



MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION
ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Middle States Commission on Higher Education Self-Study Design

Haverford College

April 24, 2018

I. Institutional Overview

Haverford College is a small, private, residential, undergraduate, liberal arts college, located outside Philadelphia, known for its academic rigor, Honor Code, and beautiful campus. The College's mission is formally expressed by the following *Statement of Purpose*:

Haverford College is committed to providing a liberal arts education in the broadest sense. This education, based on a rich academic curriculum at its core, is distinguished by a commitment to excellence and a concern for individual growth. Haverford has chosen to remain small and to foster close student/faculty relationships to achieve these objectives.

The College's rigorous academic program is flexible in form and content to meet the needs of individual students, and rests on the assumption that the able students who come here will use their capacities fully. Haverford's faculty is noted for its strength in both scholarship and teaching, and its members expect to transmit to students their enthusiasm and high standards. The faculty members are teaching at an undergraduate college of arts and sciences by choice and they expect to learn, as well as to teach, in this close relationship with undergraduates.

The full resources of the College, in and out of the classroom, are designed to promote the personal and intellectual growth of students. Through an ambitious program of visiting lecturers and cultural activities, a conscious effort to recruit faculty and students representing diverse backgrounds and perspectives, student self-governance and service programs, an athletic program focused on participation and the scholar-athlete, and through day-to-day living in a residential community, the College seeks to broaden and enrich each person's development. Students are asked to give of themselves, even as they draw new strength from others. We seek to foster the pursuit of excellence and a sense of individual and collective responsibility throughout the entire environment.

Haverford strives to be a college in which integrity, honesty, and concern for others are dominant forces. The College does not have as many formal rules or as much formal supervision as most other colleges; rather, it offers an opportunity for students to govern their affairs and conduct themselves with respect and concern for others. Each student is expected to adhere to the Honor Code as it is adopted each year by the Students' Association.

Haverford College, while a non-sectarian institution, has Quaker origins that inform many aspects of the life of the College. They help to make Haverford the special college that it is, where the excellence of its academic program is deepened by its spiritual, moral, and ethical dimensions. These show most clearly in the close relationship among members of the campus community, in the emphasis on integrity, in the interaction of the individual and the community, and in the College's concern for the uses to which its students put their expanding knowledge.

Haverford's 1,300 students currently represent 43 U.S. states and 39 foreign countries; 42% are students of color and about half of all students receive some form of financial aid. The overwhelming majority of students live on campus and attend Haverford full time. The faculty's approximately 135 full-time scholars create a student-faculty ratio of 9:1. Haverford's own resources are augmented by those of Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore Colleges and the University of Pennsylvania, who cooperate on a wide range of consortial activities including student cross registration and library services.

Following a period of leadership flux between 2011 and 2015, Haverford has since been benefiting from steady, seasoned leadership at multiple levels. Provost Kim Benston was named president in 2015, and along with the College's existing senior staff has overseen the implementation of Haverford's 2014 strategic plan, the *Plan for Haverford 2020*. Supported by a \$270 million capital campaign that concluded in 2017, the *Plan for 2020* has led to improvements in curriculum, student support programs, and institutional stewardship (physical, financial, organizational). President Benston will conclude his service as president in 2019 and a search is underway for his successor who will lead the College on its next phase of strategic development.

The College's Senior Staff, which is charged with setting and implementing institutional strategy in a shared governance model relatively typical to liberal arts colleges, has identified a set of current strengths and opportunities for as context for the self-study. The College's current strengths include:

- Consistently strong student demand with outstanding student quality and diversity, culminating in robust student outcomes.
- A faculty of accomplished teachers and scholars across the disciplines, with notable and growing strength in interdisciplinary work.

- An enduring sense of community and distinctive focus on values from which emanates compelling programming in areas such as ethical leadership, social responsibility, global citizenship, and environmental sustainability, all supported by the substantial physical and community resources of Haverford's residential community.
- A solid financial base supported by loyal and generous alumni/ae and friends.

These strengths notwithstanding, Haverford recognizes opportunities for improvement and innovation, in particular in areas strained by the current challenging operating environment in higher education. These areas include:

- The changing nature of knowledge and student educational needs in order to thrive in the 21st century, challenging the span of a small faculty.
- Increasing student diversity across multiple dimensions, necessitating fresh attention to the ways we support the success of our students, from advising to mental health to academic support.
- Increasing financial pressure on students and families that threatens college access and affordability while limiting Haverford's revenue growth in an environment of ever-escalating costs.
- A slow recovery of Haverford's finances from the 2008 Great Recession with the College progressing incrementally toward full-accrual operating equilibrium.
- A desire for continued improvement within our recently formalized system of assessment and institutional effectiveness, particularly in the context of ever-limited time and resources, by pursuing assessment work that has the most favorable cost/benefit relationship.

