued to meet the local needs of the time, the Cracker Box became too small, and the College moved to its present location on Robinwood Drive in 1966. Dr. Norman Shea, HCC’s second president, was a prodigious acquirer of real estate. During his leadership, the College greatly expanded its footprint to amass a campus of 319 acres, the largest in Maryland.

HCC’s relationship with the Middle States Commission on Higher Education began with its first comprehensive self-study in 1967 and received its first accreditation in 1968. The College has been continuously accredited since. In 1998, Hagerstown Junior College changed its name to Hagerstown Community College (HCC) to better reflect its comprehensive mission.

College Leadership

One unique aspect of HCC’s leadership history is the lengthy continuity of administrative leadership. Nationally, college presidents enjoy a tenure of just under five years at any one institution. Hagerstown Community College has had only four presidents in its 76-year history, a remarkable accomplishment. This tenure has given the College the ability to see capital and master plans through to completion over long periods of time, rather than suffer the turbulence often brought on by rapid administrative change.

Board leadership is a second area where the College has benefitted from extensive periods of leadership and service. Seven members are appointed by the Governor to six-year terms. Only two have served for less than a decade, while one Board member has served for over thirty years. This continuity of leadership has allowed the College to set long time horizons on its planning and execution.

Our Community and Its Support

Hagerstown Community College principally serves the people of Washington County, Maryland. The proximity to HCC from communities in neighboring states of West Virginia and Pennsylvania makes it more attractive for students to commute to HCC rather than attend the designated community college in their home community and state. Pennsylvanians represent almost fifteen percent of total enrollment at HCC. The College also derives enrollment from its fellow Maryland counties, especially in selective admissions programs within the Nursing and Allied Health areas.

The College enjoys the support of the region in which it serves. During the COVID pandemic, the HCC Foundation set forth an ambitious goal to raise 7.5 million dollars in honor of its 75th Anniversary. The Foundation wildly exceeded its goals. Within a year, it had raised over 10 million dollars for its scholarship endowment and another 8 million for capital projects, concluding its campaign at 18.2 million dollars raised. The community impact on this effort cannot be understated. It will allow the Foundation to double the amount awarded in scholarship assistance to just over \$1 million annually in 2025.

The funds raised for capital projects will allow the College to address major needs in skilled trades workforce training with the renovation of a building purchased during the pandemic. The new Bowman Family Workforce Development Center will allow the College to combine all of its off-site training locations to one space. The 45,000 square foot building will be occupied by HCC with portions leased to the Associated Builders and Contractors (ABC) for their training programs. This combined effort will greatly increase the number of apprenticeships in our region and allow for collaborative work between the two entities.

Key HCC Initiatives

In addition to the initiatives described in other sections herein, there are several notable activities ongoing at the College. First, is the Fletcher Incubator and Labs. Created in the early 1990’s, HCC was one of the first community colleges in the country to offer business incubation for entrepreneurs. In 2018, the incubator went through a comprehensive overhaul and upgrade to bring it to contemporary standards. With a \$10,000,000 investment by college, state and local entities, along with a new private endowment, the Fletcher Incubator and Labs was re-opened in October 2021. This incubator consists of general business incubation with six wet labs dedicated to small business research in the life sciences.

In 2022, the College entered into an agreement with Leslie Riley, CEO of Mama’s Biscuits, to form the Mama’s Biscuits Culinary Incubator. The vision for this incubator is to grow companies in the sphere of food manufacturing. The two entities currently serve 57 companies. Tenants are allowed a 24 month lease, that can be extended for an additional year if certain goals are met. Tenants must complete regular training, work with an assigned mentor, and review their financials with the incubator director.

While business incubation at a community college is a rarity, the incubators are most widely known for their diversity. The table below outlines the work and effort in growing businesses within the minority community in our region. This year HCC incubators were recognized as the first runner up for the Julius Morgan Diversity and Inclusion Award by the International Business Innovation Association.

Table 1. Ethnicity of HCC Incubator Entrepreneurs

White	34%
Black or African American	40%
American Indian and Alaska Native	0%
Asian	18%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0%
Two or More Races	0%
Hispanic or Latino	8%

A second important initiative is our work with the Department of Education to strengthen student retention. In 2022, the College was awarded a Title III grant from the U.S. Department of Education. These grants are considered hyper-competitive, and we were fortunate to be recognized in our application. This \$2.2 million dollar grant over five years is focused on increasing student persistence, completion, and goal attainment leading to increased institutional fiscal stability. We see this effort as an important component to increase student success.

Opportunities and Challenges

Hagerstown Community College is indeed fortunate that there are no significant threats before it today. The College is in sound financial shape. The State fully funds its community colleges. Washington County Government has met its obligations with regards to capital and operational funding. The College has not raised tuition in three years and does not anticipate doing so for FY24. What challenges that currently exist are really opportunities in disguise.

Washington County, and particularly the State of Maryland, are in a stage of rapid change. In 2019, Maryland adopted legislation known as The Blueprint for Maryland's Future (a.k.a. The Blueprint). This seminal law provides sweeping changes in all areas of education from pre-school to college and career readiness. For Maryland's sixteen community colleges, it provides for a complete overhaul of dual credit programs and the creation of career training programs in partnership with local school districts.

The Blueprint provides that all students must take a college and career readiness assessment at the conclusion of their Tenth-Grade year. Those testing as college and career ready (CCR) are allowed to choose a dual credit, Advanced Placement, or International Baccalaureate pathway. For students choosing a dual credit pathway, any classes taken by the student shall be free to the parent. Local school districts will bear 75% of the tuition cost and 100% of the books and fees associated with attendance. Implementation of this plan began in the Spring 2023 term.

HCC anticipates hundreds, if not thousands, of eligible students signing up for dual credit courses in the Fall 2023 term. At this writing, the number of high school students taking classes full time on campus has doubled for the Fall. The number of high school students taking classes part time on campus is up five-fold over last year to almost five hundred students. The number of students taking college courses on the high school campus could well be over 2,000 by Fall, roughly double the number from last year.

HCC leadership has worked closely with Washington County Public Schools (WCPS) to ensure that the quality of delivery of courses taught in the high schools is better than it ever has been. Fall 2023 will be the first year of full implementation and it is expected that high school students taking courses at HCC will continue to grow in subsequent years.

The Blueprint is going to change the College. The challenge before us is that we must ensure that students receive the best instruction possible, and we must prepare ourselves for a significant growth in enrollment over a short period of time. The opportunities are three-fold. First, the increase in enrollment will position the College well financially. Second, we will recover losses in enrollment encountered annually since 2012. Finally, and most importantly, we will permeate the community with access to higher education opportunities not seen since the founding of the College in 1946.

The second challenge before us is one of change. In 2021, the Maryland Legislature allowed community college employees to organize for collective bargaining rights. For HCC, this goes into effect in September 2023. The challenge is inherent in the change of the relationship between the administration and the covered employee. The possibility of collective bargaining is not a negative or positive challenge but rather one of institutional change. Change can be difficult for many, and if it

comes to pass, then our goal is to work through that change in a positive light that benefits all concerned.

Finally, the third challenge before us is another great opportunity. In 2022, Meritus Medical Center announced that it was going to build a college of osteopathic medicine on its campus. The hospital is located a half-mile from the HCC Campus. Meritus is going to focus on recruiting local students to fill the many vacancies in rural healthcare in Western Maryland and our region. This poses great opportunities for our students to pursue an affordable route to seek a career as a physician. We are working with Meritus on their path, and assisting wherever we can. This new college will bring great growth and economic development opportunities to our region. We believe that it will enhance and help us grow both our Nursing and Allied Health programs, along with pre-med majors in Biology and Chemistry.

Foreseeing this opportunity, we have made applications for grants to the Appalachian Regional Commission to purchase new equipment for our science and allied health programs, and feel confident in its funding. HCC will play a critical role for local students wanting to pursue careers in health care, and we will be prepared for this exciting future.

HCC at a Glance

Students. Over 10,000 students were enrolled at HCC in FY22, with over half of those students enrolled in non-credit courses. Almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of the credit students were from Washington, County and almost $\frac{1}{4}$ were part of a dual enrollment program.

