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I. Institutional Overview

Founded in 1826, the Maryland Institute College of Art (MICA) is a national and international leader in art and design education and a center of excellence for teaching and research in the fine and applied creative arts. Located in the heart of the City of Baltimore, adjacent to the burgeoning Station North Arts and Entertainment District, MICA plays a crucial role as an anchor institution within the emerging creative economy of the City and the region.

MICA has three academic divisions—Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies, and Open Studies—offering 18 undergraduate Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) degree programs, 20 graduate Master of Fine Arts (MFA), Master of Arts (MA), Master of Professional Studies (MPS), and post-baccalaureate certificate programs, as well as numerous non-degree offerings for youth, adult and online learners, and international students taught through the Open Studies division. In recent years, MICA has expanded its offerings across all three divisions, including recently approved programs in Product Design (BFA), Game Design (BFA), Illustration (MA), Graphic Design (MA), and User-Experience Design (MPS).

MICA enrolls approximately 2,076 students annually in its undergraduate and graduate degree programs, with Fall 2016 FTE 1,667 undergraduate and 343 graduate students. In AY2016-17, students came from 46 states and 50 countries, with 18% of undergraduate and 26% of graduate students holding F-1 or J-1 (international) visas. This is part of a trend within the student population, which has become more geographically, racially, and ethnically diverse over the past 10 years, as MICA has increased its national and international presence and reach.
In July 2014, Samuel Hoi was named the new President of MICA, succeeding Fred Lazarus IV, who retired after a thirty-six-year tenure as President. In August 2015, Dr. David Bogen became Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, succeeding Ray Allen, who retired after twenty years as MICA’s chief academic officer.

Through the intensive development and expansion of the College’s campus, academic programs, and physical and technological infrastructure, President Lazarus and his team established MICA’s position among its peers as an institution that adapts and innovates in response to change. Under President Lazarus, MICA developed a mission that expressed the College’s historical commitment to the principles of art and design education and their place in contemporary society. This statement was first adopted in MICA’s self-study report of 1997-98:

*Because we believe in the vital role of art in society, we at Maryland Institute College of Art are dedicated to the education of professional artists and designers, and to the development of a collegiate environment conducive to the evolution of art and design.*
Since the writing of this statement and the completion of the 1997-98 self-study the College has:

- Significantly increased the number and scope of its programs, especially in graduate and open studies
- Grown its overall enrollments by over 80% (165% in graduate studies)
- Expanded its residential campus in the heart of the City of Baltimore
- Developed key facilities along the North Avenue corridor of the City-designated Station North Arts & Entertainment District
- Expanded its partnership with Johns Hopkins University through the creation of the Film Centre and research partnerships in social and health design
- Developed a 21st century technological and fabrications infrastructure, and
- Greatly enhanced its reputation and expanded its recruitment of students, faculty, and staff both nationally and internationally

Under President Hoi’s leadership, MICA is focused on the development of an institutional culture with programs and operations that address the needs of a student population that is increasingly diverse, globally-oriented, and technologically and professionally astute. President Hoi has established a team-based, collaborative approach to institutional planning and decision-making and has prioritized the improvement of core systems, including governance, operations, assessment, and planning.

A key first step of this process of renewal and transformation was the completion of a process of review and re-articulation of the College’s mission and vision which was initiated by President Hoi in the Fall of 2016. This eight-month process actively engaged the entire College community, including large numbers of faculty, staff, students, board members, alumni, and other internal and external stakeholder groups. Consistent with MICA’s previous mission, the new mission is a response to the increasingly rapid evolution of art and design that has taken place over the past two decades, as well as the tremendous growth and transformation of programs that have taken place at MICA during this same period.

In May 2017, the MICA Board of Trustees approved the following new mission and vision statements for the College:

**MICA’s Mission:** EMPOWER students to forge creative, purposeful lives and careers in a diverse and changing world. THRIVE with Baltimore. MAKE the world we imagine.

**MICA’s Vision:** A just, sustainable, and joyful world activated and enriched by artists, designers, and educators who are valued for their leadership and imagination.

These new mission and vision statements make clear MICA’s core commitment to the student educational experience, to its relationship to Baltimore and to the College’s role as an anchor institution in the heart of the city’s cultural and educational district, and to MICA’s focus on the changing role of artists, designers, and educators in the world.

The re-articulation of MICA’s mission and vision was a first step in a multi-year institutional review and planning process that was conceived in the Fall of 2015 and launched in the Spring of 2016.
This process integrates the MSCHE and NASAD self-study and reaccreditation visits within the larger framework of mission/vision re-articulation, institutional review, and strategic planning with the new strategic plan being finalized in 2020, when the current plan ("MICA 2020") concludes. During “pre-planning” (AY2015-16), eight areas of aspirational priorities were identified as an initial framework for strategic planning. As part of their work, each of the self-study working groups will be asked to consider how their findings and recommendations intersect with one or more of these planning priorities:

1) **21st Century Educational Leadership**: Powerful mission. Innovative and transformative programs and methods of delivery. Development of thought and advocacy leadership with a point of view.

