



## **Self-Study Design**

**Presented to**

**Middle States Commission on Higher Education**

**September 2016**

## SELF-STUDY DESIGN FOR MANHATTAN SCHOOL OF MUSIC

### 1. INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

Manhattan School of Music (MSM) was founded as a settlement music school on the Upper East Side of Manhattan in 1918. Through its first decades the School grew in both size and ambition, and moved to its current location near Columbia University in 1969. MSM has evolved into an internationally recognized conservatory offering bachelors, masters and doctoral degrees, and has been continuously accredited for the past 60 years. In addition to degree programs, MSM offers a Professional Studies Certificate and Artist Diploma, and also runs a Precollege program for musically gifted children. The College currently enrolls 998 students in its post-secondary degree, certificate and diploma programs, while the Precollege serves 477 students (figures as of fall 2015).

MSM's overarching institutional goals are best expressed by the School's *Mission Statement*:

Manhattan School of Music is deeply committed to excellence in education, performance, and creative activity; to the humanity of the School's environment; and to the cultural enrichment of the larger community. A premier international conservatory, MSM inspires and empowers highly talented individuals to realize their potential. We take full advantage of New York's abundant learning and performance opportunities, preparing our students to be passionate performers, composers and teachers, and imaginative, effective contributors to the arts and society.

MSM offers majors in all orchestral instruments, instrumental and vocal jazz, classical voice, piano, organ, accompanying, contemporary performance, and composition. Each student receives a weekly one-hour private lesson in the major, plays or sings in assigned ensembles, and also takes a variety of courses in performance, history and theory of music, humanities, entrepreneurship and elective studies. A new major, Musical Theatre, will welcome its first class in September 2016. In addition to the course offerings at MSM, students in the College may elect to take courses at Barnard College, which is located two blocks south.

MSM's programs are enriched by opportunities for community outreach, in which students teach or perform in schools, hospitals, nursing homes and other venues in New York City. MSM's unique Distance Learning department provides teaching opportunities for MSM students online, and connects MSM to

conservatories and cultural institutions around the world for master classes and collaborative interaction.

As a school focused on musical performance and composition, MSM presents approximately 750 concerts each year, ranging from full-scale operas, orchestra and big-band concerts to intimate faculty and student recitals. With all concerts open to the public and most of them offered free of charge, MSM is a significant cultural resource in its Morningside Heights/Lower Harlem neighborhood. As a major musical institution in New York City, MSM collaborates with other arts organizations for performances at venues such as the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the New York Philharmonic, the Cathedral of Saint John the Divine, Jazz at Lincoln Center, and many others.

Since 2008, the year of MSM's most recent accreditation, numerous administrative changes have produced new policies, procedures, plans and planning strategies. In May 2013, Dr. James Gandre became MSM's ninth President. Since that time, the School has appointed a new Provost (2013), Vice President for Advancement (2014), Dean of Students (2015), Vice President for Media and Communications (2014) and Vice President for Business and Finance (2015). Of these individuals, only the Provost was appointed from within. Though all these senior positions existed prior to 2013, several of them have been reorganized to reflect new administrative priorities. Despite these changes, MSM has enjoyed a high level of continuity, because the faculty and other staff positions have remained relatively stable. At the same time, new leadership has brought an opportunity to examine both short- and long-term goals. A major strategic planning effort, undertaken in 2014, produced a new, practical planning document that includes clear and quantifiable standards and benchmarks. The new Strategic Plan stretches into 2019, with the expectation that a new planning process will occur in 2018-2019, connecting planning cycles seamlessly into the future. With plans in place, solid finances and a robust enrollment, MSM is approaching its 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary from a position of strength and confidence.

## **2. INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES**

The Self-Study will examine both MSM's strengths and its challenges. The following institutional priorities, derived from the *Mission Statement* and from MSM's Strategic Plan, will serve to focus the discussion on each of the Standards of Accreditation. Following each priority listed below, a quick guide, in parentheses, indicates where MSM has identified or expanded on this goal in its *Mission Statement* or in its Strategic Plan.

