

Self-Study Design

Baruch College

The City University of New York

Submitted to

**The Middle States Commission on Higher
Education**

In preparation for the 2008-09 Self-Study

September 2008

Self Study Design Components

Table of Contents

A. Institutional Overview	3
B. Mission	9
C. Important Recent Developments	10
D. Expectations for the Future: Goals of the Self Study	15
E. Progress on the Self Study	16
• Steering Committee Membership	16
• Working Group Co-Chairs and Membership	17
• Working Group Standards, Charges and Research Questions	19
F. Editorial Style and Format	30
G. Organization of the Report	32
H. Timetable	33
I. Profile of the Evaluation Team	34
J. Preliminary Inventory of Documents – Electronic	35
K. Preliminary Inventory of Documents – Hard Copy	36

Component A - Institutional Overview

Baruch College is one of 11 senior colleges within the City University of New York (CUNY) system. CUNY is the nation's largest urban university: 11 senior colleges, 6 community colleges, the William E. Macaulay Honors College at CUNY, the Graduate School and University Center, the CUNY Graduate School of Journalism, the CUNY School of Law, the CUNY School of Professional Studies and the Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education. More than 461,000 degree-credit students and adult, continuing and professional education students are enrolled at campuses located in all five New York City boroughs. In fall 2007, 46% of all the college students in the City of New York were attending CUNY. An additional 32,500 students are enrolled in College Now, the University's enrichment program for high school students at CUNY campuses and more than 300 New York City high schools. The University offers online baccalaureate degrees through the School of Professional Studies and individualized baccalaureate degrees through the CUNY Baccalaureate Degree.

CUNY traces its beginnings to the founding in 1847 of the Free Academy, which later became The City College, the first CUNY College. According to New York State Education Law, CUNY is "supported as an independent and integrated system of higher education on the assumption that the university will continue to maintain and expand its commitment to academic excellence and to the provision of equal access and opportunity for students, faculty and staff from all ethnic and racial groups and from both sexes." The law requires CUNY to "remain responsive to the needs of its urban setting and maintain its close articulation between senior and community college units."

Baruch, as well as all of the senior colleges in CUNY, receives its public funding from the State of New York, not from the City of New York. The CUNY community colleges, on the other hand, are largely supported by New York City funding.

Baruch College has evolved from the innovative School of Business and Civic Administration founded in 1919 by the Trustees of City College, who sought to centralize all courses in accounting, business and public administration in a single educational unit. In 1953, in honor of a distinguished alumnus and former trustee of City College, the name of the school was changed to the Barnard M. Baruch School of Business and Public Administration. In 1968 the school was reorganized as a separate senior college in CUNY. Baruch College was authorized to offer arts and sciences and education programs in addition to its business and public administration programs. In 1994 the College reorganized its three school structure with the creation of the School of Public Affairs. The College now consists of the Zicklin School of Business, the Mildred and George Weissman School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Public Affairs.

Today Baruch College offers undergraduate and graduate programs of study leading to the BBA, BA, BS, MBA, MS, MPA, MA, MEd, Executive MBA, Executive MS, Executive MSILR, and Executive MBA degrees through the Zicklin School of Business, the Weissman School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Public Affairs. The CUNY program leading to the PhD in business is based at Baruch College, as is the PhD subprogram in industrial/organizational psychology.

Baruch College has a history of over a hundred fifty years of excellence in public higher education, much of it with an emphasis on business. It draws bright and ambitious students who are serious about preparing themselves to succeed. Just like students from generations past, Baruch students today change their lives through hard work, education, internships, networking, and exposure to new ways of thinking. The combination of specialized and traditional arts and sciences subjects is designed to meet contemporary demand for the kind of high quality education that will lead to successful careers in business, public service, and related fields.

The Fall 2007 enrollment at Baruch College was 16,097 students, including 12,863 undergraduate and 3,234 graduate students. The Zicklin School registered approximately 80.3% of the undergraduate students, the Weissman School registered 17.5% and the other 2.1% were enrolled in the School of Public Affairs. On the graduate level, Zicklin accounted for 74.3%, Weissman 3.7% and the other 22.0% were enrolled in the School of Public Affairs.

The College has a full time faculty of over five hundred and an additional 463 part time instructors (adjuncts). In 2008, approximately 150 of the full time positions were new or replacements over the past three years. The College has approximately 600 full-time, non-faculty employees. It operated on a \$95 million tax-levy budget in 2007 (slightly over \$176 million on an all-funds basis). It was also supported by the Baruch College Fund, which in 2007 had assets totaling almost \$131 million.

Strategic Plan, 2006-2011

In January 2006, the Baruch College community adopted a five-year strategic plan after a year-long process involving over one hundred faculty, students, and staff participants and numerous town hall meetings, public debates and hundreds of comments. The plan rested upon a number of key assumptions.

- Baruch seeks to achieve international prominence as a public institution of business, public affairs and liberal arts within The City University of New York, dedicated to the University's twin goals of excellence and opportunity.
- A nationally recognized model of diversity, Baruch is committed to advancing global understanding, an institutional characteristic of particular importance in an increasingly culturally varied and interconnected world.
- Baruch will continue to build an exemplary model of professional higher education that contributes significantly to the well being of New York City, the metropolitan region, the country and the world and ensures a transformation in the lives of its students.
- Baruch will build a strong financial foundation with multiple funding streams and a robust endowment. Towards these ends, it supports the efforts of City University to ensure longer-term stability and predictability in public funding and strategic investment in areas of high priority.

The plan resulted in the establishment of six strategic goals to be pursued between 2006 and 2011.

