



MARIST COLLEGE

Self-Study Design

Prepared for Middle States Commission on Higher Education

November 2021

Table of Contents

I. Institutional Overview	3
II. Institutional Priorities to be Addressed in the Self-Study	3
III. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study	11
IV. Self-Study Approach	11
V. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups	11
VI. Guidelines for Reporting	20
VII. Organization of the Final Self-Study Report.....	23
VIII. Verification of Compliance Strategy	24
IX. Self-Study Timetable	24
X. Communication Plan.....	26
XI. Evaluation Team Profile	27
XII. Evidence Inventory.....	28
Appendix A. Sample Working Group Analysis Table	30
Appendix B. Sample Evidence Inventory Organizational Structure	31

I. Institutional Overview

Marist College, a mid-sized comprehensive institution rooted in the liberal arts, is a rare institution in higher education. Its riverside campus in Poughkeepsie, New York, provides state-of-the-art facilities and tech-savvy, forward-thinking academic programs for the 21st century. With its main campus located 95 minutes by train from New York City and a branch campus situated within the heart of Florence, Italy, Marist is bucolic yet plugged into the chief economic and cultural centers of the world. Guided by values handed down by its founders, Marist offers its approximately 6,400 students access to vast and contemporary learning opportunities.

The College has transformed since its founding in 1929. What was once a small training ground for Marist Brothers has evolved into a complex educational institution with a global reach. Marist is now regularly recognized by industry publications for its excellent programs and student outcomes. U.S. News & World Report ranked Marist in the Top 10 Regional Universities – North, #7 in Best Undergraduate Teaching, and #2 for Most Innovative Schools.

Currently, the College educates approximately 5,000 traditional undergraduate students, 920 graduate students, 250 adult continuing education students, and 470 high school students who take Marist courses for credit. These students come from 34 different states and 18 different countries, making Marist a vibrant and diverse community of students and scholars. The 240 full-time and 323 part-time faculty members work across seven academic schools to provide education that is grounded in the liberal arts and focused on preparing students for successful and fulfilling lives and careers.

The College is an independent institution governed by a lay board of trustees yet continues to embrace the ethical underpinnings and culture of the Marist Brothers as an important part of its history and identity. Energized by these traditions, the College is also leading the way in the use of technology to enhance teaching and learning, and to improve organizational efficiency.

Marist embarks on this self-study process at a unique point in its history. It is transitioning to a new president after one of the longest presidential tenures in the history of American higher education; it is facing complex threats to private higher education, particularly in the Northeast; it is emerging from a pandemic that endangered health and finances, and upended time-honored practices; and, like institutions across the country, it is being called upon to more purposefully contribute to a just society and healthy planet.

Brief History

The Order of the Marist Brothers was founded in France in 1817 as an effort to provide an educational and spiritual respite from the violent revolutions and counter-revolutions afflicting France at the time. Oriented toward public service and the formation of young people, the Order found a natural traction in higher education. In 1905, the Brothers purchased a home and property along the Hudson River in Poughkeepsie, NY, and named it St. Ann's Hermitage. College-level courses were first offered in 1929, and in 1946, the State of New York granted the institution, then called Marian College, an official, four-year charter. In 1960, the College changed its name to Marist College and expanded its mission, admitting laypeople to pursue undergraduate studies, and adding an evening division to serve adults in the surrounding

community. By 1969, women were admitted into all programs, and control, governance, and fiscal responsibility were transferred to a lay board. While proud of its heritage, Marist College is now an independent institution and welcomes students of all faiths.

In 1979, Dr. Dennis J. Murray became the third president and served for nearly 40 years. President Murray oversaw the expansion and beautification of the campus, prominence in the use and study of technology, increase in student body enrollment and selectivity, diversification of programs, and substantial growth in endowment and other assets. Under his leadership, the College grew from a small local college with limited resources to a nationally ranked comprehensive institution. Dr. Murray retired in 2016 but returned three years later to lead once again after the brief tenure of his successor, David N. Yellen.

On October 4, 2021, Marist welcomed with great excitement Dr. Kevin C. Weinman as the College's fifth president. President Weinman came to Marist from Amherst College, where he served as chief financial officer and chief administrative officer, and as a close advisor to Amherst's president for eight years. He brings strong academic credentials as well as financial and administrative experience that includes overseeing the areas of finance, investments, shared services, and information technology. Prior to his position at Amherst, President Weinman served as assistant vice president for finance at Dartmouth College. In that role, he directed a team of analysts and coordinated institution-wide efforts across all divisions, schools, and auxiliaries to create and maintain Dartmouth's \$1 billion annual operating budget and long-range financial plans.

Mission and Goals

"Marist is dedicated to helping students develop the intellect, character, and skills required for enlightened, ethical, and productive lives in the global community of the 21st century."

-Marist College Mission Statement

In 2016-2017, Marist engaged in a comprehensive strategic planning process that resulted in the *Marist College Strategic Plan 2018-2023: Student Success, Innovation, and the Social Good*. Building on historic strengths, the plan honors the College's core values - excellence in education, a sense of community, and a commitment to service. At the same time, it sets a path for innovation and creativity in order to fuel success in the years ahead.

The plan focuses on three essential goals: Ensuring Student Success, Promoting Innovation, and Advancing the Social Good. For each goal, specific initiatives are identified to ensure there is a clear path for effective implementation. In the area of Student Success, initiatives focus on developing essential competencies of critical thinking, written and verbal expression, ethical inquiry and reflection, technological proficiency, multiculturalism and cultural competency, entrepreneurialism, leadership, and collaborative work. They also include creating research opportunities, internships, clinical placements, and community-based learning experiences. In the area of innovation, the plan focuses on collaboration and experimentation, encouraging partnerships, new operational and pedagogical approaches, and the use of technology and analytics to support students and college operations.

Toward the advancement of the social good, Marist endeavors to promote justice, advance knowledge, protect the environment, and encourage students to serve their communities throughout their lives. Initiatives include actions aimed at increasing diversity and inclusion, enhancing Marist's leadership in ethical knowledge, using human capital to help solve societal problems, and implementing sustainable practices.

These goals and initiatives serve as the framework for the College's annual planning and assessment process. Performance is monitored closely from year to year and within the landscape of higher education.

Faculty and Academics

Marist's 240 full-time faculty members are devoted to teaching and to the personal and intellectual growth of their students. Small class sizes encourage a culture of close interaction between faculty and students. Approximately 65% of the full-time faculty are tenured or tenure-track. They are complemented by 323 part-time instructional staff teaching in all units of the College. Marist faculty are recent recipients of major NSF, NIH, and U.S. Department of Education grants; have received Fulbright Research Awards; have published books with major university presses, such as Oxford, MIT, and the University of North Carolina; and serve in key leadership positions in professional organizations and on editorial boards of major journals. The faculty is non-unionized and uses a collegial governance model.

The College offers 53 undergraduate majors, 13 graduate programs, one doctoral program, and multiple certificate programs through its seven schools: the School of Communication and the Arts, the School of Computer Science and Mathematics, the School of Liberal Arts, the School of Management, the School of Science, the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and the School of Professional Programs. The most popular majors are business, communication, psychology, and fashion. The College also offers a number of unique programs at its branch campus in Florence, Italy, including one master's degree and eight bachelor's degrees that are the only four-year U.S. bachelor's degree programs in Florence.

The undergraduate general education curriculum, called the Core/Liberal Studies program, requires two foundational courses, First Year Seminar and Writing for College; three credits each in the following eight breadth areas: Ethics & Justice, Fine Arts, History, Literature, Mathematics, Natural Science, Philosophy, and Social Science; and 12 credits in predefined thematic pathways. Within these 36 distribution credits, or in addition to them, students must take skill-intensive courses in technology competency and public presentation.

The College has expanded its graduate offerings in recent years to include a number of allied health programs. Marist's Physician Assistant program was established in 2016 and received full accreditation in 2020; the program's first cohort achieved a 100 percent first-time pass rate on their national licensing exam. The Doctor of Physical Therapy program, Marist's first doctoral degree, enrolled its first class in 2018 and was granted full accreditation status in 2020.