**Artistic and Educational Excellence:** MSM educates students who aspire to professional careers in music. Our musical standards must be maintained at the highest level, since professional standards are needed to support the development of the most talented young artists. We believe that high standards benefit all students, including those who by choice or by their talents will not pursue the extremely competitive career of professional performance. Musical thinking and performance correlate with generally desirable intellectual strengths and work-habits, such as logic and abstract thinking, organization, and goal-oriented persistence – many of MSM’s graduates have gone on to successful careers in teaching and in arts management, and in other professions such as business, law, finance and medicine. Our goal is to provide, through the lens of music, the strongest possible intellectual and artistic foundation for each of our students. (*Mission Statement*; Strategic Goal 1)

**Supportive Environment:** Musical performance is a stressful occupation, and competition can be quite intense. Through our teaching and our student services, MSM provides a nurturing environment to talented young people. Our enrollment, representing 38 states and 42 countries, is over 50% international. In a climate of internationalism and diversity, our aim is to present a variety of opportunities for students to develop their unique strengths, their ties to the community and their potential for personal fulfillment. (*Mission Statement*, Strategic Goal 2)

**Facilities and Infrastructure:** MSM’s campus is very compact, and some of our facility is more than 100 years old. We have prioritized the improvement of our spaces and our infrastructure, with renovation plans, expansion of usable space, addition of practice facilities, and upgrading of technology. (Strategic Goal 2)

**Fiscal Strength and Institutional Stability:** MSM is a small non-profit institution engaged in a labor-intensive educational activity. Our goal is to ensure that the School’s operation is sustainable and that our practical and financial decisions best support the School’s current and future needs. MSM’s stability also depends on a capable and dedicated workforce. The School is committed to providing a positive working environment for staff and faculty. (Strategic Goals 2 and 3)

**Standards and Compliance:** MSM takes seriously its responsibility to conform to federal and state regulations governing all aspects of education, student life and institutional governance. In recent years the School has increased its efforts to be aware of best practices in similar institutions, and we have put

staff time and protocols in place in order to support a variety of compliance issues. In this context we have been mindful of the Standards for Accreditation from our previous accreditation cycles, using them to guide the development of a culture of assessment and improvement. (Strategic Goal 1)

**Communications:** As an institution engaged in the performing arts, MSM offers students regular opportunities to appear on stage, and offers high-level musical programming to our community. We strive to communicate with potential students and with patrons, not only to support our concert activities and inform our basic audience, but also to bring music to a broader public. We broadcast content worldwide through distance learning, provide music to dozens of schools and facilities through our outreach program, and increasingly spread the word about music, our students, alumni and faculty through digital media. (*Mission Statement*, Strategic Goals 1 and 4)

**Continuous Improvement:** In the challenging, rapidly changing context of musical performance, MSM's goal is to maintain its position as one of the premier conservatories in the world. To achieve this goal we must continuously assess our educational programs, strengthening them, modernizing them, and assuring our students that their education here prepares them for the most demanding professional roles. Our institutional practices must also be constantly assessed and improved in order to support our core educational mission, and to provide the best possible environment for our students, faculty and staff. (Strategic Goals 1 and 2)

### 3. INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE SELF-STUDY

- Demonstration that MSM currently meets or exceeds Middle States Standards for Accreditation, as well as all other regulations as required for federal and state compliance.
- Increased understanding of MSM's institutional strengths and challenges by a larger and more varied number of students, faculty and staff. We hope to assure institutional communication and buy-in across our many constituencies.
- Documentation of academic assessment, answering these questions: How can we be as successful as possible in fostering academic and artistic excellence? How effective are current practices, and how can we improve them? How can we best determine what our standards should be? What additional methodologies, technologies or data strategies might enhance academic assessment? How can the experiences of our alumni help us improve our programs?