Strategic Goals 2006-11

To realize its vision and guide its growth and development over the next six years, the College will:

I. Offer academic programs of exceptional quality

Baruch is committed to providing demanding academic programs of the highest quality, taught by a distinguished faculty to an academically superior student body. We place great value on superb teaching, innovative research and exceptional scholarship. We believe that our distinctive mix of undergraduate, graduate and doctoral programs is a significant strategic advantage for the attainment of international prominence. Baruch will uphold and raise the standards of our programs while taking initiatives to expand and secure the College's academic reputation. Accordingly, the College will:

Continue to have one of the premier business schools in the country while ensuring that our programs in public affairs and the liberal arts are national leaders in their fields

Recruit, develop and retain a faculty of international quality

II. Ensure the quality of the college experience for all students

The College is determined that it will provide students with a collegiate setting that enables them to attain their educational goals, grow as individuals, complete their studies successfully at Baruch and establish lasting bonds with their fellow students, faculty and the institution as a whole. Accordingly, the College will:

Strengthen the quality of the academic life for all students, while maintaining and enhancing the diversity of the student body

Build a community of engaged students

Strengthen student affairs services and programs

III. Create a vibrant urban campus

The College will undertake a Campus Master Plan to ensure that our facilities appropriately advance and fully support our academic and strategic goals. There is perhaps no more visible – or complex – strategic issue facing Baruch than the renovation of the Larry and Eris Field Building at 17 Lexington Avenue, a project that will enable the College to expand significantly our classrooms, faculty offices and student, study and administrative spaces. In addition, we will take full advantage of the evolving transformative effect of technology in delivering programs, undertaking research and managing our affairs. The College will also address promptly and imaginatively a number of pressing space utilization and facilities issues. Accordingly, the College will:

Develop a Campus Master Plan

Renovate the Larry and Eris Field Building at 17 Lexington Avenue

Develop a strategic technology plan

Continue present efforts at solving a variety of facilities issues

IV. Build a strong financial foundation

Baruch intends to develop a sound financial base to ensure the quality of our educational programs at reasonable cost, expand the scope of our educational initiatives and retain our diversity. Accordingly, the College will:

Increase its endowment

Diversify the funding streams

V. Embrace a culture of service and accountability that produces excellence

Realization of the College's vision is dependent upon measurable progress over the next six years. Baruch will use established benchmarks – and where necessary, will establish new metrics – to allow continuous assessment of our activities, particularly those focused on student success. Baruch aspires to be a national model of institutional accountability, demonstrating that continuous and rigorous evaluation can improve the quality, focus and reliability of all of our initiatives. Accordingly, the College will:

Select recognized measures of success that encompass all areas of the College while recognizing the distinctive strengths of our individual academic components

Strengthen the professional development of all who work at Baruch to enrich the experience of all students and make the institution a better place to work

Strengthen internal resource planning and allocation processes

Develop appropriate ways to measure forward movement on each of the strategic objectives and major goals in the Strategic Plan 2006-2011

VI. Increase the visibility, recognition and involvement of the College in New York City, the region, the country and the world

As a leading public institution of higher education in New York City, Baruch has a major responsibility to contribute to the quality of life, economic development and overall vitality of the New York metropolitan area. Baruch will develop its reputation so that the quality of our programs and the success of our students and alumni are well known nationally and internationally. Accordingly, the College will:

Develop and implement a strategic marketing and communications plan

Develop close relations with government and community leaders

Become a significant forum for public programs on issues related to business and civic leadership

Strategic Plan Conclusion

Baruch College will build upon our remarkable history to become an institution of prominence, providing education of exceptional quality to a highly talented and diverse student body, undertaking rigorous research into selected areas of societal importance and building a culture of accountability and service to our community and the world beyond. Through careful and thoughtful execution of the goals and objectives outlined in this *Strategic Plan*, Baruch will move significantly forward towards the realization of our vision.

The College is dedicated to *offering academic programs of exceptional quality; ensuring the quality of the college experience for all students; creating a vibrant urban campus; building a strong financial foundation; embracing a culture of service and accountability that produces excellence; and increasing our visibility, recognition and involvement in New York City, the region, the country and the world.* These six strategic goals delineate an interrelated set of priorities: each is important in itself; each will contribute to the achievement of the others; and each will shape a different aspect of the Baruch College of the future. All are central to move Baruch to a new stage of achievement.

CUNY Performance Management Process (PMP)

Beginning with the 2000-01 fiscal year, the City University of New York has been following a performance management process that links planning and goal setting by the University and its 22 colleges and graduate schools, measures annual progress towards key goals, and recognizes excellent performance.

Each spring, the Chancellor states the University's performance targets for the upcoming academic year, guided by the University's Master Plan. CUNY Presidents, working with their executive teams and college communities, then map out performance goals and targets for their institutions for the coming year, in alignment with those of the University.

The college targets reflect differences in campus missions, resources and circumstances, and recognize that the colleges all start from different performance baselines.

At the end of each academic year, progress towards each college's performance targets is assessed. High performance is recognized and, as resources are available, rewarded.

Below are the performance goals and targets for Baruch College for 2008-09. For each objective the college administration has identified specific measures to gauge progress toward success. It

is anticipated that the Middle States Self-Study Working Groups will incorporate these measures in their analyses.

Baruch College Performance Management Process (PMP) Goals and Targets 2008-09

Raise Academic Quality

Objective 1: Strengthen CUNY flagship and college priority programs, and continuously update curricula and program mix

Objective 2: Attract and nurture a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching, scholarship and creative activity

Improve Student Success

Objective 3: Ensure that all students receive a solid general education and effective instruction, particularly in the first 60 credits of study

Objective 4: Increase retention and graduation rates

Objective 5: Improve postgraduate outcomes

Objective 6: Improve quality of student academic support services

Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness

Objective 7: Increase or maintain access and enrollment; facilitate movement of eligible students to and among CUNY campuses

Objective 8: Increase revenues and decrease expenses

Objective 9: Improve administrative services

Component B - Mission

The following statement was developed in 2002 as a working mission statement for Baruch College.

Baruch College is committed to transforming the lives of our diverse, high potential students by providing a quality higher education for careers in business and public affairs that blends learning in the arts and sciences with professional subjects. Organized into three schools, Baruch's distinguished faculty engage in undergraduate and graduate teaching, scholarly research, and public service.

This statement was an attempt to synthesize the essence of a much longer statement that was adopted by the College in 1998 as a part of the work of a Presidential Commission: An Academic Plan for Baruch College 1998-2003. The final paragraph of that longer statement read:

Baruch College, part of the largest public urban university system in the country, has a dual emphasis on undergraduate and graduate education. Baruch is distinguished in undergraduate education by a focus on professional educational degree programs integrated in the arts and sciences and by admission standards which enroll students with demonstrated ability and motivation to work diligently toward their academic goals. Baruch's graduate programs are designed in accordance with national standards for selective nationally ranked graduate education. Baruch is noteworthy for the remarkable cultural diversity of its student body, for its commitments to teaching and to research, for its emphasis on communication skills, for its support for lifelong learning, and for its alertness to opportunities to match the college's activities with the needs of its constituents.