Employees. HCC employs over 500 people, including 75 full-time faculty members. The student-faculty ratio was 15:1.

Economic Impact. A 2021 study showed that the College contributed more than \$151.4 million to Washington County's economy, supporting — directly and indirectly — more than 2,340 jobs across the county in fiscal year 2019.

Outcomes. Since its founding, HCC has conferred more than 25,000 degrees, with 757 awarded in the 2021-22 academic year.

Programs of Study

HCC offers over 90 certificate- and associate degree programs with additional non-credit options. The College is organized into eight academic divisions, including Health Sciences, Nursing, Behavioral and Social Sciences/Business, English and Humanities, Developmental Education and Adult Literacy Services (DEALS), Math and Science, Exercise Science, and Technology and Computer Studies. The academic programs represent a mix of transfer and career preparation areas of study. Popular programs include Business, Nursing, Biology, Psychology, and General Studies.

Enrollment Trends

Credit college enrollment has fluctuated in recent years (see Table 2.), in part due to the global pandemic as well as other environmental factors. These factors are not unlike those impacting other community colleges nationwide. Most recently, both credit and non-credit headcounts appear to be

stabilizing. Fall 2022 total credit enrollment stood at 3,496, down by only 1%, or 37 students, from Fall 2021. The College's enrollment for Fall 2022 included 735 dually enrolled students.

Enrollment Trends (Fall 2018 to Fall 2022)

Table 2. Fall Credit Enrollment: Summary by Attendance Type

	Fall 2018		Fall 2019		Fall 2020		Fall 2021		Fall 2022	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credit Students	4156	100%	3848	100%	3433	100%	3533	100%	3496	100%
<i>Full-time</i>	1012	24.4%	1061	27.6%	1193	34.8%	1137	32.2%	1129	32.3%
<i>Part-time</i>	3144	75.6%	2787	72.4%	2240	65.2%	2396	67.8%	2367	67.7%
Undergraduate	3401	81.8%	3114	80.9%	2690	78.4%	2730	77.3%	2761	79.0%
<i>Full-time</i>	946	27.8%	981	31.5%	1101	40.9%	1056	38.7%	1049	38.0%
<i>Part-time</i>	2455	72.2%	2133	68.5%	1589	59.1%	1674	61.3%	1712	62.0%
Dual Enrollment	755	18.2%	734	19.1%	743	21.6%	803	22.7%	735	21.0%
<i>Full-time</i>	66	8.7%	80	10.9%	92	12.4%	81	10.1%	80	10.9%
<i>Part-time</i>	689	91.3%	654	89.1%	651	87.6%	722	89.9%	655	89.1%

Source: MHEC Enrollment Information System (EIS)

Demographics

HCC's student body is diverse. The student population at HCC is more diverse than the minority percentages in the communities we serve. HCC's student body is more diverse (see Tables 3 and 4.) than Washington County. Increasing diversity in enrollment continues to be a priority for HCC. As reflected in the mission, HCC provides an avenue for first-generation students, non-traditional adult students, and students from families of modest means to access an education while still being close to home and able to work. With the increase in enrollment by high school students, the average age of an HCC student has been declining, and we believe this is a trend that will continue. Local economic conditions have led many adult learners to easily seek and obtain employment rather than attend college for a degree or credential.

Table 3. Twelve-Month Unduplicated Headcount- Credit Students

	FY 2018		FY 2019		FY 2020		FY 2021		FY 2022	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total Unduplicated Headcount	5,761	100%	5,749	100%	5,401	100%	4,996	100%	4,871	100%
Year-to-Year, Overall % Change	-1.1%		-0.2%		-6.1%		-7.5%		-2.5%	
by IPEDS Race/Ethnicity										
Hispanic/Latino	364	6.3%	371	6.5%	392	7.3%	396	7.9%	441	9.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	13	0.2%	15	0.3%	10	0.2%	15	0.3%	7	0.1%
Asian	120	2.1%	122	2.1%	128	2.4%	131	2.6%	123	2.5%
Black or African American	666	11.6%	722	12.6%	667	12.3%	594	11.9%	573	11.8%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	6	0.1%	9	0.2%	5	0.1%	6	0.1%	7	0.1%
White (non-Hispanic)	4,171	72.4%	4,039	70.3%	3,751	69.5%	3,418	68.4%	3,274	67.2%
Two or more races	253	4.4%	290	5.0%	288	5.3%	270	5.4%	262	5.4%
Unspecified	113	2.0%	125	2.2%	106	2.0%	136	2.7%	151	3.1%
International/Nonresident	55	1.0%	56	1.0%	54	1.0%	30	0.6%	33	0.7%
<i>Total Students of Color[^]</i>	<i>1,422</i>	<i>24.7%</i>	<i>1,529</i>	<i>26.6%</i>	<i>1,490</i>	<i>27.6%</i>	<i>1,412</i>	<i>28.3%</i>	<i>1,413</i>	<i>29.0%</i>
by Gender										
Female	3,649	63.3%	3,669	63.8%	3,544	65.6%	3,374	67.5%	3,143	64.5%
Male	2,112	36.7%	2,080	36.2%	1,857	34.4%	1,622	32.5%	1,728	35.5%
Total 12-month Credit Hours	78,970		78,487		74,834		67,979		64,305	
IPEDS Calculated 12-month FTE	2,632		2,616		2,494		2,266		2,144	
Year-to-Year, Overall % Change	1.0%		-0.6%		-4.7%		-9.1%		-5.4%	

[^]Total Students of Color count excludes white (non-Hispanic), unspecified, and international students.
 Source: IPEDS 12-Month Enrollment. IPEDS Calculated 12-month FTE is calculated using Credit total.

Comparing students of color at HCC to the local population, one can easily see that the College has made strides in attracting students to a diverse and inclusive atmosphere.

Table 4. Local Ethnicity

	Washington County %	Hagerstown, MD
White	82%	68.5%
Black or African American	12.5%	18.4%
American Indian and Alaska Native	0.3%	0.2%
Asian	1.9%	2.2%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.2%
Two or More Races	3.1%	8.5%
Hispanic or Latino	5.8%	9.4%

Source: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/washingtoncountymaryland,hagerstowncitymaryland/RHI125220>

Student Achievement

The following tables (Tables 5 and 6) display overall graduation, transfer, and retention rates for HCC students over time. From 2014 to 2018, the 100%-, 150%-, and 200%-completion rates for first-time, full-time undergraduates have been strong. Fall-to-fall retention rates for first-time, full-time undergraduates have fluctuated but are strong.

Table 5. Graduation and Transfer-Out Rates

	2014 Cohort		2015 Cohort		2016 Cohort		2017 Cohort		2018 Cohort	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Students in Cohort	331	100%	361	100%	356	100%	399	100%	406	100%
Completers (through 200%)	130	39.3%	138	38.2%	127	35.7%	159	39.8%	133	32.8%
100% normal time	66	50.8%	67	48.6%	65	51.2%	99	62.3%	90	67.7%
150% normal time	52	40.0%	50	36.2%	38	29.9%	39	24.5%	43	32.3%
200% normal time	12	9.2%	21	15.2%	24	18.9%	21	13.2%	--	--
Transfer-outs										
150% normal time	71	21.5%	78	21.6%	73	20.5%	80	20.1%	79	19.5%

"Cohort" refers to the fall cohort of full-time first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students, as defined by IPEDS. Completions and transfer data follow the academic year (Summer, Fall, Spring). Elapsed time: 100% = 4 semesters (2 years), 150% = 5 semesters (2.5 years), 200% = 6 semesters (3 years). Counts are not cumulative over time.
 Source: IPEDS Graduation Rates, IPEDS Graduation Rates 200

Table 6. Fall-to-Fall Retention for First-Year, Full-Time Credit Students

	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Fall 2020
Undergraduate Cohort	331	361	356	399	406	458	440
Fall- Year 2							
Enrolled	200	219	190	250	236	266	264
Completed	14	17	16	23	17	17	9
First year retention rate	64.7%	65.4%	57.9%	68.4%	62.3%	61.8%	62.0%

Four-year average retention rate: 63.6%

Source: IPEDS Fall Enrollment

Mission

HCC ensures equitable access to affordable, high-quality educational programs, while fostering workforce development and cultural vitality in the region.