2) **Operational Innovation**: An art school rebuilt and rewired for the future. Fiscally sustainable best practices, tuition cost management, and new business models that address the need for enhancing value and access.
3) Drive for Excellence: A relentless drive for excellence in the context of increasing diversity and differentiation of practice. A culture of assessment, professionalism, and investment in ongoing development. A culture that draws on tradition to create and respond to the new.

4) One Team Campus: A campus united in spirit, passion, values, action, confidence, and a shared capacity for optimism and joy. A community based in values of diversity, inclusion, equity, and social justice and advancement.

5) Baltimore and Beyond: A next generation anchor institution that invests beyond its gates, partners effectively with its people, and elevates Baltimore. An institution that, through this work, creates strategic national and global connections and reputation.

6) MICA Stars: Strategic and bold positioning of MICA students, alumni, faculty, staff, and the College. Investments in talent.

7) DNA and Storytelling: Unique identity and DNA. Authentic and smart branding, storytelling, and ROI case making.Alignment of external and internal communication.


II. Model for Self-Study

MICA will adopt the comprehensive model for self-study review. This model will enable the College to fully address the Requirements of Affiliation and Standards for Accreditation while providing significant opportunities for members of the MICA community to reflect on the areas of strategic focus identified above. The charges to the Working Groups will define a process of analysis and assessment that will culminate in the development of specific recommendations for improvement in each area relative to the standards and to our strategic aspirations and priorities.

The MSCHE comprehensive model also provides the most straightforward method for a parallel process of producing documentation for our concurrent review by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD). Like most other specialized art and design institutions in the United States, MICA is accredited by both its regional accreditor and by NASAD. While the NASAD accreditation is for the institution as a whole, and not specific disciplines, it has a heavy focus on the programmatic level with standards regarding curriculum, faculty, and facilities that are specific to art and design. Still, there is large overlap between the MSCHE and NASAD standards, and as such, it is very common for art and design institutions to conduct the processes for these two accreditations in tandem, with the regional self-study in the lead. By utilizing the structure described in this Plan to also support our work toward NASAD reaffirmation of accreditation, MICA will be using one internal process to complete two complementary self-study products.
III. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

MICA is at a crucial moment in its institutional history: Drawing upon its historic strengths in art and design education while transforming as an institution and an educational community to meet the needs of the current century. This commitment to ongoing development and innovation requires the advancement of processes and practices for continuous evaluation and improvement at all levels of the organization, as well as strategies for prioritization and investment in the people and the physical and technological infrastructure of the College. As an independent college of art and design where problem solving through creativity is a major focus, MICA seeks to mobilize our community and the diversity of stakeholder groups it represents around this historic task of transformation and renewal.

Following are the five main Intended Outcomes of the MSCHE Self-Study process:

1) Demonstrate that MICA meets the MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation and the Standards for Accreditation.

2) Facilitate development of a self-study document to demonstrate that MICA meets the NASAD Standards for Renewal of Accreditation.

3) Evaluate the alignment between MICA’s new mission and vision, the Standards for Accreditation, and our current institutional practices and programs.

4) Provide opportunities for thoughtful engagement within the MICA community, characterized by a culture of shared responsibility and transparency, around key practices for planning, assessment and governance that will result in new processes and increased capacity to ensure continual program and operational renewal and the alignment of resources to strategic priorities.

5) Produce a set of recommendations that are framed by MICA’s key aspirational priorities (21st Century Academic Leadership, Operational Innovation, Drive for Excellence, One Team, Baltimore & Beyond, MICA Stars, DNA & Storytelling, and Family & Network) and that will inform MICA’s next Strategic Plan.
IV. Timetable for the Self-Study/Reaccreditation Process

Following is the timetable with key milestones for completion of the self-study/reaccreditation process:

**Fall 2016:**
- Initiate Mission/Vision re-articulation and self-study process through the establishment of an all-College task force [done]
- Complete initial rounds of campus work sessions around core concepts for the new Mission/Vision [done]
- Designate members and appoint co-chairs of the Self Study Design Group [done]

**Spring 2017:**
- Complete Mission/Vision drafting and vetting process; submit to Trustees for approval [Done; approved May 2017]
- Conduct campus briefings to recruit and orient the campus community to the Self Study process [done]
- Self-Study Design Group prepares draft of Self-Study Design [done]
- Define Working Groups [done]
- Articulate charges and research questions [done]
- Designate Steering Committee members [done]
- Designate Working Group members [done]