This Self Study comes at an optimal moment for reflection for Haverford. The College is on track to implement the remaining elements of the *Plan for 2020* over the next two years and now has the opportunity to begin to anticipate its next chapter of institutional development. The College intends to use the Self-Study process as a vehicle for stock-taking in the following ways:

- How have the gains of the Plan for 2020 positioned Haverford? Are there any critical needs that must be met in order to deliver its mission in the current environment?
- What priorities are emerging as we anticipate how the College will pursue its mission over the next decade?

II. Institutional Priorities to be Addressed in Self-Study

In the broad, consultative planning process that led to the 2014 adoption of the *Plan for Haverford 2020*, the Haverford community articulated aspirations that we recast as the three overarching institutional priorities for the Self Study: Academic Excellence, Student Success, and Institutional Stewardship. These are the three legs of our current institutional strategy and are represented in the *Plan for 2020* in the following ways:

Academic Excellence

Chapter 1: The Academic Plan

- building disciplinary assets in relation to interdisciplinary constellations
- co-curricular programming
- resourcing the Plan with investments in people, faculty development, and academic spaces

Chapter 3: Expanding Learning Spaces

- technology and the liberal arts
- civic engagement and responsibility
- ethical education and leadership

Student Success

Chapter 2: Educating the Whole Student

- fostering an engaged, inclusive community
- enhancing student development via integrated advising and coordinated support services

Chapter 4: Haverford in the World

- access and admission
- career and professional advising

Institutional Stewardship

Chapter 4: Haverford in the World

- Alumni

Chapter 5: Institutional Stewardship

- financial management
- supporting staff and faculty
- technological infrastructure
- physical plant
- sustainability and environment
- governance

Without predetermining the next strategic plan, we anticipate that these three broad institutional priorities will remain focal points of institutional strategy. They map onto the MSCHE Standards of Accreditation as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Mapping of Institutional Priorities to MSCHE Standards and Working Groups

	I. Mission and Goals	II. Ethics and Integrity and Req. of Affiliation	III. Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience	IV. Support for the Student Experience	V. Educational Effectiveness Assessment	VI. Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement	VII. Governance, Leadership, and Administration
Academic Excellence	(X)	(X)	X	(X)	(X)	(X)	
Student Success	(X)		(X)	X	X	(X)	
Institutional Stewardship	X	X				X	X

X=Primary focus; (X)=Additional focus

III. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study (3-5)

Haverford will seek the following outcomes from the Self Study process:

- 1) Demonstrate compliance with the MSCHE Standards of Accreditation, Requirements of Affiliation, and accreditation-relevant federal regulations, in order to earn reaffirmation by MSCHE.
- 2) Assess the results of the *Plan for Haverford 2020* via a transparent and collaborative process.
- 3) Lay the groundwork for the next phase of strategic planning and continuous improvement.

IV. Self Study Approach

In order to address all Standards thoroughly within the Self Study, Haverford has selected a standards-based approach. The above institutional priorities will be used as lenses to concentrate our institutional reflection as we demonstrate compliance with the

Standards, assess achievement of the *Plan for Haverford 2020*, and identify opportunities for improvement and innovation. Each Standards-based working group has been assigned to focus its efforts on at least one institutional priority.

V. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

Steering Committee:

Haverford's Self Study process will draw on individuals well positioned to take stock of the institutional enterprise, existing governance structures, and the collective spirit of collaboration inherent in the College's culture.

Our eleven-member Steering Committee is composed of the Self Study Leadership Team and the Working Group Chairs. The Working Groups will be co-chaired, include a core group of members (often associated with relevant governance structures), and will be empowered to consult broadly beyond their ranks as needed. The Leadership Team will serve as an information hub to promote coordination and efficiency among the Working Groups. Our Working Groups are organized and numbered by Standard.

The Haverford College Self Study Steering Committee is composed of the following individuals:

Name	Title	Self Study Role
Richard Freedman	Associate Provost and Professor of Music	Self Study Co-Chair Self Study Leadership Team Working Group III Co-Chair Working Group V Co-Chair
Jesse Lytle	Vice President and Chief of Staff	Self Study Co-Chair Self Study Leadership Team Working Group I Co-Chair Working Group V Co-Chair Working Group VI Co-Chair
Catherine Fennell	Director of Institutional Research	Self Study Leadership Team
Bret Mulligan	Associate Professor of Classics, Faculty Representative to the Board of Managers	Working Group I Co-Chair
Franklyn Cantor	Special Assistant to the President	Working Group II Co-Chair
Christopher Mills	Assistant Vice President for College Communications	Working Group II Co-Chair

Frances Blase	Provost and Associate Professor of Chemistry	Working Group III Co-Chair
Martha Denney	Dean of the College	Working Group IV Co-Chair
Jess Lord	Dean of Admission and Financial Aid	Working Group IV Co-Chair
Maud McInerney	Associate Professor of English, Educational Planning Committee Chair	Working Group V Co-Chair
Mitchell Wein	Senior VP for Finance & Administration	Working Group VI Co-Chair Working Group VII Co-Chair

The Self Study Leadership team is a subset of the Steering Committee and will manage the self study process.

