2018-19 Institutional Effectiveness Committee
End of Year Report
May 14, 2018

Richard Freedman, Associate Provost, IEC Chair
Cathy Fennell, Director of Institutional Research, IEC Co-Vice Chair
Jesse Lytle, Vice President & Chief of Staff, IEC Co-Vice Chair

IEC agenda (for reference)

Working Group 1: The Visible Curriculum

Accomplishments:

Part A: Visible Curriculum

Our first discussion of this "Visible Curriculum" project began during 2016-17, when Spencer Golden convened a group of interested folks (Jim Keane, Chris Mills, Rich Freedman, Jenn O'Donnell, and Susan Turkel [Editor for College Catalog Project]) to discuss needs and deliverables of such a system. Meanwhile, Freedman also convened a series of meetings with Haverford, Bryn Mawr, and Swarthmore colleagues (from IT, Libraries, Faculty, and Deans) about the needs and wants of a system that would help students and their advisors discover and identify pathways. We were aided in some of this work by Haverford alumnus Jeff Frankl, a local software developer with experience in related matters. Our discussions were productive, but we were certainly far from solutions.

This fall, Spencer convened the Working Group again with eye towards the evaluation of several commercial platforms that might fit our needs:

- Smart Catalog: http://www.academiccatalog.com/
- Acalog: https://www.digarc.com/
- CourseLeaf: https://www.leepfrog.com/courseleaf/

We formulated a series of questions and technical requirements for each vendor, and arranged for demonstrations by a representative of each. There were follow-up consultations on technical matters, and discussions about cost (both implementation and ongoing). CourseLeaf emerged as the system that best meets our requirements. It has two components: CAT (the catalog management system) and CIM (the course information and proposal system). Both have strong user interfaces.

CAT also offers the possibility of enhanced functions, called "Focus Search" (at additional costs) to meet with the Visible Curriculum goals (see for instance the installation at Brown University), with the possibility of using registration information to envisage pathways, discover new interests, and other advanced functions. A more basic version of Focus Search ("Focus Search Express") comes free with our version of the CAT system, and we hope that it will be a good first step.

Kim Benston and Fran Blase accepted the recommendation of the Working Group. We are now working with Course Leaf on all aspects of implementation of Phase 1: The Catalog (called "CAT" in the lingo of Course Leaf), which we expect to be ready (in both print and pdf forms) for mid-August 2018.

During the fall of 2018 we will turn to implementation of Phase 2: The Curriculum Management package (CIM), which will bring a similarly streamlined system to our process for proposing, approving, and revising courses. This system will integrate directly with Bionic.

Part B: Curriculum Viewer

- Since 2015-16 we have also been discussing ways to make the curriculum (and not just what is on offer for a given year) more visible to students, faculty, and professional staff. The notes and themes of our discussions are assembled in a single web hub.
- Guiding questions include
  - How are courses connected with each other? As part of credentialed 'streams' like majors, minors, etc? As networks of learning or knowing?
  - How do we want to organize the curriculum? In relation to disciplines? In relation to "problems?" In relation to the libraries? Something beyond the gates? At other schools?
  - What do faculty (as underclass advisors, as major advisors) need to do with a catalog?
  - How might the catalog relate to the 'trail' of advice given by various mentors?
  - What do chairs, program coordinators need?
  - Committee members and admin types?
  - What do students want to do? As Year 1-2? As Year 3-4?
  - What do prospective students need to do with the catalog?
- Meanwhile progress towards these aims advanced in two parallel processes:
  - We continued work on the curation of course information as it is preserved in Bionic, undertaking the systematic review, correction and updating of all courses likely to be offered again during the next 5-7 years. This work will continue during 2018-19 via the new Course Leaf curriculum management package (CIM), which will vastly simplify the process of correcting course data, since in the future faculty will be able to propose edits directly in a simple interface for review and approval by the Provost or the Chair of EPC.
  - The Course Leaf CAT system includes a basic version of their Focus Search system (see notes above), called “Focus Search Express” that will allow users to quickly navigate the complete three-year Catalog (and not only courses on offer for a given academic year). This simplified version of Focus Search lacks integration with current and historical enrollment data, but it is a solid step in the right direction.
  - We simultaneously convened various workshops and conversations that aimed at the development of the most important functions for a dynamic Curriculum Viewer. With help from web developer and HC alum Jeff Frankl, we held a workshop of faculty, registrars, and interested students from across the TriCo (see here for detail minutes).
  - It is still too early to decide on a preferred platform, technical standard, or set of minimal deliverables for the imagined Curriculum Viewer, but we did identify key