- Evaluation of institutional assessment: an overview of assessment in the major administrative areas, addressing issues of ongoing improvement and modernization of practices; review to ensure effective planning and budgeting strategies to assure fiscal strength and stability; appropriate strategies for enrollment management, technology, communications, advancement, and facilities improvements to meet MSM's institutional priorities as defined above; evaluation of MSM's investments, debts, long-term financial strategies, and endowment
- Review of the student experience outside classes and academic work: how can we continue to improve the sense of community and the welcoming, supportive environment we value?
- Improved strategy for institutional data: how can we best organize and position institutional data to support our Self-Study effort, and to make data more accessible and transparent going forward?
- Review of the current Strategic Plan: a thorough examination, showing which goals have been attained or are attainable; determining the accuracy and effectiveness of the timetable; an evaluation of what might be missing that could be added now; an evaluation of the planning process that might lead to future improvements
- New recommendations for institutional development and programmatic improvement that might inform the planning process over the next ten years and beyond

#### **4. ORGANIZATION OF THE SELF-STUDY STEERING COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUPS**

**Steering Committee:** MSM has organized a Steering Committee to guide the Self-Study process. The members of the Steering Committee are:

- Dr. Marjorie Merryman, Provost and Senior Vice President (faculty in Composition), *Chair*
- Caryn Kaplan, Associate Director of Human Relations, *Co-Chair for Administration and Staff*
- Dr. Lisa Yui, Assistant Dean for Programs and Assessment (faculty in Music History and Piano Skills), *Co-Chair for Academics and Faculty*
- Dr. Monica Christensen, Dean of Students
- Carol Matos, Senior Director of Administration and Human Relations
- Gary Meyer, Vice President for Business and Finance
- Lianna Portnoy, Assistant to the Provost

The Steering Committee will oversee the Self-Study process, and members of the Steering Committee will chair or co-chair the working groups.

**Working groups:** The members of the Steering Committee have assembled working groups corresponding to each of the seven Standards for Accreditation. Each working group will:

- Identify and analyze relevant documents, processes, and institutional data; all institutional documents and data to be included in the Documentation Roadmap
- Describe and document assessment procedures relevant to the specific standard
- Bring into internal discussions any individuals or groups who might add valuable viewpoints
- Document and present findings on institutional strengths, challenges and opportunities in regard to the specific standard under consideration
- In the context of the Standard, identify linkages to MSM's mission, Strategic Plan and institutional priorities
- Periodically update the Steering Committee on progress; the working group chair will report to the Steering Committee monthly, starting in September 2016
- Create a written report based on data, analysis and findings, presenting recommendations for improvements and for methods of ongoing assessment. A preliminary report or detailed outline will be due at the end of the first semester, 2016. A full draft will be due February 1, 2017, and will be reviewed in detail by the Steering Committee. The final report is due April 15, 2017. The final report should be 10-15 pages in length.

Each Standard listed below is described in the language of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (printed in italics). Working groups are asked to organize their reports according to the charge listed for each standard. Suggested research questions are designed to support inquiry into each charge. Any documents used in association with the report should be included in the Documentation Roadmap. A preliminary Roadmap has already been assembled, and is contained on the Accreditation Shared Drive. Working groups may access all materials there, and are asked to update the Roadmap with any additional documents that have provided useful information or are referenced in the group's report. Citations should be provided in the report, linking all cited elements to the Roadmap.

As part of its report, each working group is asked to make a small number of suggestions (2-4) for institutional improvement. All such suggestions are important, as the working group will have unique insights into a specific area of the School. The Steering Committee will discuss all issues brought forward as suggestions, and will prioritize the most important or broadly useful of these for inclusion into the final Self-Study.

**Format for working group reports:** Each working group report should include the following elements:

- **Overview** – including the charge and research questions; the approach taken and techniques used
- **Analysis** – presenting data, critical analysis and conclusions, organized around the research questions; suggestions for possible institutional improvement
- **Appendices** – containing links to the shared Documentation Roadmap as well as any other reference material

**Standard I: Mission and Goals** (also addressing Requirements 7, 10)

Chair: Marjorie Merryman, Composition Faculty, Provost and Senior Vice President

- Marc Day, Assistant to the President and Liaison to the Board of Trustees
- Brian Dailey, Interim Vice President for Advancement
- David Geber, Faculty in Cello, Dean of Instrumental Performance
- Chris Rosenberg, Faculty in Jazz