Vision

HCC will be the college of choice through demonstration of inclusive educational excellence, transformative growth, and community enrichment.

Institutional Values

Six core institutional values, identified in large part through HCC's 2026 strategic plan, offer an essential context for the successful execution of HCC's mission.

- Excellence
- Integrity
- Diversity and Inclusion
- Stewardship
- Civic Engagement
- Student Centered

HCC Strategic Plan: Committed to Excellence (2021-2026)

HCC's 2021-2026 strategic plan is the result of a broad and inclusive six-month process that involved many academic and administrative units across the College. The College's vision, mission, and institutional values have been woven throughout the strategic plan. The final strategic plan contains six thematic commitments, which will serve as strategic goals for the self-study: Enrollment, Assessment, Retention, Integration, Partnerships and Community. The process culminated in the board of trustees approving the 2026 strategic plan which has been guiding the direction of the institution for the past year.

II. Institutional Priorities to be Addressed in the Self-Study

Following the MSCHE Self-Study Institute in October and November 2022, the Self-Study Steering Committee co-chairs consulted with President James Klauber to discuss the selection of institutional priorities for the self-study. A list of suggested priorities was generated based on the strategic plan commitments and current institutional priorities related to relevant initiatives. Faculty, staff, and students were surveyed to determine their preference based on this list of suggested priorities. The survey also allowed additional suggestions. The survey results suggested a strong commitment to student success and teaching excellence, and an interest in focusing on ways to facilitate student success for HCC's diverse student population and varied educational experiences. Based on these factors, a constituency of the steering committee met and crafted the following institutional priorities:

- Student success, enrollment, and retention: support students, including at-risk and early college students, by implementing first-year experience course; improving scheduling; aligning curriculum and community partnerships with transfer and career pathways; creating opportunities for developmental students; supporting students with academic and non-academic obstacles; and facilitating and promoting completion.
- Student experience: foster a welcoming, inclusive campus and classroom environment for all students by examining and improving efforts to meet the needs of students from diverse backgrounds and in different learning environments; providing extra-curricular activities and events; and improving orientation and advising.
- Teaching excellence and curriculum development: evaluate curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote inclusive practices and teaching excellence by supporting professional development; facilitating peer sharing of best practices; using student evaluations and feedback to improve instruction; evaluating and improving online course offerings; developing new developmental, ESL, and early college pathways; designing FYE course; and providing support to adjunct instructors both on and off-site.

HCC's strategic plan was designed to be closely aligned with the college's mission. The six thematic commitments of the strategic plan will serve as HCC's strategic goals for the self-study. They are Enrollment, Assessment, Retention, Integration, Partnerships and Community.

The following crosswalk tables illustrate the alignment between the College's institutional priorities and strategic goals and between institutional priorities and MSCHE's Standards for Accreditation.

Table 7: Alignment of Strategic Goals with Institutional Priorities

Strategic Goals	Priority 1 Student success, enrollment, & retention	Priority 2 Student Experience	Priority 3 Teaching Excellence & Curriculum Development
Enrollment	✓		
Assessment			✓
Retention	✓	✓	
Integration		✓	✓
Partnerships	✓	✓	✓
Community		✓	

Table 8: Alignment of Institutional Priorities with MSCHE Standards

MSCHE Standards	Priority 1 Student success, enrollment, & retention	Priority 2 Student Experience	Priority 3 Teaching Excellence & Curriculum Development
I. Mission and Goals			✓
II. Ethics and Integrity		✓	
III. Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience	✓		✓
IV. Support of the Student Experience	✓	✓	
V. Educational Effectiveness Assessment		✓	✓
VI. Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement	✓		
VII. Governance, Leadership, and Administration			

III. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

Through an inclusive and candid self-study, HCC will:

- Demonstrate how the institution currently meets the Commission’s Standards for Accreditation, Requirements of Affiliation, and verification of compliance with accreditation-related federal regulations
- Focus on continuous improvement in the attainment of the institution’s mission and its institutional priorities
- Engage the campus community in an inclusive and transparent self-appraisal process that actively and deliberately seeks to involve members from all areas of the institutional community
- Utilize the self-study process to review core institutional functions and inform evidence-based decision making around the institutional priorities, strategic plan, and related initiatives.

The self-study process will assist HCC in meeting key goals while identifying and reflecting on any gaps as it embarks on a number of new ambitious initiatives. The process will also help to raise awareness around the institutional priorities and take action when needed on areas of improvement. Overall, the result will be an enhancement of the College’s effectiveness.

IV. Self-Study Approach

HCC has chosen the standards-based approach for organizing the self-study report. The steering committee co-chairs chose this approach after attending the Self-Study Institute and reflecting on the culture of the institution. The standards-based approach will allow the college to best present evidence of compliance of the standards while systematically evaluating the institution. Each standard will be addressed by chapter with institutional priorities integrated within chapters as appropriate. Requirements of affiliation and verification of compliance with federal regulations will also be addressed within chapters as relevant.

V. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

In Fall 2022, President Klauber met with Dr. Carlee Ranalli, Dean of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, who also serves as the College’s Accreditation Liaison Officer, to discuss the upcoming MSCHE self-study. After a discussion President Klauber appointed Dr. Heike Soeffker-Culicerto, Vice President of Administration and Finance, and Kate Benchoff, Associate Professor of English Composition, to serve as co-chairs of the Self-Study Steering Committee.

Co-Chair Responsibilities

- Develop a comprehensive understanding of the MSCHE self-study process; attend the Self-Study Institute and share resources with college stakeholders
- Establish overall expectations and set basic structures for self-study, including steering committee and working group structure, resource repository, evidence inventory, guidelines, and processes
- Appoint steering committee members, create charge for the committee and provide overall leadership to the steering committee
- In collaboration with the steering committee, develop and submit the Self-Study Design

- Provide leadership in identifying and finalizing the institutional priorities
- Ensure that all stakeholders, including faculty, staff, students, and external partners, are involved and engaged in the self-study process; serve as liaisons between steering committee, institutional leaders, other stakeholders, and MSCHE representatives
- Create a self-study process timeline that includes clear and reasonable milestones
- Develop and implement a communications plan that ensures the College community is engaged in the process; the plan should communicate updates on the process and gather input from the College community
- Conduct regular meetings with the steering committee to provide updates, address challenges, and make decisions; share, update, and publish meeting calendar
- Review and provide feedback on working group outlines in a timely manner
- Assemble outlines into a cohesive final report
- Coordinate site visits and interviews with peer review team

Steering Committee

Following the Self-Study Institute, the co-chairs determined the most effective structure would be to form seven working groups, one for each standard, with the co-chairs of each group serving as members of the steering committee. The co-chairs of the working groups should include a mix of individuals with long-term institutional knowledge as well as people new to the institution since the most recent Middle States accreditation process. Groups would follow a model of including one faculty member and one administrator to co-chair each working group in order to include both perspectives in the collaborative process.

The PIE department will play a critical role throughout the process. Dr. Carlee Ranalli, Dean of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, serves an advisory role by providing ongoing guidance and support to the steering committee. A liaison from PIE was appointed to serve on each working group. The role of the PIE liaisons is to facilitate and attend working group meetings; assist in meeting milestones; facilitate evidence gathering; minimize duplication of efforts among groups and facilitate collaboration where appropriate; provide subject matter expertise and technical support as needed.

Because student input is essential to the self-study process, the steering committee will also include the SGA president to represent and report to the student body. Each group will strive to appoint a student to serve as a member of the committee.

The co-chairs considered the following criteria when assembling a steering committee that is committed, knowledgeable, and representative, thus enhancing the effectiveness and credibility of the self-study process.

