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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“At Cazenovia, you will find the best of everything an undergraduate college has to offer. Students become part of an intellectual journey, one in which the Cazenovia College experience takes them farther than they ever dreamed of going.”

President Mark Tierno

BACKGROUND

Cazenovia College was first accredited in 1961 and reaffirmed its accreditation in summer 2003 and again in summer 2008 with the periodic review process. At the time of the last self-study process in 2002-03, the College was recovering from administrative transition and budget challenges. To aid in that recovery, the College chose to create a five-year strategic plan as a self-study special topic. Adding to the challenge of aligning the accreditation standards with strategic plan goals/objectives, the College was one of the first Middle States’ institutions to approach a self-study utilizing the newly revised Characteristics of Excellence. The Commission acted to require a Monitoring Report to follow up on several recommendations by the evaluation team related to financial matters and assessment. That report was accepted by the Middle States Commission without a campus visit in November 2005.

Throughout the 2006-07 year and into fall 2007, College constituents met regularly to create the current 2007-2012 Strategic Plan (now extended to fall 2013). That significant planning effort involved over 90 participants contributing through membership on workgroups and committees, document review, and advisory functions. The rest of the campus community participated by reviewing draft plans and attending forums. Materials that were generated as a result of the year-long strategic planning effort were utilized to develop the Periodic Review Report (PRR), which was submitted to the Commission in June 2008. The Commission subsequently re-affirmed the College’s accreditation status.

Over the past decade, a great deal of work has been accomplished by campus constituents to build operations, improve the College’s financial position, establish fair and equitable policies, embed assessment practices into everyday activities, and implement change based on data analysis and evidence. The past four years have presented economic challenges that the College and its constituents continue to face; however, one of the goals of this current self-study was to fully understand the impact of the economic downturn and develop a perspective about related implications for the future. We believe we have accomplished that goal as we continue our work toward a new, well-informed strategic plan.

RESULTS

Mission and Integrity

The College’s Mission, Vision, and Goals are interconnected and fairly characterize the education that students receive as well as the aspirations the institution has for itself and its constituents. Multiple constituency groups considered the language in the Mission Statement
throughout the self-study and as a first step to create the next strategic plan. While essentially relevant, most groups suggested minor language changes to strengthen the ties to marketing and recruiting efforts and to acknowledge the central role of the ten All-College Competencies. The Self Study Steering Committee has been tasked with creating the next strategic plan. A minor edit of the Mission Statement will be recommended along with new goals for the institution. A basic assumption for the Mission and goals is that they will be integrated with one another and with student learning goals, and that they will be assessable in a direct and clear manner.

Cazenovia College includes Integrity as one of its core values. Policies, handbooks, and manuals exist to guide students, faculty, and staff in carrying out day-to-day business. The College strives to administer policies in a fair and impartial manner to address complaints, grievances, and infractions. The College provides required information to its constituents and the public through the Web, internal communications, and printed materials. Suggestions for improvement include adhering to timetables for routine handbook and policy review/revisions and improving accessibility of consumer information as required by the U.S. Department of Education.

Planning and Resources

Over the past ten years, the institution has made substantial progress in the areas of strategic growth and realizing short and long-term goals. The planning process, grounded in assessment and accountability, is designed to foster a culture of trust and confidence about the future of the College. College governance has improved significantly in terms of participation and collaboration since the last self-study, in large part stemming from an improved culture of planning and assessment. The improvements in the strategic planning process have allowed for a more informed resource allocation process. While divisional and unit planning processes can be described as participatory, collaborative, and transparent, there is opportunity for further transparency in the budget and resource allocation processes. The College should utilize the governance system, as it was designed, to help identify and establish the priorities for reinstating resources as enrollment and other funding targets are met or exceeded. In the process of creating a new strategic plan, strategies to integrate the strategic plan, the assessment plan(s), the resource allocation process, and annual reporting should be identified. Details about planning and institutional resources are included in Chapter 2.

Governing Board and Administration

Cazenovia College incorporates a structure of governance with a governing body (Trustees) as the legal authority of the College, empowered to set institutional policies, grant degrees, and operate the institution, and a President who encourages active participation by campus constituents in the teaching and learning mission of the College via a shared governance system. Both the governing board and the system of shared governance are reviewed every three years with changes implemented as a result. The shared governance system includes representation from all internal constituencies (administrators, staff, faculty, and students), and places the work of the College in the hands of the people directly responsible. The College administration, particularly the President, relies on the governance process to advise and inform decision-making. Staff members play a vital role in the success of the College through administrative support, service on governance councils and committees, project management, and student
support. A great deal of attention has been paid over the past decade to establishing sound administrative policies and procedures in order to operate the College within its stated mission.

A number of economic influences have resulted in a reduction of certain resources—staffing, compensation toward retirement, supplies, etc.—which has affected the ways in which employees accomplish their work. As a result of the self-study process, it is evident that the administration, working through the governance system and existing resource allocation processes, will need to focus on staffing needs as part of the process to establish priorities for reinstating resources once funding and enrollment targets are met. Governance and administration are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

Admissions and Retention

The challenge in meeting enrollment targets since fall 2009 has caused the College to rethink its strategies, considering the actions of other institutions vying for the same quality students. The financial aid support being offered by competing institutions has driven the discount rate up significantly. Lowered enrollment and increased discounting has resulted in a double-faceted budget challenge. The College’s revised recruiting strategies are primarily focused on increasing the number of students who apply to the College and subsequently enroll. New marketing efforts, a redesign of the website, technology enhancements (SMART Approach, Zinch, etc.), staffing, market analysis, financial aid, and the use of external resources have already been implemented. Other initiatives include faculty networking with colleagues at other institutions, sending personalized letters to high school guidance counselors acknowledging their graduates who were named to the Dean’s List, increasing engagement with community colleges, and expanding and rebalancing the geographic areas of recruiting.

With a renewed focus on recruiting, the incoming student populations for fall 2011 and 2012 rebounded from 306 in fall 2010 to 332 each of the two subsequent years (including 7 readmits). The total number of applications has increased steadily since 2007, growing from 2,123 to 2,607 in fall 2012. Nonetheless, the impact of the small fall 2010 freshmen cohort (both in terms of recruiting and retention) will be felt through spring 2014 when that cohort graduates. Enhancing efforts designed to improve strategies to recruit students who are an appropriate match for the College will result in higher retention.

Overall, the College has succeeded in implementing a number of enrollment strategies that represent appropriate responses to the altered economic and market landscapes. Expanding the realm of communication about recruiting and retention efforts has resulted in a better understanding of the role each constituency group can play toward reaching institutional goals. With a concentrated effort on recruiting students who are matched to the institution, effectively managing the discount rates, and engaging all constituents in retention efforts, the College expects to achieve optimal enrollment within two years. Details about admissions and retention are included in Chapter 4 with additional information about retention efforts throughout the Report.
Student Support Services

In support of its mission to “provide for an individualized educational experience that balances academic and student life,” Cazenovia College offers an array of student support services designed to help students remain enrolled and succeed in their academic pursuit while experiencing intellectual, social and ethical growth. Over the past ten years, the institution has made a commitment to developing, enhancing and balancing academic, student life and collaborative programs and initiatives to ensure student success that balances academic and student life. During the next several years, recruitment and retention will remain a challenge and focus for the College. Student support services help students develop the knowledge and skills necessary for success in the classroom, workplace, and community and are vital to all aspects of enrollment management. The focus needs to remain on initiating meaningful collaborations with academic colleagues, staff, students, and community partners who serve students through the creation and offering of structured, integrated and purposeful opportunities. The current strategic planning process should identify strategies to enhance the living and learning environment, with a particular focus on first-year retention and the needs of the transfer and commuter student populations. Chapter 5 includes details about the College’s student support services.

Faculty

Faculty members are well qualified to deliver curricula within Cazenovia College’s stated Mission and play a vital role in achieving the institutional goal of creating “a community of learning that is uncompromisingly excellent.” Faculty members are active in shared governance and provide significant service to the College outside the classroom. The College, in turn, has supported the faculty through enhancements in development opportunities, steady increases in salaries, and a commitment to improving the instructional environment through, for example, enhanced technology and endowed funds and scholarships under the Capital Campaign. Areas for improvement include increasing diversity, continuing the progression of salary levels in line with comparison benchmarks, evaluation and support of part-time faculty, and continuing support of faculty development. The Standard on Faculty is discussed in Chapter 6.

Educational Offerings

Educational offerings are congruent with the stated Mission with sufficient content, breadth and length, and with a current examination of the levels of rigor appropriate to the programs and degrees offered. Greater efficiency and clarity has been achieved within the curriculum following the comprehensive revision that took place in 2010. Programs that lead to a degree foster a coherent student learning experience with a synthesis of learning. Program goals are stated in terms of student learning outcomes, and periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of student learning outcomes and the utilization of evaluation results are the basis for improving student development and for enabling students to understand their own educational progress.

With respect to General Education, the College offers a program of sufficient scope to enhance students’ intellectual growth, and equivalent to at least 30 semester hours for baccalaureate programs where the skills and abilities developed in General Education are applied in the major or concentration, leading to an application of those skills and abilities within the major or
The General Education program incorporates study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives and assures that students are proficient in oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, and technological competency appropriate to the discipline. The achievement of such competencies is demonstrated within the institution’s overall plan for ongoing assessment of student learning, and assessment results are utilized for curricular improvement. General Education and educational offerings are discussed in Chapter 7.

In terms of related educational offerings, the College offers students an array of programs and support systems for development of basic skills. The College does not have a substantial offering of online coursework; however, it has expanded its operations at additional locations. As this expansion has occurred, less formal systems of assessment have developed, often involving regular review by the Office of Extended Learning, Division Chairs, and Program Directors. A specific written policy should be designed to reaffirm the assessments already in place, expand in areas of formal policy and integrate them into the overall institutional and student learning assessment system as the College enters into its upcoming revision of the institutional and student learning outcome plan(s). See Chapter 8 for further details.

Assessment

The College has worked diligently to develop an assessment culture of greater transparency and accessibility over the past decade. We have noted an institutional shift toward acknowledging and sharing data that indicate areas of needed improvement. As described in Chapters 9 and 10, the College has progressed steadily in assessment in four main areas:

1. Communication and sharing;
2. Variety of instruments and methods;
3. Comprehensiveness of analyses; and
4. Utilization of data to drive decision-making.

The continued improvements that are required in each area include:

1. Assuring that communications are systematic, timely, and accessible.
2. Eliminating duplication of efforts in the use of assessment tools and methods, honing in on the most useful and cost-effective methods.
3. Adding time-series reporting and disaggregation of data to analyses; Utilizing higher levels of technology for analysis and reporting.
4. Implementing technologic strategies to further promote assessment and user-friendly applications of the data.

The College will need to explore ways to provide assessment training and support to all constituents consistent with the expectations of accreditors and stakeholders. In order to succeed at sustainable assessment, the tools, methods, and documentation need to be efficient in terms of cost and time. Chapters 9 and 10 include specifics about the assessment efforts at the College.
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INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW AND SELF STUDY PROCESS

Institutional Overview

Cazenovia College is an independent, baccalaureate, coeducational college located in the historic village of Cazenovia, approximately twenty miles southeast of Syracuse, New York. Founded in 1824 as a Methodist seminary, the College was a pioneer in coeducation, welcoming both men and women from the beginning. Between 1904 and 1931 the institution served as a secondary school for young people in the area. Facing a declining enrollment during the 1940s, the Trustees decided to add a junior college. Opposing the addition of junior college courses, the Methodists withdrew church sponsorship in 1942. Local community leaders stepped in to form a new non-church-related board for Cazenovia Junior College.

When the College received accreditation in 1961 from the Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges, it dropped the designation “junior” and became Cazenovia College for Women. In 1974, community leaders once again stepped in to help the College successfully overcome a financial crisis. In 1982, the Trustees voted to return to coeducation, aiming for one-third male enrollment. In 1988, the New York State Board of Regents awarded Cazenovia the right to offer bachelor degrees.

In more recent years, Cazenovia College has seen persistent and meaningful change as it continues to establish itself as a leader in higher education. As an undergraduate baccalaureate college, Cazenovia has an opportunity to create educational experiences that are individualized for students, matching skill sets with available programs and co-curricular offerings. This individualized approach to the educational experience is what sets Cazenovia apart from others.

For nine years running, Cazenovia College has ranked among the top baccalaureate colleges in U.S. News & World Report’s Best Colleges publication. According to the 2013 edition of Best Colleges, Cazenovia is 20th among the top tier regional colleges in the North. In addition, Cazenovia College was listed in the magazine’s 2012 Top Ten Best Value regional colleges in the North.

Among other achievements, the College is featured on CollegesofDistinction.com, an online guide that takes a fresh look at colleges and universities appealing to students’ unique and varied interests. Based on the opinions of counselors, educators, and admissions professionals, Colleges of Distinction™ honors colleges excelling in key areas of educational quality. Cazenovia College was required to demonstrate excellence in the four distinctions: engaged students, great teaching, vibrant communities, and successful outcomes. Featured schools take a holistic approach to admissions, consistently excel in providing undergraduate education, and have a national reputation. (See http://www.collegesofdistinction.com/college-profiles/NY-new-york/205-cazenovia-college.html)

Throughout its long history, the College has been, and will continue to be, a community focused on learning, nourished by diversity, and strengthened by integrity. The central theme of student success in our most recent strategic planning cycle has guided our efforts toward accountability, excellence in teaching, and assessment of student learning outcomes. Members of the Cazenovia
College community jointly share in achieving recognition of Cazenovia as one of the nation’s leading independent colleges.

**Faculty and Academic Programs**

Cazenovia’s faculty is comprised of dedicated teacher-scholars who regularly share their expertise in ways that enrich the campus community as well as the community at large. There are 59 full-time and 64 part-time faculty members supporting the College as of fall 2012. Approximately 77% of full-time faculty members hold the doctorate or terminal degree in their academic area. The base teaching load for full-time faculty is seven courses during the academic year with load reductions for those teaching studio classes or courses with laboratory sections, and when administrative duties are assigned.