Marist offers several academic programs fully online. The Master of Business Administration (New York State's first AACSB-accredited, 100%-online MBA program), Master of Public Administration, and Bachelor of Professional Studies programs are recognized in U.S. News &

World Report's 2020 list of "Best Online Education Programs." As an early adopter of online education, Marist was uniquely positioned to quickly and successfully pivot to online learning in Spring 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Unique Learning Opportunities and Campus Life

Supplementing the academic programs, Marist also offers many unique learning opportunities. Marist's nationally recognized study abroad initiatives (currently ranked #3 among master's level institutions) include two unique first-year programs, the Freshman Florence Experience and Freshman Dublin Experience, in which students spend their first year in either Florence or Dublin. The IBM Joint Study program, in place for more than 30 years, has provided the College with the capacity to acquire and use cutting-edge technology in instruction and research, helping to place Marist among the most technologically advanced liberal arts colleges in the country. The College also has a robust Honors program that offers a foundation of high-impact practices, including mentored faculty-student research experiences, civic engagement seminars and projects, and interdisciplinary Honors seminars.

Perhaps the best known of the College's unique initiatives is The Marist Poll, which is housed in the Marist College Institute for Public Opinion. Founded in 1978, the Institute was the first college-based research center to include undergraduates in conducting survey research. Today, The Marist Poll regularly works with major media partners to conduct scientific public opinion polls on issues and elections.

Several additional Centers of Excellence further enhance the academic experience, including the Hudson River Valley Institute, the Center for Sports Communication, the Center for Social Justice Research, and the Institute for Data Center Professionals. The Center for Civic Engagement and Leadership creates opportunities for students to work with local nonprofit organizations on projects that positively contribute to the Poughkeepsie community. The College also hosts the Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library's digital archives, making it one of only six colleges and universities in the nation that are affiliated with a presidential library.

A deep sense of community characterizes the on-campus student experience. Marist is a place where students stay involved and active in campus life and the surrounding area. All of the more than 80 student clubs provide community service in the local Poughkeepsie community. Special service opportunities through Campus Ministry are particularly meaningful for students. Also popular are organizations that engage students in music, arts, theatre, dance, and culture. Approximately 600 student-athletes participate in Marist's 23 NCAA Division I athletic teams. The College's esports team was named Esports Program of the Year by the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference (MAAC) in 2020.

Marist's unique learning opportunities serve our students well. Students have been awarded some of the most prestigious national scholarships and fellowships available. Numerous graduating seniors have been awarded the Fulbright U.S. Student Program grant, and in 2020 a student received the James Madison Memorial Fellowship. Eighty-three percent of students participate in at least one credit-bearing internship, and 97% of graduates in the past five years have been employed or in graduate school within six months of completing their degrees.

Great strides have been made to diversify the racial, ethnic, religious, and economic make-up of the student body, and now 21.1% of undergraduate students identify as students of color (11.5% as Latinx/Hispanic, 4.2% as Black/African American, 2.7% as Asian, 0.1% Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander; and 2.6% as multiracial). Pell-eligible students represent nearly 14% of the student body. For comparison, in 2006, the number of students identifying as students of color was approximately 9% and Pell-eligible students were 10.3%. In addition, students of many religious backgrounds and faiths now make Marist their home.

This increase in diversity has underscored Marist's obligation to ensure all students feel welcome, valued, and able to learn. Marist's commitment to equity and inclusion is reflected in increased staffing and programming to support students identifying as BIPOC, LGBTQ+, low income, first generation, international, differently abled, veterans, and/or religious minorities. Initiatives also include training for faculty, staff, and students aimed at reducing bias and increasing cultural competency; efforts to diversify the curriculum; and the introduction of more inclusive policies and practices, to name a few. Reflecting the importance of diversity, equity, and inclusion to Marist, the Board of Trustees' Diversity and Inclusion Committee is monitoring and publicly reporting on Marist's progress in these areas.

Enrollment Trends and Financial Outlook

The world of higher education has seen tremendous change this year, and that trend is likely to continue. Marist's annual operating budget for fiscal year 2021 is \$200 million, with about \$142 million coming from net tuition and fees. Before COVID, the annual operating budget was typically about \$225 million. The \$371 million investment portfolio has been well managed, with a draw of less than 1% each year taken to support the College's budget.

Marist is well-positioned to succeed, even in this dynamic and challenging environment for higher education. The College has produced balanced budgets for more than 40 consecutive years, and this history of prudent and conservative financial management has resulted in a strong fiscal position. Marist received the highest score on the Department of Education's Financial Responsibility Test. Fitch Ratings recently reaffirmed the College's A+ credit rating and revised our outlook to "positive" from "stable," citing Marist's "solid position" in a competitive market. Marist has also received a Moody's bond rating of A2 with a stable outlook.

Traditional-aged-student recruitment has become more intense as there are fewer college-bound students in Marist's core markets. This has significantly increased the competition for new students. A more savvy and price-conscious consumer has amplified this intensity, leading to increased tuition discount rates and a reduction in net tuition revenue at most colleges and universities around the country. Marist's overall discount rate has grown slowly in recent years to approximately 37.5%. Marist is also deeply committed to the principles of access and affordability, and distributes approximately \$85 million annually through need-based grants, merit awards, and other scholarships.

Since Marist's last reaccreditation, the total number of new students entering Marist each year (freshman and transfers) has grown by about 10% (1336 to 1465). Despite the increase, the College's first-year-retention rate has remained very strong, fluctuating between 88% and 91%, and the six-year graduation rate improved to 84.7%, well above the national average.

Freshman applications also increased during this time period (9,546 to 11,512) and the overall quality and diversity of the entering students improved. The percentage of students hailing from outside New York State went from 47.1% to 55.8%, and students who identify as Black/African American, Latinx/Hispanic, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, or multi-racial increased from 14.4% to 23.1%.

While we are pleased with these results, we must continue to expand our geographic footprint and penetrate new markets if we want to continue attracting highly qualified and increasingly more diverse students to Marist. This will be especially difficult as we approach the peak of the demographic shift and compete in an increasingly competitive marketplace. We are confident that the College is well positioned to meet these future challenges.

Unfortunately, Marist has not met with the same success in the adult undergraduate market, as overall enrollment in these programs has been in steady decline for the last 10 years. To be competitive in this area, it will need to be a major strategic focus moving forward.

Overall, new graduate student enrollment has remained relatively steady over the last decade, with some fluctuation by academic program. During this time, the College successfully launched several new programs, including a MS in physician assistant studies and a Doctor of Physical Therapy. We will need to monitor our graduate portfolio very closely in the coming years and be ready to respond quickly to new opportunities that arise from changes in the marketplace.

Development and Alumni Engagement

The College successfully completed its first comprehensive campaign in 2012, raising nearly \$160 million on an ambitious goal of \$150 million. A total of 14,388 donors contributed to the Campaign for Marist, including 21 gifts of \$1 million or more. Significant support was secured for major capital initiatives, the faculty, and the establishment of more than 40 new endowed scholarships. More recently, new gifts, pledges, and grants totaled more than \$12 million in the 2019-2020 fiscal year, including more than \$2 million in unrestricted gifts.

The College's alumni, now numbering more than 46,000, are highly engaged. Alumni are increasingly successful in their careers and support Marist in growing numbers. In addition to financial support, alumni are a bridge to opportunity for students, providing mentorship, internships, and more. Marist also has an impressive record of development success with prominent philanthropists in the surrounding region, and benefits greatly from an expanding cadre of highly capable, supportive parents.

Facilities

The Marist College main campus—which consists of 75 buildings across 251 acres along the eastern and western shores of the Hudson River—reflects visionary strategic planning. The campus master plan (originally designed by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill in 2005 and updated by Robert A. M. Stern Architects in 2012) has, over several decades, reoriented the campus toward the river. Alumni will point out green, rolling fields that were once parking lots, and expansive river vistas that once looked out onto industrial plants. Adding to Marist's newly constructed buildings is an historic 60-acre riverfront estate in Esopus, NY, acquired as part of the largest gift

ever to the College in 2009. The estate is home to the Raymond A. Rich Institute for Leadership Development.