*The institution's mission defines its purpose within the context of higher education, the students it serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals are clearly linked to its mission and specify how the institution fulfills its mission. (MSCHE)*

Charge:

- Demonstrate that MSM's mission and goals are clearly stated, appropriate, broadly disseminated and understood by all internal and external constituencies
- Examine the ways in which MSM's stated mission and goals affect decision-making at all levels
- Consider the extent to which MSM is successful in meeting its goals and fulfilling its overall mission

Research questions:

1. How have MSM's *Mission Statement* and Strategic Goals been formulated, assessed, adjusted and shared with the community as a whole?
2. What evidence do we have that our mission and goals are appropriate to our specialized field, realistic and achievable?

3. To what extent do administrative decisions, priorities, programs and resource allocations support the elements of student life and learning described in the mission statement?
4. What types of evaluative processes inform our assessment of MSM's mission and goals, and the School's success in meeting them?
5. By what means can our mission and goals continue to guide the School while also adapting to change within higher education, student needs, and the music profession?

**Standard II: Ethics & Integrity** (Requirements of Affiliation 6, 12, 13, 14)

Chairs: Caryn Kaplan, Associate Director of Human Relations

Carol Matos, Senior Director of Administration & Human Relations

- Amy Anderson, Dean of Enrollment
- Melanie Dorsey, Director of Student Engagement
- Susan Fink, Director of Accounting and Controller
- Bryan Greaney, President's Chief of Staff
- David Jolley, Faculty in French Horn, Chair of Brass
- Anne Shikany, Faculty in Opera Studies, Assistant to the Artistic Director of Opera

*Ethics and integrity are central, indispensable, and defining hallmarks of effective higher education institutions. In all activities, whether internal or external, an institution must be faithful to its mission, honor its contracts and commitments, adhere to its policies, and represent itself truthfully. (MSCHE)*

Charge:

- Understand how the School supports and enacts its mission with integrity throughout all MSM activities
- Examine how MSM has clearly articulated policies, procedures, and practices that guide internal and external activities in an ethical manner

Research Questions:

1. How effective are existing structures, policies and procedures in:
  - Ensuring all members of the MSM community follow high ethical standards (e.g., avoidance of conflict of interest, fair employee practices)?
  - Safeguarding and communicating a commitment to academic and intellectual freedom and integrity?
  - Ensuring a community of respect that embraces diversity?
  - Establishing institutional mechanisms to handle grievances (from students, faculty, and staff)?
  - Ensuring integrity in public relations, institutional fact sheets, crime reports, etc.?
  - Ensuring clearly communicated and nondiscriminatory financial aid practices?
2. How are the existing policies and procedures accessible, communicated, and implemented?
3. What mechanisms are in place so that the institution engages in periodic assessment of integrity in institutional policies, procedures, and practices?
4. How can they be improved?

**Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience** (Requirements 8, 9, 15)

Chair: Marjorie Merryman, Composition Faculty, Provost and Senior Vice President

- Rebecca Charnow, Faculty in Outreach, Director of Community Partnerships
- Ruth Golden, Faculty in Voice Performance
- John Hagen, Faculty in English Language Studies, Director of ESL
- Jeffrey Namian, Registrar
- Christianne Orto, Dean of Distance Learning and Recording Arts
- Nolan Robertson, Associate Dean for Orchestra and Performance Operations

*An institution provides students with learning experiences that are characterized by rigor and coherence of all program, certificate and degree levels, regardless of instructional modality. All learning experiences, regardless of modality, program pace/schedule, level, and setting are consistent with higher education expectations. (MSCHE)*

Charge:

- Demonstrate that MSM's programs are rigorous, coherent and appropriate within the context of higher education
- Show that MSM's standards are appropriate in preparing students for advanced studies and for the professional world
- Examine the teaching methods used by MSM and demonstrate that curricular rigor and coherence are maintained across all teaching modalities and for all students, including those with learning differences.