- Richard Freedman, Associate Provost and Professor of Music
- Jesse Lytle, Vice President and Chief of Staff
- Catherine Fennell, Director of Institutional Research

Haverford's small size and relatively flat organizational structure (see attached [organization chart](#)) facilitate the exchange of information and perspectives. Our consensus-based decision-making style includes both respect for appropriate confidentiality in deliberations and engagement with multiple constituencies as initiatives unfold. However, our size also necessitates careful attention to workload and focus. The organizational structure of our Self Study is designed to balance responsibilities among busy colleagues while maximizing the value of the exercise for the institution and its mission.

To effect a collaborative and transparent process, the Leadership Team will coordinate working group interaction by theme (common documents/priorities) and around confluences/divergences. A member of the Leadership Team will participate in every Working Group in order to facilitate coordination and communication. Working Group participants have been determined by their roles on our Standing Committees (EPC, AAC, CSSP, Academic Council) in order to both involve leadership across the College and facilitate communication about the Self Study. Students will be identified for relevant working groups based on governance roles (Students Council, Honor Council, Standing Committees) and with the expectation that they would liaise with other students as appropriate. Board members are participants in Working Groups I (mission) and VII (governance), and relevant Board committees are included in our communication plan.

Working Groups will be actively engaged over the course of the 2018-19 academic year. During the summer and fall of 2019, the self-study Leadership Team working together with the Steering Committee will compile the various draft contributions, and through an iterative process refine the whole into an integrated discussion around our institutional priorities. As Self-Study drafts become presentable, the Steering Committee will share them for comment across the campus community, Board, and Corporation¹.

General Charge for All Working Groups

- 1) Demonstrate compliance with the [MSCHE Standards of Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation](#). It is vital that the Working Group address each of the points listed for the relevant Standard. Demonstrating compliance will involve adducing evidence (policy documents, analyses, data sets, minutes) and creating analytical narrative explanation of how these items show that we “meet expectations” for the given criteria. Self Study leadership has undertaken the advance work of compiling a [summary of recent of Institutional Effectiveness Committee \(IEC\)² activities related to each Standard](#) in order to jumpstart this process for the working groups.
- 2) Give special attention to the final assessment criteria of each Standard and what the MSCHE requested of us in our most recent [Statement of Accreditation Status](#) (the outcome of the Monitoring Report). Our self study is to show:
 - a) how we use information gathered during the assessment process to improve educational effectiveness (Standard V). This is most clearly manifest in the collection of faculty ratings of student work in the context of General Education and Senior Capstone work, and the ways we consider this evidence in department-level discussions, which are in turn communicated to EPC and the Provosts via the annual Departmental Assessment Plans (DAPs).

¹ The Corporation of Haverford College holds legal title to the College's assets. The Corporation delegates the management of the College to the Board of Managers, which is analogous in form and function to a board of trustees, which in turn hires the president and exercises the fiduciary duties common to a higher education board.

² The function of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, established in 2010, is to take an institutional view of assessment at the College; to support cross-functional initiatives and activities for institutional improvement; and to identify and develop initiatives to help the College meet its near- and long-term institutional goals.

- b) how we use assessment results for institutional improvement (Standard VI) in clearly documented and communicated planning processes. This is why we are especially attentive to our DAP process, and linking evaluation (and evidence) with resource allocation in the form of funding, staffing, and/or institutional attention. Across the institution, we also need to provide examples of assessment data being used for improvement.
- c) how we periodically assess that:
 - i) Mission and Goals are relevant and achievable
 - ii) Ethics and Integrity are evidenced in our policies, processes and practices
 - iii) Programs providing student learning opportunities are effective
 - iv) Programs supporting the student experience are effective
 - v) Educational assessment processes are effective
 - vi) Planning, resource allocation, and renewal processes are effective
 - vii) Governance, leadership, and administration are effective
- 3) Identify gaps in our documentation, practices, and systems of evaluation with respect to the Standards. Are we meeting the Standard, but lack some documentation? Or is there some way in which we fall short of some aspect of the Standard itself? Any shortcomings that the Working Group cannot satisfactorily address directly should be noted and communicated to the Self Study co-chairs clearly and promptly, even before the Gap reports are due in January 2019. As a starting point, the Self Study leadership team has assembled core documents for each Working Group, which are available via our [Self Study website](#) and linked [Evidence Inventory](#).

(Note: the numbering for the Institutional Effectiveness Committee working groups as set out in the [IEC Agenda for 2017-18](#) are *not* the same as those for the MSCHE Standards, but you can see a [cross-walk here](#) to help you understand the relationship between the two sets. In 2018-19, we will have only the MSCHE Standards as our Working Groups.)

- 4) Undertake analysis that uses the evidence noted above to document our successes and the challenges we face with respect to the given Standard and the institutional priorities identified for the Self Study (Academic Excellence, Student

Success, and Institutional Stewardship) through the lens of the Standard.

Provide multiple examples of assessment results being used for improvement in relation to this Standard. It would be particularly valuable if “needs” or “challenges” are linked to realizations that emerged from our various self-assessment processes now in place. How might we close any gaps identified above?