**Summer 2017:**
- Revise and submit draft of Self Study Design [done]
- Complete arrangements for visit by MSCHE staff liaison [done; visit scheduled September 6, 2017]
- Assemble data and documentation for Working Groups [in progress]
- Set up online worksite for Working Groups [in progress]
- Implement Communication Plan [in progress]
- Build website for Self-Study reporting to the community [in progress]
- Complete planning for Steering Committee and Working Group training session [in progress; Self-Study launch scheduled September 12, 2017]

**Fall 2017:**
- [September 6] MSCHE staff liaison conducts Self-Study Preparation visit
- MSCHE staff liaison approves Self-Study Design
- [September 12] Self-Study launch/Steering Committee and Working Group training session
- Working Groups receive charges, begin inquiry and establish regular meeting schedules to analyze data and documents
- Working Groups communicate regularly with Steering Committee
- Steering Committee oversees research and reporting
- [December] Working Groups submit initial report outlines
- [December] Assemble compliance documentation in conjunction with Self-Study

**Spring 2018:**
- [January] Evaluation Team Chair selected
- [January] Steering Committee sends copy of Self-Study Design to Evaluation Team Chair
- [Early February] Working Groups submit first drafts of reports to Steering Committee
- [February-March] Steering Committee reviews Working Group reports, communicates issues, questions, etc. to Working Groups
- [February-March] Steering Committee completes initial draft of “Institutional Overview” and other contextual elements of the final report
- [April 1] Working Groups submit final drafts of reports to Steering Committee
- [April-May] Steering Committee holds retreat to plan work and assign responsibilities for completing the initial draft of the Self-Study

**Summer 2018:**
- Steering Committee completes initial draft Self-Study Report
- [August] Draft Self-Study Report is posted to website and campus community is informed of availability and plan for community vetting

**Fall 2018:**
- [Late August-early September] Self-Study update is provided to faculty in the opening Full Faculty meeting
- [September] Campus community is reminded of Self-Study draft and opportunities for providing feedback
- Evaluation Team in place
- [Late September] Campus feedback on first draft of Self-Study Report completed, including review by Board of Trustees
- [October] Steering Committee prepares second draft of Self-Study Report and solicits community feedback
- [November] Second draft of Self-Study Report submitted to Evaluation Team Chair
- [November] Evaluation Team Chair preliminary visit
- Prepare final Self-Study Report
- Finalize preparations for Evaluation Team Visit
- [December] Compliance Report completed and reviewed by compliance reviewer selected by Commission

**Spring 2019:**
- [January] Submit final Self-Study Report and all related documents including financial and enrollment data, as well as a Draft Strategic Plan, to all Evaluation Team Members
- [March] Evaluation Team visit
- [April] Prepare and submit institutional response to Evaluation Team Report
- [May] Hold campus briefing and Self-Study update provided to faculty in all faculty closing meeting

**Summer 2019:**
- Commission meeting and action for reaccreditation

V. Organizational Structure and Membership of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

The work of the Self-Study will be organized and overseen by a Steering Committee which will provide regular updates to MICA’s President and the Board of Trustees. The Steering Committee will guide and collaborate with eight Working Groups. The Working Groups represent one standard each (1-7) with an additional small, specialized Working Group (8) that will address the MSCHE Requirements for Affiliation. The following chart outlines this organizational structure:

![Organizational Structure Chart]

The Self-Study Steering Committee includes broad and diverse membership from across the College, with members holding key expertise around specific Standards, educational programs, student support
services, finance and operations, institutional research, and institutional policy and compliance. Several members were part of the team that created this Self-Study Design. Membership on the Steering Committee was also developed with attention to a diversity of roles and experiences at the College. Following is the membership of the Self-Study Steering Committee:

1) Terra Schehr, Associate Vice President for Educational Planning & Development, Co-Chair
2) Nan Park Sohn, Faculty in Art Education, Co-Chair
3) David Bogen, Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost
4) Gwynne Keathley, Vice Provost for Research & Graduate Studies
5) Michael Weiss, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies
6) Christine Peterson, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services
7) Wendy Price, Associate Vice President for Academic Services
8) Crystal Shamblee, Director of Graduate Programs in Open Studies
9) Megan Miller, Associate Dean for Student Integrated Learning
10) Tania Cordes, Special Projects Manager in Communications
11) Timmy Aziz, Faculty in Architecture
12) Melissa Hilbish, Consultant
13) Mazzy Bell, Student (Undergraduate)

Each of the Working Groups has a chair who possesses leadership and knowledge in the Standard area. That person may also have a co-chair. The appointment of the Working Group members was made using the following principles as a guide:

- Build each Working Group around members with expertise relevant to the Standard while also having out-of-area representation that allows for new insights
- Build Working Groups with attention to the Documentation Roadmap, and the connection individuals have to the kind of evidence that is important for that Standard
- Include at least one Steering Committee member on each Working Group
- Represent various departments and divisions of MICA specific to the assigned Standard
- Build diversity (of gender, race, role, and seniority at MICA) into all Working Groups
- Represent students if and where their experience will advance the work on that Standard (see below)
- Keep the Working Groups small (5-11 members) so that they will be as functional as possible and will not overburden the College and the service commitments of our staff, faculty and students

The full membership of all of the Self-Study Working Groups is provided in Appendix A.
VI. Charges to the Working Groups and Guidelines for Reporting

The charges to each of the Working Groups for the seven MSCHE Standards for Accreditation and the Requirements of Affiliation are provided in Appendix B. The aim of these charges is to provide clear guidance to the Working Groups regarding the focus of their research and reporting, and to connect their work to the overall goals and intended outcomes of the self-study process.

The charges and research questions direct each Working Group to conduct research and analysis and develop a report that is aligned with Intended Outcomes 1-5 (listed in section III above). The research questions direct attention to four specific areas of focus that are within those outcomes: 1) MSCHE Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation; 2) NASAD Standards for Renewal of Accreditation; 3) alignment with MICA’s new mission and vision; and 5) recommendations and priorities for strategic planning.

It is important to note that while the Charges for the Working Groups ask them to reflect on the NASAD standards relevant to their areas, this NASAD-specific content will not be incorporated into MICA’s Self-Study Report submitted to MSCHE. Asking the Working Groups to also consider NASAD standards enables the College to make efficient use of its resources while engaging in the analysis and synthesis of information for the two concurrent re-accreditation processes.

At the launch of the self-study process, the Working Groups will be provided with a series of documents, including their charge and research questions, the Documentation Roadmap and the document archive for their Standard, and the guidelines (including a template and an approximate page count) for producing their report. During the Fall of 2017, the Pre-Working Group specifically dedicated to the MSCHE Hallmarks of Quality for online learning will synthesize its findings relevant to each standard and provide those findings to the Standard Working Groups to utilize in their reports.

At the end of this phase of the self-study, the Working Groups will deliver a report that will be comprehensive with respect to addressing the requirements for their Standard. Each report will also contain recommendations that may be incorporated into MICA’s draft Strategic Plan, which will be completed in the Fall of 2018.
VII. Communication Plan and Worksite

MICA will utilize Canvas, its online Learning Management System, and Google docs as collaborative tools during the development of the Self-Study. In addition to these tools for use among the Working Group and Steering Committee members, a dedicated webpage within MICA’s internal online space will be established and maintained as a vehicle for members of the MICA community to follow the process and provide comment on the Self-Study documents as they are developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To update the campus community about the Self-Study process</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Website; Board representatives on working groups; presentations at Board meetings</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Website; student representatives on Steering Committee and relevant Working Groups; representatives report out at Student Voice Association (SVA) meeting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Website; faculty representatives on Steering Committee and relevant Working Groups; representatives report out at relevant faculty governance meetings as needed; presentations at Provost’s Council and Full Faculty meetings</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Website; faculty representatives on Steering Committee and relevant Working Groups; updates at President’s Council meeting and All Staff meetings</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To gather feedback about the Work Group reports</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Feedback gathered at Board meeting discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Feedback from SVA Steering Committee and Working Group members after sharing relevant report drafts</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Feedback from faculty Steering Committee and Working Group members after sharing relevant report drafts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Feedback from staff Steering Committee and Working Group members after sharing relevant report drafts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To gather feedback about the Work Group reports</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Feedback gathered at Board meeting discussions with plans to finalize and approve before final is submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Representatives present and gather feedback at SVA meeting; feedback from SVA Steering Committee and Working Group members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Feedback from faculty Steering Committee and Working Group members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Feedback from staff Steering Committee and Working Group members; feedback from draft shared at President’s Council meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>Feedback gathered at Alumni Council meeting discussion and via email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. Editorial Style and Format

Working Groups will draft initial reports in the Google Doc form found in Canvas (MICA’s Learning Management System). Because there is a 100-page limit for the final Self-Study document, Working Groups should adhere to the page limit that is included in their charge. Because the individual reports from Work Groups will be edited and organized into a single cohesive final report, Groups should focus on writing concisely while addressing the research questions articulated in their charge.

Consistent formatting and voice will help the Steering Committee read and edit the working group reports quickly.