Research Questions:

1. How are MSM's programs designed, modified and assessed in terms of their rigor, coherence, professional relevance?
2. What evidence exists to show that MSM's courses and curricula are appropriately designed to prepare students for professional work or for graduate studies?
3. To what extent is MSM's general education core designed to provide a solid, college-level foundation beyond the realm of music?
4. What learning modalities are in use at MSM, and how does the School accommodate students with learning differences?

**Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience** (Requirements 8, 10)

Chair: Monica Christensen, Dean of Students

- Mark Delpriora, Faculty in Classical Guitar, Chair of Guitar
- Sophia Grigoriou, Campus Health Nurse
- Michael Lockhart, Director of International Student Services
- Jim Love, Director of Residence Life
- Marjean Olson, Faculty in Keyboard Skills
- Lianna Portnoy, Assistant to the Provost
- Lia Kayman, Assistant Registrar

*Across all educational experiences, settings, levels and instructional modalities, the institution recruits and admits students whose interests, abilities, experiences and goals are congruent with its mission and educational offerings.*

Charge:

- Examine the extent to which MSM admits, retains and supports the success of students whose interests, abilities, experiences and goals provide a reasonable expectation for success, and who are compatible with our institutional mission.
- Investigate how these desired outcomes are assessed by the institution and the degree to which outcomes are supported by evidence.

Research questions:

A. In regards to Enrollment Management

1. What procedures do we have in place to select and fund students who can benefit from MSM's mission?
2. What data do we collect that helps us understand the degree to which we have selected the right students, funded them wisely and supported them well?

B. In regards to Student Support Functions

1. What documentation do we have that MSM indeed strives to provide students with a supportive experience – the “humane environment” proclaimed in our mission statement which allows them to become “effective contributors to the arts and society?”
2. What data do we collect? How do we measure success and use data to guide improvement? Where is there still room for improvement?
  - a. Residence Life and Dining Services
  - b. Wellness
  - c. Orientation, community building, diversity support and leadership opportunities
  - d. Academic advising and support
  - e. Career guidance
  - f. International student support
  - g. Title IX, non-discrimination and student safety

**Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment** (Requirements 9, 10)

Chair: Lisa Yui, Faculty in Music History and Piano Skills, Assistant Dean for Programs and Assessment

- Casey Molino Dunn, Faculty in Entrepreneurship, Director of Center for Music Entrepreneurship
- Lauren Frankovich, Alumni Engagement Officer
- John Pagano, Faculty in Humanities, Chair of Humanities
- Anne Shikany, Faculty in Opera Studies, Assistant to the Artistic Director of Opera
- Marc Silverman, Faculty and Chair in Piano
- John Hagen, Director of ESL

*Assessment of student learning demonstrates that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their programs of study, degree level, the institution's mission, and appropriate expectations for institutions of higher education. (MSCHE)*

Charge:

- Demonstrate that MSM's assessment methodologies are effective in determining the extent to which students accomplish the learning goals articulated for each program.
- Understand how MSM's mission is reflected in expectations for student learning achievement
- Examine how MSM demonstrates a culture of evidence-based processes and outcomes with regard to the assessment of student learning

Research Questions:

1. How effective is MSM in stating, publishing and communicating our standards?
2. How is MSM's *Mission Statement* reflected in our standards?
3. How effective are MSM's assessment processes at the institution's department and degree levels?
4. How does MSM disseminate the results of assessment processes and use these results for continuous quality improvement?
5. How effective is MSM in evaluating and using assessment results to continue to improve key indications of student successes (retention rates, graduation rates, alumni successes, etc.)?

**Standard VI: Planning, Resources and Institutional Improvement** (Requirements 8, 10, 11)

Chair: Gary Meyer, Vice President for Business and Finance

- Susan Fink, Director of Accounting and Controller
- Nancy Heller, Trustee
- Luis Morel, Deputy Director of Information Technology
- Maitland Peters, Faculty and Chair of Voice, Faculty Trustee
- Luis Plaza, Director of Facilities
- Caryn Kaplan, Associate Director of Human Relations

*The institution's planning processes, resources, and structures are aligned with each other and are sufficient to fulfill its mission and goals, to continuously assess and improve its programs and services, and to respond effectively to opportunities and challenges. (MSCHE)*

Charge:

- Understand how processes, resources and structures align to fulfill MSM's mission and strategic plan.
- Examine how MSM engages in reflective practices that allow ongoing improvement.