- Commitment to institutional priorities and transparency: The individuals should demonstrate a strong dedication to the college's institutional priorities and be transparent in their decision-making processes.
- Evidence-based problem-solving: The individuals should be committed to using evidence and data to inform their decision-making and problem-solving processes. They should be willing to analyze information objectively and make informed judgments based on available evidence.
- Broad institutional perspective: The individuals should possess a broad understanding of the

institution and its operations that goes beyond their specific areas of expertise. They should be able to consider the overall institutional context and implications when making decisions or recommendations.

- Representation of constituencies and expertise: The committee should include members who represent various college constituencies and essential areas of expertise. This ensures diverse perspectives are considered during the self-study process. Constituencies may include faculty, staff, students, administrators, and other relevant stakeholders. Essential areas of expertise may encompass academic disciplines, administrative functions, student affairs, and other relevant fields.

The leadership team formally invited committee members in April 2023 and charged the committee at a kick-off meeting in May 2023.

Steering Committee Charge

The steering committee will oversee the work of the self-study. The committee will work together to provide leadership and ensure the quality of the College self-study process and final report. Select steering committee members will serve as co-chairs on one of seven working groups, with each working group having one faculty and one administrative co-chair. Each working group will have a mix of faculty, administrators, staff, and students, to carry out the self-study process. Their work will include identifying relevant evidence of compliance with the standard and drafting a corresponding chapter outline of the self-study report.

Steering Committee Responsibilities

- Develop and support a comprehensive understanding of the MSCHE self-study process; communicate the process and value of MSCHE accreditation to the campus community
- Provide leadership and coordination for the seven working groups, including establishing membership of the groups, holding regular meetings, and ensuring groups meet key milestones
- Identify potential areas for improvement in process or policy to be addressed in the self-study process using the institutional priorities as the guiding framework
- Consult with any additional HCC stakeholders to identify evidence and keep open lines of communication
- Coordinate the efforts of working groups to develop robust evidence to support reaffirmation of institutional accreditation and avoid undue duplication of efforts
- Assist in the identification of institutional gaps of process or policy and work collaboratively with institutional stakeholders to reduce exposure and improve effectiveness
- Identify meaningful linkages between the self-study process, institutional mission, and implementation of the College's strategic plan
- Review and assist in editing and synthesizing working group chapter outlines and other documents to create a coherent Self-Study report that authentically represents input from institutional stakeholders
- Coordinate institution-wide review by and feedback from the College community of the final draft of the self-study report prior to submission of the report to MSCHE
- Collaborate with the PIE office to prepare the Federal Compliance Report for submission with the final self-study report
- Meet with MSCHE representatives and members of the Peer Review Evaluation Team as needed

Steering Committee Membership

Name	Role
Self-Study Core Team	
Dr. Heike Soeffker-Culicerto (Co-Chair)	VP Administration & Finance
Kate Benchoff (Co-Chair)	Associate Professor, English Composition
Dr. Carlee Ranalli (ALO)	Dean, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness
Membership and Ex-Officio	
Dr. James Klauber (Ex-Officio)	President
Dr. Dave Warner/Dawn Schoenenberger	VP Academic & Student Affairs
L. William Proctor, Jr.	Trustee Rep
Mr. Jake Klauber	SGA Rep
Dr. Christine Ohl-Gigliotti	Dean of Students
Natalia Kennedy	Title III Rep
Working Group Co-Chairs	
Alicia Drumgoole, Assistant Prof, English	Standard 1 Faculty
Beth Kirkpatrick, Senior Director, PRM	Standard 1 Admin
Dr. DJ Madron, Prof, Sociology	Standard 2 Faculty
Chris Baer, Registrar	Standard 2 Admin
Paula Kessler, Assistant Prof, Math	Standard 3 Faculty
Vidda Beache, Dean of Distance Learning	Standard 3 Admin
Dr. Christine Cramer, Assistant Prof, Psychology	Standard 4 Faculty
Mike Martin, Coordinator, Academic Advising and Transfer	Standard 4 Admin
Dr. Cindy Blank, Professor, Biotechnology	Standard 5 Faculty
Dr. Mary Hendrickson, Division Director, BSSB	Standard 5 Admin
Dr. Lore Kuehnert, Associate Prof, History	Standard 6 Faculty
Dr. Dana Poole, Division Director, English and Humanities	Standard 6 Admin
Stacey McGee, Associate Prof, Business and Accounting	Standard 7 Faculty
Dr. Ashley Whaley, Director, Campus Advancement	Standard 7 Admin

Working Groups

The leadership team used survey results and co-chair recommendations to shape the working groups, with special focus on expertise, interest, experience, and diverse perspectives in order to create well-rounded groups. The groups were designed with the intention of representing as many viewpoints as possible, including students, office associates, custodial staff, food services, adjuncts, continuing education, and workforce solutions employees in addition to faculty, staff, and administration. Creating groups with these priorities in mind will provide an opportunity to forge new connections between various campus constituents and hopefully result in a self-study report that reflects the close-knit,

interdependent community at HCC. Student involvement is being encouraged through the Student Government Association, and working group members are soliciting student representation for their groups based on recommendations. Working groups began meeting in May, after a kickoff meeting on May 22. In addition to using the provided lines of inquiry, working groups will be able to revise or add lines of inquiry based on their analysis of the standard and institutional priorities. Data requests will be submitted using the form found in Appendix A. Each Working Group will provide a chapter outline using the form found in Section VI. Recommendations for improvement made by working groups will be selected and compiled by the Steering Committee for inclusion in the self-study report. Recommendations that do not appear in the final self-study report should be compiled for future focus by appropriate groups, including Shared Governance committees.

Working Group Charge

- Review and study MSCHE materials to become proficient in the MSCHE self-study process, standards for accreditation, and requirements of affiliation
- Oversee the collection and organization of data, documents, processes, assessment results, and other evidence that support compliance with the assigned standard, related criteria, and affiliation requirements. Describe and summarize how each piece of evidence supports assertions in the chapter outline. Coordinate any additional requests for data.
- Identify and address any gaps in policy, process, or evidence. Analyze the collected evidence to address areas where criteria are not supported or weakly supported. Wherever possible, develop strategies to address gaps to improve processes or procedures.
- Based on evidence-based findings, draft a chapter outline that analyzes the institution's compliance with the assigned standard and affiliation requirements. Consider the connections between institutional mission, identified priorities, and strategic goals, noting strengths, challenges, and opportunities for improvement/innovation where appropriate. Authentically represent input from institutional stakeholders in the outline
- Collaborate with other working groups as appropriate to avoid duplication of effort. Share information and insights that might help to identify common areas for improvement.
- Identify potential areas for improvement in institutional process or policy to be addressed in the self-study process to enhance the institution's overall effectiveness and efficiency.
- Facilitate meaningful linkages between the self-study process, institutional mission, and implementation of the College's strategic plan
- Engage appropriate stakeholders and support College-wide coordination and communication of the self-study process; communicate the value of the MSCHE accreditation process; and engage support for the self-study process
- Meet with MSCHE representatives and members of the Peer Review Evaluation Team as needed

Working Groups will analyze the collection of evidence in relation to the criteria to determine:

- Does HCC currently have it? (Meaning: Is the evidence for the criterion sufficient?)
- Does HCC currently use it? (Meaning: Can you show that this is a regular and useful practice/procedure?)
- Is it effective? (Meaning: Can you show how we use the evidence in our efforts toward innovation and continuous improvement?)

