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Timeline: Where We Are Now: Spring and Summer, 2011

- May 4: Working Group Reports Round 2 Submitted and in Review
- May 13: Review by Robert Clark
- May 20: Working Group Reports Finalized and Placed on Self-Study Site
- Summer: RASC Prepares Near-Completion Final Report; Review by President
Time Line: Fall 2011-Spring 2012

• Fall 2011
  – Campus community reviews draft self-study report.
  – Evaluation Team Chair reviews draft self-study report.
  – Institution's governing board reviews draft self-study report.
  – Institution sends draft self-study report to evaluation Team Chair, prior to Chair's preliminary visit.
  – Team Chair makes preliminary visit at least four months prior to team visit.
  – Institution prepares final version of the self-study report.

• Spring 2012
  – Institution sends final report to evaluation team and to MSCHE at least six weeks prior to team visit.
  – Team visit
  – Team report
  – Institutional response

• Summer-Fall 2012
  – Committee on Evaluation Reports meets
  – Commission action
## Summary of Commission Actions

### Summary of Actions a Team May Take or Recommend to the Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the institution in compliance with the standards?</th>
<th>Then the team shares the following with the institution in the team report:</th>
<th>And the team may, at its option, provide this to the institution:</th>
<th>The team must recommend that the Commission take this action:</th>
<th>And the team may, at its option, recommend that the Commission take this action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the team’s confidential answer is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>The team must provide this to the institution:</td>
<td>And the team may, at its option, provide this to the institution:</td>
<td>The team must recommend that the Commission take this action:</td>
<td>And the team may, at its option, recommend that the Commission take this action:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Discuss significant accomplishments, progress or exemplary innovative practices;</td>
<td>2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement and/or make recommendations</td>
<td>To reaffirm accreditation</td>
<td>To commend the institution for progress and the quality of its self-study process and the quality of the self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Recommendation(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Discuss significant accomplishments, progress, or exemplary innovative practices;</td>
<td>2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement</td>
<td>To reaffirm accreditation and request that the Periodic Review Report, due June 1 [Year], address specific issues that need attention or emphasis.</td>
<td>To commend the institution for progress and the quality of its self-study process and the quality of the self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Recommendation(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                   | 1. Discuss significant accomplishments, progress, or exemplary innovative practices; | 2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement | To reaffirm accreditation and to request a progress report(s), dated [date], documenting... | 1. To request that the Periodic Review Report, due June 1 [Year], address specific issues that need attention or emphasis.  
2. To commend the institution for progress to date and the quality of its self-study process and the quality of the self-study |
|                                                   |                                                                                |                                                                |                                                             |                                                               |
|                                                   | Male Recommendation(s)                                                        |                                                                |                                                             |                                                               |
|                                                   | 1. Discuss significant accomplishments, progress, or exemplary innovative practices; | 2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement | To reaffirm accreditation and to request a monitoring report(s), dated [date], documenting... | 1. To request that the Periodic Review Report, due June 1 [Year], address specific issues that need attention or emphasis.  
2. A visit may follow submission of the monitoring report. (Note: This is optional, used if verification of institutional status and progress requires on-site review.)  
3. To commend the institution for progress to date and the quality of its self-study process and the quality of the self-study |
|                                                   |                                                                                |                                                                |                                                             |                                                               |
|                                                   | Male Requirement(s)                                                           |                                                                |                                                             |                                                               |
|                                                   | 1. Discuss significant accomplishments, progress, or exemplary innovative practices; | 2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement | To warn the institution that its accreditation may be jeopardized and to request a monitoring report(s), dated [date], documenting... | To direct a prompt staff visit to discuss Commission expectations. |
|                                                   |                                                                                |                                                                |                                                             |                                                               |
|                                                   | Identity Areas of Insufficient Information                                     |                                                                |                                                             |                                                               |
|                                                   | 1. Discuss significant accomplishments, progress, or exemplary innovative practices; | 2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement | To postpone a decision on accreditation, and to request a supplemental information report, dated [date], documenting... | 1. A visit may follow submission of the supplemental information report. (Note: This is optional, used if verification of institutional status and progress requires on-site review.)  
2. To direct a prompt staff visit to discuss Commission expectations. |

---

**NJIT**  
New Jersey's Science & Technology University  
**The Edge In Knowledge**
Self-Study Design Model and Steering Group Model
Working Group and Communication Models
Tour of Working Group Report
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**12.0 WORKING GROUP ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST FOR STANDARD 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTS OF GENERAL EDUCATION</th>
<th>TEAM EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>Emerging Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Curriculum and Instructional Design</td>
<td>New Jersey Institution Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Assessments and Outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Resources and Support</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**NJIT ViSTa Process**

**VISION:** The desired future for the recommendation

**STRATEGY:** The methodology recommended to achieve the vision

**TACTIC:** The specific action recommended to implement the strategy

**ASSESSMENT:** The metric recommended to measure achievement of the vision

---

**NJIT New Jersey Science & Technology University**

**THE EDGE IN KNOWLEDGE**
Conclusions: The Road Ahead

- A documentary process
- A generative process