- **Margins:** 1 inch top, .75 left, right and bottom
- **Justified:** Left
- **Font:** Calibri 11 pt, single spaced
- **Main headings:** Calibri, title case, left justified, 16pt
- **Subheadings:** Calibri, italic, title case, left justified, 14pt
- **Page number:** Bottom center
- **Tables:** All tables should be numbered and titled. Please reference source materials in the working group’s Canvas document library.
- **Citations:** Footnotes are acceptable and all supporting documents should be uploaded to the working group’s Canvas document library.
- **Voice:** Third person, present tense, active voice
- **Style:** follow AP style (a brief guide is available [here](#), contact communications if you’d like access to the [online AP stylebook](#)).
- **Acronyms and Abbreviations:** Maryland Institute College of Art can be referred to as MICA or the College. The City of Baltimore can be referred to as Baltimore or the City.

IX. Profile of Evaluation Team

We request that the Chair be a President or Provost of an art & design institution and that the team have representation in the following areas:

- From art & design institutions
- From institutions with both MA and MFA programs
- From institutions with non-degree continuing education programs
- From residential campuses that are in a major metropolitan area
- From campuses that have a substantial international student population
- With curriculum design/assessment/faculty development experience
- With strategic planning experience
X. Outline of the Final Self-Study Report

I  Executive Summary
II  MICA: Institutional Overview and Context
III  Self-Study Methodology
   a  Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study
   b  Organization of Working Groups
   c  Collaborations and Communication
IV  Standard 1: Mission and Goals [REPEATED FOR EACH STANDARD]
   a  Questions Addressed and Evidence for Standards
   b  Challenges and Strengths
   c  Recommendations for Improvement and the Strategic Plan
V  Conclusion
   a  Summary Comments
   b  What Was Learned and Application for the Strategic Plan
VI  Relevant Appendices to include the Document Roadmap
APPENDIX A: Working Group Membership

Self-Study Steering Committee:

1. Terra Schehr, Associate Vice President for Educational Planning & Development, Co-Chair
2. Nan Park Sohn, Faculty in Art Education, Co-Chair
3. David Bogen, Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost
4. Gwynne Keathley, Vice Provost for Research & Graduate Studies
5. Michael Weiss, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies
6. Christine Peterson, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services
7. Wendy Price, Associate Vice President for Academic Services
8. Crystal Shamlee, Director of Graduate Programs in Open Studies
9. Megan Miller, Associate Dean for Student Integrated Learning
10. Tania Cordes, Special Projects Manager in Communications
11. Timmy Aziz, Faculty in Architecture
12. Melissa Hilbish, Consultant
13. Mazzy Bell, Student (Undergraduate)

*Steering Committee Member

Working Group #1/Standard 1—Mission & Goals

1. David Bogen*, Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost, Chair
2. Judi Kinney, Associate Dean for Student Health and Wellness
3. Stephen Towns, Program Coordinator in Community Engagement
4. Lillian Hoover, PT Faculty
5. Shadra Strickland, Faculty in Illustration
6. Judith Burton, Trustee

Working Group #2/Standard 2—Ethics & Integrity

1. Mike Molla, Vice President for Strategic Initiatives, Chair
2. Debra Rubino, Vice President for Strategic Communications
3. Christine Pentino, Executive Director of Campaign Planning & Leadership Giving
4. Laura Rossi, Director of Human Resources
5. Nan Park*, Faculty in Art Education
Working Group #3/Standard 3—Design & Delivery of the Student Learning Experience
1. David Gracyalny, Vice Provost for Professional & Continuing Education in Open Studies, Chair
2. Gwynne Keathley*, Vice Provost for Research & Graduate Studies
3. Michael Weiss*, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies
4. Heather Slania, Director of Decker Library
5. Erika Carruth, Executive Assistant for Undergraduate Studies
6. Clyde Johnson, Associate Dean for Diversity & Intercultural Development
7. Brockette Horne, Faculty in Graphic Design
8. Jeanette Gerrity-Gomez, Faculty in Humanistic Studies
9. Elizabeth Wagenheim, Faculty in Humanistic Studies
10. Thomas Gardner, Faculty in Social Design

Working Group #4/Standard 4—Support of the Student Experience
1. Mike Patterson, Vice President for Student Affairs & Dean of Students, Chair
2. Erin Jakowski, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies
3. Ken Dippong, Director of Academic Advising
4. Katey Earle, Learning Resource Specialist
5. Kelly Teeling, Associate Director of Freshman Admissions & Coordinator of Scholarship Programs
6. Karol Martinez-Doane, Director of Student Activities
7. Timmy Aziz*, Faculty in Architecture
8. Katie Morris, Faculty in Art Education
9. Wendy Jachman, Trustee
10. Katelyn Brown Student (Graduate)
11. Claire Cho Student (Undergraduate)