It is within a confluence of contexts—a presidential transition, challenges in demographics and recruitment of college students in the Northeast, reorientation of campus life due to the pandemic, and a renewed focus on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion—that Marist embarks upon its self-study process. Marist is committed to ensuring this is a collaborative, reflective, and forward-looking endeavor.

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

Marist's institutional priorities reflect a thoughtful and collaborative campus process. The Self-Study co-chairs and members of the Steering Committee first considered the Marist mission and 2018-2023 Strategic Plan and consulted with the President's Cabinet, Internal Operating Group (IOG), and the Dean of Faculty's Council (Dean's Council). Priorities were informed by campus-wide town hall listening sessions with faculty, staff, students, and alumni and key constructs were informed by both external groups (e.g., American Association of Colleges & Universities) as well as ongoing internal efforts in these areas (e.g., Board of Trustees Diversity and Inclusion Committee). These central areas of study will guide reflection and analysis as the College determines its future.

1. Investigate opportunities to enhance and expand high-impact practices to increase student engagement and success.

The self-study process will investigate how the College strengthens, supports, and coordinates high-impact practices for all students. High-impact practices take many different forms at Marist, including internships, study abroad, undergraduate research, and community-based learning. These practices enhance learning and prepare students for post-graduate success. The benefits of high-impact practices require a campus culture and infrastructure to support active, applied, collaborative, and integrative learning experiences. The self-study process will research technologies and institutional practices that increase participation and satisfaction in a diverse range of high-impact practices. The self-study will examine institutional expectations for students participating in high-impact practices, and address challenges associated with scaling, supporting, assessing, and providing equal access to these activities.

2. Explore ways to strengthen and sustain a diverse, equitable, and inclusive community.

The self-study process will help Marist evaluate its progress toward becoming a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive community for all students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Marist strives to ensure that all members of its community – people of different races, ethnic groups, religions, sexual orientations, gender identities, and political views, as well as women, veterans, and those with disabilities – feel welcomed, valued, and supported. The self-study process will investigate recruitment and retention practices that support the needs of a diverse faculty, staff, and student body. It will also focus on satisfaction and success of students, faculty, and staff to cultivate a diverse, equitable, and inclusive community. Marist will also assess creative ways it can apply its tradition of ethical responsibility, civic engagement, and undergraduate research to solve social and political problems.

3. *Research the College's adaptive business model to prepare for changing conditions and to ensure long-term stability and vitality.*

The self-study process will consider the College's approaches toward fiscal stability in the context of expected demographic, enrollment, affordability, and similar challenges in the dynamic higher education landscape. The self-study process will provide Marist with the opportunity to review, discuss, and appraise strategies that produce a strong value proposition and lead to student success both during and following their Marist experience. Fiscal stability will be pursued in a manner consistent with the College's mission and values statements.

Table 1 and Table 2 demonstrate the alignment of identified priorities with key areas of importance, namely the Marist College mission and the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) standards for accreditation.

Table 1. Alignment of Institutional Priorities with the Marist College Mission Statement

Marist College Mission Statement	IP 1	IP 2	IP 3
Marist is dedicated to helping students develop the:	Investigate opportunities to enhance and expand high-impact practices	Explore ways to strengthen and sustain a diverse, equitable, and inclusive community	Research the College's adaptive business model
Intellect required for enlightened lives in the global community of the 21 st century	X	X	X
Character required for ethical lives in the global community of the 21 st century	X	X	X
Skills required for productive lives in the global community of the 21 st century	X	X	X

Table 2. Alignment of the Institutional Priorities with the MSCHE Accreditation Standards

MSCHE Standards for Accreditation	IP 1	IP 2	IP 3
	Investigate opportunities to enhance and expand high-impact practices	Explore ways to strengthen and sustain a diverse, equitable, and inclusive community	Research the College's adaptive business model
I. Mission and Goals	X	X	X
II. Ethics and Integrity	X	X	X
III. Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience	X	X	X
IV. Support of the Student Experience	X	X	X

V. Educational Effectiveness Assessment	X	X	X
VI. Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement	X	X	X
VII. Governance, Leadership, and Administration		X	X

III. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

Emerging from these institutional priorities are the following intended outcomes of the self-study process:

1. The College will demonstrate that it meets all MSCHE standards for accreditation and requirements of affiliation.
2. The College will focus on continuous improvement to fulfill the institution's mission and priorities. Throughout the course of the self-study process, the College will use its strong culture of assessment to gather evidence, analyze evidence, and communicate its findings to the college community.
3. The College will develop its self-study using an inclusive and transparent process that will engage with important campus stakeholders at key milestones.
4. The self-study process will provide the College with the opportunity to reflect on its institutional priorities in the context of the MSCHE standards for accreditation. This process will result in a roadmap for planners to make progress on institutional priorities.

IV. Self-Study Approach

Marist College has selected a standards-based approach for the self-study process and organization of the final Self-Study Report. This approach was selected to carefully align the efforts of the working groups with the expectations as outlined by the MSCHE, namely the standards, criteria, and requirements of affiliation. Seven of the working groups will each be assigned a particular MSCHE standard, with its corresponding criteria, and will be tasked with examining the evidence relevant to that standard. An eighth working group will be dedicated to coordinating the evidence inventory. The Steering Committee determined that such a standards-based approach would lead to a more comprehensive and thorough analysis of the evidence by standard, while also incorporating designated self-study priorities and requirements of affiliation into the review process. As outlined below, working groups will be tasked with generating intermediate analyses, strengths, weaknesses, and patterns, as well as a preliminary report on the standard in question. These working group reports will serve as the foundation for the final Self-Study Report, which will also be organized by MSCHE standard. One chapter in the final report will be devoted to each standard and accompanying criteria, priorities, and requirements of affiliation to assure compliance with all MSCHE expectations and institutional directions.

V. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

The organizational structure began with a leadership team, consisting of administrators and faculty representing academics as well as operations, who attended the Self-Study Institute in Fall 2020 to launch the re-accreditation process. From there, the College appointed a Steering

Committee and working groups structured to provide effective leadership for the self-study process and broad representation from across campus constituents.

Membership on both the Steering Committee and the working groups was determined first by nomination from area vice presidents as well as occasional self-nomination. Using these nominations as well as consultation with key stakeholders, the leadership team reviewed possible members based on selection criteria of relevant expertise and at least three years of employment at the College. Possible members were also evaluated for competing responsibilities to ensure that those serving would have the necessary time to dedicate to this vital effort.

Members of these groups represent a range of administrators, faculty, staff, students, alumni, and trustees as well as individuals who represent diverse demographic backgrounds to bring a breadth of expertise and perspectives to the process. Individuals were selected with knowledge of the various aspects of campus operations, including academics as well as student life, admissions, finances, governance, and more. For the working group co-chairs in particular, a concerted effort was made to pair an administrator with knowledge of the relevant institutional area with a faculty member who can provide academic context and perspective. This intentional pairing of an administrator who holds vital knowledge of relevant operations with a faculty member to provide an outside perspective was designed to promote an efficient, open, and inclusive self-study process that goes beyond affirmation and promotes genuine reflective analysis. Our working committee co-chairs were selected to complement one another in terms of background and perspective, providing a balanced approach to the self-study review.

Committees were evaluated overall for representation across areas of the College as well as gender, race/ethnicity, and membership in other social identity groups to construct diverse teams that could work together to evaluate evidence from multiple perspectives and effectively carry out the self-study process. Members were then invited to participate as a Steering Committee or working group member and agreed to serve the College in this capacity.