Both statements convey the message that Baruch College is a publicly supported institution of higher education with a mandate to provide a high quality undergraduate and graduate education for a highly motivated career oriented and diverse student body that reflects the population of the City of New York.

Component C - Important Recent Developments

The Baruch College that is being presented for reaccreditation in 2008-09 is a much stronger and more dynamic institution than the one that existed a decade ago. The contemporary Baruch College is an institution on the move, with a sense of excitement and enthusiasm as faculty, staff and students push for higher levels of accomplishment. The specifics of these changes will be borne out in the Self-Study. Below are a few highlights:

The current Self-Study examines an institution that recognizes its rich history of over 150 years of excellence in bringing higher education to the residents of the City of New York and also sees its role in continuing to prepare its students to be productive participants in the 21st century global society.

Facilities

“Now we have a building worthy of our students!” *Prof. Cynthia Whittaker, Chair of the History Department, August 27, 2001.*

In the fall of 2001, Baruch College underwent a major transformation when it moved the bulk of its academic operations from leased space scattered among commercial buildings over a ten block stretch of Manhattan into a new 786,000 square foot structure at Lexington Avenue and 25th Street. The building is termed the “Vertical Campus” because it extends upward and downward from street level rather than horizontally as is the case with most college campuses. Built at a cost of \$319 million the facility includes the latest in educational technology. It houses 102 classrooms, 14 research labs, 36 computer labs, a 500-seat and a 300-seat auditorium, a conference center, 48 conference rooms, 375 offices for faculty, 219 offices for deans, chairpersons, and other college administrators, and 425 workstations for other college staff.

The building also includes athletic facilities (recreation and fitness centers, gymnasium, racquetball courts, pool, and locker rooms), fine arts facilities (a recital hall, flexible theater, studios, graphic arts, photo labs, music studios and rehearsal spaces, and a recording studio), the college bookstore and a food court.

The new building has helped transform the College, increasing faculty engagement, building a sense of community, permitting a much wider range of activities to be sponsored on campus, enhancing the educational experience through the high-tech classrooms and labs, and providing a more attractive draw for potential students.

One review described the opening of the Vertical Campus as “...a turning point in urban educational design...” It said that “...the high-tech Vertical Campus creates dramatic new possibilities for learning and teaching.”

The new building complements the Library and Technology Center that sits directly across the street. That structure houses the William and Anita Newman Library, winner of the 2003 ACRL Award for Excellence among College Libraries college computer center. It is also the location of the Wasserman Trading Floor in the Subotnick Financial Services Center, one of the largest and

most complete educational facilities of its kind anywhere. It introduces Baruch students to economic, financial, journalistic, and technological principles using professional financial market data systems and analytic software.

The next facilities challenge for the College will be addressing the need to renovate the 1929 Larry and Eris Field Building at 17 Lexington Avenue, the original 1847 site of the Free Academy of New York. The College is in the process of updating its Master Capital Plan. Planning efforts will be described by one of the Self-Study Working Groups.

Students

Significant changes have occurred since the last Middle States review. The total enrollment at the college has averaged just over 15,500 students a year, but the mix of entering students, the preparation of those students, and the College's ability to retain and graduate them have seen major, positive changes. Following college enrollment plans, the percentage of new students who were first-time freshmen (as opposed to transfer students) grew from 34.1% (Fall 1998) to 51.4% (Fall 2007). The number of new freshmen has increased significantly, going from 981 in 1998 to 1,479 in fall 2007. Moreover, the College has been attracting better prepared students, as the SAT scores rose from 1036 to 1129 over that same period.

The College is proud of the rapid improvement in one of the most basic measures of student success, retention and graduation rates. The six-year graduation rate for the cohort of students who entered in 1996 was 37.4%. The six-year graduation rate for the cohort who entered in 2001 is 59.8%.

The number of degrees awarded has risen from 2,804 (1998-99) to 3,746 (2007-08). A number of factors have contributed to this impressive rise. First, the end of remediation at the College in 2000 and the more recent increases in admissions standards have brought about an undergraduate student body far better prepared for college-level work than before. Through the Freshman Year Initiative the College has revamped its orientation program, expanded the availability of freshman learning communities, and provided early intervention options to address student difficulties; on the whole, student engagement has increased. All of these activities have helped improve the retention rates. In the last ten years, the fall-to-fall freshman retention rate has improved from 81.6% to 88.2%.

The student body continues to be the most diverse in the United States. In Fall 2007 the percentages were: 13% African American, 16% Hispanic, 34% Asian and 37% white. They report 158 countries of origin and are native speakers of 108 languages.

Faculty

A critical problem faced at the time of the last review was a shortage of faculty positions, particularly in the Zicklin School of Business with one-quarter of its full time faculty positions filled with temporary, non-tenure-track faculty. This situation was largely the result of insufficient funding to support tenure track hires and a union contract that limited salaries below

market levels. The College corrected the problem with two changes. First, in fall 2001 CUNY approved a tuition premium plan for all MBA students. This increase provided nearly \$3 million additional dollars per year to support the Zicklin School. Second, a new union contract was approved in 2002 that raised salary levels approximately 8%, and, more importantly, recognized the University's ability to provide base salaries up to 165% above the contract salary schedules in order to recruit or retain faculty. In the fall of 2008 a second contract was approved that will provide for an additional increase of 10.15% over the three year life of the contract.

Beyond the salary increases provided for in the contracts, there has been a major change in the funding formula for the City University. To be discussed elsewhere in this report, the CUNY Compact has generated additional revenue that has enabled the College to create additional faculty lines.

In 1998-99 Baruch College has a full time teaching faculty of 409. In the fall of 2007 it had a full time teaching faculty of 492, a net increase of nearly 17% over nine years.

Finances

There has been a significant increase in the financial support for the College since the last Middle States review. The College reported total expenditures of approximately \$127 million in the fiscal year ending in June 1998. It reports a total of approximately \$176 million in the year ending June 2007.