Working Group #5/Standard 5—Educational Effectiveness & Assessment
1. Terra Schehr*, Associate Vice President for Educational Planning & Development, Chair
2. Joe Basile, Associate Dean for Liberal Arts
3. Marcus Civin, Associate Dean for Curriculum & Assessment in Graduate Studies
4. Crystal Shambee*, Director of Graduate Programs in Open Studies
5. Dan Gutstein, Director of Writing Studio
6. Sian Evans, Instruction Librarian
7. Megan Miller*, Associate Dean for Student Integrated Learning

Working Group #6/Standard 6—Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement
1. Doug Mann, Vice President for Operations & Finance, Chair
2. Wendy Price*, Associate Vice President for Academic Services
3. Lillian Burke, Associate Vice President for Development & Constituent Relations
4. Cristina Goncalves, Manager of Academic Operations in Graduate Studies
5. David Apaw, Director of Network Services
6. Rufus Davis, Director of Building Services
7. Karie Bowman, Controller, Finance
8. Ian Bourland, Faculty in Art History
9. Jim Miller, Trustee
Working Group #7/Standard 7—Governance, Leadership, and Administration

1. Alexa Kim, Vice President for Technology Systems and Services, Chair
2. Rita Walters, Vice President for Advancement
3. Estevanny Turns, Associate Vice President for Human Resources
4. Tania Cordes*, Special Projects Manager in Communications
5. Jenny Carson, Faculty in Art History
6. Gwen Davidson, Trustee
7. Neill Meyerhoff, Trustee
8. Beth Yashnyk, Student (Graduate)

Working Group #8/Requirements of Affiliation and Compliance

1. Christine Peterson*, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services, Chair
2. Hadley Garbart, Director of Student Records & Research
3. Brigitte Sullivan, Director of Budget
4. George Tyree, Associate Director of Financial Aid
5. Sarah Maravetz, Director of Data Management & Registration
6. Scott Stone, Director of Residence Life & Student Conduct

Pre-Work Working Group—Hallmarks of Quality for Distance Education:

1. Crystal Shamblee*, Director of Graduate Programs in Open Studies
2. Pam Stefanuca, Director of Instructional Advancement & Technology
3. Adam Morad, Instructional Technologist in Open Studies
4. Heather Bradbury, Director of Master of Professional Studies Program
APPENDIX B: Working Group Charges

Standard 1: Mission and Goals
 Charge: The Working Group for Standard 1: Mission and Goals will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data and documentation regarding the institutional mission and goals. The Working Group will evaluate MICA’s current mission and goals using the MSCHE criteria for Standard 1, the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation, the MSCHE Hallmarks of Quality for online learning, and the relevant NASAD Standards as identified in the NASAD crosswalk file and the NASAD Handbook. The Working Group will also explore relationships between MICA’s Mission and MICA’s aspirational priorities that were developed as part of the preparation for strategic planning and self-study in AY2015-16.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report of no more than 10 pages that addresses MICA’s adherence to Standard 1 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to mission and goals that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform MICA’s strategic planning process.

Research Questions:
1. To what extent and how does MICA meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 1 and the Hallmarks of Quality for online learning associated with this Standard?
2. To what extent and how does MICA meet the associated NASAD accreditation requirements for the mission and purpose of schools of art and design?
3. How were MICA’s newly articulated mission and vision statements developed? In what ways is MICA communicating its mission and goals to both internal and external stakeholders? How are the mission and goals being integrated into planning, program development, and resource allocation to assure consistency in application across the campus?
4. In what ways do MICA’s new mission and vision statements align with MICA’s aspirational priorities (21st Century Academic Leadership, Operational Innovation, Drive for Excellence, One Team, Baltimore & Beyond, MICA Stars, DNA & Storytelling, and Family & Network)? How can the mission and vision statements be used to guide the strategic planning process?

Standard 2: Ethics and Integrity
 Charge: The Working Group for Standard 2: Ethics and Integrity will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, policies and documentation regarding the ethics and integrity of MICA’s institutional practices, policies and operations. The Working Group will evaluate the ethics and integrity of MICA’s institutional practices, policies and operations using the MSCHE criteria for Standard 2, the MSCHE Hallmarks of Quality for online learning, and the relevant NASAD Standards as identified in the NASAD crosswalk file and the NASAD Handbook. The Working Group will also explore relationships between institutional ethics and integrity and MICA’s aspirational priorities that were developed as part of the preparation for strategic planning and self-study in AY2015-16.
Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report of no more than 10 pages that addresses MICA’s adherence to Standard 2 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to institutional ethics and integrity that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform MICA’s strategic planning process.

Research Questions:

1. To what extent and how does MICA meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 2 and the Hallmarks of Quality for online learning associated with this Standard?

2. To what extent and how does MICA meet the associated NASAD accreditation requirements, and especially the “Code of Ethics” for art and design units?