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee is specifically tasked with guiding the process overall, with the following charge:

- A) Determining, with stakeholder involvement, institutional priorities and intended outcomes to be addressed through the self-study process.
- B) Drafting and reviewing the self-study design as well as its various components.
- C) Guiding and overseeing the working groups individually and collectively.
- D) Creating a strategy for populating and managing the evidence inventory.
- E) Maintaining open lines of communication with campus constituencies regarding self-study progress and content.
- F) Overseeing the development of final Self-Study Report and supporting documentation.
- G) Engaging in the VP Liaison Visit and Evaluation Team Site Visit.

Steering Committee members are the following:

Table 3. Steering Committee Membership

Name	Title and Affiliation
Thomas Wermuth '84 (<i>Chair</i>)	Vice President for Academic Affairs
Carol Rinke (<i>Co-Chair</i>)	Associate Professor of Education Assistant Dean of the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Harrison Baker '14	Associate Athletic Director/External Affairs
Geoffrey Brackett	Executive Vice President
Ron Coleman	Professor of Computer Science
Christina Daniele	Vice President of Human Resources
Kate Donham '05M	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
Maryellen Guardino '07/'08M/'12M	Director of Office of Accommodations and Accessibility
Sean Kaylor '90	Vice President for Enrollment, Marketing & Communications
Carolyn Matheus '01/'02M	Associate Professor of Information Systems and Director of Honors Program
Marisa Moore	Director of Counseling Services
Robyn Rosen	Professor of History and Director of First Year Seminar
James Snyder	Associate Professor of Philosophy and Interim Dean for Academic Engagement and Interim Dean of the School of Management
Martin Shaffer	Dean of the School of Liberal Arts and Associate Professor of Political Science
Tenzin Tsundu '22	Student Government Association President, Class of 2022
Elisa Woolridge	Associate Professor of Chemistry

Steering Committee members will coordinate efforts by the working groups through a liaison structure. Each Steering Committee member will be associated with a particular working group and maintain close communication with their respective co-chairs. Steering Committee liaisons will be responsible for reviewing interim reports from the working groups and providing ongoing feedback. Through this liaison structure and dialogues at regular Steering Committee meetings, members will be positioned to communicate across working groups, identifying common areas of inquiry as well as gaps or possible duplication of efforts to assure a coordinated effort overall.

Working Groups

The Steering Committee partners with eight working group teams, seven focused on the MSCHE Standards and Requirements of Affiliation (RoA) and an eighth devoted to managing the evidence inventory. Working groups are charged with conducting the on-the-ground evidence collection and analysis to inform insights around the College's attainment of MSCHE standards and requirements of affiliation, while simultaneously investigating progress toward meeting identified priorities. All working groups examine aspects of the three self-study priorities that are relevant to the designated standard. Requirements of affiliation, on the other hand, are divided among the various working groups so that all 15 are addressed at least once during the self-study process. This design assures a comprehensive examination of the evidence.

Each working group is charged to:

- A) Consider and, if needed, revise lines of inquiry to address key standards, requirements of affiliation, and institutional priorities.
- B) In collaboration with peer committees, generate a body of evidence to inform the lines of inquiry.
- C) Analyze evidence sources for areas that demonstrate compliance, areas that demonstrate lack of attainment, and areas warranting further investigation.
- D) Triangulate preliminary conclusions with multiple evidence sources and expand evidence base where needed.
- E) Generate a written report outlining the process and findings.

Working groups are structured in the following manner:

Working Group I: Mission and Goals

Membership for Working Group I includes the following:

- Michael Caputo (*Co-Chair*), *Vice President for Information Technology/CIO*
- Pamela Harper (*Co-Chair*), *Associate Professor of Marketing*
- Katharine Dill, *Assistant Professor of Social Work*
- Jennifer Finn, *Senior Professional Lecturer and Department Chair of Fashion*
- Moira Fitzgibbons, *Professor of English*
- Joseph Giacalone '03/'09M, *Executive Director of International Admission*
- Matthew Glomski, *Associate Professor of Mathematics*
- Leigh Graham, *Associate Professor of English*
- Diane Hart '08M, *Assistant Vice President of Operations*
- Mary Jones, *Executive Director of Career Services*
- Raymond Kepner, *Associate Professor of Biology*
- Mark Palmer '20, MPA '23 *Presidential Fellow and MPA Student*
- Della Lee Sue, *Assistant Professor of Economics*
- Andrew Villani '08/'13M, *Operations Director of the Hudson River Valley Institute*
- *Board of Trustees Member - TBD*

Working Group I will be provided with a framework for investigating the following lines of inquiry:

- Based on the evidence, in what ways are Marist's mission and goals supportive of the priorities outlined for the self-study process and where might be areas for greater alignment?
- In what ways and to what extent do the Marist mission and goals support the relevant requirements of affiliation? Where might gaps exist?
- To what extent does Marist meet the criteria as outlined in Standard I? What appear to be Marist's strengths, weaknesses, and promising directions in relation to Standard I, based on the evidence?
- What evidence exists that Marist interrogates its own practices in relation to Standard I and what have been the outcomes of this ongoing self-assessment process?

These lines of inquiry are aligned with the following expectations:

- Self-study priorities #1, #2, and #3
- RoA #7 and #10
- Standard I and all associated criteria
- Self-assessment processes relevant to Standard I

Working Group II: Ethics and Integrity

Membership for Working Group II includes the following:

- Sima Ahuja (*Co-Chair*), *College Counsel*
- Addrain Conyers (*Co-Chair*), *Associate Professor and Department Chair of Criminal Justice and Director of Academic Diversity and Inclusion*
- Andrei Buckareff, *Professor of Philosophy*
- Nancy Calabrese '17M, *Head Librarian for Public and Research Services*
- Brian Dolansky, *Associate Director of Safety and Security*
- Jodi Hartmann, *Senior Professional Lecturer of Fashion Design*
- Christina Kearney, *Controller*
- P. Zion Klos, *Assistant Professor of Environmental Science*
- Cheryl Lown, '84/'96/'09, *Interim Registrar and Associate Registrar*
- Thomas Madden, *Assistant Professor of Business Law*
- Colin McCann '00M, *Associate Director of First Year Programs/Leadership Development*
- Christopher Mobeck, *Student, Class of 2023*
- Deborah Reeves-Duncan '94/'00M, *Director of Trio Student Support Services*
- Kent Rinehart '94/'99M, *Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management and Dean of Undergraduate Admission*
- Michele Rivas, *Assistant Professor of Psychology*
- Cynthia Worrad, *Assistant Dean of the School of Computer Science and Mathematics*
- *Board of Trustees Member - TBD*

Working Group II will be provided with a framework for investigating the following lines of inquiry:

- Based on the evidence, in what ways are Marist's practices of ethics and integrity supportive of the priorities outlined for the self-study process and where might be areas for greater alignment?
- In what ways and to what extent do Marist's practices of ethics and integrity support the relevant requirements of affiliation? Where might gaps exist?
- To what extent does Marist meet the criteria as outlined in Standard II? What appear to be Marist's strengths, weaknesses, and promising directions in relation to Standard II, based on the evidence?
- What evidence exists that Marist interrogates its own practices in relation to Standard II and what have been the outcomes of this ongoing self-assessment process?

These lines of inquiry are aligned with the following expectations:

- Self-study priorities #1, #2, and #3
- RoA #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7
- Standard II and all associated criteria
- Self-assessment processes relevant to Standard II

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

Membership for Working Group III includes the following:

- Deborah Gatins (*Co-Chair*), *Dean of the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Associate Professor of Psychology*
- Kevin Gaugler (*Co-Chair*), *Professor of Modern Languages and Interim Assistant Dean of the School of Liberal Arts*
- Jaime Lynne Bishop, *Instructional Designer for Digital Education*
- Tony Carrizales, *Associate Professor of Public Administration and Department Chair of Public and Non-Profit Administration*
- Susan Chambre, *Assistant Professor of Education*
- Alexa D'Agostino, *Associate Vice President for Marketing*
- Catherine Gambeski, *Student, Class of 2022*
- Qihao Ji, *Assistant Professor of Communication*
- John Peters, *Dean of International Programs and Acting Dean of Marist Italy and Associate Professor of Economics*
- Donald Schwartz, *Associate Professor of Computer Science*
- Patricia Taylor, *Graduate School and Fellowship Advisor*
- Joey Wall '03M, *Director of Media and Instructional Technology*

Working Group III will be provided with a framework for investigating the following lines of inquiry:

- Based on the evidence, in what ways is Marist's student learning experience supportive of the priorities outlined for the self-study process and where might be areas for greater alignment?
- In what ways and to what extent does Marist's student learning experience support the relevant requirements of affiliation? Where might gaps exist?
- To what extent does Marist meet the criteria as outlined in Standard III? What appear to be Marist's strengths, weaknesses, and promising directions in relation to Standard III, based on the evidence?
- What evidence exists that Marist interrogates its own practices in relation to Standard III and what have been the outcomes of this ongoing self-assessment process?