priorities, including the pressing need for students in their first year(s) to have ways of discovering new interests, and also of finding the various ways in which familiar interests are manifest in unexpected places across the curriculum. Course Leaf, in fact, offers a very powerful system for this kind of exploration (it is available at extra cost).

- We simultaneously have experimented with discovery and search tools, both commercial and home-grown. None of these is perfect, and several are clearly problematic.

    - Not Bionic is an open-source Django web application by Casey Falk (HC '16). It works with data pulled from Bionic, and allows anyone to search, sort, and save lists of classes. Configured as a search engine by time and department, it could be adapted to work with more complex metadata, but would require expensive professional programming and supervision to be viable as a sustainable system.

    - Semester.ly is a fee-based service developed by graduates of Johns Hopkins University, and allows various search/save/sort functions. It could work with our Web Catalog or via an API to output from Bionic.

    - Havertivity is a mobile app that we currently use at Haverford College to publicize student activities. It has other features that might integrate with course information.

    - Adam Portier's API for interaction with Course Data exported from Bionic is available for use.

    - 2018 Visible Curriculum Search Engine (an Omeka site hosted here at Haverford, currently populated with revised Bionic course data). We could easily add tags or other thematic markers to course data. We could convene a group of students and faculty to add tags to courses, in order to develop an appropriate vocabulary of themes and interests not covered by course titles or descriptions themselves.

    - Stanford University's CartaLab, a promising tool that combines course, enrollment, and preference data. Ben Le (as a delegate from EPC) visited CartaLab during the fall of 2017, where he learned that their system would not fit our needs for various reasons.

Next Steps:

- During 2018-19 we will continue conversations about the Visible Curriculum in various ways:

    - Implementing Course Leaf for Curriculum Management (CIM)

    - Training chairs, administrative assistants, and the Provost's office team in the in's and out's of Course Leaf for both CAT and CIM.

    - Adding revised Bionic data to our home-grown Visible Curriculum Omeka site, and convening a small working group of faculty and students to develop a vocabulary of tags and other descriptors of value to students and advisors.

- It's worth noting that the Course Leaf license includes the capacity to manage one additional document as part of the system (at no extra cost). After consultation with members of FAPC (who have in any case been at work on updates for the Faculty Handbook), we have decided that Course Leaf will become the home of a reconfigured Faculty-Staff Handbook. The Handbook will have its own set of editors, and will be published via the Course Leaf server (with instant download as PDFs).

Working Group 2: Academic Advising

Accomplishments:

In October 2017, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) asked Dean Phil Bean and a select group of colleagues from various College offices, to compile a report on academic advising that would:

- describe the goals of academic advising in relation to broader institutional goals;
- describe the advising process as it currently exists and produce a summary that documents the interacting components, spheres of responsibility, and student points of contact (required or encouraged) within the comprehensive system;
- offer reflections regarding how certain we are that advising is:
    - accurate (aligned with College policy and requirements)
    - timely (cognizant of critical course selections that permit or exclude subsequent options)
    - actionable (connected with clear choices, alternatives, or pathways that students can pursue)
    - durable and shared.

Based on previous exit interviews with graduating seniors, on reflections by faculty advisors and deans, and through long anecdotal experience, it has been clear to us that pre-major advising is of crucial importance to the successful development of student interests. The first two years in college are a time when students are exploring or testing interests and typically taking gateway courses that can determine not only what they might want to study but also what they will be positioned to study in later years. Also in their first two years, students are supposed to be fulfilling all or at least the great bulk of their distributional requirements, and how they do so can determine how much freedom of action they will have to delve into the curriculum in the second half of their careers.