Working Group I- Standard I: Mission and Goals

Co-Chairs

- **Beth Kirkpatrick**, Senior Director of PRM
- **Alicia Drumgoole**, Assistant Professor, English

Working Group Members

- Kathleen Jordan D'Ambrisi, Division Director, Health Sciences
- Becky McDermott, Director of Grants Development
- Juan Luna, Assistant Professor, Electrical Engineering
- Michele Blash, Assistant Professor, Nursing
- Sammy Munuswamy, Adjunct Instructor, DEALS
- Fonda Franklin, Manager, Human Resources
- Student Rep

PIE Liaison: **Carlee Ranalli**, Dean, Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Working Group I Charge

- Compile the most relevant evidence and analyze methods used by HCC to comply with Standard I and related criteria
- Demonstrate compliance with MSCHE compliance with Standard I, Requirements of Affiliation (ROAs) 7 and 10

Potential Lines of Inquiry:

1. College History
 - a. How has the history of HCC impacted the mission and goals?
 - b. How has HCC changed its mission and goals over time?
 - c. What's changed at HCC since the last MS accreditation?
 - d. How does HCC share its story?
 - e. How does HCC communicate its mission, strategic goals, and institutional learning outcomes to both internal and external stakeholders?
2. Role of Administration and College Leadership
 - a. Is the administrative structure (including administration and various board memberships) aligned to effectively support the fulfillment of the HCC's mission and goals?
 - b. What is the onboarding process for new administrators, faculty, and board members related to mission and goals?
 - c. What is the role of college leadership in articulating the mission and goals?
 - d. What evidence demonstrates how the HCC's mission guides the decision-making and governing process?
3. Development of Mission and Goals
 - a. How were the current mission and goals developed?
 - b. To what degree are the mission and goals realistic and appropriate in the context of higher education and the region served by HCC.
 - c. How are the major aspects of HCC's mission and goals reflected in the strategic plan?
 - d. In what ways do the mission and goals set a clear and compelling direction for the College?

- e. Describe the process and who's involved in setting the mission and goals.
 - f. What evidence supports that services and operations are responsive to the mission and goals of the institution?
4. Implementation of the Mission and Goals
 - a. How does the institution conduct its strategic planning and budgeting process?
 - b. How do the mission and goals affect academic and administrative decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curriculum development, and assessment, including decisions about what internal initiatives and external opportunities are pursued?
 - c. What evidence shows how divisions and departments align their goals with the College's strategic plan?
 5. Constituents Served by the College
 - a. What audiences does the mission prioritize?
 - b. Who benefits from the College mission and goals?
 - c. How do the mission and goals respond to the unique interests and needs of internal and external constituencies?
 - d. Are opportunities to shape the mission and goals of the College equally accessible to all constituencies?
 6. Communication Related to the Mission and Goals
 - a. How are the mission and goals communicated to internal and external constituents?
 - b. Are the college mission and goals transparent, accessible, and consistent?
 - c. What evidence supports that internal and external constituents are aware of the college's mission and goals?
 7. Potential Gaps and Recommendations
 - a. What evidence exists that the college's values persist or change over time?
 - b. Did the investigation reveal that there are services and operations that are missing or inconsistent with the mission and goals?
 - c. How does HCC periodically assess the mission to ensure that the College's institutional goals are relevant and achievable?
 - d. How is the college proactive in meeting its mission and goals for the future?

Working Group II- Standard II: Ethics and Integrity

Co-Chairs

- **Chris Baer**, Registrar
- **Daniel (DJ) Madron**, Professor, Sociology

Working Group Members

- Mike Stevenson, Program Coordinator, CVT
- Marti Grahl, Intake Assessment & Transition Specialist, PALS
- Dawn Nally, Assistant Professor, Nursing
- Melinda Howell, Associate Professor, Psychology
- Kathy Fike, Instructor, HIM
- Dawn Reed, Coordinator of Administration and Finance
- Elaina Scrivener, Student Rep

PIE Liaison: **Carlee Ranalli**, Dean, Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Working Group II Charge

- Compile the most relevant evidence and objectively analyze how the College complies with Standard II and related criteria
- Ensure compliance with Standard II, ROAs 1-6, 14.
- Address compliance with federal/MSCHE policies and regulations (Standard II, ROA 5), periodic assessment of the effectiveness of HCC policies/procedures and how they are implemented (Standard II) and providing accurate information to MSCHE (ROA14).

Potential Lines of Inquiry:

1. What evidence best demonstrates HCC's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, and a climate of respect among diverse constituents?
2. What evidence best demonstrates the college's commitment to respect for academic and intellectual freedom, freedom of expression, individual property rights, and avoidance of conflicts of interest?
3. What evidence demonstrates the college's commitment to accessibility?
4. What mechanisms are in place to assure the college engages in periodic assessment of ethics and integrity in institutional policies, processes, practices? In what manner are these assessments implemented, and how do processes enable the College to continuously improve?
5. In what ways does HCC demonstrate respect and appreciation for community members of diverse backgrounds with diverse ideas and perspectives? How does the college foster a climate of respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration, particularly in ways that embrace our institutional priority for diversity, equity, and inclusion?
6. How effectively does the college address complaints or grievances raised by students, faculty, or staff?
7. How effective are the college's processes for the development and implementation of policies and procedures to assure fair and impartial hiring, evaluation, promotion, discipline, and separation of employees?
8. How effective are the college's processes for maintaining honesty and truthfulness in public relations announcements, advertisements, recruiting and admissions materials, and internal communications? Do these materials demonstrate alignment to the college's institutional priorities?
9. How effectively does HCC promote affordability and accessibility?
10. How does HCC foster a climate of transparency and accountability with regard to policies and procedures?
11. In what ways do HCC's policies and procedures clearly communicate high ethical standards to students, faculty, staff, and community partners?
12. Has the review and assessment of HCC's institutional practices surrounding ethics and integrity strengthened institutional policies and procedures?

Working Group III- Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

Co-Chairs

- **Vidda Beache**, Dean of Distance Learning
- **Paula Kessler**, Assistant Professor, Math

Working Group Members

- Dawn Schoenenberger, Division Director, Developmental Education & Adult Literacy Services
- Leia Thompson Wood, Instructional Designer
- Dr. Olu Bamiduro, Assistant Professor, Mechanical Engineering Technology
- Victor Olusegun Adegboyega-Edun, Assistant Professor, Web and Animation Technology
- Veronica Stein, Professor, Chemistry and Physical Science
- Mary Beth Chaney, Assistant Professor, Early Childhood Education
- Jamie Bachtell, Manager, Disability Support Services and Cohort Programs
- Jessica Baker, Program Manager, Allied Health
- Charles Coffin, Specialist, Learning Support
- Maureen Iskra, Program Manager, Business Certification and Licensure
- Student Rep

PIE Liaison: Alison Preston, Director of Institutional Research, Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Working Group III Charge

- Compile the most relevant evidence and objectively analyze how the College complies with Standard III and related criteria
- Demonstrate compliance with MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation 8, 9, 10, and 15
- Coordinate with Standard V Educational Effectiveness Assessment Working Group to analyze program effectiveness in the delivery of student learning opportunities.

Potential Lines of Inquiry

1. Is there equitable rigor and coherence of learning experiences (i.e., testing, assessment) ensured between all modalities?
2. How do faculty and staff professional development opportunities support the teaching and program offerings?
3. How do the size, mix, and diversity of the faculty at HCC address the needs of students and the institution?
4. How are general education and program requirements, aligned with institutional learning outcomes and the college's Mission and Goals? A review of whether current general education requirements enhance student learning and adequately prepare students for the workforce.
5. To what extent are diversity, equity, and inclusion integrated into the learning experiences offered by HCC?
6. To what extent do college resources support the delivery of academic learning experience and student success?

7. How does the college clearly and accurately communicate information related to academic programs of study, academic progress, and resources to foster student success?
8. How effective are the processes of developing and designing new programs for the college, and are they consistent across curricula?