These lines of inquiry are aligned with the following expectations:

- Self-study priorities #1, #2, and #3
- RoA #8, #9, #10, and #15
- Standard III and all associated criteria
- Self-assessment processes relevant to Standard III

Working Group IV: Support of the Student Experience

Membership for Working Group IV includes the following:

- Matthew McMahon (*Co-Chair*), *Assistant Dean of Operations and Facilities*
- Joseph Kirtland (*Co-Chair*), *Professor and Department Chair of Mathematics*
- Daniel Amernick, *Assistant Professor of Media Arts*
- Marie Elena Castellano, *Coordinator of First Year Programs/Leadership Development*
- Catherine Chaterdon, *Assistant Professor of English*

- Judith Creedon, *Learning Disability Specialist*
- Kathryn Daye, *Director of the Academic Learning Center*
- Megan Dennis, *Assistant Professor of Biology*
- Anna Hagenbuch, *Student, Class of 2023*
- Li Li, *Associate Professor of Accounting*
- Jamie Peters, *Student, Class of 2022*
- James Rauh, *Clinical Assistant Professor of Physical Therapy*
- Iris Ruiz-Grech, *Director of the Center for Multicultural Affairs and Higher Education Opportunity Program*
- Jaclyn Sager '11, *Director of Transfer Admission*
- Georganna Ulary, *Assistant Professor of Philosophy*

Working Group IV will be provided with a framework for investigating the following lines of inquiry:

- Based on the evidence, in what ways does Marist's support of the student learning experience align with the priorities outlined for the self-study process and where might be areas for greater alignment?
- In what ways and to what extent does Marist's support of the student learning experience align with the relevant requirements of affiliation? Where might gaps exist?
- To what extent does Marist meet the criteria as outlined in Standard IV? What appear to be Marist's strengths, weaknesses, and promising directions in relation to Standard IV, based on the evidence?
- What evidence exists that Marist interrogates its own practices in relation to Standard IV and what have been the outcomes of this ongoing self-assessment process?

These Lines of Inquiry are aligned with the following expectations:

- Self-study priorities #1, #2, and #3
- RoA #8 and #10
- Standard IV and all associated criteria
- Self-assessment processes relevant to Standard IV

Working Group V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Membership for Working Group V includes the following:

- Haseeb Arroon '14/'17M/'19M (*Co-Chair*), *Director of Institutional Data, Research, and Planning*
- Sara Dwyer-McNulty (*Co-Chair*), *Professor of History and Director of Core/Liberal Studies Program*
- Kathleen Boyle, *Senior Professional Lecturer of Communication*
- Joanna D'Avanzo, *Senior Professional Lecturer of Advertising and Department Chair of Communication*
- Kristen Dovgan, *Assistant Professor of Psychology*
- Brian Gormanly '13, *Professional Lecturer of Computing Technology*
- Dabby Hines '09M, *Director of the Center for Advising and Academic Services*
- Kelly Holmes, *Assistant Vice President of Enrollment Management and Dean of Graduate Admission*
- Vanessa Nichol-Peters, *Director of Marist Italy*

- Michael O’Sullivan, *Professor of History*
- Jay Pantaleo ’16M, *Professional Lecturer of Decision Sciences*
- Sophie Park, *Student, Class of 2024*
- Alicia Slater, *Professor of Biology and Dean of the School of Science*
- Michelle Williams, *Associate Director of Student Activities*

Working Group V will be provided with a framework for investigating the following lines of inquiry:

- Based on the evidence, in what ways do Marist’s assessment processes support the priorities outlined for the self-study process and where might be areas for greater alignment?
- In what ways and to what extent do Marist’s assessment processes align with the relevant requirements of affiliation? Where might gaps exist?
- To what extent does Marist meet the criteria as outlined in Standard V? What appear to be Marist’s strengths, weaknesses, and promising directions in relation to Standard V, based on the evidence?
- What evidence exists that Marist interrogates its own practices in relation to Standard V and what have been the outcomes of this ongoing self-assessment process?

These Lines of Inquiry are aligned with the following expectations:

- Self-Study priorities #1, #2, and #3
- RoA #8, #9, and #10
- Standard V and all associated criteria
- Self-assessment processes relevant to Standard V

Working Group VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Membership for Working Group VI includes the following:

- Christopher Algozzine ‘89/’95M (*Co-Chair*), *Senior Professional Lecturer of Computer Science*
- Elizabeth Veasey (*Co-Chair*), *Associate Vice President for Financial Planning and Analysis*
- Justin Butwell, *Director of Physical Plant*
- Joseph Cuccia ’13/’14M, *Business Manager for Information Technology*
- Adrien D’Aprile, *Student, Class of 2023*
- Christopher DelGiorno ’88, *Vice President for College Advancement*
- Carol Friedman, *Senior Professional Lecturer of Accounting*
- Melissa Gaeke, *Senior Professional Lecturer of Political Science and Director of the Center for Civic Engagement and Leadership*
- Joanne Gavin, *Professor of Management and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs in the School of Management*
- Jonea Gurwitt, *Director of Foundation and Government Grants*
- Brian Haughey, *Associate Professor of Finance and Director of the Investment Center*
- Brandon James, *Assistant Athletics Director of Business Operations*
- Brian Loh, *Lecturer of Religious Studies*
- Frank Merenda, *Associate Professor of Criminal Justice*
- *Board of Trustees Member - TBD*

Working Group VI will be provided with a framework for investigating the following lines of inquiry:

- Based on the evidence, in what ways do Marist's planning, resources, and improvement processes support the priorities outlined for the self-study process and where might be areas for greater alignment?
- In what ways and to what extent do Marist's planning, resources, and improvement processes align with the relevant requirements of affiliation? Where might gaps exist?
- To what extent does Marist meet the criteria as outlined in Standard VI? What appear to be Marist's strengths, weaknesses, and promising directions in relation to Standard VI, based on the evidence?
- What evidence exists that Marist interrogates its own practices in relation to Standard VI and what have been the outcomes of this ongoing self-assessment process?

These lines of inquiry are aligned with the following expectations:

- Self-Study priorities #1, #2, and #3
- RoA #8, #10, and #11
- Standard VI and all associated criteria
- Self-assessment processes relevant to Standard VI

Working Group VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

Membership for Working Group VII includes the following:

- James Melitski (*Co-Chair*), *Professor of Public Administration*
- Emily Saland (*Co-Chair*), *Chief of Staff and Secretary to the Board of Trustees*
- Kristine Cullen, *Assistant Dean of the School of Professional Programs*
- Caleb Davis, *Executive Vice President of the Student Body, Class of 2024*
- Christopher Doyle '03, *Director of Undergraduate Admission*
- Joshua Kotzin, *Associate Professor of English*
- Elizabeth Reid, *Assistant Professor of Mathematics*
- John Ritschdorff '68, *Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs*
- Sonia Roy, *Distinguished Professional Lecturer of Fashion Design*
- Jason Trent, *Associate Professor of Psychology*
- Xiaoli Wang, *Associate Professor of Finance*
- Amy Woods '97, *Executive Director of Alumni Relations*
- Wenjing Xie, *Associate Professor of Communication*
- *Board of Trustees Member - TBD*

Working Group VII will be provided with a framework for investigating the following lines of inquiry:

- Based on the evidence, in what ways do Marist's governance processes support the priorities outlined for the self-study process and where might be areas for greater alignment?
- In what ways and to what extent do Marist's governance processes align with the relevant requirements of affiliation? Where might gaps exist?