The College offers four degrees—Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Professional Studies. Four academic Divisions (Art and Design; Humanities and Natural Sciences; Social and Behavioral Sciences; Business and Management) house the College’s 33 baccalaureate degree programs, including concentrations and specializations within majors. Internships and other opportunities for experiential learning are an integral part of many of the College’s academic programs. Other academic opportunities include the All College Honors Program, The First Year Program, the First Year Summer College Program, and the Study Abroad Program. (See *Cazenovia College Catalog*.)

The General Education Program helps integrate the College curriculum and provides for a common educational experience. General Education requirements are based on a set of ten All College Competencies. General Education courses each address one or more of the Competencies. Beyond this, the Competencies are integrated into all degree programs. Required coursework in different majors fosters significant development beyond that found in the gateway requirements of the General Education Program for some competencies, which are particularly significant to the major.

The Office of Extended Learning offers courses for more than 225 nontraditional learners who work on their degrees principally in the evening and on weekends. The majority of these courses are offered at a number of instructional sites and five active additional locations with a sixth one recently approved. Beyond the baccalaureate offerings, six associate degree programs are offered only through Extended Learning. In addition, Extended Learning offers non-credit courses and professional seminars, and opportunities for developing employment-related skills.

The College maintains a Center for Teaching and Learning that offers a broad array of services to students as well as faculty. The Center’s staff is highly regarded in their support of a number of grant-funded programs that provide access to underserved populations of students. The Faculty Steering Committee on Teaching Development, and staff from the Center for Teaching and Learning, offer ongoing support in teaching pedagogy through discussions and workshops.

**Student Life**

The College has typically enrolled about 1,000 degree-seeking students with an average of 90% of the full-time students residing in campus housing. Residence halls have been constructed,
acquired through lease arrangements, or newly renovated to offer attractive options for on-campus living. The College’s Living Learning Communities constitute collaboration between Student Life and Academic Affairs to offer a holistic program including residential living options that enhance the First Year Seminar. Students study, socialize, live, and learn within a supported community of students interested in similar topic areas. Faculty participate in discussions and other events held in the residences.

In addition to residence life, the Division of Student Development includes judicial affairs, athletics, co-curricular education, fitness and wellness programs, health and counseling services, and interfaith programs. More than 55 clubs and organizations, as well as other programs and activities, are available to provide students with opportunities for personal growth and development. In keeping with the College’s mission to embrace student success, the division is focused on creating structured, integrated, and purposeful opportunities for students to be engaged in the life of the College.

**Campus** [See http://map.cazenovia.edu for virtual Campus Tour]

Cazenovia’s main campus is comprised of 35 buildings on a 24-acre site. Most major buildings and residence halls surround a centrally-located open quadrangle. All main campus facilities and Cazenovia village amenities are within comfortable walking distance from any point on campus. The College facilities include a library, health/counseling center, historic theater, new art and design facility, instructional and office buildings, and nine residential living options including single bedroom suites and apartments. South Campus, two blocks from the main quad, houses programs in Studio Art, Fashion Design, and Art Foundations courses. The campus sports complex, one block from the main quad, includes two gymnasiums, a fitness center, a dance studio, an indoor swimming pool, a racquetball court, an athletic training room, and newly upgraded outdoor playing fields and tennis courts. During fall 2011, a synthetic turf playing field was installed at the athletic complex as one of the primary projects included in the College’s first-ever, *Comprehensive Capital Campaign: Building Futures One at a Time.* [See The Campaign For Cazenovia College.](http://map.cazenovia.edu) Replacing the worn grass field with “all-season” synthetic turf was highly significant for the College and its students, and was noted by the visiting team in the prior self-study as an area for improvement. On September 29, 2012, the field was dedicated as Christakos Field. The celebration included launching the public phase of the Campaign. In addition to the main campus facilities, the College owns a 243-acre facility in the Town of Cazenovia, The Farm, which houses the Equine Education Center, a ROPES training course, and field sites for several academic disciplines.

**Cazenovia Community**

The beauty of the Village of Cazenovia is second to none. Located at the foot of Cazenovia Lake, the Village lies amid rolling hills, meadows, and woods. Settled in 1793, the community is primarily residential and retains much of the classic charm of its early days, with handsome old homes and tree-lined streets. Syracuse is the closest major urban center, but New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, Toronto and other cities are readily accessible from Cazenovia.
Budget and Finance

The College is primarily tuition-driven, operating on a budget of approximately $23.78 million. Salary and benefits represent about 60% of the operating budget. Capital improvements are funded through annual allocations approved by the Trustees. As of fall 2012, the endowment was valued at about $26.4 million. The College is committed to raising funds through its Comprehensive Capital Campaign ($10 million), the Annual Fund, and other project-related fundraising activities. Five initiatives included in the Campaign are upgrading the athletic field to synthetic turf; expanding South Campus for the Studio Art programs; upgrading science labs; adding endowed scholarships and academic support; and providing increased funding for annual operations. As of November 2012, $6,447,712 had been raised and one project completed.

Reporting Relationships

The President serves at the pleasure of 27 trustees (up to 36 are provided for in the By-laws), many of whom reside in Central New York. Of the 27 trustees, 10 are alumni of the College. The full Board and its standing committees meet three times a year with 3-4 additional meetings a year of the Executive Committee and the Finance Committee. The Board committees are chaired by individuals who have achieved competence in particular areas of administration, business, fund-raising, planning and development. Working on recommendations from the College’s administration and the councils and committees comprising the formal shared governance system, the Board has the ultimate fiduciary responsibility for the College.

As the Chief Executive Officer, the President works closely with seven executive staff who oversee the administrative divisions of the College: the Executive Vice President, the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, the Vice President for Institutional Advancement, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty, the Associate Dean of the Faculty and Dean of the First-Year Program, the Vice President for Financial Affairs, and the Vice President for Student Development and Dean for Student Life. The College employs approximately 170 full-time and 77 part-time staff and administrators. They play an integral role in creating the entire educational experience. The governance and administrative organizational charts for the College are included in Appendix A.1

SELF STUDY PROCESS

Focus and Goals of the Self Study

Aside from the obvious goal of achieving re-affirmation of accreditation in good standing, the College had several broad goals that it hoped to reach in the process of self-study. One of the goals was to fully understand the impact of the economic downturn and develop a perspective about related implications for the future. Given that the College felt the impact of economic circumstances for several years—which slowed progress toward goals—a sixth year was added to the current strategic plan so that the College could get closer to achieving goals set at the outset of the current plan. Throughout the 2011-12 year, we undertook our institutional self-study and during the 2012-13 year, we will utilize the study results to develop a new strategic
plan. Separating these two processes provided us with the distinct advantage of having a considerable amount of data generated by the self-study to better inform the strategic planning process. A steering committee is working to produce a draft of the new plan by spring 2013.

Second, it was important to have a thorough understanding of how our programs and services help students to attain their own goals and objectives. This involved a comprehensive review and analysis of all aspects of the educational experience from the recruiting process through graduation. For example, the College attempted to understand the consequences of the comprehensive curriculum revision undertaken in the spring and summer of 2010. At that time, the College engaged in a systematic review of all academic programs on campus. The General Education Assessment Committee recommended revisions to the General Education Program to further ensure that it provided a common curricular experience that was tied to the All-College Competencies, grounded in Liberal Arts and Sciences, and consistent with the New York State Education Department’s (NYSED) standards as well as broader accreditation criteria. Subsequently, all academic programs (majors) were revised to incorporate the revised General Education Program and conform to new institutional standards for program size. With the revisions in place, our Self Study was a meaningful tool to begin to identify the effects of those changes on our students’ educational experience. [Further details are provided in Chapter 7.]

Our third goal for the Self Study was to confirm that the practices of assessment and planning, established over the past decade, were indeed systematic, sustainable, and useful. Establishing routine assessment in every area on campus has been a major strategic action item since the last self-study in 2001-03. All divisions and departments at the College are involved in assessment activities. We believe that leadership, planning, and communication strategies are in place to support sustained assessment practices. A number of key measures provide us with valuable data on the student experience, the teaching and learning environment, and the overall health of the College. The self-study process was an opportunity to examine the various pieces of the assessment system, identify improvements in our assessment practices, and ensure that a continuous cycle of quality improvement was and is in place. The Committee on Institutional Assessment is in process of reviewing the College’s Assessment Plans and will incorporate the findings from the self-study process to draft new plans by spring 2013.

Finally, by engaging as many constituents as possible in the self-study process, we hoped to strengthen the sense of collaboration and community within the College family. All the College’s constituents have consistently strived to achieve the overall goal of improving the College’s reputation and this process of self-study intended to enhance that effort. The open and inclusive process of self-study included all constituencies at the College and resulted in healthy dialogue about the challenging environment and institutional strengths and weaknesses. It also served to improve communication about routine operations and the upcoming planning cycle.

**Process**

The current self-study process began in fall 2010 when the President invited the Board of Trustees to be an integral part of the self-study. A fully representative Self Study Steering Committee (SSSC) was appointed and began its work in spring 2011. In addition, representative Workgroups were formed resulting in 65 people engaging directly in the work of self-study.
Meanwhile, Councils within the governance system, the senior staff, and the Board of Trustees engaged in discussions about the Mission and Vision Statements. The Middle States staff liaison visit took place September 13, 2011 and our process, model, and goals were confirmed. The Self Study Design document was approved in October.

Extensive work of the SSSC and Workgroups continued throughout the academic year and into fall 2012. Drafts of the Self Study Report and related documents were shared with the campus community and a final draft was submitted to the Team Chair in advance of his preliminary visit on October 10-11, 2012. The Team Chair met with many constituents during his visit and confirmed that the campus was indeed prepared for its evaluation visit in March 2013.

Cazenovia College chose to conduct a comprehensive self-study grouping the standards according to programmatic and operational areas of focus. Conducting a comprehensive review with this approach provided us with a different perspective than the annual review process of the past ten years. The annual reviews of the strategic plans have essentially comprised an assessment of the College by divisions and departments with only modest interdisciplinary collaboration in the process. We believe this “departmentalized” approach may not facilitate a complete understanding of the interconnected nature of our work and the necessary strategies to succeed as an institution at higher levels. The manner in which we conducted our self-study provided us with valuable information about how to organize our upcoming strategic plan and related annual review process.
MISSION, GOALS, AND INTEGRITY (Standards 1 and 6)

In the early stages of planning the Self Study, the Steering Committee recognized that the Mission and Goals of the College formed the foundation for the work of all areas of the College, and were the starting point for the work of all of the other Workgroups. Similarly, Integrity is not guaranteed by the actions of any particular area of the College, any office, or individual. Rather it is a characteristic of the processes, procedures, and decisions of the institution taken as a whole. Therefore, it was decided that the Steering Committee would charge itself with the coordination and execution of an examination of the College’s commitment to its Mission, and the Integrity with which it acts upon that commitment. To that end, it posed a series of pointed questions for itself and asked each of the eight Workgroups to consider them in their own research and analyses.

Introduction to Mission and Goals

The current Mission and Vision Statements were adopted in 2006 as the first step in creating the five-year Strategic Plan 2007-2012. The Statements served as the foundation for the Plan, which has been highly utilized by all divisions across the College and is now extended to a sixth year. Committees and constituency groups have been engaged in assessing these Statements for their relevance and utility in goal setting for the next strategic plan.

Mission (as approved October 2006)

Founded in 1824, Cazenovia College is a small, independent, coeducational college offering baccalaureate programs in the liberal arts and professional studies. Embracing student success as its primary mission, the College comprises a diverse yet close-knit residential community that fosters intellectual, social, and ethical growth. Our experiential and co-curricular learning opportunities and dedicated team of faculty and staff provide for an individualized educational experience that balances academic and student life. Graduates of Cazenovia College possess the knowledge and skills necessary to become informed and successful participants in the global community.

Vision (as approved October 2006)

All members of the Cazenovia College community will jointly share in achieving recognition of Cazenovia as one of the nation’s leading independent colleges. The cultural, intellectual, and physical environments of the College; its academic and student life programs; athletic and co-curricular successes; and opportunities developed through its alumni network will form the foundation of an uncommon, uncompromisingly excellent education.

Graduates of Cazenovia College will be empowered by an innovative combination of liberal and professional education. By connecting theory with insights gained from practice, they will be able to solve concrete problems in the world around them. Our alumni will possess the high-level abilities—analytical, communicative, practical, and ethical—required for active, responsible participation in both public and private life. With skills that are transferable from
discipline to discipline, career to career, and one environment to another, Cazenovia College graduates will possess the abilities to work in their chosen fields as well as fields not yet imagined.

Cazenovia College will create a community of learning that meets the highest expectations. The College will, as a result, be positioned to continue its long tradition of making an active, ongoing contribution to the intellectual and economic success of a diverse democracy in an increasingly interconnected world.

CONTEXT

Cazenovia College’s current Mission and Vision Statements evolved from versions adopted in 2001-02, each case as the first step in a strategic planning process. Constituents determined that the new strategic plans would be built upon a primary theme of student success with emphasis on building competencies that would be required for participation in a global community. The Mission and Vision Statements, then, served as an appropriate foundation.

Although the College’s Mission Statement has been revised several times in the past decade or so, the core educational mission of Cazenovia College has remained consistent. What remains true is our small size, our educational offerings blending the liberal arts with professional studies, the integration of co-curricular programming toward building competencies, and our commitment to an individualized educational experience. Elements of each characteristic are evident in the current and past statements.

The Vision Statement is intended to articulate specific, goal-oriented outcomes for the institution and its graduates and, for practical purposes, to provide language that would be relevant for future iterations of the Mission Statement. As determined during the 2005-06 strategic planning process, the College succeeded in achieving a number of elements articulated in the 2001-02 Vision Statement, most of which were integrally linked to the 2002-2007 Strategic Plan. As intended, content from that Vision Statement was subsequently incorporated into the 2006 Mission Statement including the commitment to teaching within a professional studies curriculum grounded in the liberal arts, highlighting the dedication of faculty and staff, and emphasizing our co-curricular contributions to competency building.