Working Group IV- Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience

Co-Chairs

- **Mike Martin**, Coordinator, Academic Advising and Transfer
- **Christine Cramer**, Assistant Professor of Psychology

Working Group Members

- Dr. Charles M. Scheetz, Director, Financial Aid
- Kevin Crawford, Director, Admissions and Enrollment Management
- Angie Auldridge, Manager, Retention and Registration
- Beth Mcknight, Retention Specialist
- Heather Barnhart, Coordinator, Student Activities
- David Grimes, Adjunct/Learning Support Specialist
- Suzannah Moran, Professor, Geography
- Alyssa Little, Assistant Professor, Dance
- Thomas Burge - Assistant Professor, Exercise Science and Health
- Jim Niessner, Assistant Professor, DEALS
- Tanda Emanuel, Assistant Professor/Program Coordinator, HIM
- Lori Kendall, Program Manager, Personal Enrichment and Youth
- Robin Witmer-Kline, Assistant Professor, Psychology
- Amanda Miller, Professor, English
- Student Rep

PIE Liaison: Alison Preston, Director of Institutional Research, Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Working Group IV Charge

- Compile the most relevant evidence and objectively analyze how the college complies with Standard IV and related criteria
- Demonstrate compliance with MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation 8 and 10

Potential Lines of Inquiry

1. HCC has enrolled an increasingly diverse student body with unique financial, social and transportation needs. How have the College's academic and student support programs evolved to meet these needs? How is the college positioning itself to handle the anticipated demographic changes?
2. How do functional areas assess and report on the effectiveness of their programs in supporting the student experience? How effective are the extracurricular and non-academic services and programs offered to support the student experience and foster student success? To what extent

- does the college assess these policies, processes, and practices?
3. How has the College transformed its orientation, advisement, and other student services to enhance student success?
 4. How do the policies and practices link together through the entire student experience, including recruitment, admission, academic success, completion, and post-completion placement for all educational offerings and modalities?
 5. How effective is the college in ensuring the maintenance and protection of student information?
 6. To what degree is accurate and comprehensive information regarding costs, fiscal responsibilities, and repayment options made available and accessible for all students and interested parties?
 7. How do the procedures and practices link together through the entire student experience, including recruitment, admission, academic success, completion, and post-completion outcomes for all educational offerings and modalities?

Working Group V- Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Co-Chairs

- **Mary Hendrickson**, Division Director, BSSB
- **Cindy Blank**, Professor, Biotechnology

Working Group Members

- Jeff Schramm, Assistant Professor, Biology
- Rebecca Westmeyer, Associate Professor, Math
- Sean G Wynkoop, Assistant Professor, English and Speech
- Alison Preston, Director of Institutional Research
- Richard Shulman, Director of Facilities
- Dr. Christine Ohl-Gigliotti, Dean of Students
- Dr. Laura Renninger, Dean of Instruction
- Karen Hammond, Division Director, Nursing
- Student Rep

PIE Liaison: Taylor Rigsby, Data and Assessment Specialist, Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Working Group V Charge

- Compile the most relevant evidence and analyze how the college complies with MSCHE Standard V and all related criteria
- Demonstrate compliance with MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation 8, 9, and 10

Potential Lines of Inquiry

1. Provide evidence that institutional (e.g., ILOs) and degree/program goals are clearly stated, aligned with each other (for example, curriculum maps), and support the College's mission. Demonstrate that the goals are accompanied by "defensible standards" for evaluating whether students are achieving them.
2. What systems are in place to collect, analyze, and report the extent to which student learning goals at the course, program, and institutional level are achieved? How have these systems

changed over the period since the last self-study? What processes were used to evaluate the need for change? To what extent are the methods used effectively?

3. How effectively does the College assess student learning and achievement, including educational goals, at the program/degree level? Provide evidence that degree and program goals prepare students in a manner consistent with the College mission “for successful careers, meaningful lives, and, as appropriate, further education.” Program review data may include evidence relating to student learning and achievement, such as SLOA results, graduation rates, placement information, retention of students at the program level, as well as other pertinent indicators.
4. What system exists to collect, analyze and evaluate the extent to which general education goals are achieved? How has the system of assessment changed over time? What process(es) was/were used to evaluate the need for changes? To what extent, is the system effective?
5. Upon reflection, including from the responses above, what additional improvements are needed to enhance the assessment of educational effectiveness? Are the systems used sustainable?
6. How are the results of student learning and achievement assessments used to make improvements in teaching and learning? Provide evidence of this practice in various aspects of College processes, including planning, budgeting, developing and modifying curricula, updating academic policy (such as the modification of prerequisite requirements), assisting students in improving their learning, improving pedagogy, providing faculty development, and improving key indicators of student success (retention, graduation, transfer), etc.
7. Provide evidence and documentation that student achievement indicators and assessment results are communicated to stakeholders and that the information that is shared with stakeholders is used to improve teaching and learning.
8. To what extent are assessment processes regularly reviewed and used to set strategic goals for educational improvement? How does the College ensure its assessment activities evolve to reflect institutional priorities and best practices?

Working Group VI- Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Co-Chairs

- **Dana Poole**, Division Director, English and Humanities
- **Lore Kuehnert**, Associate Professor, History

Working Group Members

- David Bittorf, Director, Finance
- Patrick McCord, Assistant Director, Facilities
- LuAnn Fisher, Digital Resources Librarian
- Jack Drooger, Program Manager, Trades, Transportation, and IT
- John Dankulich, Manager, Campus Food Services
- Joe Seiler, Manager, Information Technology
- Student Rep

PIE Liaison: JoAnna Shank, Research Associate, Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Working Group VI Charge

- Compile the most relevant evidence and analyze how the college complies with MSCHE Standard VI and all related criteria
- Demonstrate compliance with MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation 8, 10, and 11

Potential Lines of Inquiry

1. How are resources allocated in alignment with the mission and strategic institutional priorities?
2. How does the College's strategic planning process advance institutional improvement?
3. How does the financial planning and budgeting process align with and support HCC's mission, institutional priorities, and strategic goals?
4. How do assessment and institutional improvement tie to planning and resource allocation decisions and what evidence demonstrates the effectiveness of these assessment processes?
5. How effectively does the College ensure the sustainability of its long-term assets in alignment with the mission, strategic goals, and institutional priorities?
6. How are the physical and technical infrastructure updated to meet the needs of innovation and delivery of new and existing academic programs?
7. How is decision making informed by the changing landscape of higher education in order to achieve the College's mission and strategic goals?

Working Group VII- Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

Co-Chairs

- **Stacey McGee**, Associate Professor, Business and Accounting
- **Ashley Whaley**, Director, Campus Advancement

Working Group Members

- Laurie Montgomery, Division Director, Math & Science
- Jess S. Miller, Development Coordinator
- Rosie Oberholzer, Human Resources Specialist
- Becky Shives, Executive Assistant, President's Office
- Melinda May, Professor, English and Humanities
- Margaret Yaukey, Instructor, Art
- Eric Schwartz, Assistant Professor, Political Science
- James Pierne, Assistant Professor, Business Management
- Jamie Cannon, Labor Relations General Counsel
- Maya Mentzer, Student Rep

PIE Liaison: Carlee Ranalli, Dean, Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Working Group VII Charge

- Compile the most relevant evidence and analyze how the college complies with MSCHE standard VII and all related criteria
- Demonstrate compliance with MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation 12 and 13

Potential Lines of Inquiry

1. How are governance, leadership, and administrative structures assessed, and how effective are these assessments in guiding advancements in institutional operations?
2. How effectively does the board of trustees enable the college to meet the institutional priorities and strategic goals?
3. To what extent does shared governance ensure the support of college advancement through the management and allocation of resources?
4. In what ways do current governance structures facilitate participation in decision-making by faculty, staff and students to advance the mission and goals of HCC? How effectively does the governance structure interact with faculty, staff, and students to achieve academic excellence and fulfill the college's mission?
5. To what degree is a transparent governance structure clearly articulated to outline roles, responsibilities, and accountability for decision-making by each constituency?
6. How effective are procedures in place to review and assess the governance structure, leadership, administrative offices, and faculty departments to ensure support of the College's mission and institutional priorities?
7. What opportunities to enhance continuous improvement and innovation have you discovered, and what recommendations can you make for improvement in these areas?
8. What efforts are made by administration and leadership to enhance internal communication in order to help alleviate organizational stress?
9. What efforts are made by administration and leadership to assist employees on seeing their roles as agents of transformation within the community and the College. How does the College provide, proactively, leadership development opportunities on a regular, planned basis?

VI. Guidelines for Reporting

Steering committee co-chairs and the Dean of PIE will meet twice a month to discuss progress, address issues that arise, and determine appropriate steps to keep the process on schedule. The steering committee/co-chairs will communicate monthly to collaborate, discuss progress, and share insights and challenges. The working group co-chairs will submit a monthly report that includes the following: the current goals, how much progress has been made toward those goals, the evidence that was collected or accessed in the evidence inventory, and any requests for help or support from the steering committee. Regular updates will also be provided to the steering committee via the PIE liaisons assigned to each group. A working group timetable has been created, which lists expected work products and time frames for the completion of tasks. (See Appendix B: Working Group Timetable).