- To what extent does Marist meet the criteria as outlined in Standard VII? What appear to be Marist's strengths, weaknesses, and promising directions in relation to Standard VII, based on the evidence?
- What evidence exists that Marist interrogates its own practices in relation to Standard VII and what have been the outcomes of this ongoing self-assessment process?

These lines of inquiry are aligned with the following expectations:

- Self-Study priorities #1, #2, and #3
- RoA #12, #13, and #14
- Standard VII and all associated criteria
- Self-assessment processes relevant to Standard VII

Working Group VIII: Evidence Inventory

Membership for Working Group VIII includes the following:

- Rebecca Albitz (*Co-Chair*), *Director of the Library*
- Michelle Stokes '02/'05M (*Co-Chair*), *Associate Dean for Academic Affairs*
- Jaime Cocco-Simmons, *Manager of Student Financial Services Systems and Data Operations*
- Lora Gannon, *Assistant Controller*
- Alan Labouseur '90, *Associate Professor of Computer Science*
- Edward Presutti '19M, *Director of Data Analytics and Reporting*
- Julin Sharp, *Assistant Vice President for Information Technology*

Working Group VIII will operate somewhat distinctly, as this team is charged with organizing the Evidence Inventory rather than examining the evidence sources. Working Group VIII is charged with:

- Establishing a comprehensive evidence inventory, using the collaborative Microsoft Teams platform, and refining the evidence sources as appropriate.
- Assuring privacy and security of data sources, as appropriate.
- Organizing the evidence inventory using a clear and logical naming structure.
- Providing evidence sources to working groups as requested.
- Coordinating across working groups to identify areas of gap or duplication.
- Uploading evidence to the Evidence Library on the MSCHE portal.
- Supplying additional evidence sources as needed during the Evaluation Team Visit and throughout the self-study process.

VI. Guidelines for Reporting

Ongoing and structured communication, in both electronic and face-to-face format, will assure that the working groups achieve their charge and fulfill their responsibilities in a comprehensive, timely, and effective manner. As mentioned above, the Steering Committee will utilize a liaison structure such that one to two Steering Committee members will be assigned to connect directly with each working group. The Steering Committee liaisons will maintain regular communication with their affiliated working group to ascertain progress toward goals and collaboratively problem-solve any issues that may arise. They will also collect, review, and provide feedback on written reports as outlined below. Through this liaison structure, the Steering Committee will use their regular bi-monthly meeting to communicate about the progress of the working groups

overall, avoid duplication of efforts, streamline approaches, and generally coordinate the effort. The liaison structure will also be used to suggest and promote areas for collaboration and/or interaction among the working groups, as needed.

Following an initial orientation, working groups will meet on a weekly basis to identify and gather evidence sources, conduct relevant analyses, determine strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations, and communicate their findings with the Steering Committee and the larger campus community. Minutes from these weekly meetings should be posted to the collaborative Microsoft Teams platform to inform all working group and Steering Committee members of ongoing progress. Working groups will also be asked to complete written reports on a monthly basis throughout their designated self-study period. The timeline and expectations for written reports are outlined below. Following formal written updates from all groups, Steering Committee members and working group co-chairs will also communicate about overall progress to the larger campus community, through updates to the Academic Affairs Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, Faculty Plenaries, Dean's Council, Internal Operating Group (IOG), Student Government Association (SGA), and Board meetings.

Interim Report #1 (Due December 1, 2021): Using the Analysis Table (sample provided in Appendix A) as a guide, working groups will focus on identifying the relevant evidence sources, compiling documents from the appropriate offices with support from Working Group VIII, and carrying out any analytic procedures necessary to align the compiling of the relevant standards and criteria. Individuals responsible for particular analyses should also be identified. As part of this update, any ongoing concerns or issues to be addressed should also be included for transparent communication and problem-solving.

Interim Report #2 (January 18, 2022): During the conclusion of the Fall semester and winter intersession, working groups will focus on identification of strengths, substantiation of those strengths with evidence as appropriate, identified weakness, and substantiation of those weakness with evidence as appropriate. Substantiation may include document title and corresponding page number. Working groups will also provide a narrative summary of any emerging strengths, weaknesses, themes, and future directions, as well as any future analyses necessary to complete the self-study process.

Interim Report #3 (Due February 15, 2022): Working groups will provide a draft final report for review and feedback that includes synthesis across the lines of inquiry. The draft final report should be organized according to the final report template and contain the key content in preliminary form. In particular, the groups' findings with respect to the self-study priorities, requirements of affiliation, standards and criteria, and self-assessment processes should be highlighted, along with the corresponding evidence sources. Strengths, weaknesses, and future directions should also be described.

Final Report (Due April 1, 2022): Working groups will provide a final report to the Steering Committee that fully elaborates on the ways in which evidence supports the Commission's standards and criteria, requirements of affiliation, and self-study priorities, including areas of strength, weakness, and future directions. Themes or patterns should

also be identified that cut across and between individual standards. Working group co-chairs are asked to provide a preliminary version of the final report two weeks prior to the final due date. The final report will serve as the foundation for the Self-Study Report chapter for the affiliated standard.

The final report is intended to be objective in nature and framed as an evidence-based inquiry into the current status of the College. It should be written from the perspective of a data-informed analysis of current policies and practices, with a lens toward equitable implementation. The final report should also be comprehensive in nature, systematically addressing all appropriate lines of inquiry and supporting each response with documentation of evidence evaluated, analyses conducted, and conclusions drawn.

Specific guidelines with respect to writing conventions include:

- Final reports should be no more than 15 pages in length, single spaced, “before” and “after” spacing set to zero, using APA 7th edition format and writing conventions.
- Documents should be written in Times New Roman, 12-point font, with 1-inch margins.
- For abbreviations, please write out the term the first time it is used, with the abbreviation in parentheses. For examples, Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). Subsequent instances may use the abbreviation only.
- Please refer to Marist College as “the College.”
- Number all tables and figures. You may either place tables and figures in the document or compile them together as appendices at the end.
- For consistency, please use the Oxford comma and place periods inside of quotation marks. Use only one space after each period.
- Based on current conventions, individuals may be referred to as he, she, or they.
- Please use active voice throughout the document.
- Do not capitalize the terms standards, criteria, evidence, priorities, or self-study. Only capitalize working group when it is the name of a particular committee, e.g., Working Group III, Steering Committee.
- No hyperlinks should be included in the final report document. Please refer to evidence sources by the official document title provided by Working Group VIII and cite the document source and page number in parentheses using APA 7th edition guidelines (Title, year if available, page number).

The final report should be organized around the following template structure. Working groups are expected to craft a coherent narrative, substantiated with supporting evidence, that describes the state of the College with respect to the lines of inquiry and key expectations. Working group final reports should not be merely a summary of the evidence reviewed, but rather a coherent narrative organized around a central thesis and key supporting points.

Section I: Executive Summary

A maximum one-page summary of the process undertaken and key findings from each line of inquiry.

Section II: Working Group Charge

An overview of the group's charge and summary of questions it addressed. The names, email addresses, and phone extensions of all working group members should be listed for reference. Discussion of the connection of the group's topic with those of other groups and of any collaboration between groups that took place.

Section III: Analyses Conducted

An analytical discussion of the inquiry undertaken. This section should describe the lines of inquiry and detail the process undertaken to examine them in relation to the evidence sources.

Section IV: Analysis of Priorities

An explanation of how the group's findings and conclusions fulfill the self-study priorities relevant to the group.

Section V: Analysis of Requirements of Affiliation

An explanation of how the group's findings and conclusions fulfill the requirements of affiliation, with specific criteria referenced.