The College prominently displays its current Mission and Vision Statements on the first page of the College Catalog with the Mission Statement forming the core of the “About Cazenovia” page on the College’s website. In addition to outcome and goal-oriented language in the Mission and Vision Statements, the College lists Student Learning Goals in the Catalog as well as General Education requirements (listed as four goals). The Student Learning Goals state “Students at Cazenovia College become educated, involved, and productive citizens, well-prepared to act as leaders in the global community. Through the general education curriculum, professionally-oriented and liberal arts curricula; experiential, co-curricular and extracurricular programs; and residential life experiences, they experience intellectual, social and ethical growth, developing the knowledge and skills necessary for success in the classroom, the workplace, and the community.” These goals flow directly from the Mission Statement.
Also stated in the Catalog are the General Education goals, which are fourfold:

1. To help students develop the knowledge and skills necessary for success in the classroom;
2. To promote a common curricular experience while emphasizing the interrelatedness of liberal and professional education;
3. To prepare students to become lifelong learners in both their professional and personal lives; and
4. To develop leadership abilities that allow students to become successful members of the College and ultimately the global community.

Cazenovia College has four overarching Institutional Goals that flow from the Mission and Vision and serve as the foundation for the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan (as was true for the previous five-year Plan). Those Goals are as follows.

1. Be recognized as one of the nation’s leading independent small colleges by actualizing the College’s Vision Statement.
2. Create a community of learning that is uncompromisingly excellent.
3. Improve students’ overall success.
4. Improve institutional efficiency through good stewardship.

In the current Plan (as well as the previous one), Institutional Objectives flow from the four Goals and Performance Indicators are specified. Each major administrative division of the College (and many departments and programs) has increasingly specific Initiatives and Actions tied directly to the institutional Goals and Objectives. Each area has identified Performance Indicators that include targets for the duration of the planning cycle. At the close of each year, the Annual Report on the Strategic Plan is compiled with information from divisions, programs, and departments thus constituting an assessment of the institution’s progress toward meeting Goals and Objectives. Additional descriptions related to the Mission, Goals, and Strategic Plan as they relate to specific areas of the College are included throughout this Self Study Report.

ANALYSIS

In past years, reviews of the Mission Statements have been conducted at key points—as the first step in a strategic planning process and for activities associated with institutional accreditation. The Council on Long Range Planning has as one if its responsibilities to make recommendations that inform accreditation and strategic planning and to recommend long-range goals and objectives for the institution. The first step in the formal process of strategic planning is to examine the Mission Statement and determine if the College is meeting its stated Mission and whether that Statement continues to be relevant considering a number of factors. While the most recent direct reviews of the Mission—in spring/summer 2011 (Council on Long Range Planning and Senior Staff Retreat) and in winter 2012 (Self Study Steering Committee)—were undertaken for accreditation purposes, the information gathered provides a foundation for the strategic planning process to be completed in the 2012-13 academic year. Together with the indirect reviews occurring in the course of self-study by the various Workgroups, the Council on Long Range Planning and the Steering Committee will have meaningful information to consider in its contributions to creating the new strategic plan.
The discussion about the Mission by members of the Council on Long Range Planning in spring 2011 focused on several areas. First, it was important to know that constituents believed the College was delivering its educational programs consistent with the stated Mission. Second, the discussion centered on the relevance of the Statement in terms of competencies, the population served, and the words/terms used to describe programs and services. While members concluded that the College was staying true to its stated Mission, many expressed a need for updated language to reflect education-seeking trends (off-campus study, advanced technology, changing demographics, etc.) to the extent that such trends have dictated changes at the College. Another crucial finding by the Council was the need to match clearly defined measures to clearly defined words/phrases within the Mission Statement for future assessment. For example, defining what we mean by a “successful participant in the global community” will help us identify measures of direct and indirect assessment that provide clearly linked results.

In summer 2011, the President’s leadership team reviewed the Mission and Vision Statements within the same parameters as those considered by the Council on Long Range Planning. Similar comments were expressed about updating the language and seeking out clear assessment measures. In addition, the team expressed a desire for updated language that could be integrated into admissions recruiting efforts and marketing materials while remaining true to the core mission of a quality education. The result of that discussion was the suggestion that the Mission language be updated to possibly include reference to the College’s current marketing theme of Building Futures Since 1824, which subsequently served as the basis for the name of the fundraising campaign, Building Futures One at a Time: The Campaign for Cazenovia College.

As part of the assessment of the College’s Mission, the Self Study Steering Committee assumed responsibility for the inquiry for Standard 1: Mission and Goals and spearheaded the inclusion of targeted questions about the institution’s Mission and Goals in a recent survey of campus constituents. The Steering Committee generated a set of self-study questions for its inquiry that centered on context, the internal and external environments, populations served, constituent awareness, enrollment management, and the College’s role in advancing higher education. Many of the same findings were noted as in the paragraphs above, in particular the emphasis on using language that is readily defined and on identifying measures for assessing the Mission.

The Institutional Self Assessment Survey 2012 sought to document campus constituents’ awareness and understanding of the College’s Mission and Goals in the context of the Middle States requirements. In response to questions about the Mission and Vision Statements, 89% of respondents indicated that their own personal understanding of each was strong or adequate. Results were mixed regarding the public and students’ understanding of the Mission and Vision. Eighty-three percent agreed or strongly agreed that the Mission Statement was publicized and available to all College constituencies. As it has always been a point of pride on campus that students are the focal point in all the activities of the College, it is not surprising that 85% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that student success was the College’s primary mission.

Relative to key phrases in the Mission Statement, a range of 84% to 73% agreed or strongly agreed that the College fosters intellectual, social and ethical growth; provides an individualized educational experience that balances academic and student life; and has graduates that possess
the knowledge and skills necessary to become informed and successful participants in the global community.

Regarding the assessment aspect of the College’s Mission and Goals, a majority of respondents to the survey strongly agreed or agreed to five core elements. Respondents indicated that the Mission and Goals were 1) used by the College to evaluate its effectiveness; 2) used to develop and shape the College’s programs and practices; 3) developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body; 4) specific as to how the institution would fulfill its Mission; and 5) consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education. Further assessment of the Mission, Vision, and Goals in the context of divisions, departments, programs, and services offered at the College are included throughout this Report.

CONCLUSIONS

As the College enters into its next strategic planning cycle, information gathered in the process of self-study will inform the new plan, which begins in fall 2013. It is likely that the Mission Statement will remain consistent in its content with some minor changes in language to indicate changes in the areas specified previously. One suggestion made, resulting from the various reviews, was to incorporate some of the language in the current Vision Statement into the updated Mission. Another suggestion was for the College to consider organizing its next strategic plan around the criteria required to be a member of the Colleges of Distinction organization. A good deal of discussion and effort has already taken place to articulate how Cazenovia College meets those criteria. The organization’s four distinctions—Engaged Students, Great Teaching, Vibrant Community, and Successful Outcomes—are highly relevant to our Mission and the goals we have for our students and all those we serve.

Suggestion

- In the course of strategic planning, the College should establish clear links for the Mission Statement to the Strategic Plan, assessment plans, All-College Competencies, and resource allocation procedures.

INTEGRITY

CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS

The Statement of Core Values found on the first page of the College Catalog states, “Throughout its long history, Cazenovia College has been a community focused on learning, nourished by diversity, and strengthened by integrity. Our task is to preserve this tradition for future generations …” Our goal in this section of the self-study was to examine how well we were doing at preserving that integrity that strengthens us, and how well we were demonstrating our commitment to integrity to others. That integrity should be evident in clear and readily available written policies and procedures, accurate and complete communications to internal and external stakeholders, and a regular system of review through a shared system of governance.
Policies and Procedures

For the institution to act fairly and in compliance with ethical standards it is essential that the College have a clear set of policies, procedures, and publications. The administrative stability of the last ten years, which stands in sharp contrast to the disruptive administrative turnover described in the 2003 Self Study Report, has allowed the College to make great progress in formalizing, standardizing, and publicizing college procedures and policies. This progress is evident in the continuing development of the Employee Handbook, the Faculty Handbook, and the Student Handbook, each of which is readily available to members of the campus community.

Electronic copies of the current Employee and Faculty Handbooks are available to employees through the College’s SharePoint. Printed copies are also available. These documents contain clear statements of support for academic and intellectual freedom, and recent survey results indicate that there is little concern among the faculty, staff, and administration about the College commitment to those standards. A strong majority of respondents to the Institutional Self-Assessment Survey 2012 indicated that they understood the College policies in this area (81% agreed or strongly agreed) and believed that “[t]he College adheres to ethical standards in its policies and provides support for academic and intellectual freedom,” (75% agreed or strongly agreed). The Faculty Handbook contains policies for petitioning for redress of alleged infringements of academic freedom through the Faculty Grievance Committee, though no petitions have been brought forward in recent years. The Employee Handbook references the College’s Intellectual Property Policy and related procedures.

Policies for hiring, evaluation, and dismissal of employees are also articulated in the Employee Handbook, the Faculty Handbook, the Adjunct Handbook, and the Academic Affairs Policy Manual. Seventy percent of respondents to the Institutional Self-Assessment Survey 2012 indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that “[t]he College’s written employment policies are adequate and appropriate,” with 12% disagreeing and 4% strongly disagreeing. Similarly, 64% agreed/strongly agreed that “the systems used by the College for recruiting employees are adequate and appropriate,” though the percentage who were neutral/unsure rose to 25%. Improved policies and procedures for the annual evaluation of Faculty were implemented in 2009-10, and an improved system for awarding professional development funds was added in 2010-11. Similarly, the goal was to have consistent annual performance appraisal for all employees, though the completion rate has at times been less than desired. Additional information about hiring, development, and evaluation of faculty and staff as indicators of success are included in Chapters 3 and 6.

The Employee Handbook includes institutional policies on conflicts of interest, and the College amended its Bylaws in 2007 to include the Conflict of Interest Policy and Form for trustees, which they complete annually. College administrators also file such forms. Included in the Employee Handbook is the Anonymous Whistle Blower policy for reporting allegations of financial misconduct, including violations of the Conflict of Interest policy. The Whistle Blower Policy makes use of an anonymous disclosure service provided through a third-party service. Additional policies, once written and approved through the governance process, are distributed and slated for inclusion in updates of various handbooks and manuals.
Similarly, the Student Handbook is available to all students, prospective students, and members of the public through the College’s website. At the core of the Handbook is a Student Code of Conduct designed “to encourage an environment that is safe, healthy, and conducive to positive student development in and out of the classroom.” Included in the Handbook are policies on Alcohol, Anti-Harassment/Discrimination, Hate Crimes, Illegal Drugs, Sexual Assault, Smoking, and Weapons. Judicial policies are described as is the policy on Academic Dishonesty. There are many avenues available for students to express grievances. The Student Handbook contains a clearly stated formal complaint procedure. A grade appeal policy is listed separately on the College’s website (under Academics/Academic Policies), and is used both for on-campus classes and for classes delivered through Extended Learning.

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) governs the handling of all student records across campus. A form is available to allow students to release information to an individual. Records for Judicial Affairs, academics, health and counseling, disabilities, employment, career services, financial aid and admissions, student accounts, and others are secured, maintained, and retained according to regulations. Access is limited to those with a need to know. New employees receive policies on confidentiality with training provided. All parents are notified about how to access FERPA information at the beginning of the fall semester and new families in the spring semester. New students and parents are notified at summer orientations and information about FERPA is provided on the Registrar’s section of the College’s website and a link to information provided on the Parent Relations page.

Security of electronic databases is coordinated by the Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) Department, which does not directly release any student data to third parties (including parents). All access to CazNET, is password protected and a limited number of employees are authorized to access Datatel. Passwords for access to the network must be changed every 180 days. The main database is backed up every night and periodically replicated to tape. The replicated tapes are stored in the media vault. Retired disks and tapes are destroyed.

The College participates in a program for destruction of confidential documents through a contract with Cintas. There are bins on campus in the Business, Health Center, Financial Aid, Campus Services, Admissions, Joy Hall, and Human Resources Offices. The containers are locked and access is granted to Cintas and the Plant Operations Manager. Containers are emptied on an 8-week schedule with a Certificate of Destruction provided by Cintas at each visit.

The College adheres to MSCHE and NYSED guidelines for substantial programmatic or other material changes affecting the institution. Internal constituents are informed of the College’s role with MSCHE and NYSED through statements included on the website, the Catalog, the Intranet, meetings, and relevant printed publications.

Communication

New and constantly evolving technology has provided both opportunities and challenges in disseminating information and communicating with constituencies. The Datatel system has been in place for nearly a decade and a number of reporting programs have been developed to extract data from the system. For a time, the College utilized public folders in Outlook to post things
such as governance council minutes and other College documents. Today these can be found on SharePoint, the Intranet (CazNet), or on the College’s public website. The public folders and Outlook continue to be utilized for campus room scheduling. The College’s website has been redesigned several times, and will continue to evolve in future months and years with consideration as to the integration and functionality of the CazNet system.

The College’s website contains links to essential information about the College. This includes links to the usual historical information, “Fast Facts”, and institutional data within the IR webpages. Beyond this, one can find financial aid information, including a Net Price Calculator, and other compliance information such as that required for NCAA, Title IX, and Campus Safety and security, among a number of other things. The list of disclosures is summarized in a form on the IR webpage titled Directory of Consumer Information. There are plans to incorporate the directory information into the IR webpages with hyperlinks to related information.

As a cost saving measure, printed annual editions of the Academic Catalog were discontinued in favor of multi-year editions. Up-to-date editions of the Catalog are published on the College’s website. The sections of the Catalog are indexed and easily accessible through hyperlinks. Five prior Catalogs are also available online. Degree requirements are transferred into the degree audit system in Datatel. Requirements for prior years are archived in the system, so students can see their status using the requirements for any year since the year they first enrolled.