3. How do MICA’s newly articulated mission and vision statements provide direction for addressing issues of ethics and integrity in institutional practices, policies, and operations?

4. In what ways, if any, does your evaluation of MICA relative to this Standard link with MICA’s aspirational priorities (21st Century Academic Leadership, Operational Innovation, Drive for Excellence, One Team, Baltimore & Beyond, MICA Stars, DNA & Storytelling, and Family & Network)? What specific priorities or areas of improvement should be emphasized?

Standard 3: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

Charge: The Working Group for Standard 3: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, policies and reports regarding the design, delivery and assessment of all academic programs at MICA. The Working Group will evaluate the rigor and coherence of the student learning experience at MICA using the MSCHE criteria for Standard 3, the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation, the MSCHE Hallmarks of Quality for online learning, and the relevant NASAD Standards as identified in the NASAD crosswalk file and the NASAD Handbook. The Working Group will also explore relationships between MICA’s current academic programs and methods of delivery and the aspirational priorities that were developed as part of the preparation for strategic planning and self-study in AY2015-16.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report of no more than 15 pages that addresses MICA’s adherence to Standard 3 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to the design and delivery of student learning experience that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform MICA’s strategic planning process.

Research Questions:

1. To what extent and how does MICA meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 3 and the Hallmarks of Quality for online learning associated with this Standard?

2. To what extent and how does MICA meet the associated NASAD accreditation requirements, including criteria for individual programs and the student learning experience considered as a whole?

3. How do MICA’s newly articulated mission and vision statements provide new direction for the design and delivery of its academic programs? To what extent does the learning experience at MICA provide opportunities for students to develop the skills and abilities to create purposeful lives and careers? To
what extent does the learning experience at MICA address the needs of an increasingly diverse and globally oriented student population?

4. In what ways, if any, does your evaluation of MICA relative to this Standard link with MICA’s aspirational priorities (21st Century Academic Leadership, Operational Innovation, Drive for Excellence, One Team, Baltimore & Beyond, MICA Stars, DNA & Storytelling, and Family & Network)? What critical priorities for improvement and/or transformation of student educational experience should be included in our strategic plan?

**Standard 4: Support of the Student Experience**

**Charge:** The Working Group for Standard 4: Support of the Student Experience will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, policies and reports regarding the recruitment, matriculation, retention, and support of all students at MICA. The Working Group will evaluate the alignment of MICA’s enrollment strategies with our mission and offerings and the coherence and effectiveness of our student support systems using the MSCHE criteria for Standard 4, the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation, the MSCHE Hallmarks of Quality for online learning, and the relevant NASAD Standards as identified in the NASAD crosswalk file and the NASAD Handbook. The Working Group will also explore relationships between MICA’s enrollment, student success, and support strategies and the aspirational priorities that were developed as part of the preparation for strategic planning and self-study in AY2015-16.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report of no more than 10 pages that addresses MICA’s adherence to Standard 4 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to enrollment and support of the student experience that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform MICA’s strategic planning process.

**Research Questions:**

1. To what extent and how does MICA meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 4 and the Hallmarks of Quality for online learning associated with this Standard across the range of student backgrounds, expectations and experiences?

2. To what extent and how does MICA meet the associated NASAD accreditation requirements associated with this Standard across the range of student backgrounds, expectations and experiences?

3. What direction do MICA’s newly articulated mission and vision statements provide for the development of enrollment strategies and/or student support services? To what extent do the services and organizations that support student learning empower students to develop the skills and abilities to create purposeful lives and careers? To what extent do the services and organizations that support student learning address the needs of an increasingly diverse and globally oriented student population?

4. In what ways, if any, does your evaluation of MICA relative to this Standard link with MICA’s aspirational priorities (21st Century Academic Leadership, Operational Innovation, Drive for Excellence, One Team, Baltimore & Beyond, MICA Stars, DNA & Storytelling, and Family & Network)? What are the most critical areas of priority for improvement and/or transformation of support for students and their learning that should be included in our strategic plan?
**Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness Assessment**

**Charge:** The Working Group for Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness Assessment will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, policies and reports regarding the assessment of student learning and the use of these assessments for improving the student educational experience at MICA. The Working Group will evaluate the institutional plan and the current practice for assessing student learning and improving programs using the MSCHE criteria for Standard 5, the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation, the MSCHE Hallmarks of Quality for online learning, and the relevant NASAD Standards as identified in the NASAD crosswalk file and the NASAD Handbook. The Working Group will also explore how learning outcomes assessment and program review can support the aspirational priorities that were developed as part of the preparation for strategic planning and self-study in AY2015-16.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report of no more than 15 pages that addresses MICA’s adherence to Standard 5 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to the assessment of student learning and program review that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform MICA’s strategic planning process.