Section VI: Analysis of Standards and Criteria

An explanation of how the group's findings and conclusions fulfill the Commission's standards and criteria, making sure to address all aspects of the criteria in a thematic or holistic manner.

Section VII: Analysis of Self-Assessment Practices

An explanation of how the group's findings and conclusions fulfill the expectation for ongoing self-assessment of practices in the designated area.

Section VIII: Discussion and Conclusions

Summary of themes or patterns that emerged for the working group from across multiple lines of inquiry. Recommendations for improvement and future directions for the College, based on the alignment of evidence with expectations.

VII. Organization of the Final Self-Study Report

The final self-study will conform to the guidelines for reporting outlined above. The self-study is pursuing a standard-based approach and will include chapters dedicated to each of the seven standards. In addition, it will include an executive summary outlining major findings and recommendations, an introduction focusing on the institution as a whole, a conclusion outlining major findings and recommendations, and appendices. The final Self-Study Report is projected to have the following structure:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction
 - Institutional Overview
 - Description of the Self-Study Process
- Chapter 1 – Mission and Goals
- Chapter 2 – Ethics and Integrity

- Chapter 3 – Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience
- Chapter 4 – Support of the Student Experience
- Chapter 5 – Educational Effectiveness and Assessment
- Chapter 6 – Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement
- Chapter 7 – Governance, Leadership, and Administration
- Conclusion
 - o Major findings and recommendations related to the standards, and the institutional priorities
 - o Roadmap for long-term planning, as intended by self-study outcomes
- Appendices (Data)

During the analysis process, working groups may identify strengths, weaknesses, and recommended action items. The Steering Committee will synthesize these recommendations and identify coherent themes for consideration by College leadership. These recommendations will then be forwarded to the President’s Cabinet and Internal Operating Group (IOG) for review and response. Those suggestions deemed most productive will become part of the roadmap for long-term planning for the College.

VIII. Verification of Compliance Strategy

Verification of compliance with accreditation-relevant federal regulations will be coordinated by the Steering Committee, in close collaboration with Working Group II. Working Group II is charged with evaluating Requirement of Affiliation #5, “Compliance with government policies, regulations and requirements” and all associated federal regulations have been subsumed in the charge to this particular working group. Members will work closely with the pertinent offices on campus to gather documentation and include it as part of the overall analysis. Working Group II will also be asked to produce a separate draft Verification of Compliance report, specific to these items. This draft report will serve as the foundation for a final Verification of Compliance Report, produced by the Steering Committee.

IX. Self-Study Timetable

The Self-Study timetable is outlined below, within the framework of Fall 2020 attendance at the Self-Study Institute and preparation for a Spring 2023 Evaluation Team Visit. This timetable has been communicated frequently with campus constituents and refined as needed as part of the self-study reflective process.

Table 4. Self-Study Timetable

2021	
January	Self-Study Co-Chairs selected
January 20	Remote meeting with Commission VP Liaison Discuss priorities, approach, self-study as reflective process
February – May	Communicate with campus constituencies about self-study process Conduct Listening Sessions and generate input on institutional priorities Establish intended outcomes of study Create strategy for verification of compliance Create strategy for populating and managing Evidence Inventory
June – August	Assemble Steering Committee and working groups Develop process for Steering Committee oversight of and interaction with working groups Draft Self-Study Design
September	Communicate with campus constituents about Self-Study Design Review and refine Self-Study Design
September 28	Submit Self-Study Design to Commission VP Liaison (2 weeks prior to prep visit)
October 12	Commission VP Preparation Visit Virtual campus visit. Working visit to get to know players, educate community on accreditation and Self-Study process
October	Feedback, revisions, and acceptance of Self-Study Design
November – December	Working groups convene Working groups populate and evaluate Evidence Inventory Working groups begin reviewing and evaluating evidence
2022	
January – March	Working groups continue reviewing and evaluating evidence Working groups submit interim reports
April 1	Working groups submit final reports
April – May	Working group findings are communicated to campus constituents Commission liaison proposes Evaluation Team Chair. Institution can confer. Chair is chosen. Visit dates are chosen
June – August	Self-Study Report drafted Full team roster is selected
September - October	Ongoing communication about Self-Study Report with campus constituents Self-Study Report revised and refined
October-November	Self-Study draft sent to Team Chair (2 weeks prior to visit)
TBA Fall	Team Chair’s preliminary visit (2 weeks after draft report sent)
2023	
December-January	Team Chair feedback Self-Study Report revisions Self-Study Report finalized and shared with campus Feedback incorporated from students, trustees, alumni, and other constituents
February – March	Final Report/Verification of Compliance/Evidence Inventory uploaded to portal (6 weeks prior to team visit)
Spring	Assign separate logistical coordinator Prepare for visit: Agenda, Meetings, consult with team on visit and travel needs
TBA Spring	Team Visit (6 weeks after upload) Campus meetings Draft preliminary report Provide oral report
14 Days Later	Full draft report 5 days to correct factual errors Final report and Institutional response

X. Communication Plan

The purpose of the College’s Self-Study Communication Plan is to gather evidence, to update the community about important developments and key findings, and to engage with the Marist community throughout the course of the self-study process. The goal of this plan is to ensure a transparent and inclusive process.

The self-study co-chairs and the Steering Committee will use a wide range of communication methods – including email updates, website updates, presentations to the college community, regular updates to standing committees, and town halls – in order to keep the college community informed and engaged throughout the course of the self-study process. Self-study co-chairs also intend to rely on extant channels of communication, such as standing committee structures, to keep the campus community apprised of self-study developments and processes. The audiences of this plan include students, faculty, staff, administrators, and alumni. The college’s MSCHE homepage archives ongoing campus communications while also providing the Marist community with the opportunity for feedback to the Steering Committee.

Table 5. Communication Plan

Audience	Methods	Timing	Individual(s) Responsible
Working Groups	Self-Study Teams Site Email Updates Self-Study Website	Initial orientation and consistent communications and updates throughout the self-study process	Co-Chairs Steering Committee
Faculty	Updates to Faculty Affairs Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Faculty Plenary MARFAC Email Updates to Faculty Town Hall Listening Sessions School Meetings Self-Study Website	Weekly updates to Faculty Affairs Committee and Academic Affairs Committee; monthly updates at faculty plenary; periodic email updates via MARFAC; periodic town halls; monthly updates at school meetings; targeted communications to Florence branch campus; consistent updates to website	Co-Chairs Steering Committee Working Group Co-Chairs
Staff	Committee Updates MARSTAFF Email Updates to Staff	Consistent updates at committee meetings; periodic MARSTAFF updates; periodic town halls; targeted communications to Florence branch campus; consistent updates to website	Co-Chairs Steering Committee

	Town Hall Listening Sessions Self-Study Website		Working Group Chairs
Students	Student Government Association Updates MARSTU Email Updates to Students Town Hall Listening Sessions Self-Study Website	Regular Student Government Association updates; periodic MARSTU email updates; periodic town hall listening sessions; targeted communications to Florence branch campus; consistent updates to website	Co-Chairs Steering Committee Working Group Chairs
Alumni	Email Updates to Alumni Executive Board and Liaisons Town Hall Listening Sessions Self-Study Website	Regular emails to alumni boards and liaisons; periodic town hall listening sessions; consistent updates to website	Co-Chairs Steering Committee Working Group Chairs
Cabinet/IOG	In-person Updates to Cabinet and IOG members Self-Study Website	In-person progress updates at bi-monthly Cabinet/IOG meetings; consistent updates to website	Co-Chairs
Board of Trustees	Tri-annual In-person Updates	Tri-annual progress updates at Board of Trustee meetings	Co-Chairs

XI. Evaluation Team Profile

Composing a knowledgeable evaluation team that understands the context of the institution is vital to this process. The College requests that the commission select the chair from an aspirant school and the evaluation team members from peer institutions. In order to provide meaningful feedback from this review process, the team should have a familiarity with the complexities of an institution such as Marist. Marist has a strong commitment to the liberal arts, paired with exceptional pre-professional programs.