The College is committed to insuring that students are not adversely affected by changes to course requirements or course offerings. For example, after the College engaged in a significant revision of the General Education Program and all degree programs in 2008 (see Chapter 7) steps were taken to ensure that those changes would not negatively impact current students. Where substitutions were required, they followed the formal procedures for review of such proposed changes. The reviews required approval by the faculty advisor, Program Director, and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Where reasonable substitutions were not available, faculty offered Independent Study versions of the required courses.

**Governance Review**

Another point of stability is the system of shared governance. The College has been operating under the current system of shared governance since 2000. The governance structure is articulated in the Shared Governance Document (Appendix A.2). While the basic structure has remained the same, elements of the plan have been revised several times since 2000, most recently in 2011. The appropriate sections of the document are reviewed annually by individual Councils and in its entirety every three years by the Council on Long Range Planning. Regarding research integrity, the Faculty Council is charged with reviewing policies regarding the collection, protection, and dissemination of confidential human subject research data, and to monitor the operation of the Institutional Review Board.
CONCLUSIONS

Integrity is evident in clear and readily available written policies and procedures, transparent and accurate communications to internal and external stakeholders, and regular policy review through a shared system of governance. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment holds responsibility for generating, maintaining, reviewing, and releasing institutional data. Data integrity is assured through system checks and balances.

Privacy regulations are strictly adhered to with outside counsel sought in circumstances that are not straightforward or clear. All employees are advised about regulations regarding student, employment, and institutional records and how release of any information must be handled. Per policy, the Communications Office serves as the public voice for the College in most matters.

Suggestion

- As a compliance matter, the information currently included in the Directory of Consumer Information (http://www.cazenovia.edu/default.aspx?tabid=3165) should be integrated into a more readily-accessible and interactive web page within the College’s website.
CHAPTER 2

PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL
(Standard 2)
INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES (Standard 3)

The Workgroup assigned to study Standards 2 and 3 reviewed the condition and operational effectiveness of the College including policies, practices, and documents relating to its planning processes; financial condition; technology infrastructure; physical plant; budget processes, capital improvements/deferred maintenance; and sustainability of those practices. Members of the group evaluated the last five to ten years of business, finance, physical plant, and capital data using all available internal sources, as well as pertinent regional and national comparative data. Particular emphasis was placed on understanding the evaluation and communication aspects of the planning and budgeting processes as well as the interconnectedness of the various plans/processes to allocation, reallocation, and renewal as they affect constituents.

CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS

Strategic Planning Processes

The Strategic Plan helps ensure that the College’s operations are guided by realistic and widely understood goals. The Plan fosters stability and effectiveness for the entire institution—ensuring responsible resource development and allocation, successful operations, and efficient reaccreditation. The planning process, grounded in assessment and accountability, is designed to foster a culture of trust and confidence about the future of the College.

The strategic planning process is clear and well defined. It is a continuous process and an integral component of institutional renewal. The process is based on regular cycles of goal setting, budgeting, operations, and assessment, as described in the Planning Calendar, included in the Strategic Plan. The Calendar describes a schedule for planning at the departmental level, the budgeting cycle, governance membership, budget reviews, and planning retreats.

The process is indeed a campus-wide collaboration that engages trustees, administration, faculty, staff, and students. The governance system’s Council on Long Range Planning provides guidance and direction in the planning process by making recommendations that inform the College’s accreditation, strategic and budgeting processes, the academic calendar, and the governance structure. The College’s Vision Statement, revised in 2006, describes the collective manner in which the decision-making process begins at the institution: “All members of the Cazenovia College community will jointly share in achieving recognition of Cazenovia as one of the nation’s leading independent colleges.”

The Strategic Plan and Institutional Goals

The strategic planning process involves a strong commitment by all constituents of the College. The President continues his commitment to inclusivity in the process with all levels of administration, staff, and faculty participating to ensure the Mission and Vision of the College
are realized. The *Mission* and *Vision Statements*, Planning Assumptions, Planning Calendar, short and long-term Goals and Objectives are identified and discussed.

As noted in Chapter 1, the institution’s four Goals focus on the college experience for all students, as well as wider recognition of the institution’s success. Guiding objectives include striving for national recognition of academic programs, student-centered programs, and faculty, along with continuing improvement of facilities. Similar objectives were also included in the previous Plan, which emphasized improving the physical plant (following years of deferred maintenance), establishing sound policies and procedures, and building a culture of assessment. In order to help attract a better cadre of student, the current *Strategic Plan 2007-2013* was designed to build on the prior strategies, but emphasize student success while attaining the guiding objectives.

Divisions and departments within the College created Initiatives related to the Institutional Goals and Objectives. Each Initiative links specifically to Action items. Action, or tactical, plans identify core strategies for divisional, departmental, and programmatic planning. Constituents utilize action plans as guiding tools to assist with resource management and budgeting. Each Initiative, and related set of Action items, generally includes measures and performance indicators. Each division/department reports annually on the area’s progress toward institutional renewal. Striving to achieve the institutional Goals has resulted in national recognition of academic programs, student-centered programs, and faculty, as well as continued improvements in grounds, facilities, and the infrastructure.

Utilizing the College’s governance system to carry out the planning process should ensure that effective and efficient communication takes place. The Council on Long Range Planning generally holds responsibility for recommending a planning process and framework. Council members participate in the development of strategic plans. In 2002, the planning process was concurrent with the self-study process, so the planning and self-study committees proceeded as one, achieving both efficiency and regular campus-wide communication as a result. Aside from assessing Mission and Vision Statements early in the process, planning committees established a set of assumptions to be discussed widely. Some assumptions lend themselves to straightforward validation, such as “The residential population will continue to exceed 80%”; while others may require more comprehensive assessment methods to determine if they remain reasonable assumptions throughout the cycle.

In some cases, the language used for assumptions, as well as Institutional Goals/Objectives and Divisional Initiatives/Actions, makes them challenging to measure. For example, in the current *Strategic Plan*, Goal Two is to “Create a community of learning that is uncompromisingly excellent.” A related Objective is “Create an atmosphere of learning beyond the classroom.” Both the Goal and the Objective create challenges in measuring and assessing the extent to which the institution is achieving them. If goals and/or objectives are vague, it may be unclear how they link directly to day-to-day operations and resource allocation, resulting in a lack of understanding as to how a particular area or program helps the College to achieve its goals.

Both institutional and divisional/departmental plans are reviewed and renewed on an annual basis. Reports on all levels of performance are compiled, reviewed at the institutional,
divisional, and departmental levels, and made available to the entire college community as the Annual Report on the Strategic Plan. These reports, together with input from the Council on Long Range Planning, inform adjustments to the various strategic plans. At the institutional level, each new strategic plan, and generally each annual update, is presented to the Council on Long Range Planning. The Plan is presented, in accordance with the governance process, as a recommendation to the President before passing to the full Board of Trustees for final approval.

**Strategic Planning, Budgeting Process, and Resource Allocation**

As the planning cycle proceeds, it includes the institution’s budget development and assessment cycles. Divisional and departmental plans are developed with consideration of previous and projected budgets, and used as a tool for requesting budgetary changes. The Strategic Plan incorporates resource allocation in the context of strategic initiatives, which generally represent changes to the existing Operating and/or Capital Budgets.

The Council on Long Range Planning and the Vice President for Financial Affairs/Chief Financial Officer (CFO) play a significant role in connecting the strategic planning and resource allocation processes. This is well evidenced in governance and institutional documents (examples assembled in the Self Study Resource collection). Other campus-wide committees and councils, such as the Academic Cabinet, the Council on Enrollment Management, and the Council on Employee Welfare, are examples of representative groups that also contribute to the advisement process as to how resource allocation may occur. The institution’s senior administrators exercise their authority in this area by reviewing information from constituents, governance councils/committees, and assessment outcomes. Prudent decision making regarding resource allocation can assist in the linkage of the institution’s strategies within all areas of the College for future growth and development.

Effective renewal requires significant attention be given to annual operating and capital budgets. The CFO gathers input for the budgets from each division and prepares a draft budget based on the information received, along with historical data and any other pertinent information that has been given for the preparation. The President reviews the various budgets before they are presented to the Finance Committee of the Board for further analysis and review. Once thoroughly reviewed, a final draft is presented to the Board of Trustees at the May meeting for approval. Between May and September, operating budget adjustments may occur based on enrollment data. If significant alterations are necessary, a revised budget is presented to the Board of Trustees at the fall meeting. The processes are documented in detail in the College Bylaws and the Strategic Budgeting Document (Appendix B.1).

The institution is 85% dependent on student tuition, room, board, and fees as its primary source of revenue, as can be evidenced in the financial documents of the College including the annual audited financial statements and monthly budget documents. The revenue targets are established based on input from the Enrollment Management Division. The costs for attendance and financial assumptions, upon which the budgets are based, are authorized over a year in advance by the Board of Trustees (tuition, fees, room, board, endowment drawdown, etc.). Once approved, the multi-year Operating and Capital Budgets (Appendix B.2) are shared with the Council on Long Range Planning. The role of the Council, with input from constituents, is to
recommend priorities for the use of funds both in terms of savings as needed and restoration of initiatives if enrollment targets are exceeded.

College-wide budget-to-actual reports are distributed on a monthly basis to vice presidents. Budget managers each have continuous access to real-time budget information for their areas through the College’s Our Budget system derived from the Enterprise Resource Planning system (ERP) in Datatel. Effectiveness of resource allocation depends on successful management of the budget-to-actual on an ongoing basis within each department.

While divisional and departmental planning processes can be described as participatory, collaborative, and transparent, there may be opportunity for further transparency in the budget process that exists in relation to the ongoing planning process. Although the Strategic Plan and other planning documents are acknowledged and used throughout the community with evidence linking them to resource allocation for initiatives, it can be difficult for those not directly involved in the institutional budgeting process to see how operational planning is related to resource allocation, and more specifically resource reallocation. Institutional guiding documents do not describe or report on the links between the final budget, the Strategic Plan, and operating resource allocation, with the exception of sporadic divisional results on operational budgeting that may appear in the Annual Report on the Strategic Plan. Two changes that may help with transparency are 1) preparing a strategic plan based on a three-year cycle rather than five years, allowing for decision making aligned with the three-year budgets and responsive to internal and external forces that significantly alter future directions; and 2) developing a reporting system to account for routine operations as they relate to resource allocation and reallocation.

As a result of several years of economic upheaval, environmental scanning is required on a frequent basis in order to validate planning assumptions, establish yearly action items, and reset performance indicators. Adjustments to the Strategic Plan may occur for unanticipated internal successes as well as external factors that cause significant disruption to plans, such as the recent economic recession. The following are examples of unanticipated changes, both welcomed and unwelcomed, in the course of a planning cycle.

During the academic year 2007-08, the Board of Trustees approved a budget for 2008-09 based on a fall opening enrollment assumption of 966. The actual enrollment for fall 2008 was 976 full-time students (an unanticipated internal success), representing a growth of 200 students since fall 2002 (see Enrollment Chart p.44). Based on this outcome and other historical, financial, and institutional data, the Board approved a budget for 2009-10 based on an enrollment projection of 993 full-time students. Although some indicators of economic downturn were already evident, the enrollment picture continued to appear healthy. Working from an informed assumption of enrollment as high as 1,017 for 2010-11 and a projected all-in discount rate of 36%, the President continued to explore options to increase and enhance campus life options for students. Having already added several attractive housing options, he took the opportunity to rent space (a fully equipped restaurant) in a complex where the College already had several long-term lease commitments for student housing, the bookstore operation, and the Copy Shop. The intent was to provide (along with public use) an additional dining venue for students because the existing Dining Hall capacity was 305 seated and overcrowding was noted at popular dining times when the enrollment was at 976. In April 2009, the campus community was informed about the new
lease arrangement where students could utilize a feature called Dining Dollars added to their normal meal plans.

In the midst of the unfolding economic recession that followed in spring 2009, the actual enrollment for fall 2009 was 966 with a comprehensive discount rate of 37.58%. The numbers reflected 27 fewer students than projected and a discount rate that was 1.58% higher than anticipated. The budgetary impact of this was a shortfall of approximately $600,000 for the enrollment shortage and $512,000 for the variance in the discount rate, which meant the budget needed to be adjusted by $1,112,000 for the 2009-10 fiscal year. Many budget line-item reductions were made, including one where the Board of Trustees directed a 4% overall reduction in the College’s contribution to employees’ retirement plans for 2009-10, pay increases were deferred, and a number of open positions were left vacant.

Immediate and intermediate budgetary adjustments were made over the fall 2009 and spring 2010 semesters; however, the Board of Trustees determined more significant and sustainable adjustments had to be made to avoid facing a difficult budget situation for 2010-11 in the event of another enrollment shortfall. These adjustments included position eliminations and restructures, a continued reduction of the employer contributions to TIAA CREF, pay freezes, a reduction in all discretionary expenses, and an increased withdrawal percentage from the endowment earnings. The Board also determined that the restaurant operation was not viable for the College and directed that the operation close and other uses for the leased space be researched. The budgetary impact from the restaurant’s operational loss did not directly affect the Operating Budget of the College, nor did it have any attachment to the cuts in the items mentioned above for the year that it was incurred. There was a one-time draw from investment earnings to cover the losses, which is documented in the Board of Trustee minutes. Fortunately, the College was able to attract a local restaurateur to sublease the space, helping to offset the expense related to the long-term lease commitment that was made. Also fortunate, was the subtenant’s willingness to incorporate the students’ Dining Dollars program into his business.

Although these plan adjustments were a difficult and unwelcomed undertaking, the Board of Trustees and campus community were able to accomplish the necessary adjustments so the College would remain a viable operation through uncertain times. As it turns out, the actions taken during the 2009-10 year were worthwhile measures because the fall 2010 enrollment dropped further to 955 and the comprehensive discount rose to 39.48%. The recruiting environment remained particularly challenging with the financial pressures that students and families were facing, and additional scholarship dollars needed to be offered to continue to attract quality students. The increased discount rate alone created a 2010-11 budget impact of $680,000, which once again required further reductions to arrive at a viable budget level. It should be noted that there were significant efforts and achievements made to address the internal and external challenges described above.