As was noted in the 2005 Periodic Review Report, the level of State support for CUNY and Baruch College had been shrinking on a proportional basis. This resulted in a sizeable CUNY-wide tuition increase in 2003 and an additional increase for graduate students in fall 2005. Baruch has been able to bring in additional resources that have made and will continue to provide a positive impact on the institution. In 2002 the College was able to get approval to charge an MBA tuition premium, now generating close to \$3 million a year. These funds have supported faculty hiring, increases in the number of graduate assistantships, and additional support staff in student service areas. Also, beginning in fall 2003 CUNY established a student technology fee, which provided about \$2.2 million the first year and has allowed the College to increase the level of student technology support.

The most noteworthy change in financial support for the college is the CUNY Compact, a funding agreement between the City University and the City and State of New York. The CUNY Compact is an innovative multi-year financing strategy that delineates shared responsibility among the State and the City, the University (through internal efficiencies), philanthropic sources, and the students through enrollment growth and modest, predictable tuition increases.

The CUNY Compact has increased the level of public support to the College and has helped stimulate a dramatic increase in philanthropic support. The Self-Study report will go into more detail in describing these and other changes in the College finances.

Planning

The *2006-2011 Strategic Plan*, described in the Institutional Overview section of this Self-Study design, sets forth the College's view of where it sees itself moving over the next several years and describes the intermediate steps to be taken in pursuit of those goals. The CUNY Performance Management Process (PMP) is an instrument that the University has developed for monitoring progress, prioritizing effort, and focusing energies on agreed upon ends. The City University Master Plan and the Baruch College Facilities Master Plan are other tools that will be used to control and direct growth at Baruch College, and measure progress toward meeting objectives.

One of the benefits of undertaking the Middle States Self-Study at this time is the fact that it provides an opportunity to review all of these planning efforts and to determine the extent to which they support and reinforce each other.

Baruch College Honors

Recognition by one's peers is an important indicator of the impact a person or institution has. Below is a list of honors Baruch College has received over the past several years. Some recognize many years of effort; others are the result of new initiatives. All document the important contributions Baruch College makes to make to higher education in the City of New York.

- Baruch College is among the top 10% of U.S. colleges according to The Princeton Review, which selected the College for inclusion in its, "The Best 368 Colleges: 2009 Edition."
- Baruch ranks third among some 3,800 U.S. colleges and universities polled for Consumers Digest Magazine's list of 100 Top Values Schools, 2007.
- Baruch ranks among the top 35 universities in the Northeast that offer a full range of undergraduate and master's programs and is among the top six of those institutions that are public (U.S. News & World Report, "America's Top Colleges 2008").
- Baruch's undergraduate business programs ranked 41st nationally, the second most highly regarded in the NY/NJ metropolitan area. The undergraduate business program was also ranked among the top 25 of public institutions (U.S. News & World Report, "America's Top Colleges 2008").
- Baruch's Zicklin School of Business is included in the 2007 edition of The Princeton Review's annual "Best Business Schools" listing.
- The 2006 edition of the Wall Street Journal/Harris Interactive Business School Survey ranked Baruch 50th among the nation's top 50 regional undergraduate business colleges.
- Baruch's Part-Time MBA Program is ranked 22nd in the nation by U.S. News & World Report ("America's Best Graduate Schools 2009"), making it second in New York City.

It was the only ranked public part-time program in New York State.

- Baruch is one of the nation's best value undergraduate institutions according to the Princeton Review's America's Best Value Colleges (2008).
- Baruch was cited as one of the best colleges in the Northeast in the 2008 edition of the Princeton Review's Guide to the Best Northeastern Colleges.
- Baruch College won the 2008 TIAA-CREF Hesburgh Award for Faculty Development to Enhance Undergraduate Teaching and Learning.
- Baruch's MBA program offered through the College's Zicklin School of Business ranks among the Aspen Institute's Global 100 list of colleges and universities included in its Center for Business Education's Beyond Grey Pinstripes 2007 MBA survey, a biennial survey and alternative ranking of business schools that are driving discussions of social and environmental issues into the core curriculum and addressing these topics in terms of mainstream business decision-making.
- Baruch College won the American Advertising Federation's 2007 District Two Diversity Achievement Award for an Educator. The annual award honors progressive individuals, corporations, and institutions that exemplify forward thinking in the enrichment of diversity of advertising.
- The Kaplan/Newsweek 2008 edition of America's Hottest Colleges ranks Baruch College as one of the nation's 372 most interesting schools. Rankings were determined by factors such as academic strength, student body, and specialty programs. Also on the 2008 list are Harvard, Princeton, and New York University.
- For nine years, Baruch has topped the list of the most ethnically diverse colleges in the United States (U.S. News & World Report, "America's Top Colleges 2008").
- Baruch's School of Public Affairs is ranked in the top 20 percent in the nation for its Master of Public Administration program by U.S. News & World Report (2006).
- Baruch's innovative; 17-floor William and Anita Newman Vertical Campus was honored in 2003 by the American Institute of Architects with the highest award it offers to an individual building.
- The William and Anita Newman Library was named the top college library in the nation for 2003 by the Association of Research and College Libraries/American Library Association. Previous winners of the award were Oberlin, Wellesley, and Earlham Colleges.

Component D - Expectations for the Future: Goals of the Self Study

The Middle States Self-Study presents a unique opportunity to bring together a broad range of planning, evaluation, and assessment efforts.

This Self-Study Design makes reference to the *Baruch College Strategic Plan, 2006-2011*, the recently approved *City University of New York Master Plan, 2008-2012*, the *City University of New York's Performance Measures Process* with its annual Performance Goals and Targets, the CUNY Compact agreement with the State of New York and the *Baruch College Facilities Master Plan*. Each has an impact on the successful operation of the College, on whether it meets its goals, achieves its objectives or fulfills its mission. In addition to meeting the requirements for Middle States reaccreditation, the goals of the self-study are:

- To make members of the college community more aware of ongoing planning efforts and to encourage them to participate.
- To compose a concise and constructive document that serves as a valuable tool for institutional planning, change, and growth.
- To educate all constituencies with regard to the institution's continuing mission.
- To create a common vision of the institution's future direction.
- To take a critical look at the integrity of the institution in a time of rapid change.
- To assess the degree to which institutional goals permeate planning decisions and actions, and use the self-study experience to strengthen the connection between academic and administrative initiatives.
- Identify accomplishments and strengths, challenges and opportunities, in the areas of academic programming, administrative planning, student learning and professional development.
- Enhance the ongoing assessment processes so that thoughtful examination leads to continued and effective improvements.
- Engage the college community in thinking broadly about the position of the College in the New York higher education community.