- 5) Suggest opportunities for improvement and innovation around how the College might advance its priorities and goals. Since we are now in the final phase of our most recent strategic plan, these will be of great value as we prepare the ground for the next plan. We thus ask that you
 - a) Re-read the [Plan for 2020](#), and reflect on [what has been accomplished](#).
 - b) Think about what remains undone, or what has emerged since the *Plan for 2020* was crafted that now seems important. These could be in the form of questions. Wherever possible, identify how “needs” or “challenges” emerged from our various self-assessment processes.
 - c) Understand that recommendations and suggestions will be compiled, considered holistically, and prioritized for the final report. A limited number of recommendations will be put forth in the final narrative, and we will report our progress on these in our next Self Study in 2028. Any number of operational suggestions could be referred to existing processes for consideration and action.

Working Group Composition and Charges

Working Group I: Mission and Goals

Related institutional Priorities: Institutional Stewardship (primary)
Academic Excellence
Student Success

Co-Chairs:

Jesse Lytle, Vice President & Chief of Staff
Bret Mulligan, Faculty Board Representative

Membership:

John Morse, Clerk, Corporation Advisory Committee
Rachel Hochberg, Staff Association Representative

Students Council Co-President

Identify the extent to which the College meets Middle States expectations for mission and goals. Consider current understanding of Haverford's mission in relationship to the College's strategic planning efforts and their implementation over the last decade, as well as its continued relevance as the College looks prospectively toward its next chapter of institutional development.

Key people and resources: In addition to the resources identified in the Evidence Inventory, review reports of recent planning efforts; consult with Corporation Advisory Committee, Council for Diversity & Inclusion, Council on Sustainability & Social Responsibility, the Plan for 2020 Implementation Committee.

Working Group II: Ethics and Integrity (incl. Requirements of Affiliation)

*Related Institutional Priority: Institutional Stewardship (primary)
Academic Excellence*

Co-Chairs:

Franklyn Cantor, Special Assistant to the President
Chris Mills, Assistant Vice President for College Communications

Membership:

Marta Bartholomew, Assistant Provost
Muriel Brisbon, Director of Human Resources
Mike Colahan, Director of Financial Aid
Mary Maier, Director of Admission
Michael Martinez, Dean of Student Life
Jesse Lytle, Vice President & Chief of Staff
Financial Services Representative
Honor Council Co-Chair

Determine the extent to which the College meets Middle States expectations with regard to Ethics and Integrity. Consider whether our policies, practices, and communications support our values and priorities. This Working Group will also be responsible for documenting compliance with the fifteen MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation and preparing the Verification of Compliance.

Key people and resources: In addition to the resources identified in the Evidence Inventory, consult with the Council for Diversity & Inclusion, Office of the Provost, Office of the President, Office of Communications, Office of Admission, Office of Institutional Research, EEO Officers, Affirmative Action Officers, Title IX Coordinator.

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

*Related Institutional Priorities: Academic Excellence (primary)
Student Success*

Co-Chairs:

Fran Blase, Provost
Rich Freedman, Associate Provost

Membership:

Marta Bartholomew, Assistant Provost
Jim Keane, Registrar
Faculty Representative, Academic Council
Student Representative, Educational Policy Committee

Determine whether the College meets Middle States' expectations with regard to the design and delivery of the student learning experience. Analyze how our assessment of the student learning experience has informed our priorities. Examine the extent to which support and opportunities provided to faculty members lead to the excellent academic experience we aspire to provide our students. Discuss how the senior capstone experience contributes to student success.

Key people and resources: In addition to the resources identified in the Evidence Inventory, consult with the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), FAPC, Academic Council, Office of the Provost, the Academic Centers, Chesick Scholars program, Study Abroad, Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship, Multicultural Scholars Program, Office of Academic Resources.

Working Group IV: Support of the Student Experience

*Related Institutional Priorities: Student Success (primary)
Academic Excellence*

Co-Chairs:

Martha Denney, Dean of the College
Jess Lord, Vice President & Dean of Admission and Financial Aid

Members:

Brian Cuzzolina/Raquel Esteves-Joyce, Office of Academic Resources (OAR)
Amy Feifer, Center for Career and Professional Advising
Cathy Fennell/Kevin Iglesias, Office of Institutional Research
Ana Lopez Sanchez, Associate Professor of Spanish, Chair of CSSP
Wendy Smith, Director of Athletics
Kelly Wilcox, Dean for Student Health & Learning Resources
Students' Council Representatives (2)

Examine the extent to which the College meets Middle States' expectations with regard to support of the student experience. Identify the College's strengths, challenges, and opportunities in supporting the success of all Haverford students.

Key people and resources: In addition to the resources identified in the Evidence Inventory, consult with the Students' Council, Honor Council, Customs, Council on Diversity & Inclusion, Office of Academic Affairs, Office of Academic Resources, Access & Disability Services, Counseling and Psychological Services, Health Services, Chesick Scholars program, Office of International Student Support, Office of Multicultural Affairs, Athletics, the Center for Career & Professional Advising, Admission and Financial Aid, Honors Committee, Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship, Multicultural Scholars Program, LIFTFAR, Horizons Program.