As evidenced, the College’s financial resources are heavily dependent on student enrollment. Fall attendance has decreased by 6% over the past three years. As the College progresses through the next few years, financial matters will need continuous monitoring focusing on new fall full-time student enrollment, as well as the growing need to provide financial aid for prospective students. Although new student recruiting held steady at 332, the fall 2012 full-time
student count of 884 was less than our revised plan. The lower enrollment combined with a higher tuition discount rate, contributed to an estimated revenue shortfall of approximately $860,000 for 2012-13. This operating deficit was discussed at length by the full Board of Trustees and the board’s Finance Committee. The Trustees, at their October Board meeting, unanimously agreed to cover the operating deficit for 2012-13 by utilizing the College’s line of credit borrowing and acknowledging that the 2013-14 fiscal year will present a similar situation as the Fall 2010 cohort is now approximately 60 students below the typical junior class enrollment, as noted in Figure 1. Our model of full-time student attendance indicates that the College will return to an attendance level above 950 students for the 2014-15 fiscal year. [See Chapter 4 for details about recent recruiting and enrollment strategies.]

Figure 1: Enrollment by Class Standing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Standing and Enrollment</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Students Average = 326</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 2009, 2011, 2012 = 333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average = 230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 2009, 2010, 2012=242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average = 181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 2009-11 = 196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average = 189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There have been a number of successful efforts added to the Strategic Plan within the past six years. The Comprehensive Capital Campaign: Building Futures One at a Time is an example of a successful effort toward institutional renewal. Historically, fundraising led by the President, Board of Trustees, and the Institutional Advancement Division, has provided support for operations as well as capital needs. Major capital initiatives have typically been accomplished as singular campaign projects, as opposed to a major comprehensive (combined) capital campaign. Such singular capital projects have included the College’s campaign for building the art and design building (Reisman Hall) and renovating an existing facility into a student center (The J. M. McDonald Student Center in Chapman Hall.)

In an effort to enhance institutional growth and development, the Board of Trustees voted in 2008 to establish a Feasibility Study Committee, comprised of members of the Board of Trustees, to determine if the College was positioned to undertake its first comprehensive capital campaign. A fundraising consulting firm, hired in 2009, conducted an “internal readiness” study of the College’s Institutional Advancement division and overall leadership, including the Board
of Trustees. At the College’s Senior Staff Retreat in summer 2009, the executive staff and President discussed potential campaign priorities based on input about College needs, divisional initiatives, donor interest, and institutional Goals/Objectives, which had been created and discussed through the Council on Long Range Planning and strategic planning meetings. A lengthy list was narrowed to the following categories:

- A synthetic turf field to replace the natural grass at the Athletic Complex;
- Renovation of South Campus involving construction of a new building;
- Renovation of two science labs in Eckel Hall;
- Growth of the Endowment through
  - Endowed scholarships
  - Endowed funds in support of Academic Excellence (i.e. Endowed Chairs, Honors Program, Lecture Series, student travel, Faculty and Staff Development, etc.); and
- Annual Fund, programmatic, and annual operating support.

According to the College’s Mission Statement, “Cazenovia College embraces learning as its primary focus and is committed to creating an environment that encourages intellectual, social and ethical growth, preparing students to become leaders in the global community.” The enhancement of academic spaces and programs supported by the Campaign directly relate to this Mission. In addition, the College’s campaign goals link to the Vision Statement. By investing in facilities (academic and co-curricular), endowment, operating support, academic programs, and scholarships, the Campaign will help to:

- attract and retain highly-qualified and dedicated faculty and staff;
- build upon a foundation of study in the liberal arts;
- build stronger relationships with the College’s key constituencies;
- improve facilities and grounds; and
- assist with greater national recruiting impact.

Following the internal readiness research, the consulting firm conducted a feasibility study involving the College’s constituencies to determine the level of interest in supporting the campaign priorities that were identified. This study included face-to-face interviews with donors, an online survey sent to all alumni, and on-campus focus group sessions with members of the campus community and greater Central New York region.

In terms of generating resources to sustain and improve the institution, both the Board Chair and the President cited the thorough and deliberate process that Trustees followed to launch the Campaign. As of July 2010, the Board appointed Campaign Co-chairs to implement Phase 1, the silent phase. By July 2011, the Campaign had reached its first goal of $3 million with 100% giving and support leadership by the Trustees themselves. Phase 2 began immediately and by spring 2012, the on-campus effort was established. As of June 2012, Phase 2 was completed with the goal of $6 million in cash and pledges having been exceeded, including a $1 million transformational gift pledge from the Jephson Educational Trusts to name South Campus.

**Strategic Planning and Communication**

Targets, goals, and performance outcomes are regularly presented to the Board of Trustees and generally shared among department directors. Information on College goals and performance
(and their impact on the institution’s financial situation and budgets) is also presented to the College community as a whole minimally twice a year in the presidential “State of the College” address, which generally occurs in the fall and spring semesters following meetings of the Board. The President also meets with groups of college constituents in order to explain the institution’s performance, goals, initiatives, and budget. Further, the Director for Institutional Research and Assessment posts a wealth of data to the College’s Intranet Sharepoint site.

Although the *Strategic Plan* and other related documents are written in a clear and concise manner and are widely available and understood within the community (see data from the *Institutional Self-Assessment Survey 2012*), detailed information about operational decisions and performance is not always communicated in a way that reflects or promotes community ownership of the process or its results. To enhance communication and ownership of the planning processes, one improvement to consider is communication between leadership and staff. Processes are in place to communicate across the campus, but college constituents are often unaware of some notable projects around campus and significant changes to prior budgets or plans. Dr. Tierno has recently addressed this concern through his own periodic updates and informational e-mails to the campus, by encouraging more communications from vice presidents, and by holding small roundtable discussions with various constituency groups on campus.

Another area to address is that of institutional initiatives that are undertaken as opportunities arise. These initiatives often involve and affect operations and resources, but sometimes must be acted upon quickly or during summer months and semester breaks. When they occur outside the inclusive planning, budgeting, and reporting structures, the decision-making process or the relationship of the initiative to institutional priorities may be unclear to those not involved. This is not unique to Cazenovia College in terms of the hiatus in governance work that often occurs when classes are not in session, resulting in revisions or adjustments to plans that are sometimes made by the leadership without additional input from shared governance groups. Dr. Tierno has recently addressed this systemic issue with various groups in hopes of improving transparency in decision making and resource allocation while at the same time not delaying progress.

**Strategic Planning and Assessment**

Periodic assessment of Cazenovia College’s institutional performance is addressed primarily on the basis of the *Strategic Plan* and its associated documents and annual reporting processes. Through the use of Initiatives, Action items, Performance Indicators, and estimated costs, all based on institutional Goals and Objectives, each division along with the entire institution has the means of measuring performance toward the Goals set by the *Strategic Plan*. By examining each division’s annual reports, which provide tables showing the relationships between Goals, Action items, Performance Indicators, and estimated costs, it is possible to ascertain what has been accomplished or left unfinished.

While a record of progress toward and accomplishment of performance goals is maintained, the evaluation and assessment methods to reach those goals are not always clearly documented. Targets are adjusted year to year based on contingencies and reevaluations after actual results or unknown factors are considered. The assessment methods and data analyses are complex, in some instances, making it challenging to follow the decision-making process through to the final
outcome. Narrative in the Annual Report on the Strategic Plan often includes information and data related to targets that were and were not achieved; but, while the Annual Report is posted for the entire campus community to read, it is a comprehensive document that may not be the best method of communicating results to a wide audience. One suggestion, which is already in progress by the Director for Institutional Research and Assessment, is to create strategic plan and operational dashboards that are user-friendly and readily accessible. In addition, the self-study process has provided an opportunity to establish a document library to centralize the large volume of files and data that provide information about planning and assessment results. Detailed information on institutional assessment is included in Chapter 10.

INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES (Standard 3)

Strategies to Measure/Assess Needed Resources

Resource allocation depends upon analysis of routine operations and the yearly budget process as well as specific divisional goals listed in the Strategic Plan. There are various budgeting tools used to assess, track, and revise financial planning for the College. The processes in place to monitor and refine the budget are performing well; however, consideration in the next planning cycle about a formal assessment process clearly linking budget decisions to student outcomes would strengthen the process. When resources are limited, transparency in allocation and reallocation is important to sustain a shared direction in executing annual goals and objectives, particularly when frequent adjustments to the plans are required.

Asset Allocation Policies and Procedures

As discussed in previous sections, the President and Senior Staff consider program recommendations from faculty, staff, and councils within the governance system for funding priorities. The preliminary budget parameters and planning assumptions are determined and refined as necessary. This information is communicated to department directors and to the Council on Long Range Planning. Department directors work with staff to prepare preliminary plans and requests. Departmental budget requests must be consistent with divisional goals and objectives.

Allocation Approach Ensures Adequate Personnel

Plans for hiring new employees are generally documented in the Action Plans for each division or department. Filling an existing position and hiring for a new position are contingent on a number of factors—student enrollment, the budget for the academic year, and departmental needs. Frequently, support staff and administrative positions can be consolidated or staff positions can be realigned. Both the job realignment and staffing changes are flexible depending on the budget. The overall goals for staffing are to support the learning environment of the College. [See Chapter 3 for detailed information on support staffing.]

In terms of instructional support, the institution follows a timetable and procedure to assure adequate personnel in Academic Affairs. The Registrar’s Office initiates a proposed schedule
based on the previous year’s course offerings and forwards the information to Division Chairs. Each Chair reviews and forwards the information to academic Program Directors. Program Directors add or delete courses as appropriate. (Some programs offer courses based on a schedule of rotation.) After reviewing the proposed schedule, each Program Director sends course recommendations back to the Chair. Division Chairs discuss staffing needs at Academic Cabinet meetings. Once courses are identified, Program Directors, in consultation with the Division Chair, begin the staffing process with full-time faculty members requesting courses first, followed by open sections of courses being filled with adjunct faculty. [See Chapter 6 for additional information on Faculty.]

In general, when a position is open within the College, both Human Resources and the department head will review the needs of the position, consider the position description and the overall needs of that department. The Human Resources Office utilizes benchmarking data in determining priority needs for the College. The President’s Office holds final approval of all changes in staffing, compensation, and employee status.

Financial Planning and Budgeting Process

As discussed in Standard 2, the budgeting process is an integral part of resource allocation and resource management at Cazenovia College. The Board of Trustees and the President are ultimately responsible for continuous improvements to the instruction, technology, facilities, the workforce, and the campus environment in support of the Mission, Vision and strategic Goals of the College. The Strategic Budgeting Document (Appendix B.2) defines the process for creation and refinement as well as review of the annual and projected budgets.

Monthly budget-to-actual reports are prepared by the Business Office and scrutinized to review the utilization of financial resources and to determine any shortfalls or excesses which need to be addressed as they arise. Senior Staff, the President, and the Trustee Finance Committee are key members of this review process. For budget lines that are not within the expected budget projections, the Directors and Vice Presidents of each respective area are required to ensure their entire reporting area will be on target with budget totals or provide an explanation and solution.

The intended process of budgeting is to have flow from staff and faculty through the directors and the vice presidents of those respective departments. The process and tools in place allow for proper management of the budget. Budget review and revision is ongoing to meet changing needs and initiatives and can be evidenced by the monthly documents, which compare budget-to-actual figures. The process of ongoing review by the designated individuals within each department through the Our Budget tool, is further indication that the budget is the responsibility of the entire campus and is not a static document, but a revolving tool based on actual results and input from various constituents within the College. This process is further examined and reviewed during the annual financial audit performed by an independent auditing firm. The annual audit is required by the federal government (as well as the NYSED) to meet grant requirements and to meet annual requirements of the College’s lending financial institutions. As part of the annual audit, the outside audit firm reviews the budget-to-actual report for the fiscal year. The firm also performs an audit of the actual results of operation and the financial statements, which are prepared by the Controller, and then renders an opinion on the audit and
the financial statements. The annual audit has consistently achieved an “unqualified opinion,” indicating that there are no material issues within the financial statements.

The budgeting process ensures that the College has sufficient resources to meet current year obligations and informs the longer term viability of the institution. The budget relies on fiscal conservatism and prudent use of available resources. The Board of Trustees has the ultimate responsibility for the budgets of the institution and decisions are evaluated as consistent with the Mission of the institution. The College is heavily reliant on student revenues, so not meeting enrollment targets has a significant effect on the budget. The budget is continuously reviewed and updated as the outcomes are realized. This is evidenced in the Board of Trustees Finance Committee meeting minutes, which reflect directives from that Committee for budget revisions.

The budget process incorporates development of an annual Capital Budget to address facility improvements and maintenance concerns as well as equipment replacement. This is evident in the section of the Strategic Plan 2007-2013 for Facilities/Physical Plant as well as in the Capital Projects List (Appendix B.3), which is posted for campus-wide review. The College’s financial position has not provided significant opportunity to fund capital improvements outside the annual allocations from the Endowment; however, the Board remains committed to investing in the physical plant. In fact, since 2003, nearly $20 million has been invested in facility and infrastructure improvements above and beyond the annual Operating Budget allocations.

**Facilities Master Plan**

Management of the 536,637 square feet of facilities and infrastructure of Cazenovia College occurs on a day-to-day basis; however, all daily and longer-range activities do need to relate to a larger institutional mission and vision. Therefore, in 2003, the College authorized Highland Associates to compile a Master Plan of Facilities and facility needs (hard copy in Resource collection). While the Master Plan was labeled as 2003-2008 it was intended to be farther reaching and had planning potential out to 2013. This plan utilized the previous Master Plan for Facilities (1997) to note complete systems of all buildings and make recommendations for improvements and maintenance. As such, the College has continued to expand the preventative maintenance of buildings and systems and move away from previous management models of deferred maintenance. This has resulted in cost savings overall. In addition, preventative maintenance, as well as other initiatives, has resulted in the reduction of greenhouse gases produced with further reductions anticipated as outlined in the 2011 Climate Action Plan for Cazenovia College prepared by EYP Architects & Engineering. As a signatory to the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment (ACUPCC), the College is engaged in regular analysis of energy consumption, sustainable practices, student education, and benchmarking. The College has also achieved Tree Campus USA designation showing that the College has a master plan for arboriculture (in addition to the aforementioned plans for buildings and landscaping). This requires attainment of five core standards relating to tree care and planning, and associated community engagement.