Component E – Progress on the Self-Study

Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

A Self-Study Steering Committee has been appointed. Five Working Groups have been appointed and issued charges defining the scope of their research and identifying the appropriate Middle States Standards.

The Self-Study Steering Committee is composed of fifteen individuals:

- two Steering Committee co-chairs,
- two co-chairs of each of five Working Groups,
- two administrators assigned from the Provost's office, and
- one representative from the Student Government Association

The Steering Committee has two co-chairs: one is a member of the faculty and the other is a member of the administration. Each of the five Working Groups is co-chaired by one faculty member and one member of the administration. Each Working Group includes a student representative and one or more alternates. This structure will help to ensure that all aspects of the institution are fully represented and that all institutional resources will be available to the members of the committee.

Steering Committee Membership (15)

Co-Chairs: James McCarthy, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Terrence F. Martell, Saxe Distinguished Professor of Finance and Director of the Weissman Center for International Business

Members: Stanton F. Biddle, Provost's Office
Barbara Lawrence, Provost's Office

Working Group Committee Co-Chairs (10)

Mary Gorman Hetherington, President's Office
Paula Berggren, English Dept. Weissman
Johanna D'Aleo, VP Administration and Finance
Stan Altman, School of Public Affairs
Marybeth Murphy, Undergraduate Admissions & Financial Aid
Ann Brandwein, Statistics CIS, Zicklin
David Birdsell, School of Public Affairs
Cynthia Whittaker, History Dept. Weissman
Dennis Slavin, Provost's Office
Valerie Watnik, Law Dept., Zicklin

Rezwana Hoque, President-Undergraduate Student Government

Working Group Co-Chairs and Membership

1. Overall Mission, Institutional Effectiveness and Integrity

Co-Chairs: Mary Gorman Hetherington, President's Office
and Paula Berggren, English Dept., Weissman School

Members: Arthur Downing, Library/BCTC
Donald Vredenburg, Management Dept., Zicklin School
Glenn Petersen, Sociology & Anthropology Dept. Weissman School
Ali Khaliq, Undergraduate Student Representative
Jonah Cooperman, Graduate Student Representative

2. Planning, Governance and Resources

Co-Chairs: Johanna D'Aleo, VP Administration and Finance
and Stan Altman, School of Public Affairs

Members Boo Choi, Weissman Dean's Office
Corlisse Thomas, Student Development & Counseling
Mary Finnen, Office of the Vice President for Administration and Finance
Joseph Onochie, Economics and Finance Dept. Zicklin School
Paul Firstenberg, School of Public Affairs
Aissata Camara, Student Representative

3. Student Recruitment, Retention and Support

Co-Chairs: Marybeth Murphy, Undergraduate Admissions & Financial Aid
and Ann Brandwein, Statistics CIS, Zicklin School

Members: Carol Morgan, Student Academic Counseling Center
Glenn Albright, Psychology Dept. Weissman School
Michael Lovaglio, School of Public Affairs
Tom Lo, Graduate Admissions
Carl Aylman, Office of Student Life
Maria DiMeo Calvelli, Law Dept. Zicklin School
Alvin Tran, Student Representative

4. Faculty

Co-Chairs: David Birdsell, School of Public Affairs
and Cynthia Whittaker, History Dept. Weissman School

Members: Ted Joyce, Economics & Finance Dept. Zicklin School
Mary McGlynn, English Dept. Weissman School
Debbie Kaminer, Law Dept. Zicklin School
Glenn Apolinar, Student Representative

5. Development and Assessment of Educational Programs

Co-Chairs: Dennis Slavin, Provost's Office
and Valerie Watnik, Law Dept., Zicklin

Members: Rita Ormsby, Library
Phyllis Zadra, Zicklin Dean's Office
Myung So Lee, Zicklin Dean's Office
Ann Ruecker, School of Public Affairs
Gary Hentzi, Weissman Dean's Office
Ann Clarkson, Continuing and Professional Studies (CAPS)
Caroline Fernandez, Student Representative

Baruch College Working Group Standards, Charges and Research Questions

General Charges to Working Groups

1. The research and reporting activity of all Self Study Working Groups will be guided by the general principles outlined in the Self-Study Design.
2. Each of the five Working Groups has been assigned to research and report on the College's compliance with at least one of the fourteen *Characteristics of Excellence* that constitute the eligibility requirements and standards for accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Specific charges to each of the Working Groups are identified in the research questions that follow.
3. For each of the standards to be addressed, the Working Group will respond to the research questions represented in their charge and will be further informed by the “Context”, the “Fundamental Elements” and the “Optional Analysis and Evidence” specified by Middle States in *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Eligibility Requirements and Standards for Accreditation* (Twelfth Edition Revised 2006). Working Group reports should be sharply focused on the assigned standard(s) as interpreted by the research questions and must address all “Fundamental Elements.”
4. Working Groups are encouraged to solicit wide input to their deliberations, consulting documentation and involving the offices, committees and individuals responsible for identified activity in developing their reports. Each Working Group should also solicit college wide comment to their findings prior to submission of their final report, via announced meetings or electronic means to be decided by the group.
5. Final reports of the Working Groups, including copies of all documentation created by the Working Groups, must be submitted by [to be determined - spring 2009].

Individual Working Group Standards, Charges and Research Questions

1. Overall Mission, Institutional Effectiveness and Integrity

Standard 1 – Mission and Goals

Standard 6 – Integrity

Standard 7 – Institutional Assessment

Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives

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

Standard 6: Integrity

In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support to academic and intellectual freedom.

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in: achieving its mission and goals; implementing planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes; using institutional resources efficiently; providing leadership and governance; providing administrative structures and services; demonstrating institutional integrity; and assuring that institutional processes and resources support appropriate learning and other outcomes for its students and graduates.

Charge:

The Working Group will consider whether the college's stated mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and explains whom the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish.

It will also seek to determine the extent to which current and projected operations, goals and objectives are consistent with that mission.