Students who enroll in constellations of courses that constitute an unrealistic challenge sometimes do not learn as effectively as they might, nor do they earn grades sufficiently high as to make the future pursuit of certain disciplines realistic. Students who do not fulfill distributional requirements thoughtfully might likewise lose the opportunity to study topics potentially of great interest during their last two years in college, when they should have a more deeply informed sense of what they want to study and why it would be worthwhile to do so.

In short, finding ways to maximize the effectiveness of pre-major advising is consistent with helping to ensure that the greatest number of students of all backgrounds might benefit as much as possible from their time at Haverford and that the College has fulfilled its educational mission. Given that Haverford, like so many other institutions of higher learning, is being transformed by students who come from backgrounds not traditionally represented in college, it is imperative to ensure that the assumptions that have governed academic advising, and the procedures that embody the advising system, are as well suited to the needs of the diversity of Haverford's students.

The body of this report (which is now part of the body of evidence being assembled for the MSCHE Self Study) describes current advising practices in detail (see in particular pages 5-8 of this document).

Next Steps:

Phil Bean's report concludes with a number of concrete recommendations for further action, including the following, along with a remaining item from the original charge:

- convening various focus groups from students, faculty, and deans who will aim to formulate a holistic vision of how students ought to seek advice, and how it ought to be given, all with an eye towards the priorities of accuracy, timeliness, durability, and actionability
- adapting key components of the successful system of advising now underway in the Chesick Scholars program for use throughout our advisory systems
- offering training sessions for upper-class advisors and faculty advisors, such as:
  - May-June sessions for new UCA's
  - a year-long series of Advisor's Workshops for faculty who are about to advise students for the first time (normally in the second year of a tenure-line appointment), these sessions will be the advisor's equivalent of the successful Teaching and Learning Institute now available to all first-year faculty
- ideas on various technological resources that can be made available to all advisors in a central place, also ideas on possible improvements to Bionic and other electronic systems that will help students and advisors chart efficient pathways, especially for those pursuing double majors or other sets of credentials.
- creation of an advising visualization (perhaps in timeline format),, based on pages 5-8 of 2016-17 report (item 046) to provide a high-level overview of the advising process for students, faculty and others.

Working Group 3: Retention

Accomplishments:

Phil Bean with the working group's assistance produced a retention report that reviews recent years' trends and outlines next steps.

Next Steps:

- The Office of Academic Affairs will ensure that the institution is assessing the contours of the retention situation by taking the lead on the following:

    - The Registrar and Dean of Academic Affairs will generate a "Progress Interruption Report" on June 30 each year summarizing the number of students who discontinued their studies without graduating.
    - The pertinent aspects of the report will be shared with institutional stakeholders

- The Dean's Office and IEC working group need to establish clarity about what organizational structure will have ongoing responsibility for retention oversight including the following tasks:
    - Monitoring the three groups that comprise the cohort that interrupts its studies for one or more semesters and seeking to answer to assessment questions regarding each group:
        - Students placed on College Leave: why were students placed on College Leave, and what is the demographic profile of this group? Does the experience of this group tell us anything about how the College might better support these students?
        - Students who take Dean's Leave: why did these students take Dean's Leave, and what is the demographic profile of this group? Does the experience of this group tell us anything about how the College might better support these students?
        - Students who transferred: why did these students transfer, where did they transfer to (name, size, and location of institution), and what is the demographic profile of this group? Were these students seeking other academic opportunities not available at the College?
        - The College should review these and an additional, fundamental assessment question: why do some of them fail to resume their studies at Haverford? The goal in asking this question is to discern whether the institution is serving all constituencies within the student body as well as it might and to do so by disseminating findings annually to the stakeholders identified above, thus creating a feedback loop.
    - Meet annually to discuss the Progress Interruption Report (see above).
- Jim Keane will investigate more granular Dean's Leave coding for Bionic.
- Phil Bean will draft an explanation of our retention system (emphasizing process) and what data is collected for CSSP discussion (to generate the annual retention report and institutionalize the process.) This will contribute to the work of the self study's student experience working group.