Each self-study group will be provided with the following outline template at the orientation meeting:

Outline Template

I. Introduction/Background/Overview

- Provide a brief review of the Standard(s) addressed by the Work Group.
- What aspect of the HCC's operations, programs and/or services was researched and analyzed?
- Which plan, policy, procedure and assessment did you consider or use?
- Why were these areas of focus chosen and how did you determine them?

II. Description of Lines of Inquiry

- What lines of inquiry did you focus on and why?
- How were these lines of inquiry determined? Who had input in creating or revising them?
- How do these particular lines of inquiry enable your group to fulfill its charge?

III. Collaboration, Connections and Evidence Inventory Approach

- Which other self-study groups did you collaborate with and why? Where did your lines of inquiry intersect?
- How did you contribute to/use the evidence inventory?

IV. Assessment Tools

- What was your method or approach to analyzing your lines of inquiry?
- What research did you do? What assessment information did you use to analyze the lines of inquiry? (Can be a list)
- Was the research and evidence you used sufficient to address your lines of inquiry? If not, what data should be collected in the future?

V. Areas of Strength: This section must be based upon empirical evidence.

- Provide a brief statement of strengths.
- How do we meet the fundamental elements of this standard(s)? Provide assessments/reports, etc. used to reach your conclusions, in addition to specific examples if applicable.
- List areas where the College has demonstrated exceptional and/or consistent effectiveness and areas in which the College has demonstrated significant improvement since the 2004 self-study.
- Are there questions being investigated by other work groups that have bearing on this report? Identify the groups and questions that are related.

VI. Opportunities for improvement and innovation: This section must be based upon empirical evidence.

- List evidence-based opportunities for improvement and innovation based on analytical report.
- Provide a brief statement of challenges.
- List specific recommendations for improvement, including potential strategies.
- Are there questions being investigated by other work groups that have bearing on this report? Identify the groups and questions that are related.

The core leadership team will draft chapters based on the outline templates submitted by the working groups in order to provide a cohesive report. The outlines submitted by the working groups should be formatted according to the following guidelines:

- Microsoft Word
- APA formatting for citations
- Single-spaced, Calibri 12-point font
- Active voice, third person, present tense
- 10-12 pages

VII. Organization of the Final Self-Study Report

The final self-study report will be organized by chapter, beginning with an executive summary that clearly identifies key findings and recommendations for improvement. An introduction chapter will provide an overview of the institution and a brief description of how the institutional priorities were selected. The introduction will also explain the organization of the remaining chapters and how to use the evidence inventory.

The report will be organized as follows:

1. Table of Contents, Glossary, List of Tables
2. Executive Summary
3. Introduction
4. Standard I: Mission and Goals
5. Standard II: Ethics and Integrity
6. Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience
7. Standard IV: Support of the Student Learning Experience
8. Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment
9. Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement
10. Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration
11. Requirements of Affiliation (including links to where each is addressed in the report and additional evidence if not addressed in the body of the report)
12. Conclusion (including a summary of key findings, outline of initial plans to address identified opportunities, and concluding observations of how the self-study process is being used to continuously improve student achievement and meet the College's mission and goals)

VIII. Verification of Compliance Strategy

Dr. Carlee Ranalli, Dean of PIE and ALO will collaborate with appropriate units across the College to compile and confirm the necessary evidence to verify institutional compliance with accreditation-relevant federal regulations developed by the United States Department of Education. Dr. Ranalli will seek evidence to determine whether the necessary policies and/or procedures are (1) in writing, (2) approved and administered through applicable institutional processes, (3) accessible to constituents, and (4) reflect current practice. Dr. Ranalli will regularly confer with Working Group II (Ethics and Integrity) throughout the process. Periodic updates will be provided to the steering committee co-chairs during scheduled meetings and to the full steering committee during regular steering committee meetings. A draft compliance report will be submitted to the steering committee for approval in spring 2024.

As recommended, the Verification of Federal Regulations Compliance Report and supporting evidence will be combined into a single, bookmarked PDF file and uploaded to the MSCHE portal in January 2025, along with the Self-Study Report and other relevant documents.

The following table includes a list of potential units to be consulted during this process:

Current Compliance Areas	Units to be Consulted
Student identity verification in distance and correspondence education	Office of the Registrar, Office of Student Financial Aid, Dean of Distance Learning, IT
Transfer of credit policies and articulation agreements	Office of the Registrar, Dean of Instruction
Title IV program responsibilities	Office of Student Financial Aid
Institutional records of student complaints	Office of Student Services, VPAAS
Required information for students and the public standing with State and other accrediting agencies	PIE
Contractual relationships	VP for Finance and Administration
Assignment of credit hours	Dean of Instruction, VPAAS

IX. Self-Study Timetable

The timetable below was created to assist in guiding the steering committee, working groups, and other college stakeholders in their work. This timetable will be published on the self-study website as part of the communication plan.

Self-Study Timetable	
2022	
Oct-Dec	Attend Self-Study Institute, Co-Chairs identified and begin meeting, create Teams site/webpage, begin drafting communications plan
2023	
Jan	Identify Institutional Priorities, consider Steering Committee membership
Jan 27	Call with VP Liaison
April	Steering Committee membership confirmed
April	Submit Self-Study Design Draft
April 25	Self-Study Prep Visit with VP Liaison (Dr. Melissa Hardin)
May 15	Finalize Working Group membership
May 22	Self-study Kickoff Orientation
June 2	Steering Committee begins meeting every 2 weeks
June 12	Revisions and acceptance of Self-Study Design
May-Sept	Working Groups collect evidence, submit data requests, conduct gap analysis, and provide updates to the Steering Committee
Oct 15	First chapter outline due
Dec 15	First chapter draft completed
2024	

Jan-Feb	Working Groups receive feedback and revise chapter outlines
Mar 1	Working Groups Submit Chapter Outline Draft #2
April 14	Working Groups Submit Final Chapter Outlines
May	Team Chair selected, Site Evaluation date identified, accepted Self-Study Design provided to Team Chair, Draft Self-Study Report #1 written by Core Leadership Team
June	Draft Self-Study Report #1 shared for feedback
Aug -Sept	Draft Self-Study Report #2 written and shared with college community for feedback
Oct	Final Revisions to Self-Study Report
	Draft Self-Study Report sent to Team Chair (2 weeks before visit), Verification of Federal Regulations Compliance Report finalized for Steering Committee
Nov	Team Chair Preliminary Visit
Dec 20	Final Self-Study Report shared with the college community.
2025	
Jan	Upload Report, Verification of Compliance, Evidence Inventory (6 weeks before team visit), prepare College community for upcoming site visit.
Mar-April	On-Site Evaluation Team Visit Receive draft team report within 2 weeks after the Site Visit Provide corrections of factual errors in team report within five days Evaluation Team Report submitted to MSCHE by Team Chair within five days Formal Institutional Response within one week Campus and community announcement regarding the evaluation team report
June	MSCHE action

X. Communication Plan

An overarching communication plan was created to keep campus constituencies informed about the process. This will help to ensure the self-study is inclusive and transparent, facilitate feedback from institutional stakeholders, and provide updates about major developments related to the self-study process.

While most members of the community will be involved in some aspect of the research, it is crucial that all have ready access to the process, progress, and the findings and recommendations of other teams. To provide this access, the College has established a website that will contain an introduction to the self-study process, the Self-Study Design, email links to key leaders, committee meeting minutes, regularly updated announcements, links to self-study documents, and links to relevant external resources. In addition to the website, there will be campus e-mail updates when appropriate. Progress of the Self-Study will also be reported at Board of Trustees meetings.