The Working Group may also consider the appropriateness of the current mission statement and evaluate documentation of the consistency and integrity of policies, procedures and practices.

The Working Group will also determine the extent to which the college has developed and implemented an assessment plan and processes that evaluate its overall effectiveness in meeting the requirements of Standard 7 - Institutional Assessment.

Research Questions:

Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives

1. What are the major themes of mission around which there is broad consensus, and how well are they articulated in the College's formal mission statement? What process exists for revision of the mission statement?
2. What points of tension with regard to mission among various constituencies of the College need to be addressed? What process exists for airing and resolving such tensions?
3. How well do programs reflect the goals outlined in the College's mission and strategic plan? What process exists for monitoring implementation of the College's strategic plan?
4. How does the strategic plan continue to guide the development and ongoing operation of programs and services?

Standard 6: Integrity

5. How clearly are the College's ethical standards for personal and institutional behavior articulated and how fully are they seen to govern decisions about personnel and program? Are there mechanisms for addressing inconsistencies should they arise?
6. How clearly are the College's standards for student conduct, particularly with regard to academic integrity, articulated and what processes are in place to resolve problems that arise?

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

7. The College's Strategic Plan calls for creating a culture of assessment at Baruch. How successfully is this commitment being implemented?
8. How does the college ensure that assessment procedures harmonize with the faculty's creative and innovative processes in shaping curriculum?
9. How well does the College respond to the assessment requirements of external bodies, including the City University and the accrediting bodies of its professional programs? How well are the various assessment activities integrated?

2. **Planning, Governance and Resources**

Standard 2 – Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal

Standard 3 – Institutional Resources

Standard 4 – Leadership and Governance

Standard 5 – Administration

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

An institution conducts ongoing planning and -resource allocation based on its mission and uses the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

The human, financial, technical, physical facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution's mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution's mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution's resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

The institution's system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

Standard 5: Administration

The institution's administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/ scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution's organization and governance.

The Working Group will review the College's *Strategic Plan 2006-11* adopted by the College in 2006 and the *Baruch College Performance Goals and Targets, 2008-09* adopted by the City University of New York in 2008 to determine the extent to which the allocation of resources is consistent with goals and objectives and the extent to which progress toward meeting goals and objectives is being documented.

The Working Group will examine the college's system of governance to determine whether it clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making.

It will determine whether the governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

The Working Group will also examine whether the college's administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution's organization and governance.

The Working Group may develop other self-study questions, as it deems appropriate.

Research Questions:

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal- Examples

1. To what extent is the conceptual and procedural relationship between the institution's strategic plan and the budget development process (both operational and capital) well understood and effectively implemented? In what ways do planning and resource allocation processes provide evidence of a commitment to institutional renewal?
2. What prompted recent significant initiatives and changes in the institution's program, services, and activities? How effectively did the institution's strategic plans guide those initiatives and changes?
3. How and why have institutional planning processes changed over the past five years? Have those process changes achieved the desired impact?
4. What issues should the institution be planning for? How will an integrated system of planning and resource allocation help address those issues?
5. Are the suggestions for improvement under other standards included in the institutional or strategic plan?

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

6. What steps have been taken to evaluate how effectively resources are allocated and expended? What specific changes have been implemented and with what results?
7. Are there specific examples of resources that may be available but are not particularly accessible? How does the lack of accessibility affect the institution's ability to fulfill its mission and facilitate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes?
8. In what areas, and in what ways in those areas, are insufficient or inefficiently-used resources affecting the institution's ability to achieve its mission and goals?
9. How do the institution's resources and uses of resources compare with those of its peers? Are there appropriate reasons for any significant differences?
10. What are the most significant challenges facing the institution relative to human resources, technology resources, and physical plant resources over the next five years? What is the process by which these challenges have been or will be identified? What is the process by

which specific and comprehensive plans for addressing these challenges are being formulated within the context of overall institutional planning?

11. Are there sufficient resources to fund suggestions for improvement in other areas?

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

12. To what extent are the distinct role and responsibilities of each constituent group within arenas of shared governance understood and accepted by those involved? To what extent are existing structures utilized for decision-making, and to what extent are structures circumvented?

13. How have the institution's for-profit ventures been structured and managed so as to avoid possible conflict of interest among participating administrators, faculty, or board members?

14. In what ways and for what reasons have the institution's governance systems changed over the past five years? What has been the impact of these changes?

15. What might improve institutional governance?

16. Is the City University of New York Board of Trustees effective in raising resources?

Standard 5: Administration - Examples

17. How effective are current processes to review and improve administrative operations?

18. In what ways and for what reasons have staffing patterns and reporting lines been changed within the past five years? How appropriate were those changes?

19. What has been the impact of the recent administrative reorganizations?

20. When was the most recent review of the effectiveness of administrative structures undertaken? What were the findings? What actions were taken in response to the findings? How effective were those actions?

21. How can we assure that administrative structures are facilitating learning?

22. Are student services adequately staffed?

3. **Student Recruitment, Retention and Support**
Standard 8 – Student Admissions and Retention
Standard 9 – Student Support Services

Standard 8: Student Admissions

The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.

The Working Group will focus on students and their recruitment, retention and graduation; and the support services the college creates and maintains to meet their needs.

The Working Group will evaluate the college's efforts to meet its strategic goals to "strengthen the quality of academic life for all students while maintaining and enhancing the diversity of the student body, build a community of engaged students and strengthen student affairs services and programs."

Research Questions:

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

1. Do comparisons of the institution's retention and graduation rates to similar schools, aspirant institutions, and national averages indicate that the institution is performing effectively? If not, what should be done?
2. Are enrollment projections sufficiently realistic to support the institution's financial projections & physical facilities? If not, what steps are being done to address this problem?

Standard 9: Student Support Services - Examples

3. How does the institution provide support to enrolled students who are identified as being "at risk"? How effective are these support services?
4. What changes in the provision of student support services have been implemented over the past five years & how effective were these changes? To what extent do such changes demonstrate an institutional commitment to student success?
5. Which services should be improved, added, expanded, or eliminated? How should changes be implemented?

4. Faculty
Standard 10 – Faculty

Standard 10: Faculty

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

The Working Group will evaluate progress toward achieving the college's goal of attracting and nurturing a strong faculty that is recognized for excellence in teaching, scholarship, and creative activity.