Working Group V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

*Related Institutional Priorities: Student Success (primary)
Academic Excellence*

Co-Chairs:

Rich Freedman, Associate Provost, Professor of Music
Maud McInerney, EPC Chair, Associate Professor of English

Membership:

Jim Keane, Registrar
Benjamin Le, Professor of Psychology
Honor Council representative

Student Representative, Educational Policy Committee

The College has developed a new system for the assessment of student learning over recent years. Determine how well the current structure for assessment meets Middle States expectations and is supporting the priorities of academic excellence and student success.

Key people and resources: In addition to the resources identified in the Evidence Inventory, consult with the Office of the Provost, EPC, FAPC, Registrar, Centers.

Working Group VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

*Related Institutional Priorities: Institutional Stewardship (primary)
Academic Excellence
Student Success*

Co-chairs:

Jesse Lytle, Vice President & Chief of Staff

Mitch Wein, Senior Vice President for Finance & Administration

Membership:

Terri Albertson, Controller

Mike Casel, Chief Investment Officer

Cathy Fennell/Kevin Iglesias, Office of Institutional Research

Ann Figueredo, VP for Institutional Advancement

Megan Fitch, Chief Information Officer

Rob Manning, Professor of Mathematics, Chair, Administrative Advisory
Committee

Students' Council representative

Examine the extent to which the College meets Middle States' expectations with regard to planning, resources, and institutional improvement. Haverford is working within a newly formalized process for assessment of institutional effectiveness. Determine how well it is serving the institution and whether it is leading to institutional improvement. Examine how well the three institutional priorities within this Self Study--Academic Excellence, Student Success, and Institutional Stewardship--are supported by planning processes and resources.

Key people and resources: In addition to the resources identified in the Evidence Inventory, consult with Administrative Advisory Committee, Plan for 2020 Implementation Committee, Senior Staff, Working Group on Benefits.

Working Group VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

*Related Institutional Priorities: Institutional Stewardship (primary)
Academic Excellence
Student Success*

Co-chairs:

Jesse Lytle, Vice President & Chief of Staff

Mitch Wein, Senior Vice President for Finance & Administration

Membership:

Ginny Christensen, Board of Managers and Corporation

Lisabeth Lieberman, Staff Association Executive Committee

Co-President, Students' Council

Faculty Representative, Faculty Affairs and Policy Committee

Examine the extent to which the College meets Middle States' expectations with regard to governance, leadership, and administration. Consider the ways in which organizational and governance structures of the faculty, staff, students, Board, and Corporation support our three institutional priorities within this Self Study--Academic Excellence, Student Success, and Institutional Stewardship--including identifying notable strengths or challenges.

Key people and resources: In addition to the resources identified in the Evidence Inventory, consult with FAPC, Students' Council, the Staff Association Executive Committee, Executive Committee of the Board of Managers, and the Corporation Advisory Committee.

Responsibilities of Chairs and Working Group Members

- The Working Group chairs are expected to adhere to the instructions and guidance provided, execute the work required to address the Working Group charge on the timeline provided (see Section X), and produce a final report that accurately reflects the Working Group's work and conclusions.

- Chairs should ensure timely communication with Self Study leadership and with the Chairs of other Working Groups as needed. Send along periodic reports, respond to queries, and ask for help when appropriate.
- Chairs should also ensure that the Working Group is collaborating effectively. Meet when appropriate, articulate a division of labor for other members of the group, and set deadlines to keep everyone on track. In the spirit of Haverford's Quaker traditions and respect for varied perspectives, chairs should ensure that everyone has an opportunity to contribute, and that particular voices do not dominate the conversation. Review the Working Group charge periodically in an effort to keep discussions on topic; use the shared notes documents on the Self Study website to keep track of ideas that might be useful for another Working Group or in the future but are not germane to the present tasks.
- Membership in the Working Group also carries responsibilities. The Self Study is important and complex work that cannot be accomplished without many members of the community working together. It is expected that Working Group members attend all meetings, participate fully in the process, and carry a fair share of the workload involved. In many cases the Working Group members will have special responsibility to ensure communication with some College committee, office, or department in which they also participate. Members should not hesitate to note important issues or problems that are being overlooked, but they should not use the Working Group as a forum to air unrelated concerns.
- As members of the Self Study Steering Committee, the chairs are also responsible for coordinating their efforts so that our Self Study is conducted efficiently and effectively, sharing practices and conclusions that may be helpful to other Chairs, and minimizing the burden on the community.
- Document management is key to all collaborative work. Avoid confusing email chains and attachments. Use Google documents (via the Self Study website) to keep the authoritative version of your minutes, notes, and drafts all in one place. (Permissions for view/edit/comment can easily be managed from each document.)
- Confidentiality is the responsibility of all members of a Working Group. The ideas, problems, and in some cases the documents under consideration are internal matters to the College, and should not be published, shared, or communicated beyond the Working Group other than through the specific

channels of consultation that will unfold in the course of the process described above.