Research Questions:

1. How are MSM's planning processes (financial and budgeting), resources (infrastructure, physical, human, and fiscal) and structures periodically assessed for effectiveness and aligned to the institution's strategic plan and to each other?
2. How do the institution's resources (i.e., infrastructure, physical, human and fiscal) support the institution's operations?
3. What mechanisms does the institution have to assess the effectiveness of its planning, resource allocation, and renewal processes? How are the planning processes used to assess the adequacy of resources and the efficient use of those resources to allow the institution to achieve its mission and goals and fulfill its Strategic Plan?

**Standard VII: Governance, Leadership and Administration** (requirements 1-6, 12, 13, 14)

Co-Chairs: Marjorie Merryman, Composition Faculty, Provost and Senior Vice President

Carol Matos, Senior Director of Administration and Human Relations

- Jeff Breithaupt, Vice President for Media and Communications
- Phillip Kawin, Faculty in Piano, Chair of Faculty Council
- Linda Mercurio, Trustee, Chair of Committee on Academic Affairs and Student Success
- Gary Meyer, Vice President for Business and Finance
- Manly Romero, Performance Librarian, Chair of InterStaff Committee

*The institution is governed and administered in a manner that allows it to realize its stated mission and goals in a way that effectively benefits the institution, its students, and the other constituencies it serves. Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, religious, educational system or other unaccredited organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose, and it operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. (MSCHE)*

Charge:

- Understand and assess the governing structures of MSM
- Review MSM's protocols and strategies to assure regulatory compliance
- Examine the governing and decision-making processes in relation to MSM's mission and goals

Research Questions:

1. How is MSM's governance structured and how are members of the Board of Trustees qualified, chosen and evaluated?
2. How does the Board understand MSM's mission and goals and how does this understanding affect decisions made at the Board level?
3. How does the Board choose a President, and how is this individual qualified and evaluated?
4. How is the senior administration organized, how are its members qualified, and how does its structure support the mission of the School, the President and the Board?
5. How does MSM assure that regulations and compliance elements (federal, state and Middle States) are properly reviewed and carried out?
6. Do decision-making mechanisms allow for robust input from students, faculty and professional staff, while also ensuring appropriate Board oversight? In that context, are the Council of

Chairs, the Faculty Council and the Student Council successful in representing the interests of their constituent groups, and do these Councils have an effective and appropriate voice in MSM's governance and administrative decisions?

### **Coordination of Requirements of Affiliation, and Data Coordination**

In addition to the working groups for each standard, the Steering Committee has appointed a sub-committee to coordinate data collection and on-line communications, and to assemble documentation related to the compliance review process.

Chair: Lianna Portnoy, Assistant to the Provost

- Jessica Ferrell, Manager of HR Systems

### **5. ROLE OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE and GUIDELINES FOR REPORTS OF WORKING GROUPS**

The Steering Committee will offer support to the working groups. Each meeting of the Steering Committee will serve as a check-in on the progress of the working groups, since all working group leaders are members of the Steering Committee. Through the Provost's office, the Steering Committee will offer material and practical support where needed.

Each working group report should follow this general format:

1. The report will begin with an overview of the group's charge in relation to its assigned Standard for Accreditation and related Requirements of Affiliation. The scope and responsibility of the group should be viewed as broadly inclusive within the Standard.
2. To the extent that Standards overlap, working groups are asked to communicate with each other, collaborate where appropriate and reference each other's findings. It is not necessary or desirable for groups to replicate each other's work. The report should describe any collaboration between groups, and make clear where any possibly overlapping topics are fully discussed.
3. The report will describe and discuss documents, data and analytic processes undertaken in relation to the Standards and Requirements. This discussion will lead to conclusions, including both strengths and challenges.
4. The conclusions drawn will be discussed in terms of MSM's mission (*Mission Statement*) and Strategic Plan.
5. The report will conclude with recommendations for ongoing assessment and continuing institutional improvement.