Issues to be considered include recruitment, retention, professional development, criteria for evaluation, workload, participation in curriculum development and academic planning.

Research Questions:

1. How do we support faculty development in their roles as scholars, teachers and citizens? How do we assess and evaluate faculty performance in these three roles? What efforts are made to maintain faculty engagement and morale?
2. Is the process for faculty appointment, tenure and promotion consistent and transparent across all academic units? Are the standards for scholarship similar in all three schools and in all departments? What impact does workload have in this process, and is the workload consistent across all three schools?
3. How effective are our policies and practices in regard to recruiting, integrating and retaining new faculty? How competitive are our salaries at every level?
4. Have our hiring practices supported our goal of creating a more diverse faculty? What plans are being developed to address the impending retirement of a significant number of senior faculty and how are they linked to the diversity goal?
5. How are adjuncts who teach at the College integrated into departmental and institutional goals? What are the mechanisms in place for their hiring, training and professional development? What percentage of courses is taught by adjuncts?

5. Development and Assessment of Educational Programs

Standard 11 – Educational Offerings

Standard 12 – General Education

Standard 13 – Related Education Activities

Standard 14 – Assessment of Student Learning

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

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

Standard 12: General Education

The institution's curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

Institutional programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Assessment of student learning demonstrates that the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional goals, and that students at graduation have achieved appropriate higher education goals.

The Working Group will consider the extent to which the institution's educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its mission; the extent to which the curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy.

The Working Group will evaluate related educational activities to determine the extent to which they are consistent with the college's stated mission and goals and current priorities.

Finally, the Working Group will address the issue of assessment throughout the college – institutional, educational offerings, general education, related educational activities, and student learning. It will evaluate whether the college has determined what it wants its students to learn. It will evaluate the extent to which the college has developed and implemented appropriate mechanisms that will document the extent to which students have succeeded.

The Working Group will make recommendations in those areas in need of improvement.

Research Questions:

Standard 11 – Educational Offerings

1. To what extent do our educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to the College's mission? How do we know?
2. In what ways does the learning experience of our transfer students differ from that of students in the same program who have completed all their courses at Baruch College? Are these differences positive or negative? Have we attempted to address the impact that the different learning experiences of our transfer students have on our students or on our programs?
3. For courses that are offered in many sections, how have we ensured consistently high quality? Are syllabi, textbooks, and exams uniform? Should they be? What evidence supports this conclusion?

Standard 12 – General Education

4. Are the curricula designed and taught so that students acquire and demonstrate college level proficiency in general education and essential skills (including oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy)?
5. Is responsibility for the goals of general education shared across the three schools? If so, in what ways?
6. How are the goals of general education communicated to our students? Do the students understand the relationship of those goals to their overall education and careers?
7. What have been the most recent changes to general education at Baruch? Have those changes been effective? Does the working group offer any recommendations for changes?

Standard 13 – Related Education Activities

8. What are Baruch's services in support of basic skills for under-prepared students? Are those services consistent with the college's mission? Do these services meet their learning and development goals?
9. Are the college's related educational activities consistent with Baruch's stated mission, goals, and current priorities? Areas to investigate include but are not necessarily limited to: evaluation of certificate programs; opportunities for credit-bearing experiential learning; availability and evaluation of non-credit offerings; programs offered with institutional, community, and international partners.

Standard 14 – Assessment of Student Learning

10. Has the college consistently determined and communicated its key learning goals to students? Does the working group offer any recommendation for changes in communicating these goals?

11. Has the college developed and implemented appropriate mechanisms that will document the extent to which students have succeeded? If not, what needs to be done so that the college can develop comprehensive results to guide it on making future curricular decisions?
12. Have changes in curricula and course delivery taken place in response to current assessment data that suggested such changes were needed? What additional changes should the college make in response to current assessment data?
13. What is the state of assessment of educational offerings throughout the college? Does the working group offer recommendations for future activities or directions in this area?

Component F – Editorial Style and Format

The co-chairs of the five Working Groups will assume responsibility for assigning to members tasks such as collecting responses, organizing information, and producing drafts of chapters. Each Working Group will submit a double-spaced, 25-50 page report, which addresses the chapter topic assigned, plus an appendix for supporting documentation. The work of the Working Groups will be compiled into one report, including the charges, questions, methods, resources, data, findings, and recommendations of each Working Group. The Steering Committee will review and edit this work, and provide additional sections to compose a comprehensive Self-Study Report. The additional sections will include an executive summary, the Annual Institutional Profile, an overview of the process, conclusions, recommendations, and appendices.

Recommended outline of each Working Group report

- a brief description of the charge of the Working Group;
- a statement of the Standard(s) to be addressed by the Working Group and how it conducted its work;
- substantial analysis, with minimal description, of the findings of the Working Group;
- evidence of support by documentation of all findings;
- direct and clear assessment of strengths and challenges in the area(s) addressed by the Working Group; and
- a section on recommendations.

Mechanics for writing

- use active voice instead of passive, as much as possible;
- use third person (e.g., they, the office, the students, the administration, the faculty) rather than first person (e.g., I, we, you, our);
- refer to positions and offices, rather than to names of people;
- use spell check;
- avoid hyphens at the right hand margin;
- avoid unnecessary abbreviations;
- italicize books and other publications
- when using acronyms, write them out the first time they are used with the acronym in (); and
- use plurals to avoid he/she

Technical guidelines

- use Microsoft Word 12-point Times New Roman
- submit documents in double space
- double space after headings
- double space between paragraphs
- fully justify text in paragraphs

- center primary headings with all letters in bold caps in 14 point, e.g., chapter titles;
- left justify secondary headings with all letters in bold caps in 12 point font, e.g., major divisions of a chapter;
- left justify and underline (not bold) fourth level headings with the first letter of important words capitalized, e.g., subdivisions of a chapter;
- use Microsoft Excel spreadsheets for charts and graphs;
- format pages with one and quarter inch margins on left and right sides (for binding), and one-inch margins on top and bottom;
- submit drafts by e-mail attachment.