Getting Started and Deliverables

To ensure an efficient start to our Self Study process in 2018-19, each Working Group Co-Chair is expected to take some concrete steps during the remainder of the 2017-18 academic year:

- review the [2015 PRR](#) and [2017 Monitoring report](#) in order to become aware of past successes and challenges in meeting **previous** accreditation standards. Formerly, there were 14 Standards, two of which focused on assessment.
- review the seven **current** MSCHE Standards of Accreditation (and the 15 Requirements of Affiliation), with particular attention to the Standard that is your Working Group's focus. Each one of the new Standards includes an assessment component. Three of the Requirements of Affiliation, where compliance is expected to be continuous, relate to systematic assessment processes and the use of assessment results for improvement.
 - Note: Four principles guided the development of the new Standards and are worthy of attention within our Self Study:
 - Mission-centric application
 - Focus on the Student Learning Experience
 - Assessment throughout, as part of every Standard
 - Attention to innovation/institutional improvement
- read the “criteria” related to your assigned Standard and articulate what evidence supports our compliance with it. As you will notice, many of these criteria are in the form of “meets expectations or minimum standards.” The Self Study leadership team has already started the work of identifying the relevant documents and evidence. They also have taken the steps to select from among your MSCHE Standard those criteria that are most relevant to Haverford, and to identify which current projects (as articulated in the 2017-18 IEC Agenda) relate to your Standard. Two summary documents will help you navigate to the relevant information:
 - The [Evidence Inventory](#) (look in the tab for your group. What's missing? Please tell us where to find these additional materials).
 - The appendix: [IEC Activities and MSCHE Standards](#) (here you can jump to your Standard via the table of contents).

With the “evidence” noted above in hand, we ask that each group begin to develop a statement that explains in narrative form how we currently “meet the criteria,” how we have “evaluated or reflected or measured our progress,” and “what steps need to be taken next.” At this point, it is not your job to fill gaps or fix problems that you identify, but some elaboration of them would be welcome as a thought piece. This work will unfold in stages:

- *By July 1, 2018* the leadership of each Working Group (in consultation with appropriate colleagues) should craft a short “position paper” relative to the Standard. Use the Google Doc for your Standard as the common space for this work (see the [Self Study website](#) for the link. These documents will be visible only to members of the various working groups and Self Study leadership for now).
Main points to keep in mind:
 - articulate how we meet the criteria
 - explain how we evaluate/review/assess for improvement
 - cite evidence and examples from the trove of documents you are building
 - make note of data, policies, documents, practices that are missing, incomplete, or broken
 - identify challenges and opportunities beyond 2020
- *By September 2018*, other members for the working group should
 - review the 2015 PRR and the 2017 Monitoring report in order to become aware of past successes and challenges in meeting the **previous** accreditation standards.
 - review the **present** Standard of Accreditation which is the group’s focus.
 - read and comment on the position paper. Revise and elaborate as appropriate.
- *During the 2018-19 Academic Year*, the Working Group will begin a process of cross-consultation in a series of expanding circles within the community, organized and monitored by the Self Study leadership. These conversations will be conducted:
 - among all the working groups, who will read each other’s draft documents
 - with members of relevant College committees, departments and offices, chiefly via the various members of each Working Group, who are also members of those committees, departments and offices.

- with the College community at large, in forums convened for faculty, staff, and students, and with the Board as appropriate.
- *By January 15, 2019, each Working Group will prepare a Gap & Emerging Recommendation Report on their Standard.* These include preliminary findings organized by the Standard's criteria, a summary of what's missing at this point, any recommendations likely to be included in the Final Report, along with a refined Evidence Inventory. Templates for each Standard are on the Self Study website. Please complete this template as your Gap & Emerging Recommendation Report. An update of this report will be due by early April 2019. Appropriate summaries will be compiled for relevant April Board Committee meetings.
- *By the end of the 2018-19 Academic Year, each Working Group will write a Final Report of 10-15 pages in length that will include:*
 - an overview of the Working Group's charge, and the institutional priorities (Academic Excellence, Student Success, Institutional Stewardship) considered in the course their labors
 - the finding on compliance with the Standard, including an explanation of how we meet each criteria, with citation of the most relevant evidence from our documents, and noting any gaps that remain between the criteria and our current practices.
 - analytical discussion identifying both our strengths and challenges, articulating our assessment approach for this Standard, and providing concrete examples of assessment in action for institutional improvement.
 - a summary of what was learned from or shared with other Working Groups, relevant College committees, departments and offices, and the community at large.
 - major recommendations (if any) for institutional improvement and innovation related to the themes of our Self Study (Academic Excellence, Student Success, and/or Institutional Stewardship). We will be expected to report on our progress on these recommendations in our subsequent Self Study in 2028. Therefore, not all Working Group major recommendations will find their way into the final version of the Self Study Report. However, this comprehensive set of recommendations will be important to our discussions as we begin to formulate a strategic plan beyond 2020.