For day-to-day physical plant maintenance, concerns with facilities or classroom infrastructure are tracked through a computerized “footprint” system. The average open footprint time has decreased from 12 days to 3 days (per the 2011-2012 Annual Report) therefore attesting to more
efficiency in addressing issues brought forward by the constituents. An evaluation of the end-user experience, however, should be conducted to understand the extent to which the footprint system is accessible and doing what it was designed to do in terms of communication.

Classroom spaces are assessed in depth several times per year by the Executive Vice President/Chief Operating Officer, the Facilities Management Officer, and the Plant Operations Manager (see Classroom Assessment Inventory). In addition, cleaning and maintenance personnel observe these spaces on a regular basis while performing their job duties and report any deficiencies to the Facilities Management Officer. Maintenance items are noted for either immediate action or action during the next academic break period. The inventory taken of classrooms and classroom learning equipment is then presented to the Academic Cabinet for review. Decision-making authority regarding classroom upgrades is managed through the Academic Cabinet, the Executive Vice President, the Council on Long Range Planning, and the Board of Trustees Committee on Buildings and Grounds (if required). Major facility changes and requests are managed through the use of the Facilities Request Form and require authorizations at multiple levels. Communication of upgrades and changes to facilities happens frequently from the Executive Vice President’s office, helping to keep the campus community informed of progress toward goals. From the numerous planning documents and procedural manuals it is apparent that this is an area in which Cazenovia College is very proficient. In addition, communication from upper administration has been increasingly informative for several years.

Evidence that Learning Resources are Adequately Supported

Initiative number 3 on page 16 of the Strategic Plan 2007-2013 articulates the plan for “providing an appropriate and functional academic infrastructure.” The Action items linked to this Initiative are to 1) provide appropriate types of classroom space through monitoring and inventorying; 2) provide clean, well-maintained classrooms by regular maintenance and repair; and 3) annually assess needs to ensure faculty have adequate office space. In addition, a Performance Indicator is included specifying that the College will add at least one media-enhanced classroom per year. A document recently circulated by the Council on Long Range Planning indicates that, for the most part, these goals have been met. As mentioned in the discussion on Standard 2, the Comprehensive Capital Campaign is the most notable example of the College’s commitment to improving the teaching and learning environment.

Facilities

Assessment of facilities and the infrastructure takes place on a routine basis. As mentioned, the College routinely engages in analysis of its energy systems (currently participating in a benchmarking study of similarly sized institutions). This data is useful in determining eligibility for state and federal rebates/incentives.

At such time when major projects are undertaken, comprehensive assessment takes place in the form of programming to understand the faculty and student needs as well as the future direction of the College. A former Trustee and chair of the Trustee Building and Grounds Committee for nine years, has been instrumental in completing the assessment of academic needs for the art and
design programs, and the science programs. Her architectural firm designed the Reisman Hall facility, the first new academic building to be constructed at the College in over 40 years. The College also uses professional organizations for benchmarking and networking on facilities, such as NACUBO, IACBE, cIcu, and EYP energy. Regular review of the Classroom Assessment Inventory, the Capital Projects List, the footprint system, weekly meeting minutes, and Campus Services daily worksheets all serve as means of assessment.

Staff [See Chapters 3 and 6 for information about the College’s human resources.]

**Equipment Acquisition and Replacement Process**

Equipment management generally takes place in two departments—Physical Plant and Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). Routine equipment acquisition and replacement in terms of the Physical Plant is managed by use of the footprint system or through annual Operating/Capital Budget requests. The ICT Department is charged with maintaining the College’s computer, network, voice and audio-visual infrastructure. The Department consists of three major areas of focus: the Support Desk, Services/Operations, Development, and Audio Visual/Media support. The ICT Department conducts a yearly review of campus-wide hardware and software needs. They select labs, offices, and departments that need equipment and software upgrades. Through this process, workstations campus-wide have been standardized and are maintained. The replacement process is based on internal department decisions as well as plans/assessment outcomes noted in the Strategic Plan 2007-2013 (e.g., upgrading five classrooms per year). The most recent wide-scale desktop computer replacement occurred in summer 2012. For faculty, there is a system in place for equipment and software acquisition based on instructional needs. Faculty and Program Directors notify Division Chairs of their pedagogical needs; requests are presented to the Academic Cabinet whose members consult with both ICT and the CFO who oversees the ICT department. The current process is somewhat cumbersome and could be streamlined. In addition, formal assessments should be developed to document the status of the various needs or outcomes.

Training on new equipment installed in classrooms should be conducted on an ongoing basis, particularly in the case of smart technology. To assure that proper training for faculty and staff takes place, the ICT department will need to continue cross-training its own staff in smart and media-enhanced technologies.

Investments in Blackboard, ERP system, Datatel, Ultipro, academic program-specific software, expansion of the wireless network, and other tools have helped enhance the teaching, learning, living, and operating environments. Rapid changes in technology have challenged the College in terms of resource expenditures, although the decreasing costs of hardware have allowed allocated resources to stretch further. Widening the circle of communication with campus constituents about technology needs and developing a formal assessment system should assist with meeting remaining challenges.

One of the functions of the Council on Long Range Planning is “to review campus-wide technology needs and recommend goals, priorities, and implementation plans” *(Shared*
Use of the governance system to develop a master plan for technology, beyond a replacement schedule, is recommended.

**Institutional Controls**

Financial controls are integrated into daily operations of the College to ensure effective utilization of resources. Although the Business Office has oversight of the financial affairs of the College, responsibility for the maintenance of control levels is with each division vice president and director. Budget managers have access to the Our Budget tool, to monitor the real-time expenses, encumbrances, and revenues as posted through the General Ledger system in Datatel.

As part of the Our Budget tool, when a department representative determines a purchase is needed, he or she determines if it falls within the allocated budget as posted. A requisition is entered for approval on the requisition system, which is also integrated into the Our Budget tool. The requisition must then be approved electronically through the system by the department head, which causes the requisition to go to the next level of approval. Each level is assigned a maximum approval level. For example, a vice president has approval authority up to $1,999. If a requisition exceeds that amount, it requires an approval at either the Controller level and/or the CFO. Once all approvals are final, the requisition is processed by Purchasing and the requisition becomes a purchase order, which is actually used to order the item(s) needed. The process of approving a requisition to a purchase order triggers entry of the information into the Datatel ERP system, where it follows a set approval/payment process. When a budget line is utilized for a requisition that may exceed the department’s allocated budget, the requisition system requires further processes of approval, primarily clearance by the CFO.

All budget lines, including payroll and revenue lines, are the responsibility of each respective department head. The budget control process is the roadmap for effective use of all college resources. At the end of the fiscal year, the Business Office ensures expenses incurred or revenues received are recorded in the proper year, in keeping with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. The annual independent audit is a final check to ensure that the College is performing these processes as required.

**Annual Independent Audits**

Each year the financial status of the College undergoes an audit by an independent accounting firm and the College has consistently received an unqualified or “clean” opinion (Appendix B.4 – 2011 and 2012 Audited Financial Statements). The firm evaluates the internal controls and processes and provides recommendations to management and the Board of Trustees for improvement thereon. In addition, the firm conducts audits of the College’s federally funded programs to ensure compliance with the A-133 Federal Government guidelines; this also receives consistently clean opinions. The College typically does not receive audit adjustments from the firm, meaning that all financial record-keeping is in order. The firm reviews annual tax filings to ensure that the College is compliant and timely in its filings. At the time of the previous self-study the College was not compliant or current with its annual Internal Revenue Form 990 and related state informational and tax filing requirements. The College has become
fully compliant in all reporting requirements and has greatly improved the quality of documentation in the financial records under the current leadership.

The Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees reviews the audited statements. The Committee may make recommendations about previous fiscal year resource allocations and may also review the proposed Operating Budget to assure it is consistent with the Mission of the institution. Committee members also review capital expenses and may make recommendations for future capital resource allocations.

**Periodic Assessment of Institutional Resource Use**

Cazenovia College has developed various assessment tools which measure the success, or lack thereof, of the outcomes of planning. While the allocation of resources is supported and documented as to whether the actual revenue and expenses meet the guidelines of the budget, better analysis of whether a particular allocation is the best use of the available resources should take place. Regular informal analysis takes place at the administrative level; however, the President has recently begun to encourage councils within the governance system to consider resource priorities within their respective areas to inform the allocation process (e.g., Employee Welfare Council’s consideration of staffing, compensation, and benefits).

Efforts are also taking place to understand and appreciate the resource factors associated with academic programs. A past example of a programmatic change based on internal analysis of the cost to benefits, was the elimination of a College-operated nursery school. Based on a thorough assessment, the College determined that significant savings could be realized if the operation were run by an outside party, assuming that the same or better quality of learning opportunities would continue for students enrolled in the Education programs. Relevant data are being generated by the Director for Institutional Research and Assessment and shared with various constituency groups (*Delaware Study, UCLA HERI Faculty Survey*, etc.); however, some studies require several years of data to fully understand the cost to benefit circumstances.

While the College should continue to use tools such as the *Delaware Study* to assess outcomes, other opportunities should be explored for assessment that would provide support or deterrence of the reliance on such data.

**CONCLUSION**

As an institution looking forward to its bicentennial celebration in 2024, Cazenovia College is guided by its Mission and Vision toward goals and strategies to sustain itself in a competitive market and further enhance its viability. Over the past ten years, the institution has made substantial progress in the areas of strategic growth and realizing short and long-term goals. The College’s *Strategic Plan* is an essential tool in moving the institution forward by establishing long-term institutional goals. The planning process, grounded in assessment and accountability, is designed to foster a culture of trust and confidence about the future of the College. A number of suggestions for improving the planning process are noted below.
College governance has improved significantly in terms of participation and collaboration since the last self-study. In large part, this stems from the culture of planning and assessment that has become stronger over the last ten years. The improvements in the strategic planning process have allowed for a more informed resource allocation process. While divisional and unit planning processes can be described as participatory, collaborative, and transparent, there may be opportunity for further transparency in the budget and resource allocation processes. The College should utilize the governance system as it was designed to help identify and establish the priorities for reinstating resources as enrollment and other funding targets are met or exceeded.

Suggestions

- The goals within the Strategic Plan should be clearly measurable if they are to provide useful information in further planning.
- Opportunities for further transparency in the budgeting and resource allocation processes should be identified and implemented in conjunction with the planning process.
- In light of the recent and current economic trends, the strategic plan may be more relative and effective if it were prepared on a three-year cycle rather than a five-year cycle.
- Institutional assessment processes and methods should be identified and implemented to address specifically any shortfalls in achieving institutional goals.
- The functionality or usefulness of the Strategic Plan itself should be assessed and the assessment should be used to improve the development of future plans to ensure that it meets the planning needs of the College.
- To strengthen the transparency of the governance system, documentation of the decision making processes that occur should be more thoroughly reported as opposed to just reporting on the results of the decisions.
- A master plan for staffing, staff support, and training should be developed and implemented.

Recommendation

- Working through the governance system and established resource allocation processes, the College should establish priorities for reinstating needed resources as enrollment targets are met or exceeded.
CHAPTER 3

LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION (Standards 4 and 5)

The Workgroup assigned to study Leadership and Governance, and Administration, reviewed the governing board, the institution’s system of shared governance, the administration, and the College’s administrative structures. The Workgroup examined College policies, practices and documents related to Human Resources, shared governance, governing board oversight, leadership, administration, and others. The group’s research also included addressing matters of overall philosophy, integrity, communication, and assessment. Each area is described as follows.

- The College’s Bylaws allow for a board of up to 30 trustees at-large and 6 additional trustees elected by and from the Alumni Association Board. The President of the College is an ex-officio member of the Board with full voting power.
- The College’s shared governance system includes five governing Councils—Faculty, Enrollment Management, Long Range Planning, Employee Welfare, and Student Affairs. The system also includes the Student Government Association. (Appendix A.2)
- The College’s administration includes the President and his leadership team and all those with an administrative position designation. Employees with Staff designation support the administrative work of the College through project/program implementation, council and committee work, and various other assignments. (See Administrative Descriptions.)
- The College’s administrative structures, based on the scope of the self-study questions, include the various institutional and employment policies, procedures and practices.

CONTEXT

Cazenovia College incorporates a structure of governance with a governing body (Trustees) as the legal authority of the College, empowered to set institutional policies, grant degrees, and operate the institution. The Board hires a President who, in turn, encourages active participation by campus constituents in the teaching and learning mission of the College via a shared governance system. The shared governance system, as described in the Shared Governance Document, includes representation from all internal constituencies (administrators, staff, faculty, and students), and places the work of the College in the hands of the people directly responsible. This sharing of responsibilities is valuable because, as a result of their involvement, the people who participate in the governance process are generally committed to decisions made by the process. The system is designed to promote broad-based understanding of the College’s agenda and foster communication between college constituencies regarding important issues. The governance system is intended both as a practical means of making decisions and as a means of involving a broad range of people in the decision-making process. Ultimately, the success of the governance system lies in the hands of those who use it. In addition, the governance structure is linked to both the strategic planning and budget development processes. The Council on Long Range Planning, involving elected representatives from the various governance councils and constituency groups as well as key leaders, is the body responsible for reviewing strategic and capital plans, the budget development process, governance, and institutional priorities.
The College administration, particularly the President, relies on the governance process to advise and inform decision-making. The President and his direct reports work with all constituents to operate the College. A statement noted in the 2003 Self Study Report about administration and leadership still holds true today. The current President promotes two general principles as the basis of administrative practice and good leadership for the College. The first is that the administration’s chief task is to secure the outcomes that will, in turn, secure the future of the College. The second is that there is “no better way to encourage excellence in others than by demonstrating excellence [one]self. These principles underline the importance of active, effective, and outcomes-based administration, undertaken with the courtesy, clarity, and integrity necessary to both gain and provide support to one’s peers. By upholding these principles and by holding themselves accountable to them, the President, the executive administration and, indeed, everyone who serves the College will contribute to the institution’s present and future success.”