Purpose	Audience(s)	Methods	Timing	Person Responsible
To determine institutional priorities and interest in Working Groups	Campus Community	Survey- email	SP 23	Core Team
To share documents and data for research process	Steering Committee & Working Groups	Teams folders for document storage; PIE representative in each self-study group; regular check-ins by Core Team	SP/FA 23	Core Team, PIE representative, repository manager
To update the campus community on the Self-Study process	Administration and Staff	HCC Middle States Self-Study Webpage; open forums; administrative and staff representatives on Steering Committee; updates at Academic Affairs meetings; email updates	SP 23-SP 25 Ongoing updates to website; periodic updates at AA meetings	Steering Committee; Core Team; webmaster
To update the faculty on the Self-Study process	Faculty	HCC Middle States Self-Study Webpage; open forums; faculty representatives on Steering Committee; updates at Faculty Assembly meetings; updates at division meetings; email updates	SP 23-SP 25 Ongoing updates to website; monthly reports at Faculty Assembly meetings	Steering Committee; Core Team
Sharing updates on Working Group reports and solicit feedback	Students	SGA meetings; open forums; email updates	SP 23-SP 25	SGA representative; Steering Committee
Sharing updates on Working Group reports and solicit feedback	Alumni/Community	updates in alumni newsletter and emails	SP 23-SP 25	Steering Committee; Core Team
Sharing updates on Working Group reports and solicit feedback	Board of Trustees	HCC Middle States Self-Study Webpage; presentations at BOT meetings	SP 23-SP 25	BOT Steering Committee member; Core Team

Sharing updates on Working Group reports and solicit feedback	Administration and Staff	Feedback about relevant Working Group reports by administrative and staff representatives on Steering Committee; feedback from reviewing body	SP 23-SP 25	Steering Committee; Core Team
Sharing updates on Working Group reports and solicit feedback	Faculty	Feedback about relevant Working Group reports by faculty representatives on Steering Committee; feedback from reviewing body	SP 23-SP 25	Steering Committee; Core Team

XI. Evaluation Team Profile

Given HCC’s mission, the team chair should be a current or former community college president who has had significant leadership responsibilities within a largely rural community college of a similar size. The chair should be familiar with institutions that provide a robust offering of programs that include both credit and non-credit opportunities as well as a mix of transfer and career-oriented degrees. A team with substantial experience with dual enrollment programs would be preferred.

With HCC's continued commitment to strengthening and sustaining academic development, having one or more team members selected who has solid experience in curriculum development, instructional design, academic standards and outcomes assessment is highly desired. A person with considerable experience in enrollment management, academic advising, and student support services in a learning-center environment would make a valuable team member for this peer review process as well.

Institutions considered comparable and inspirational peers are listed in Tables 9 and 10 below. The process used to select HCC’s peer and aspirant institutions did not identify more than one institution accredited by MSCHE.

Table 9. Peer Institutions

Institution	State	Accreditor
<i>Hagerstown Community College</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>MSCHE</i>
Peer Institutions		
Davidson County Community College	NC	SACSCOC
Gateway Community and Technical College	KY	SACSCOC
Hazard Community and Technical College	KY	SACSCOC
Jefferson College	MO	HLC
Kaskaskia College	IL	HLC
Kishwaukee College	IL	HLC
Madisonville Community College	KY	SACSCOC

Mid Michigan College	MI	HLC
Northern Oklahoma College	OK	HLC
Owensboro Community and Technical College	KY	SACSCOC
St Clair County Community College	MI	HLC
SUNY Corning Community College	NY	MSCHE
Tunxis Community College	CT	NECHE

Table 10. Aspirant Institutions

Institution	State	Accreditor
<i>Hagerstown Community College</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>MSCHE</i>
Aspirant Institutions		
Clovis Community College	NM	HLC
East Mississippi Community College	MS	SACSCOC
Northeast Community College	NE	HLC
Northwood Technical College ¹	WI	HLC
Pearl River Community College	MS	SACSCOC
West Hills College-Lemoore	CA	ACCJC

Frederick Community College has a common student recruitment target area. There are no known conflicts of interest.

XII. Strategies for Managing the Evidence Inventory

HCC’s approach to curating and maintaining the primary evidence inventory is to assign the collection, organization, and analysis of evidence to the relevant working groups. HCC will compile a primary evidence inventory that will serve as a repository of all resources and documents identified to document compliance with the standards and requirements of affiliation. Each Working Group has been assigned a PIE liaison as a supporting member. This liaison will contribute to and observe the overall process with an eye on evidence gathering and inventorying while being mindful of any duplication of effort as well as gaps that emerge.

The primary inventory will be housed in a Teams site created by the PIE team and shared among committee members. The site includes folders for each of the working groups as well as a folder for posting general evidence and a folder to organize the verification of compliance materials. Steering committee and working group members will have read access to the inventory while PIE liaisons will have write and delete access. PIE liaisons will provide technical support and expertise in using the inventory. The primary inventory will be refined to create the final evidence inventory, which will contain only documents used to support assertions made in the final report. A master inventory will be

¹ Northwood Technical College was formerly named Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College and is still referred to by that name on data sources that pre-date the change.

created to facilitate the identification of areas lacking sufficient documentation and create a long-term resource for the College.

Working Groups will utilize a multi-phase process to populate and curate the evidence inventory:

- **Evidence Collection.** Relevant resources and documents to support each assigned standard and requirements of affiliation will be gathered and reviewed. As appropriate, the MSCHE evidence rubric will be used to evaluate key resources. The master inventory will be populated with evidence. Groups have been charged with completing their initial evidence collection by June 2023. Documents in the inventory will be numbered using a shared naming convention using the standard and criteria it applies to.
- **Gap Analysis.** Groups have been charged with identifying and addressing gaps found in their evidence. Group members will document gaps and provide recommendations for addressing these gaps. The steering committee will review the gap analyses and determine how to address identified gaps.
- **Development of Final Evidence Inventory.** The final inventory uploaded to the MSCHE portal in January 2024 will include only the documents referenced in the final self-study report. The master and final inventories will be maintained and made available to the Evaluation Team and representatives from MSCHE upon request.

Appendix A: Request for Information/Data for Self-Study Work Group

Request for Information/Data for Self-Study Work Groups

Complete this form to request information or data that are needed by Self-Study Work Groups. After submission of this form, the PIE Office will follow-up with the person who submitted the form if necessary. Unless otherwise specified, the information or data requested will be delivered directly to the Work Group's Teams Site and a notification of the availability of the document(s) will be posted in the discussion for that group.

Submitted by:

- Work Group
- Name of Person Making Request
- Date of Request

Information/Data needed:

Information to serve as an exhibit in Middle States Resource Library:

- Yes
- No

Unless otherwise requested, information will be delivered to the Work Group's Teams site.

- Yes, deliver to the Teams site (default)
- Please provide information directly to:

Additional Comments

Appendix B: Working Group Timetable

Working Group Timetable	
2023	
Jan-March	Consider and establish Steering Committee membership
April 25	Self-study Preparation Visit with VP Liaison
May	Establish and charge Steering Committee and Working Groups to schedule kickoff meetings for groups, begin outlining chapter, gather evidence
May 22	Steering Committee meeting
June 12	Submit Self-Study Design Revision
June 25	Complete first phase of evidence collection, submit requests to PIE liaison to acquire additional documentation
Aug/Sept	Finalize evidence gathering and chapter outlines (including known gaps in evidence)
September	First internal working outline (using Do we, have it? Do We Use It? Does it Work? analysis)
October	Solidify best evidence and align with assertions in the chapter outline
October 15	Submit chapter outline for drafting
November	Finalize chapter draft, conduct final gap analysis for evidence
December 15	First chapter draft completed
2024	
Jan/Feb	Revise chapter outline based on feedback
March 1	Submit second chapter outline draft
April 14	Submit the final chapter outline of the report
May 31	Team Chair selected; On-Site Evaluation dates chosen
June-July	Draft report disseminated for review and feedback from designated readers
Aug/Sept	Draft report disseminated to the College community for feedback
Oct/Nov	Final revisions to report and host Team Chair preliminary visit
December 20	Final report shared with the College community
2025	
Jan-April	Prepare for an on-site Team Evaluation visit