Component G – Organization of the Report

The Self-Study Report will be organized according to the Working Group structure outlined in the Self-Study Design with Chapters 3-7 reflecting the work of the five individual Working Groups. The “general charges to the Working Groups” outline the methodology to be used in interpreting standards, formulating research questions, conducting research, and developing conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter 1	Overview of the Institution
Chapter 2	Executive Summary
Chapter 3	Overall Mission, Institutional Effectiveness and Integrity (Standards 1, 6 and 7)
Chapter 4	Planning, Governance and Resources (Standards 2, 3, 4 and 5)
Chapter 5	Student Recruitment, Retention and Support (Standards 8 and 9)
Chapter 6	Faculty (Standard 10)
Chapter 7	Development and Assessment of Educational Programs (Standards 11, 12, 13 and 14)
Chapter 8	Conclusions and Recommendations
Chapter 9	Appendices

Component H - Timetable

Baruch College

Time Table for Middle States Accreditation

Summer 2007 – Summer 2010

April 2007	Middle States notified college of pending evaluation
November 2007	College representative attended Middle States Self-Study Institute in Delaware (November 5-6, 2007)
June 2008	Steering Committee co-chairs are designated and members appointed
	1 st meeting of Steering Committee (6/11/08)
July 2008	Working Group members are appointed
August 2008	College representatives attended MSA Assessment Workshops in Puerto Rico
	Charges to Working Groups formulated
September 2008	Steering Committee reviewed preliminary draft of Self-Study Design (9/02/08)
	Draft Self Study Design submitted to Middle States
	Middle States Liaison conducts Self-Study preparation visit (9/17-18/2008)
Fall 2008	Staff liaison approves Self-Study Design
	Steering Committee oversees research and preparation of reports by the five working groups
	Working groups involve constituencies in self study research
Winter 2009	Evaluation Team Chair is selected College and Team Chair select date for site visit
Spring 2009	Steering Committee receives draft text from Working groups and begins work on institutional self study
Summer 2009	Steering Committee completes the preliminary draft of self study based on reports of working groups
	Evaluation Team members selected
Fall 2009	College and campus community review and critique draft self study
	Evaluation Team Chair receives draft self study
	Draft Self study is revised in response to feedback received
	Evaluation Team Chair conducts preliminary site visit
	Self-Study is finalized, approved by institution and submitted to Middle States
Spring 2010	Evaluation team receives final self study report (6 weeks prior to site visit)
	External Review Team conducts site visit
	External Review team submits evaluation report to Middle States
June 2010	Middle States Commission acts on Recommendation

Component I – Profile of Evaluation Team

Baruch College is a publicly supported urban institution of higher education drawing the overwhelming majority of its approximately 16,000 students from New York City and its metropolitan area. For many years it has been recognized as the most racially and ethnically diverse college in the country. In 2007, over seventy percent of the students were children of immigrants and over 92 different languages were spoken in students' homes. Baruch College is a non-residential commuter campus with many of its students working while pursuing their studies. A significant proportion of the students are also the first in their families to attend college.

Primarily known for its excellent programs in business, Baruch College also has strong arts and sciences programs and programs in public affairs. The College offers undergraduate and graduate programs of study leading to the BBA, BA, BS, MBA, MS, MPA, MA, MEd, Executive MBA, Executive MS, Executive MSILR, and Executive MBA degrees through the Zicklin School of Business, the Weissman School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Public Affairs. The College also houses the CUNY program leading to the PhD in business and the CUNY PhD subprogram in industrial/organizational psychology.

The Baruch College evaluation team should be composed of eight to ten members who are familiar with the challenges of urban public systems and institutions. Members should be familiar with institutions that serve predominantly undergraduate populations with a heavy representation of minority, international, and first generation college attending students. They should also be familiar with needs and requirements of graduate programs in business and public affairs.

The evaluation team should be headed by university or college president.

The following are suggested areas of evaluator expertise:

- academic programs in business, public affairs, and arts and sciences
- information literacy and library technology
- enrollment management
- budgeting and finance
- assessment of student learning
- institutional assessment
- career planning and placement
- fund raising/college development

Institutions that meet these requirements include the following:

College of New Jersey, NJ
Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA
Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ
New Jersey City University, Jersey City, NJ
Penn State University, University Park, PA
Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

Towson State University, Towson, MD
University of Delaware, DE
University of Maryland, Baltimore County, MD
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Pittsburgh

Component J - Preliminary Inventory of Documents – Electronic

1. Baruch College. Middle States Institutional Self Study, January 2000

http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/president/middlestates/baruch_college_self-Study_report1.doc

2. Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, Staff and Students of Baruch College, City of New York, by an evaluation team representing the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. Prepared following an analysis of the institution's self-study report and a visit to the campus on March 5-8, 2000. [n.d. 2000]

http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/president/middlestates/Middle_States_Report-March_2000.pdf

3. Periodic Review Report to the Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, June 1, 2005.

http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/facultyhandbook/documents/FinalPRR_000.doc

4. Baruch College Strategic Plan, 2006-11, January 25, 2006.

<http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/president/documents/BaruchCollegeStrategicPlan2006-2011.pdf>

5. Baruch College Performance Goals and Targets, 2007-2008

<http://www1.cuny.edu/administration/chancellor/performance-goals/baruch.pdf>

6. CUNY Master Plan, 2008-12. Approved by the CUNY Board of Trustees, June 23, 2008

http://web.cuny.edu/administration/chancellor/materplan_08_12.pdf

7. Baruch College Faculty Handbook

<http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/facultyhandbook/>

8. Link to City University of New York Performance Management Process site on homepage

<http://web.cuny.edu/administration/chancellor/performance-goals.html>

9. City University of New York. Affirmative Action Summary Data by College, Ethnicity and Gender for Instructional and Classified Staff. Report Fall 2007

http://web.cuny.edu/administration/ohrm/reports-forms/aadsb/aads_combined_Fall2007.pdf

Component K - Preliminary Inventory of Documents – Hard Copy

Baruch College, The City University of New York. *Institutional Self Study, January 2000*, 175p.
+ appendices.

Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, Staff and Students of Baruch College, City of New York, by an evaluation team representing the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. Prepared following an analysis of the institution's self-study report and a visit to the campus on March 5-8, 2000. [n.d. 2000]

Berrol, Selma Cantor. *Getting Down to Business: Baruch College in the City University of New York, 1847-1987*. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1989)