Staff members play a vital role in the success of the College through administrative support, service on governance councils and committees, project management, and student support. Student leadership is addressed in Chapter 5. Faculty leadership is discussed in Chapter 6.

Sound administrative policies and procedures are required in order to operate the College within its stated mission. To facilitate effective and equitable administration, the Human Resources Department provides leadership for the development, implementation, and assessment of institutional policies, procedures, practices, and programs for employees.

**ANALYSIS**

**Leadership and Governance**

Leadership is demonstrated through an environment that embraces and encourages leadership development, diversity, integrity, community, learning, accountability, tradition, and excellence for all employees. According to the *Shared Governance Document* (2011), governance at Cazenovia College emanates from the Trustees of the College as detailed in the College’s *Bylaws*. The *Bylaws*, in turn, empower the President with authority over and responsibility for all programming and operations of the College. Each constituency of the College has a clearly defined role in policy development and decision-making.

**Board of Trustees**

In order to oversee the institution’s mission, organization, financial status, and academic programs, the governing body needs to be of an appropriate size and composed of members with a range of qualifications, talents, and expertise to allow the Board, as a whole, to fulfill all of its responsibilities. As a result of the previous Middle States Self Study and the *Governing Board Survey of 2004 and 2007*, the Board revised the College *Bylaws* in 2007 to increase Board membership to 30 at-large members and 6 alumni members. This was in response to a documented need to increase the range of expertise of the Board and to strengthen connections with alumni. The Board’s Committee on Trustees regularly reviews prospective members and presents a slate of nominations to be voted upon at the spring meeting of the Board. The Alumni
Association Board sends forward names of nominees for alumni trustee seats or Alumni trustees come directly to the Board as a result of the general recruiting process.

In response to assessment findings in recent years, diversity among the Board’s membership had increased in terms of representation and expertise. As of October 2012, the Board’s membership stood at 27 and comprised 41% females and 59% males, along with 7% minority representation. In 2009-10, the minority representation was 13.8% and the gender split was identical. Thirty-seven percent of current trustees are alumni of the College. In terms of expertise, the Committee on Trustees developed a matrix to identify target areas for Board recruitment. The matrix clearly demonstrates a need for expertise in the areas of architecture/engineering, hospitality, insurance, communications/marketing and areas specific to education in post-secondary institutions. The data will assist members to focus their recruiting strategies.

To ensure appropriate function of Board members, new trustees begin their role at the College with a daylong orientation. They meet with the President and each member of his senior leadership team, and with other trustees during the day. They receive an orientation packet with the updated Board of Trustees Handbook, the Mission and Vision Statements, the College Catalog, organizational charts, written procedural guidelines for specific Standing Committees of the Board, and the College Bylaws. To assure that all Trustees are oriented to the academic programs at the institution, detail on the enrollment, faculty, and resources for academic programs have been added to supplement the orientation materials. Trustees have a dedicated website within the College’s Intranet system for discussion, access to documents, data, and assessment outcomes. The Board Chair noted that additional training about the Intranet would help Trustees with accessing information (completed 10/20/12). In addition, greater consistency in divisional reporting documents would help with locating important and timely information.

The governing board conducts a comprehensive self-assessment every three years with the most recent assessment conducted in spring 2011. The main purpose of the study is to gather information about current Trustees’ knowledge and engagement, and perceptions of the successes and effectiveness of the Board. The survey instrument has remained consistent since at least 1997, allowing for longitudinal comparisons of results to identify areas for improvements. The 2011 survey was the first to be conducted via Web administration.

A number of examples can be cited as evidence of change based on assessment of the Board. The 2007 Governing Board Survey indicated a need to improve trustee knowledge of Board Organization/Performance. As a result, the Board revised its Handbook, particularly related to procedural guidelines for specific Standing Committees. The Board also revised the length and content of the orientation for new members.

The College’s Bylaws, amended in 2007, incorporated considerations from prior self-assessment findings. The updated Bylaws included a revised Conflict of Interest statement and form, which each board member must complete annually. In addition, Trustees must now periodically review and update their Committee Charters to ensure that goals are being met. Survey questions helped determine Trustees’ perceptions about whether they maintained an appropriate level of engagement in the operations and activities of the College. Again, changes to the Bylaws in 2007 addressed a perception by some trustees that they were overly involved in day-to-day
operations. According to President Tierno, the Bylaws revisions emphasized the Board’s role in policy and oversight, versus operations and management, guiding their decision-making about using resources wisely “especially during a very difficult economy. This is experiential for the board; they are actively engaged in helping the College succeed, probably more so than most boards. Today’s board has a higher expectation for itself than ten years ago.”

Results of the 2007 self-assessment survey helped determine the Board’s readiness to take on a fundraising campaign. [See Chapter 2 for details on the Campaign.] In relation to its responsibilities to support the Mission of the College in terms of generating resources needed to sustain and improve the institution, both the Board Chair and the President cited the thorough and deliberate process that Trustees followed to launch the College’s first-ever Comprehensive Capital Campaign. The Board has participated at a giving rate of 100% and Trustees continue to demonstrate solid leadership in achieving stated goals. The Campaign is the most public evidence of the Board’s leadership and commitment to Cazenovia College.

Overall, the 2011 Board self-assessment survey data indicated improvements in nine criteria areas compared to the three prior studies. The criteria areas with the greatest improvement in ratings were Financial Support (Fundraising) and Board Relationships with Key Constituents. Trustees described themselves as knowledgeable and well-informed with regard to their obligations, responsibilities, and the institution. All trustee respondents rated themselves as a good or very good trustee. Eighty-nine percent of trustee respondents indicated they had found their trusteeship to be stimulating and rewarding. The data indicated that Trustees were most confident concerning financial management, institutional mission and educational policy, and board/chief executive relations. Financial matters remain the dominant issue occupying the Board’s time and attention as reported in the 2011 and previous surveys.

President

As stated in the Bylaws, the President of the College shall be elected by the Board and shall continue to serve at the pleasure of the Board. The President shall serve as the Chief Executive Officer of the College with overall responsibility for the College and its students. The President shall be the primary representative of the College to the public, head all educational departments, and have general oversight and direction of all programming and operations of the College.

In February 2000, the Board of Trustees appointed Dr. Mark Tierno as President effective July 1, 2000. According to the prospectus prepared by the search firm, the charges to the next president focused on areas such as vision, student enrollment, shared governance, fundraising, budget controls, improving facilities, town/gown relations, and improving the status of the academic programs and resources. Improvements have occurred within all criteria. Several overall hallmarks of President Tierno’s administration include fair and consistent administration of policies; advocacy for the importance of all constituency groups in the success of the College and its students; a commitment to data-driven decision-making; and promotion of engagement in shared governance. He has also achieved notable successes in the areas of fundraising, facility improvements, and town/gown relations.
The Board of Trustees evaluates the President’s leadership effectiveness in relation to strategic planning and institutional goals. To prepare for the annual assessment, the President evaluates himself based on certain criteria including his success at achieving stated performance indicators of the Strategic Plan. At the same time, the Board Chair sends a questionnaire to all Board members to evaluate the President on given criteria including meeting performance indicators tied to the Strategic Plan. The full Board discusses the President’s evaluation during an executive session at the May meeting. The President discusses his self-evaluation with the Board’s Presidential Compensation Committee following the May meeting. An example of an outcome of his annual evaluation was the Board’s request that he discontinue teaching a course every year in order to concentrate on the College’s Comprehensive Capital Campaign.

Shared Governance

As mentioned previously, the shared governance system includes representation from all internal constituencies and places operational decision-making in the hands of the people directly responsible for the work of the College. Throughout his tenure, President Tierno has continued to make the use of the governance system a high priority and has repeatedly stressed the importance of campus-wide participation.

The College’s Vision Statement states, “All members of the Cazenovia College community will jointly share in achieving recognition of Cazenovia as one of the nation’s leading independent colleges.” As will be demonstrated throughout this Report, all College constituents are eligible to participate in the College’s governance process toward that goal of achieving greater national recognition. In addition, the College’s Mission Statement identifies the Cazenovia experience as “an individualized educational experience that balances academic and student life.” The current governance structure includes Faculty Council whose essential role is to be a conduit in academic decision making between faculty and administrators as well as the Council on Student Affairs, which recommends policy changes related to all areas of student life. The Employee Welfare Council, the Council for Long Range Planning, and the Council on Enrollment Management address other essential College functions, including reviewing compensation, benefits and other employment policies, budgeting and long-range planning, and student recruitment respectively.

The College’s current governance structure was adopted in May 2000. The shared governance structure is reviewed triennially, resulting in a number of revisions, most recently in December 2011. The governance structure recognizes the Board of Trustees, whose members hire a President, as the legal authority of the College. The President delegates authority to the five Councils described above, and the Committees recognized as the standing committees of the College. The President looks to the five Councils to recommend to him policies, procedures, and operational priorities relevant to their charges described in each group’s charter. The Student Government Association (SGA) operates parallel to the governance structure, and follows similar procedures.

Recommendations from the 2003 Middle States Self Study called for promoting greater confidence in and commitment to the governance system; educating leadership, council and committee members and the College community about the system, and advocating for its
effective use; and avoiding the formation of issue-specific committees exterior to the governance system. According to the 2010 Shared Governance Survey, 53% of employee respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the College’s governance structure systematically evaluated its own effectiveness in performing its duties with 47% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. In rating effectiveness, 20% of employee respondents rated the overall effectiveness of the College’s current governance structure as good or excellent. Forty-three percent rated its effectiveness as neutral and 37% rated the overall effectiveness of the College’s current governance structure as fair or poor. The Council on Long Range Planning discussed these findings and subsequent changes were implemented to improve communication and participation. The Governance Document was updated in December 2011 to reflect the changes. The next review will take place in spring 2013.

Governance procedures and practices are available to the campus community through the internal CazNet SharePoint system. The Shared Governance Document, the list of Councils and Committee Members/vacancies, and minutes of the Council and Committee meetings are available. Although called for in the Shared Governance Document, there is sporadic use of the SharePoint system to post Council and Committee documents. A review of the available documents from fall 2007 through spring 2011 revealed, with one exception, that each Council and Committee had posted at least three years of some related documents. Accordingly, both the 2007 and 2010 governance survey responses indicated a need to improve communication from the Councils and Committees and/or the representatives communicating to their constituent groups. The second matter of elected representatives communicating to constituents is particularly inconsistent. In 2007, 61% of the respondents identified communication as an area for improvement; and, similarly, in 2010, 55% of the respondents did not feel appropriately communicated to. Encouraging consistent posting of documents as well as implementing methods for communication by representatives would help address the concerns that were expressed in the governance survey responses.

The Shared Governance Document requires that each Council/Committee deliberate on matters relevant to the Council/Committee charter and send recommendations to the President by hard copy and by e-mail. Based on the documents uploaded to the Shared Governance SharePoint web pages for 2008-2011 (agendas and meeting minutes) some of the Councils/Committees are following the established decision-making process, but not all. Specific recommendations made to the President by a Council/Committee and the response to those recommendations are not necessarily posted to the SharePoint web pages (some can be found in the Council’s Annual Report to the President, and others are simply sent via e-mail by a Council Chair as they occur). Upon surveying the chairs of the Councils for the past several years, the Workgroup reviewing this Standard noted that the process for deliberation on recommendations, the process of feedback from constituents, and the communication of presidential decisions varied widely. Differences in communication styles and expectations of Council/Committee representatives could be a factor in the inconsistent manner with which information is disseminated.

Each Council is required to submit an annual report on Council activities to the President by the end of each academic year. The annual report should include 1) a summary of the year’s council activities; 2) overall impressions of the effectiveness of the Council; 3) a summary and status report of any recommendations sent forward for action; and 4) any recommendations for change
to the Governance Structure. It was noted that the annual reports lacked consistency in their formatting and the information contained in the reports. At each Council’s fall term meeting with the President, progress related to any open recommendations submitted the prior year by that Council are discussed with the President. Major action or agenda items for the upcoming term are also reviewed.

The Employee Welfare Council (EWC) and the Faculty Council have been notable examples of how the Governance system should work and for ways that assessment results can be utilized to improve the system. Documents have been posted consistently and frequent e-mail messages sent to all constituents regarding agenda items and recommendations. The EWC regularly reviews findings and trends relating to health benefits. For instance, the comprehensive assessment of health plans in 2008-09 resulted in a revised EPO plan and new PPO plan coupled with an HSA (Health Savings Account). The Council was also instrumental in reviewing the 403b plan (TIAA-CREF) reduction/restoration and issuing recommendations; the expansion of the Conflict of Interest Policy in 2009-10; the administration of the Employee Survey in the spring 2009: a new definition for retirement; and periodic reviews/recommendations for changes to the Employee Handbook. The Faculty Council’s work on the curriculum revision is another notable example (discussed in detail in Chapter 6) as well as numerous other examples.

Administration

The President’s direct reports comprise the College’s senior staff/leadership team. Membership of the senior staff/leadership team has remained stable since 2003, allowing for continuity in effecting policies, strategic planning, and execution of goals. Since 2003, restructures to the leadership team have included the removal of the Chief Technology Officer and adding the Director of Communications. President Tierno, in an effort to have direct impact on internal and external communications, moved the Communications Office from the Division of Institutional Advancement to one of his direct reports/areas.