**Research Questions:**

1. To what extent and how does MICA meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 5 and the Hallmarks of Quality for online learning associated with this Standard?

2. To what extent and how does MICA meet the associated NASAD accreditation requirements associated with this Standard at the institutional and program levels?

3. To what extent are MICA’s newly articulated mission and vision statements apparent in the goals for student learning and educational effectiveness? What critical work remains to align MICA’s assessment practices with its new mission and vision?

4. In what ways, if any, does your evaluation of MICA relative to this Standard link with MICA’s aspirational priorities (21st Century Academic Leadership, Operational Innovation, Drive for Excellence, One Team, Baltimore & Beyond, MICA Stars, DNA & Storytelling, and Family & Network)? What are the critical priorities for enhancing educational effectiveness and improving teaching and learning at MICA?

**Standard 6: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement**

**Charge:** The Working Group for Standard 6: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, planning documents, policies and reports regarding MICA’s processes for planning, resource allocation, and institutional strategic and financial planning. The Working Group will evaluate the alignment of different planning processes with each other and with the mission and vision of the College using the MSCHE criteria for Standard 6, the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation, the MSCHE Hallmarks of Quality for online learning, and the relevant NASAD Standards as identified in the NASAD crosswalk file and the NASAD Handbook. The Working Group will also explore how improvements and/or innovations in planning processes and resource allocation can support the aspirational priorities that were developed as part of the preparation for strategic planning and self-study in AY2015-16.
Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report of no more than 15 pages that addresses MICA’s adherence to Standard 6 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to institutional planning processes and resource allocation that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform MICA’s strategic planning process.

**Research Questions:**

1. To what extent and how does MICA meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 6 and the Hallmarks of Quality for online learning associated with this Standard across the range of institutional processes for planning and resource allocation?

2. To what extent and how does MICA meet the associated NASAD accreditation requirements associated with this Standard across the range of institutional processes for planning and resource allocation?

3. How does MICA’s financial planning and budgeting process align with the College’s newly articulated mission and vision statements? How does MICA assess the effectiveness of its planning and resource allocation processes? Are institutional objectives, both college-wide and by individual units, clearly stated, linked to MICA’s new mission statement, and reflective of conclusions drawn from assessment results?

4. In what ways, if any, does your evaluation of MICA relative to this Standard link with MICA’s aspirational priorities (21st Century Academic Leadership, Operational Innovation, Drive for Excellence, One Team, Baltimore & Beyond, MICA Stars, DNA & Storytelling, and Family & Network)? What are the most critical areas of priority for improving our institutional planning and resource allocation processes to optimize our ability to pursue our strategic goals?

**Standard 7: Governance, Leadership, and Administration**

**Charge:** The Working Group for Standard 7: Governance, Leadership, and Administration will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, planning documents, policies and reports regarding the effectiveness and integrity of MICA’s governance and organizational practices. The Working Group will evaluate MICA’s governance structure using the MSCHE criteria for Standard 7, the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation, the MSCHE Hallmarks of Quality for online learning, and the relevant NASAD Standards as identified in the NASAD crosswalk file and the NASAD Handbook. The Working Group will also explore the relationship between MICA’s current governance structure and the aspirational priorities that were developed as part of the preparation for strategic planning and self-study in AY2015-16.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report of no more than 5 pages that addresses MICA’s adherence to Standard 7 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to the effectiveness of MICA’s governance structure that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform MICA’s strategic planning process.
Research Questions:

1. To what extent and how does MICA meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 7 and the Hallmarks of Quality for online learning across the range of stakeholder groups and areas of responsibility associated with this Standard?

2. To what extent and how does MICA meet the associated NASAD accreditation requirements across the range of stakeholder groups and areas of responsibility associated with this Standard?

3. What are the key relationships between MICA’s governance structure and the newly articulated mission and vision? What adjustments or changes in governance structure may be required to achieve better alignment between mission/vision and governance at MICA?

4. In what ways, if any, does your evaluation of MICA relative to this Standard link with MICA’s aspirational priorities (21st Century Academic Leadership, Operational Innovation, Drive for Excellence, One Team, Baltimore & Beyond, MICA Stars, DNA & Storytelling, and Family & Network)? What are the most critical areas of priority for improving our governance structure and processes to optimize our ability to pursue our strategic goals?

Requirements of Affiliation

Along with the seven Standards, Middle States requires institutions to demonstrate compliance with 15 “Requirements of Affiliation.” Compliance with some of these requirements (7-13 & 15) will be addressed in the chapters pertaining to various standards; others (1-6 & 14) will be demonstrated via submission of MSCHE’s “Verification of Compliance Report.”

Charge: The Working Group for Requirements of Affiliation will complete the Verification of Compliance Report by gathering, reviewing and summarizing, as necessary, existing College documentation and procedures.