Working Group 4: Collecting and using student experience data for improvement

Accomplishments:

The working group spent this year reviewing present efforts to collect data about the student experience at Haverford.

A number of offices do occasional and even somewhat regular surveys of that are generally topic- or program-specific (Dining Services, CCPA, OAR, Health Services, etc). These are less useful in evaluating the broader student experience. An inventory of all ongoing student survey efforts by administrative and academic units would be useful to maintain.

The major comprehensive instruments are:
1. CIRP survey of first-year students (response rate 90%)
2. HEDS survey of senior students (response rate 60%)

It could be useful to promote the results among more elements of the campus. They are scaled instruments so the data can be easily collected and assembled, but they are not as rich as qualitative instruments might be. They could measure changes in perceived skills or could also be complemented by other instruments (see below).

Other somewhat more limited instruments are the following:

1. First-Year Survey on Advising; administered every year for the past several years and used by Academic Affairs and the First-Year Dean to consider changes in the pre-major advising system;
2. HEDS Sexual Assault Campus Climate Survey; administered every other year. Data is gathered by Institutional Research and shared with the campus by the Title IX Coordinator; used by the Sexual Misconduct Advisory Committee and the Title IX coordinator to evaluate trends and develop educational outreach;
3. Sophomore and junior class surveys administered by the Sophomore Success initiative; these have not been administered for the past several years for lack of personnel time and clear affiliation with an office or individual.

The major instrument that Haverford previously used is the Senior Exit Interview, which was discontinued two years ago due insufficient benefit relative to its cost (largely in employee time). Haverford may wish to replace it with another qualitative instrument, and there has been some discussion of a sophomore interview or survey. One element of the Senior Exit Interviews that was potentially useful was the data collected on the experience in the major; further data collection would usefully be coordinated with academic departments.

Next Steps:

- Propose a system of distribution of existing data;
- Consider a structure of gathering information from sophomores that could be compared to the information obtained in the CIRP survey the prior year, as well as that obtained in the HEDS senior survey for that class two years later;
- Consider a replacement for the qualitative experience of the Senior Exit Interview that would complement and not duplicate the HEDS senior survey and major-based instruments, but that might help increase the response rate to the former if it is seen as a package;
- Work with the Provost's Office and departments to suggest templates for gathering information from senior majors on a regular basis, and consider how the departmental data could be synthesized and shared campus-wide;
- Consider ways of sharing advice from students gathered in sophomore and junior surveys, if they can be reinstated in a robust and sustainable way, with their peers so that information is directly available to them and not simply via administrative analyses and outreach efforts;
- Consider a permanent structure (e.g. a small committee of students, faculty and staff) to oversee and coordinate the gathering and dissemination of information on the student experience, with clear responsibilities and reporting lines. The generation of an annual

report, as outlined in the Working Group charge, could be the responsibility of this group.

Working Group 5: Student Learning Assessment

Accomplishments:

During 2017-18 we sustained the Assessment Plan for student learning that was designed, approved, and implemented during the previous academic year. This work, coordinated by the Associate Provost for Curricular Development and the Registrar, involved a series of proscribed steps that together form the core of a cycle of assessment, reflection, and planning for improvement that are the aim of the system as a whole. In brief, these steps included:

- A review by the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) of the previous assessment data. A summary of interesting trends, along with commentary by EPC, were presented to the Faculty during our monthly meeting in September (Self Study Evidence Inventory Item 048).

- Continued gathering of assessment data for both General Education courses (in both fall and spring terms) and Senior Capstones (in the spring term), based on the sets of rubrics previously endorsed by EPC and the Faculty.

- Completion (in April) of Departmental Assessment Plan (DAP) Reports for each academic department, in which faculty are asked to consider academic challenges in light of assessment data. These reports will be read by the Provosts and EPC during the early days of the fall semester. Departments will also be expected to reference their DAP results as they craft budget and other requests in November and December.

Next Steps:

- As we move into the Self Study process for 2018-19, we will evaluate how the entire Assessment Plan is functioning, and how we might improve rubrics, guidelines, data analysis, and DAPs.
- Move the Assessment Web Site and related materials for data entry to a Google Team Drive, where it will be owned collectively (rather than current system hosted in Freedman and Keane Google Drives).