- minor suggestions for improvement or small projects that would support innovation. These might be things that are already underway, but ripe for further action. These will be compiled as an outcome of the Self Study process, and assigned for appropriate consideration and action. We would not be expected to report formally on our progress on these as part of our subsequent Self Study in 2028.

Document Management Instructions

- The Self Study web site: <https://sites.google.com/haverford.edu/self-study/home> is a key resource for managing the work of the Self Study. It includes:
 - the Self Study Design (this document), which includes Working Group Charges
 - a summary of Institutional Effectiveness Committee activities related to the Standards
 - the Evidence Inventory (which is a master list with individual tabs for each Working Group; the individual documents and assessments are linked for quick reference)
 - a dedicated page for each Working Group, with links to Google Documents minutes, notes, and draft Reports. Other documents can easily be linked here, too.
 - Note: Document management is key to all collaborative work. We have decided to avoid confusing email chains and attachments by using Google documents to keep the authoritative version of everyone's minutes, notes, and drafts all in one place. (Permissions for view/edit/comment can easily be managed from each document.)

VI. Guidelines for Reporting

Key due dates for Working Group products are shaded in gray in the comprehensive timeline in Section X, and summarized here with links to templates:

July 1, 2018	Position papers by Standard are due from WG leaders. An example for Standard III is available here .
January 15, 2019	Working Group Gap & Emerging Recommendations Reports are due. These include preliminary findings, summary of what's missing at this point, along with a refined Evidence Inventory. A sample report template for WG VI is here .
April 3, 2019	April updates of the January Gap & Emerging Recommendations Reports are due from the Working Groups. At this point, the Steering Committee will review and prepare summaries for discussion in relevant April Board Committee meetings.
May 29, 2019	Working Groups submit final reports with prescribed content. The WG Final Report outline is here .

Tone, Content, and Editorial Process

- The Working Group Report should be analytical, with assertions supported by evidence. It should be balanced, based on the Working Group findings, and avoid extremes of flattery or critique. The report should cover what we do well in addition to what needs attention; for example a discussion of the Honor Code within Standard IV might speak to its salience and value within student culture while acknowledging the kinds of concerns with it that students periodically identify.
- It is nevertheless important to recognize that your Report may not appear verbatim as a “chapter” in the final Self Study. Self Study leadership will routinely make editorial changes in the interests of consistency or space. They will also make adjustments to harmonize recommendations, avoid overlap, or clarify

actions to be taken. Our aim is a coherent, consistent, and comprehensive Self Study.

- The Steering Committee may request that Working Groups provide additional analyses, or re-write sections of reports in order to provide a better resource for the Self Study.

Length and Format

- While there are not strict guidelines on length for the WG reports, there are limitations on the Self Study length, and so the WG reports should themselves have a length that will provide appropriate balance. Therefore, they are generally expected to be 10-15 single-spaced pages.
- As indicated above within document management, we ask you to use the Self Study website and Google documents for your report drafts and other documents. We will review and format your work, but in general you should use:
 - Georgia 12 point font, single spaced, 1” margins
 - With respect to capitalization, spelling, and punctuation, we will follow the Haverford College Style Guides:
 - [Brief HC Style Guide](#)
 - [Complete Style Guide](#) (GDoc)
 - [Short list of terms](#) frequently used in the Self Study

VII. Organization of the Final Self-Study Report

1. Table of Contents
2. Executive Summary
3. Institutional Overview
4. Standard I: Mission and Goals
5. Standard II: Ethics and Integrity (includes Requirements of Affiliation)
6. Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience
7. Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience
8. Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment
9. Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

10. Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration
11. Opportunities for Improvement and Innovation

VIII. Verification of Compliance Strategy

Working Group II is charged with completion of the Verification of Compliance. At present, this covers the following areas applicable to Haverford College:

1. Transfer of credit policies and articulation agreements
2. Title IV program responsibilities
3. Institutional records of student complaints
4. Required information for students and the public
5. Standing with state and other accrediting agencies
6. Assignment of credit hours

IX. Evidence Inventory

The Evidence Inventory is a master list of all the documents we have (or will have) identified in support of the Self Study. Initially, the Evidence Inventory assembles resources for all working groups in a commonly accessible space. Items will be added, removed and/or updated as the Self Study progresses. A curated collection of the most appropriate evidence will be uploaded by Standard to the Middle States portal, along with the final Self Study narrative in early 2020.

The Evidence Inventory is a tabbed Google Sheet:

- the first sheet is the master inventory; each item has a document ID, a short title, quick description, and link to where it can be found (on the web or in the Self Study shared Google Drive). Click on any link to view or download that document. The document is “live” and thus always current. The Evidence Inventory is maintained by the Self Study leadership team. If a Working Group alerts the leadership to a new document, it will be added promptly.
- the documents are not in any particular order on the first sheet, but their relationship to individual Standards is noted in the columns to the right, which in turn are used by Google Sheets to automatically build dedicated lists for each Working Group (see the tabs at the bottom of the document). The lists are “live” and thus always current. If a Working Group notices a document from the Master List that is relevant to its work but not tagged

for the group, please alert us. For easy reference, the dedicated lists are also available on the individual pages for each Working Group in the Self Study web site.