## **6. GENERAL TIMETABLE FOR STEERING COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUPS**

**Fall Semester, 2016:** The chair of each working group should plan to give a brief progress report to the Steering Committee once every month during the fall semester of 2016.

**December 12, 2016:** A draft of each group's report should be submitted to the Steering Committee

**January 2017:** The Steering Committee will prepare notes and comments for each draft, and will deliver these back to the working groups

**February-April, 2017:** Revisions will be made to the drafts

**April 15, 2017:** All working group reports, with all revisions, submitted to the Steering Committee, ready to be assembled into the Self-Study Report

**April-October, 2017:** Steering Committee and members of working groups lead MSM community discussions of the Draft Report

## 7. TIMETABLE FOR THE SELF-STUDY

Action Dates	TASK
November 2015	Attend CIP Self-Study Institute
December 2015	Steering Committee organized
January 2016 – March 2016	Mission review and revision; preparation for Self-Study with Faculty, Staff, Board of Trustees
February 2016 – April 2016	Working groups identified and organized
February 2016 – April 2016	Self-Study Design drafted
April 2016	Self-Study Design mailed to MSCHE Liaison
May 11, 2016	Visit from Heather Perfetti, MSCHE Liaison; meetings with President, Steering Committee, faculty, students and Trustees
May 2016	Orientation for working groups
June 23, 2016	Working groups begin their studies; report on accreditation and review of Mission and Strategic Plan with Board of Directors
September 2016 – December 2016	Creation of accreditation website Introduction to accreditation effort for students and alumni Presentation to Council of Chairs (faculty) and All-Staff meeting Review of progress by BOT Committee on Academic Affairs and Student Success (CAASS)
September 2016 – December 2016	Data gathering & analysis by working groups Self-Study Steering Committee meetings regularly, reviewing and discussing key components of reports
January 2017 – February 2017	Steering Committee reads and edits portions of draft reports, returns reports to working groups with comments

February 1, 2017	Draft reports due to Steering Committee
February 2017	Convene Committee for Compliance Report
March – April 2017	Steering Committee collaborates with working groups to revise reports Feedback sought from students, faculty, staff and BOT
April 2017	Compilation of first Self-Study draft report
May 2017 – September 2017	Community Review of final Self-Study draft report Full report presented to all constituencies for further comment
September 2017	Further revisions to Self-Study report
September 2017	Self-Study report submitted to Chair of the Evaluation Team
September 2017	Report/Discussion with Board on Self-Study report
October/November 2017	Visit by Chair of Evaluation Team
November 2017 – January 2018	Final revisions to Self-Study Report; Board approval
December 12, 2017	Compliance Report submitted to Commission
February 2018	Final Self-Study Report mailed to MSCHE evaluators
March 2018	Visit by MSCHE Evaluation Team
June 2018	Commission action

## 8. Communication Plan

Objective	Audience	Methods	Timing
Update community about Self-Study process	Students	Special website Intro meeting and follow ups with Student Council	Fall '16 and ongoing Fall '16 and at least once per semester
	Alumni	Article in Alum magazine	Winter 2016
	Faculty	Special website Presentation to Council of Chairs  Numerous faculty on Steering Com and on working groups	Fall '16 and ongoing Spring '15 and once per semester throughout
	Board of Trustees (BOT)	Special website Presentations at BOT meetings Full BOT review of Mission Continuous updates at meetings of the Committee on Academic Affairs and Student Success (CAASS)	Fall '16 and ongoing At least one per semester Fall '16 Five times/year, '16-'17
	Admin/Staff	Special website Presentations to All-Staff meetings Numerous staff on Steering Com and on working groups	Fall '16 and ongoing Fall '16 and as needed
Gather feedback on Working Group reports	Students	Student Council reps to read selected sections and review conclusions and recommendations	Spring/summer 2017
	Alumni	No specific plan, but a number of alums are current staff members; one member of the Steering Committee is an alumna; one member of the CAASS (which will review all reports for BOT) is an alumna	Spring 2017
	Faculty	Faculty reps on all working groups and the Steering Committee Major conclusions and recommendations will be presented at Council of Chairs for feedback before final versions	Spring/summer 2017 Spring 2017
	BOT	Feedback from BOT reps on working groups and Steering Committee Conclusions and Recommendations reviewed by the CAASS	Spring/summer 2017 Spring/summer 2017
	Admin/Staff	Feedback from staff reps on working groups and Steering Committee Conclusions & Recommendations of relevant portions reviewed by InterStaff Committee	Spring/summer 2017 Spring/summer 2017