Working Group 6: Institutional Effectiveness

Accomplishments:

The College's systematic approach to Institutional Effectiveness was reviewed and modifications were initiated to achieve the three goals below. A standardized format for Department/Division Assessment Plans (DAPs) is integral to the achievement of each goal:

Goal 1: Better align assessment, planning, and resource allocation

- A standard format Planning DAP was created at the divisional level as budget proposals were under development for FY19. Following approval of the College budget and any necessary adjustments, these documents become the Operational Division DAPs for FY19.
- This divisional DAP now includes an expanded common management, assessment, and planning goal, with objectives.

- The standard DAP formats for both Divisions and Departments now include a mechanism for recording, at the conclusion of the fiscal year, the key findings (thereby creating the "Report"), the actions taken or to be taken, and the resource or budget implications. This evidence of "closing the loop" will then be available on a continuing basis.
- Budget request forms were revised to require direct assessment evidence in support of new resource requests.
- The budget development process now includes the preparation of a divisional summary and prioritization of budget requests, and the standardized planning DAP is available for use in the institutional priority-setting process.
- The next step is for departments to transition to a standard DAP form, prepared at the time of budget request development in the fall.

Goal 2: Make Department/Division Assessment Plans (DAPs) more valuable and useful

- DAPs, like DAP Reports containing assessment results, are now restricted to transparency within the Division, as determined by the Division Leadership. It is no longer our approach for all members of the community to be able to access all plans. This change permits additional detail to be committed to the DAPs, thereby increasing usefulness. Each Division now has a restricted access Divisional Assessment Plan folder on Box for the planning DAPs. DAP reports containing results of the assessments are stored separately within the Division at this juncture.
- Expectations have been clarified and will be discussed further as Departments create planning DAPs in the new standard format:
  - Goals are to be recast in terms of both core functions and major initiatives
  - Objectives are to be refined as action items for both initiatives for the year and core functions to be managed on an ongoing basis
  - Objectives are to include an indication of how success will be measured, wherever possible.

Goal 3: Improve the process of documenting linkages between levels

- The new standard DAP format permits annual review and linkages between levels.
- For Divisions, this means that the DAP now
  - indicates where divisional goals or objectives support (link up to) the College's goals and sections of the Strategic Plan
  - indicates where reporting departments are expected to support (link up to) divisional goals or objectives
- For Departments, the standard DAP format to be deployed indicates where departmental goals or objectives support (link up to) Divisional goals or objectives.

The previously established IE system was monitored for 2017-18. All 78 DAPs were prepared and reside in Box. End of the year conversations between Division Leaders, Departments, and Sub-departments about the DAP Reports are being scheduled.

The MSCHE Evidence Inventory for Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement was compiled.

Next Steps:

- Phased development of planning DAPs at the departmental level (see above)

- Since the new mechanism within the DAP for highlighting the use of assessment for institutional improvement ("closing of the loop") will not have been through a complete cycle as we start our self study, a brief survey will be deployed in late spring 2018 to collect available evidence. It will ask each department to identify it's best example of:
    - A finding or plan from its 2016-17 DAP Report
    - The change the Department made in 2017-18 in response to this finding
    - An indication of whether/how this assessment impacted the 2018-19 budget request
- Updating of the external and internal Assessment websites to reflect the developments above
- Updating of the internal budget process website to more fully describe the integration of assessment, planning, and budgeting, i.e. how the budget process is designed to direct resources toward areas of demonstrated institutional need and opportunity, and how/where DAP assessment results are incorporated into the process.

Working Group 7: Collaborative on Program Evaluation (Initiatives with outside funding or potential for outside funding).

Accomplishments:

This working group offered guidance and support to those undertaking program evaluation or considering evaluating the impact of their programs on students/participants. The emphasis was on strategies and components of an effective program evaluation plan.