- As the Self Study narrative is being prepared, the contents of the Evidence Inventory will be reviewed, curated, and updated as appropriate. While abridged evidence will be selected for upload to Middle States with the narrative, the final unabridged version of this virtual repository will replace the on campus-based “documents room” for the visiting team.

X. Self-Study Timetable

Middle States Self Study Timeline	
November 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Self Study Institute
November/Dec/Jan 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assemble Steering committee ● Begin Design ● Phone conference with MSCHE VP Liaison to review initial design elements
February - April 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Announce Self Study process to campus constituencies and Board ● Appoint Working Groups ● Draft Design shared with MSCHE VP Liaison by March 23 ● MSCHE VP Liaison Self Study Preparation visit to campus on April 6 visit
May - June 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Revisions and final approval of Design (by MSCHE VP Liaison) ● WG leaders (in consultation) prepare “position papers” for each Standard
July 1, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Position papers by Standard are due from WG leaders
September - December 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Working Groups gather and analyze evidence

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultations with other Working Groups and appropriate Committees and constituencies • Working Groups prepare Gap & Emerging Recommendation Reports
January 15, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Group Gap & Emerging Recommendations Reports are due. These include preliminary findings, summary of what's missing at this point, along with a refined Evidence Inventory.
January - May 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Group consultations with each other and appropriate Committees and constituencies • Self Study process updates to the Community • Team Chair chosen • Team Visit dates chosen • Self Study Design sent to Visiting Team Chair
April 3, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April updates of the January Gap & Emerging Recommendations Reports are due from the Working Groups. • At this point, the Steering Committee will review and prepare summaries for discussion in relevant April Board Committee meetings.
May 29, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Groups submit final reports with prescribed content
May - August 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self Study narrative is drafted • Verification of Compliance Report is prepared
September - October 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community and Board review of Self Study draft • Verification of Compliance with Federal Regulations is prepared by Working Group II
November -December 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised Self Study draft is sent to Team Visit Chair (two weeks before visit) • Team Chair preliminary visit

December 2019/January 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self Study is finalized, based on Team Chair feedback, and shared with community/Board
February 2020	<p>Upload to the MSCHE portal, six weeks before the team visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Self Study • Selected Evidence Inventory documentation • Verification of Compliance with Federal Regulations
March/April 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visiting Team on campus • Team Report • Institutional Response
June 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSCHE Commission meets to determine action

XI. Communication Plan

The Self Study Leadership team will manage the communication plan which is incorporated within the timeline above. Updates pertaining to the Self Study process, areas of collaboration, and findings will be shared via common assemblies (faculty meetings, all staff meetings, Students Council, and Board meetings) and periodic electronic updates. A Google form has been established within the Self Study website to collect and manage feedback from the community. The Steering Committee and Working Groups will leverage the Self Study website for collaboration. A series of report templates have been developed to articulate expectations and contribute to the development of reports with a common structural framework.

XII. Evaluation Team Profile

In selecting a team to evaluate Haverford College, it would be most appropriate if the individuals were familiar with the challenges of a small, residential, highly-selective, academically rigorous, financially-constrained, private, non-sectarian liberal arts college. We have a strong preference for a chair who understands well our sector and the distinctive history, practices, culture, and markets within which selective liberal arts colleges operate. We also seek in the chair an individual with leadership experience across all or multiple functional areas of such an institution; while a president would

most obviously fit this profile there may be other candidates whose backgrounds would be sufficiently broad to be able to provide such a holistic perspective on Haverford.

Academically, our closest peer institutions tend to include:

- Amherst College
- Bowdoin College
- Bryn Mawr College
- Carleton College
- Claremont McKenna College
- Davidson College
- Middlebury College
- Pomona College
- Swarthmore College
- Vassar College
- Wellesley College
- Williams College

While on a financial basis, Haverford is also similar to

- Bates College
- Colby College
- Colgate University
- Colorado College
- Grinnell College
- Hamilton College
- Harvey Mudd College
- Oberlin College
- Macalester College
- Smith College
- Washington and Lee University
- Wesleyan University

We wish to note that Haverford, Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore Colleges form the Tri-College Consortium and actively engage in numerous collaborations. Therefore, including Bryn Mawr or Swarthmore representatives on Haverford's evaluation team could present a conflict of interest.

We also would note that Haverford, along with Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore Colleges, is a member of the Pennsylvania Consortium for the Liberal Arts (PCLA). The PCLA

mission includes enhancing cross-institutional knowledge in order to improve the quality of our institutions and programs, as well as to create opportunities for cost efficiencies. All PCLA institutions are within the Middle States accrediting region, and we would welcome visiting team members from:

Dickinson College
Franklin and Marshall College
Gettysburg College
Juniata College
Lafayette College
Muhlenberg College
Ursinus College
Washington and Jefferson College