Objective	Audience	Methods	Timing
Gather feedback on the Self-Study draft	Students	Student Council reps to read and comment on selected sections. All-student questionnaire on conclusions and prioritizing suggested improvements	Fall 2017
	Alumni	Article in Alumni magazine outlining process, conclusions and suggested improvements, inviting commentary	Fall 2017
	Faculty	Presentation to Fac Council and Council of Chairs, followed by full faculty, with opportunity for feedback	Fall 2017
	BOT	Presentation of full draft to the CAASS for Committee commentary and approval, followed by presentation to full BOT	Fall 2017
	Admin/Staff	Presentations by Steering Committee at All-Staff meetings	Fall 2017

## 9. ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL SELF-STUDY REPORT

### Executive Summary

- Brief description of major findings and recommendations contained in the Self-Study

### Introduction

- A brief overview of the Self-Study process

### A chapter on each of the Standards of Accreditation

- Heading indicating the Standard covered by each chapter
- Content with format corresponding to the organization listed above under “Guidelines”

### Conclusion

- A summary of major conclusions reached, including strengths and challenges
- Recommendations for continuing improvement
- Appendix, including Documentation Roadmap

## 10. EDITORIAL STYLE AND FORMAT

The Chair and Co-Chairs of the Steering Committee will edit the final Self-Study. Reports of working groups should follow these guidelines:

- 11-point Calibri font, 1.5 spacing, one-inch margins
- Refer to Manhattan School of Music, MSM or the School
- Institutional titles capitalized (President, Dean, etc.)

## **11. PROFILE OF THE EVALUATION TEAM**

Manhattan School of Music offers a highly specialized education in a conservatory environment, and in many aspects of administrative organization the School is generally similar to the six other independent American conservatories. Typically the independent conservatories do not have faculty rank or tenure; they have large numbers of part-time faculty, in order to offer expert instruction on all instruments. These schools attract higher percentages of international students than typical colleges of similar size, and they generally offer several degrees at different levels. All these schools provide individual instruction to every student as a centerpiece of the education, and they all assess students on the basis of individual live performance.

Beyond the independent conservatories, the most similar institutions to MSM are schools of music embedded in colleges and universities. Many of these have curricula and modes of instruction similar to MSM's, but for faculty they are more likely to include some form of professorial rankings.

For MSM's Evaluation Team, it is important that several members of the group have experience in the specialized world of conservatory education. The School would like to see the following if possible:

- For team leader, a President, CAO, Provost or Dean from an independent conservatory or a school of music

Other executive members might include:

- A Dean of Students or other officer experienced in Student Affairs, ideally from a small, urban campus with both resident and non-resident students
- A CFO of a small, relatively tuition-dependent school
- A Dean of Enrollment or Dean of Admissions

Faculty members:

- Performance faculty from schools similar in level to MSM
- Academic faculty who teach in performance-based or arts-based institutions

**Some suggested schools from which team members might be drawn:**

New England Conservatory

Colburn School

Cleveland Institute of Music

San Francisco Conservatory

Peabody Institute (Johns Hopkins University)

Hartt School of Music (University of Hartford)

Eastman School of Music (University of Rochester)

Westminster Choir College (Rider University)

SUNY Purchase Conservatory of Music

Mason Gross School of the Arts (Music) (Rutgers University)