During this past academic year, two programs, in particular, engaged fully with this process of developing a formal evaluation plan. The Chesick Scholars program and the Haverford Innovations program both identified individual timelines for the development and deployment of these program evaluation plans. The Chesick Scholars program is in the later stages of completing a comprehensive program plan that allows for effective administration of a common curricula and the ability to evaluate program impact upon the participants, both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Program evaluation planning at HIP has continued through the academic year as plans are in the process of being developed for both the overall program as well as individual programmatic activities. This planning will continue through the summer and next academic year as pilot programs are deployed and reviewed.

Two other programs, CPGC and ELSI had previously developed baseline evaluation plans. However plans to enhance existing plans are underway. Further, several consultative meetings with MAST revealed their desire to begin to build an evaluation strategy and the integrated framework that would allow for sustained assessment and impact reporting. Up to this point, steps undertaken by MAST have been foundational in scope.

Next Steps:

- Continued support for program evaluation development

Working Group 8: Communication, Data, and Transparency

Accomplishments:

This working group completed its full agenda.

- Alumni Outcomes Webtool. The graduate outcomes visualization (covering employment and education) is live within the CCPA webpage. The next round of data collection from the HEDS alumni survey began April 23, and will be added to the data set over the summer. A link to the initial visualization was part of the invitation to participate in the 2018 survey (HC '93, '07, '12, '17).

  For the initial 2017 survey (HC '92, '06, '11, and '16), we had a 60% response rate, which increased to 93% when supplemented with employer/educational attainment data resident in Raiser's Edge. We will consider how to include this data appropriately and effectively within the Evidence Inventory.

- Demographic Data Work. We have continued to advocate for clear, effective, and compliant data collection, storage, and reporting across multiple systems of record. Collection of this information within Bionic will be ready, for the first time, for the new incoming class of 2022, and we continue to work to disentangle and clarify stored student demographic data.

- Complaint Framework. The revised student complaint framework has been published. To systematically review the nature and number of complaints across the College for 2017, our first annual Complaint Review Meeting took place on 1/3/2018. Patterns, improvements in response to complaints, and modifications of complaint protocols were discussed and noted. (Full meeting minutes are available upon request.) To support student awareness of important policies and procedures, as well as the complaint resolution process, the Dean's Office will notify the student body of these resources at the beginning of each semester.

- HEOA Website Revision. The new, improved, and comprehensive HEOA website has been written and published. This new hub has supplanted pages covering portions of this material on the websites of IR and Financial Aid.

- MSCHE Evidence Inventory. The Requirements of Affiliation evidence inventory was completed in December, and will be revisited as further pieces are written/collected.

Working Group 9: Self Study Preparation

Accomplishments:

Over the course of the year, the IEC leadership team (in collaboration with Senior Staff) oversaw the planning process for our Self Study as required by terms of our accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). The Self Study will unfold in stages over the course of the next 18 months, culminating in a spring 2020 visit by a team of peers selected by the MSCHE. The final report will be submitted to the MSCHE early in 2020.

During the fall 2017 term, IEC leadership met regularly, attended a three-day workshop sponsored by the MSCHE, and communicated with our designated liaison, Dr. Stephen Pugliese. Steve offered feedback as we built out the various components of the Self Study Design, which will guide our work during the next 18 months. Meanwhile we (in consultation with Senior Staff) assembled seven small Self Study Working Groups (each devoted to one of the seven standards mandated by

MSCHE). For 2018-2019, these seven Working Groups will replace the previous Workings Groups formed by IEC during the last few years.

All materials for the Self Study will be organized via a single web site visible only to members of the Haverford College community: https://sites.google.com/haverford.edu/self-study/home. Each Working Group will have shared space here for notes, agendas, and drafts. The hub will also assemble all of the evidence, selections from which will be submitted to the MSCHE in support of our narrative Self Study. Of course the hub will contain public documents that will help all members of the community remain informed about the work ahead. Periodic meetings and announcements will invite feedback on the draft reports by each group, who will be reaching out to still other key members of the faculty and staff for documents, ideas, and suggestions.

Steve Pugliese came to campus on Friday, April 6, 2018 for our Self Study Preparation Visit. He met with the President, Self Study Steering Committee and Senior Staff, and (in an open meeting) with approximately 25 members of the campus community, to discuss our plans for the Self Study and to answer questions about the accreditation process. He was pleased with our preparations and made only minor suggestions to our Design, which was subsequently accepted with strong his endorsement. By July 1, Working Group Co-Chairs will draft position papers on each Standard, as foundations for Working Group deliberations beginning in the early fall.