Key characteristics of Marist to keep in mind when selecting the evaluation team include:

- Marist College is a comprehensive institution grounded in the liberal arts with strong professional and pre-professional programs
- Carnegie Classification is Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs
- Marist educates approximately 5,000 traditional-age undergraduate students and 1,200 adult and graduate students in 53 undergraduate majors and numerous graduate programs,

including fully online MBA, MPA, MS, and MA degrees, and also the Physician Assistant Studies and Doctor of Physical Therapy programs.

- The most popular undergraduate majors are Business, Communication, Psychology, and Fashion.
- Marist is located in the Hudson River Valley (halfway between New York City and Albany), has a branch campus in Florence, Italy, and numerous additional locations throughout New York State.
- Marist has a nationally ranked study abroad program, with more than half of all students having an abroad experience, including semester, full year, spring attachment courses, and unique first-year programs in Florence and Dublin.
- Marist's academic centers of excellence include the nationally known Marist Poll, Center for Civic Engagement and Leadership, Hudson River Valley Institute, Center for Sports Communication, Center for Social Justice Research, and Institute for Data Center Professionals.

Chair Selection:

Marist requests that the commission appoints a chair to the evaluation team that is a president or provost from an aspirant school such as Boston University, Bucknell University, Colgate University, College of the Holy Cross, Lafayette College, Lehigh University and Villanova University.

Team Selection:

Marist requests that the commission selects the evaluation team from peer institutions such as Fairfield University, Ithaca College, Loyola University Maryland, Providence College, Quinnipiac University, The College of New Jersey, and the University of Scranton.

XII. Evidence Inventory

Marist College deems the evidence inventory to be such a vital component of the self-study process that a separate working group has been assigned to accomplish this task (Working Group VIII). The members of this group are key employees from across the campus with knowledge of the institutional data and reports. The working group will be co-chaired by the director of the library and the associate dean for academic affairs, with members representing the office of institutional data, research & planning, and the office of admissions, among others. Each member of this working group will be assigned as a liaison to the other working groups in order to ensure they have the evidence needed to carry out their charge. This also provides a centralized means of capturing the evidence for consistency among the various groups, avoiding duplication of effort, assuring data security, and accurately and efficiently populating the MSCHE portal.

Marist College's evidence inventory will be housed within a Microsoft Teams online platform. Copies of requested documents will be made accessible to individual working groups within a folder designated for each standard, accessible only to working group members. An overarching evidence inventory will be structured based upon Marist's administrative organization for ease of retrieving documents for the working groups. Documents will be copied from this core evidence inventory and added to and subtracted from individual working group folders as needed to

support their work. At the end of the self-study process, those documents referenced within the final self-study narrative will be uploaded into the Middle States portal. The overarching evidence inventory will be maintained to support the work of the Middle States Visiting Team and expanded as needed by the request of the Visiting Evaluation Team. A table of contents to this inventory will be provided to facilitate the visitor's independent navigation of the inventory.

Finally, in keeping the continuous improvement mindset, Marist plans to evaluate its own self-study process through a survey distributed to all individuals with a formal role in the process on the Steering Committee or working groups. Results from this survey will be distributed to the Steering Committee and patterns or themes identified from the feedback will be housed in the Office of Academic Affairs to guide subsequent octennial reviews.

Appendix A. Sample Working Group Analysis Table

Each working group will be provided with a framework for aligning lines of inquiry with expectations, evidence sources, and analyses. This framework will be individualized for each working group, based on designated standard and requirements of affiliation, and used as a foundation for the working group processes.

Line of Inquiry	Expectation	Evidence for Review	Data Source (office)	Analytic Procedure	Identified Strengths	Substantiation of Strengths	Identified Weaknesses	Substantiation of Weaknesses	Observed Patterns	Proposed Future Directions
<i>LOI #1</i>	Priority #1									
	Priority #2									
	Priority #3									
<i>LOI #2</i>	Associated Requirements of Affiliation									
<i>LOI #3</i>	Standard/ Criteria									
<i>LOI #4</i>	Assessment Process									

Appendix B. Sample Evidence Inventory Organizational Structure

Based on a preliminary analysis of key documents necessary across all seven MSCHE standards and requirements of affiliation, the following organizational structure was generated, based on College office, for populating, and ultimately managing, the evidence inventory. Working groups will have the autonomy to modify and adapt the evidence inventory as they see fit, but will work within this structure to access, store, analyze, and catalog key documents throughout the self-study process.

Core Documents

- College Catalog
- Faculty Handbook
- Administrative Handbook
- Student Handbook/Student Code of Conduct
- Strategic Plan
- PACI

Board of Trustees

- College Governance Documents
 - Charter
 - By-laws
 - Mission/Vision
 - Campus Master Plan
- Membership
 - Orientation materials
 - Conflict of Interest forms

President

- Position Description
- Cabinet members/position descriptions
- Diversity Council

EVP

- Institutional Research
 - IPEDS reports
 - By year
 - Operating Plans
 - By year
 - SEMS survey
 - Graduate outcomes data
- Physical Plant
 - Operating plans
 - By year
- Safety & Security
 - Operating Plans
 - By year
 - Clery Reports
 - By year

VP Human Resources
 Training programs
 Sexual Assault
 Diversity
 Title IX
 Recruitment documentation
 Orientation documentation
 Women's Leadership Program
 Operating Plans
 By year
General Counsel

VPAA

Faculty Senate
 Faculty Handbook
 Plenary organization/committees
 Annual Reports
 By year

CORE

 Curricula
 FYS
 Pathways
 Learning Outcomes
 Assessment Rubrics
Honors Program
Academic Schools
 Comm/Arts
 Departments
 Art & Digital Media
 Communication
 Fashion
 Film, Television, Games, and Interactive Media
 Music
 Chair Reports
 By year
 Assessment rubrics
Management
 Departments
 Economics, Accounting, and Finance
 Management
 Public & Nonprofit Management
 Organization and the Environment
 Chair Reports
 By year
 Accreditation reports
 Assessment rubrics

Computer Science/Math

Departments

Computing Technology

Mathematics

Chair Reports

By year

Assessment rubrics

Liberal Arts

Departments

English

History

Modern Languages and Cultures

Philosophy and Religious Studies

Political Science

Pre-Law & Paralegal

Theatre

Chair Reports

By year

Assessment rubrics

Writing Center

Science

Departments

Athletic Training

Biology

Chemistry, Biochemistry, and Physics

Doctor of Physical Therapy

Environmental Science and Policy

Medical Laboratory Science

Physician Assistant Studies

Pre-Health

Chair Reports

By year

Accreditation reports

Assessment rubrics

Social and Behavioral Sciences

Programs/Curricula

Criminal Justice

Education

Psychology

Social Work

Chair Reports

By year

Accreditation reports

Assessment rubrics

International Programs

Operating Plans

By year
Assessment Self-study
Registrar
Operating Plans
By year
Assessment Self-study
Library
Operating Plans
By year
Assessment Self-study
Academic Grants
Operating Plans
By year
Assessment Self-study
Career Services
Operating Plans
By year
Assessment Self-study
Advising and Academic Services
Operating Plans
By year
Assessment Self-study
Academic Support Services
Academic Learning Center
Operating Plans
By year
Assessment Self-study
Center for Athlete Enhancement
Operating Plans
By year
Assessment Self-study
Center for Multicultural Affairs/HEOP
Operating Plans
By year
Assessment Self-study
International Student Services
Operating Plans
By year
Assessment Self-study
Liberty Partnership
Center for Civic Engagement/Leadership

VP Enrollment Management

Admissions
Financial Aid
Scholarships available

Marketing and Communications

VP Business Affairs

Audited financial statements, by year
Budget

VP College Advancement

VP Information Technology

Operating Plans
Auditors

VP Student Affairs

First Year Programs
Health Services
Accommodations/Accessibility
 Participation data
Counseling
Upward Bound
Campus Ministry
Student Activities
 Student Government
Housing/Residential Life
Athletics