Self Study and the Seven Standards at a glance
The MSCHE has articulated seven key Standards for accreditation, including the following broad themes:

- Mission and Goals
- Ethics and Integrity
- Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience
- Support of the Student Experience
- Educational Effectiveness Assessment
- Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement
- Governance, Leadership, and Administration

In demonstrating compliance with each Standard we will be following various criteria established by the MSCHE (for instance by providing documents that show how we appoint and support qualified faculty in their development as scholars or teachers, or show that we have clear expectations for our students, and solid ways of supporting them as they pursue their degrees). We are also asked to identify places where we think we could do a better job (for instance document something we already do with respect to the curriculum, or improve our advising practices in some way). In brief: we will undertake "gap analysis" for each standard. Above all the MSCHE asks that we show how we use various systems of "assessment" (not only in the sense now familiar to faculty, but also the system of DAPs now in use across the College) to improve our programs and our workplace.

Next Steps:

During The Self Study
IEC and the Working Groups will need help in various ways during the coming months:

- members of the various Self Study Working Groups (each devoted to work on one of the seven MSCHE Standards) will take part in reviewing documents, identifying problems, and drafting components of the report
- members of various committees will be asked to help identify documents, suggest potential solutions or projects for the future, and review draft statements from the Working Groups
- chairs, individual faculty and administrative departments will need to be mindful of our Assessment and DAP systems; the MSCHE views efforts at the continuous improvement of our educational programs as essential, and they will want to see evidence that we are gathering information about student accomplishment, reflecting on our learning goals and programs in light of those accomplishments, and in turn using the lessons learned to set priorities, revise programs, and allocate resources. Similarly, evidence of continuous improvement in administrative operations is also necessary.
- everyone will need to take notice of the emerging work of the Self Study: read brief reports, attend various forums to be convened by the Working Groups, and offer their views on the suggestions for future work.

Beyond 2020
In addition to the demonstration of requirements and the analysis of gaps, we will also use the obligation afforded by the Self Study to set the stage for a new cycle of strategic planning for the years beyond 2020. The timing is fortuitous, and we should take advantage of the conjunction of this pending Self Study and the culmination of our previous Strategic Plan for 2020 to articulate possible priorities and projects for the years to come.

Working Group 10: Mission Statement Review

Accomplishments:

As a matter of good governance, but also in order to comply with Middle States Standard 1, the College must periodically assess our mission and goals to ensure they are "relevant and achievable." The creation of the *Plan for Haverford 2020* in 2012-14 included a nuanced discussion of Haverford's mission and goals, in which the *Plan*'s priorities were rooted. The implementation of the *Plan for 2020* and the institutional success that has been thematic throughout its span stand as prima facie evidence of the relevance and achievability of Haverford's mission and goals.

Prospectively, an opportune time to once again take stock of mission and goals will be the development of the College's next strategic plan, presumably to be undertaken by Haverford's next president in 2019 and beyond. In service to this timeline, the Board of Managers has this year been engaged in foundational discussions of Haverford's "value proposition" and "financial model" which are critical shapers of mission to the extent that they represent the viability of the College to pursue its educational goals in the current operating environment.

As a reference and provocation to this process, Kim Benston and Jesse Lytle distilled the College's current "Statement of Purpose" into a more succinct, elemental (and as yet wholly unofficial) articulation of the College's mission.

> *Haverford College provides students an intellectually rigorous and ethically attuned education that prepares them for lives of service and leadership. The full resources of Haverford's Quaker-rooted, diverse, residential community are designed to educate the*

whole student, who is encouraged to cultivate independence of mind and spirit alongside devotion to the values of trust, concern, and mutual respect.

Next Steps:

As the community proceeds through the stages of the next planning cycle, we will probe and refine our articulations of mission and goals in order, once again, to establish a shared commitment to a mission for Haverford that is compelling, relevant, and achievable.