The members of the leadership team feel collaboration is often, regular, and conducted in a professional manner. There is a level of respect, collegiality and collaboration among team members and a strong understanding of each other’s responsibilities. Senior staff meetings seem to be very fluid, and much of each meeting focuses on updates from respective areas, and sharing of data and information pertinent to pending recommendations or changes to policies. The challenge, in particular to problem resolution, is to balance necessary and timely decision-making with the desire for transparency and effective use of the governance system. Sometimes, administrative decisions must be made in a timely manner at the expense of community-wide input and feedback, particularly in response to rapid changes in the economic and regulatory environments. To address longer term initiatives, the President holds a summer retreat, held offsite every July, to revitalize the group and discuss strategic objectives.

After a thorough review of the position descriptions and résumés of the leadership team, it is apparent that the necessary skill sets and qualifications of the leaders are appropriate to lead the institution. It should also be noted that the College recognizes and values achievements and years of service, as key personnel have been promoted within the organization.
While no direct cause and effect has been established, the stability of the leadership team may be a factor in the retention rate of the middle management (director level employees) with over 80% completing five or more years of service to the College. Among all employee groups, as noted in the 2009 Employee Survey, 80.4% of employees agreed or strongly agreed that they wanted to be working at the College “one year from now” (n=92).

Clear delineation and documentation of lines of organization and authority are evidenced through the College’s Bylaws, the Shared Governance Document, and the Administrative Division Descriptions document. Included in the Administrative Division Descriptions are organizational charts depicting reporting relationships (Appendix A.1). As stated in the College’s Institutional Self Assessment Survey 2012, 70% of respondents said the clarity of reporting relationships at the College was strong or adequate (n = 92).

Regular staff meetings occur at the executive, divisional, and departmental levels. The President conducts biweekly one-on-one meetings with his direct reports, along with the weekly meeting with his leadership team. The leadership team communicates appropriate information to their direct reports through departmental meetings. Administrators then communicate relevant information to their staff. The President has also instituted periodic meetings with director-level managers, aimed at empowering directors to work together as a decision-making unit and from time to time sending recommendations to the President and/or the Governance Councils.

Every fall (and generally spring), the President conducts a State of the College address. Throughout the year, he holds meetings with affinity groups to improve communication about policies, decisions, and initiatives that affect those groups. Records of the meetings are generally posted to the CazNet SharePoints. Councils and Committees within the shared governance system also provide updated information through the Governance SharePoint. Administrative decisions made as a result of recommendations by Councils are generally posted to the SharePoint. Changes to policies and/or practices may be reflected in the Employee Handbook.

As reported in The Chronicle’s 2010 Great Colleges to Work For survey, only 40% of employee respondents rated the transparency, clarity, and interactivity of internal communications at the institution as good to excellent. Based on this finding, the President requested that vice presidents issue increased communication with constituency groups by conducting affinity group meetings, and with the entire campus community via roundtable discussions, coffee and conversation forums, and open presentations. The 2012 Chronicle survey results demonstrated slight improvement to 42%, so several new initiatives are in progress including 1) a Communications PULSE Survey to assess preferred methods, timing, and content of key communications, and 2) employee forums with the President to address communication needs directly.

Administrative Structures and Services

Hiring Practices and Policies

Cazenovia College has guidelines in place that address hiring and recruiting of all employees. In the document, Recruitment Guidelines and Hiring Practices for Faculty, Staff and
Administrative Positions information regarding budget considerations for recruiting, pre-selection and screening, interviewing tips, various roles in the selection process and pre-offer reference checks are discussed. The Human Resources Office has available a checklist for recruiting. Position descriptions are developed (or are already in place) for open positions along with qualifications and degree requirements. Where appropriate, the College takes into consideration work experience as an alternative to degree qualifications. Depending on the vacant position, the position description and requirements may be posted on the College’s website, in the local printed and online news subscriptions, The Chronicle of Higher Education, The Chronicle of Philanthropy, and Higheredjobs.com. With approval from the Human Resources Office, the position opening may be posted to additional appropriate websites, including those targeting underrepresented populations.

The College’s employee recruiting process integrates checks and balances. Necessary paperwork at the beginning and at the end of a search includes managerial approval at three levels. Applicants complete a general application form, which includes data utilized by the College to implement its employment Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Plan. Federal employment authorization is required upon hire and background checks are conducted on all full-time and regular part-time hires, and those who have direct interaction with students or children, such as coaches. New employee orientations include affirming the position description, which ultimately links to the annual performance evaluation (for non-faculty). As noted in the 2009 Employee Survey, 79.3% of employees agreed or strongly agreed that they were in a job that best allowed them to use their talents and skills. Related to that finding, a majority (62%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they understood the connection between their role and the College’s Strategic Plan. Improving employee satisfaction in these areas helps the College to achieve its targets for employee retention. As identified in the Employee Welfare/Human Resources Performance Indicator Grid in the 2011-12 Annual Report, over the last five years the retention rate of employees has been steady (07/08 - 85%, 08/09 - 90%, 09/10 – 95%, 10/11 – 90%, and 90% for 11/12), exceeding national benchmarks.

Through utilization of hiring and recruiting processes, and position descriptions, the College has engaged administrators and staff with appropriate skill sets and degrees, resulting in qualified employees who are a good fit for the College. In The Chronicle’s 2012 Great Colleges to Work For survey, 66% of employees responded positively in the category of Job Satisfaction/Support. In the College’s 2008-09 Employee Survey, 69% of the employees agreed or strongly agreed that they were empowered to achieve results in their position.

Professional Development

As noted in the 2012 Employee Handbook, the College encourages employees to broaden their knowledge and skills within their individual professions, as well as higher education administration in general. Employees are encouraged to learn as much as possible about the work of other administrative areas and academic programs in the context of seeking to develop a better understanding and broader perspective of the Mission and Goals of the institution. In addition to the tuition benefit and on-campus training and development programs for employees, the College assists with professional development through institutional membership in professional organizations, many of them specific to higher education. Active participation in
professional organizational meetings is viewed as beneficial for employees and the College. Many employees belong to at least one professional organization funded by College resources; several belong to more than one. Where institutional membership is not available, employees may pay their own individual membership(s). Modest funding is available for professional development at the departmental and institutional levels; however, as noted in various reports and surveys, this is an area requiring greater improvement and investment.

Some improvements in professional development opportunities for faculty have occurred in recent years. In addition to dedicated funding, the allocation of funds within the Operating Budget was restructured to accommodate higher-level initiatives that were not being supported through the minimal funding provided per faculty member. The Faculty Council proposed a sabbatical leave program in 2007, which the President accepted. [See Chapter 6 for details.]

On the administrative/staff side, departmental budget lines include funding for staff and leadership development. The Board of Trustees supported the President’s attendance at the Harvard Leadership Institute Conference in summer 2008. The President has, in turn, supported the sponsorship of senior staff participation in a number of leadership workshops as well as on-campus offerings for all levels of leadership.

A day is set aside in early October for college-wide professional development. Programming has been met with varied satisfaction due to diverse needs. On occasion, certain constituency groups have been able to hold specialized programming. Often, other employees participate in community service initiatives at a local charitable organization, attend training sessions, and update certifications such as CPR. The 2012 Professional Development Day was utilized for sharing the results of the Self Study.

The Chronicle’s 2012 Great Colleges to Work For survey indicated a 58% positive response in the category of professional development (down from 65% in 2010). In the 2009 Employee Survey, 64.5% of College employees agreed or strongly agreed that Cazenovia College provided effective training/development so they could perform their present duties properly. The College will need to continue the dialogue with all constituency groups to improve opportunities and funding for professional development, particularly for faculty, in order to achieve a result in that area closer to the Chronicle study’s 2012 comparison benchmark of 73%.

Staffing and Employee Support

In spring 2010, hiring for vacated staff and administrative positions was put on hold due to budget constraints. More significantly, the College needed to eliminate some positions and restructure others to help balance the Operating Budget in anticipation of enrollment figures for fall 2010. Some divisions and departments have been operating on limited human resources since then, such as Student Life, Career Services, Academic Affairs, and others. The degree to which students have felt the impact in terms of their experience is not readily evident. In many cases, responsibilities were shifted to other employees, resulting in little to no impact on the student experience; however, the impact on the employees must continue to be monitored because there is evidence that employees may feel affected by the limited resources. As cited in the Institutional Self Assessment Survey 2012, 60% of respondents disagreed or strongly
disagreed that the size of the College’s workforce was adequate and appropriate. Monitoring this aspect will need to be a top priority for the 2012-13 year.

In order to address the needs stated above, it is recommended that governance councils forward recommendations on the priorities for reinstating resources (e.g. pay raises, increasing the College’s TIAA-CREF contribution, staffing) as the enrollment targets are met or exceeded.

Employee Evaluation and Assessment

The 2012 Employee Handbook includes language regarding Performance Review and Development that indicates the intended continuous process of communication between the employees and supervisors. The performance review process is designed to encourage employee participation and input, and begins with expectation setting in the first month of employment. The College strives to conduct periodic reviews of performance during the first year of employment and on an annual basis thereafter.

In terms of employees’ perspectives on the performance review process, the 2009 Employee Survey indicated that less than 50% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their most recent performance review was effective in terms of how they were doing and identifying areas for improvement. The Employee Welfare Annual Report Indicators for 2010-11 revealed a sharp decrease in the timely completion rate of performance reviews (non-faculty). During the 2011-12 academic year, managers made an effort to complete all annual reviews within their departments. By June 2012, the completion rate had increased to 65%.

A project was undertaken in summer 2012 to follow up on the findings noted in the 2009 Employee Survey about employees’ perceptions of the review process. Sixty-four percent reported having engaged in a performance review in the past year. Overall, a majority of employees agreed or strongly agreed that their position expectations were clear, that the process was fair, that they had an opportunity to complete a self-assessment, that they were treated with respect during the process, and that their evaluation was accurate. Regarding the performance review instrument utilized, a majority of employees responded positively that they were satisfied with and understood the rating criteria; however, only 40% responded favorably about the instrument itself. Results were mixed in terms of whether the process and/or the frequency of evaluations should be changed. Clearly, two areas for improvement emerged as a result of the study—consistency and consensus in the timing of the reviews and the instrument itself.

CONCLUSIONS

The Board of Trustees embraces the College’s Strategic Plan as a guide for its own goals. The Board’s leadership is measured by the success of the Plan. Trustees regularly assess their leadership, knowledge, engagement, and perceptions of success and effectiveness of the Board. According to the 2011 Board of Trustees Survey, Trustees reported they were engaged, dedicated, and committed to the institution. Survey responses also indicated Trustees had confidence in their leadership and in the health and viability of the institution.
Institutional assessment takes place on a regular basis via the strategic planning process. The President and division/department leaders are evaluated in terms of individual performance and division/department performance (outcomes-based). Assessment of both the governing board and administration is accomplished with several instruments:

1) assessment using the self-evaluation tool (all levels of employees), annual reports (faculty, administrative divisions), and surveys (Board Survey),
2) performance assessment by others (supervisor or employees below the person(s) being assessed directly or by survey), and
3) outcomes assessment (related to the Strategic Plan/goals).

The assessment instruments for those at the highest levels of leadership, the individuals and groups with greatest responsibility for ensuring achievement of the Strategic Plan Goals, are highlighted in the Resource Grid for Standards 4 and 5 available in the Resource collection. Performance is often tied to departmental/divisional assessment. Existing survey instruments gather some data about leadership effectiveness, but the College should consider adding Cazenovia-specific questions to those instruments (The Chronicle’s Great Colleges to Work For survey, HERI Faculty Survey, Employee Survey) to better assess the successes of leaders in elements not directly related to meeting Strategic Plan targets. In addition, the performance evaluation tool might be revised to include the College’s definition(s) of leadership.

Suggestions

- The College should strive to achieve a high percentage of completed annual reviews, particularly for those in leadership roles.
- Develop a readily accessible master calendar that includes all aspects of campus events, governance meetings, Board meetings, divisional/departmental meetings, and issue-specific meetings.
- Analyze results of the Communication PULSE survey and identify opportunities to improve internal communications.
- Improve governance Councils’ communications to constituents.
CHAPTER 4

STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND RETENTION (Standard 8)

The Student Admissions and Retention Workgroup examined all aspects of the College’s enrollment and retention processes. The group reviewed plans, assessment results, institutional policies, publications, and other items that provided evidence that the College is meeting expectations of the campus community and administering policies that are consistent with the College’s Mission and Goals. The process included collaboration with members of other self-study committees, in particular the one researching Student Support Services and Related Educational Offerings.

CONTEXT

Student Admissions and Retention encompasses every area on campus with the primary responsibility and leadership falling on the Enrollment Management Division. The Admissions Office includes 13 staff members and has the responsibility for recruiting full-time students (freshmen, transfers, and readmits). The admissions process relies on a carefully planned set of strategic communications including direct mail, distribution of publications, and personal contact via phone, e-mail, and Web services. In addition to working with students and families, contacts are also facilitated with school counselors and teachers, alumni, businesses, and the media. The philosophy of the Admissions Office is to put the students first and provide them with fair and accurate information needed to make the best possible decision in choosing a college. The Admissions Office holds membership in the National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC), which provides guidance through the Association’s Statement of Principles of Good Practice. The expectation of the employees to act professionally and ethically, putting students first and providing good customer service, is consistent with conduct set out for NACAC members. Included in the Statement of Principles of Good Practice is the expectation that colleges will permit students to have until May 1 to choose among offers of admission, which Cazenovia College does.

Enrollment Services is comprised of services for the Financial Aid, Registrar, and Student Accounts areas and includes six staff members. The philosophy of Enrollment Services is to foster a positive experience for students, a key part of the institution’s strategy toward retention. In order to provide high quality and efficient services to students and families, the Registrar, Financial Aid, and Student Accounts offices were relocated to one central location in 2005. This relocation was the beginning of a one-stop service center for students. The Enrollment Services area provides support for the following:

- To the Admissions Office by preparing financial aid packages for accepted students and by providing services to continuing students. The staff manages a budget of over $28.7 million, including federal, state, private, and institutional funds. Registration, academic records, class scheduling, instructional space assignments, graduation clearance, are managed and a substantial aspect of institutional data and reporting. The staff assures integrity in transcript management and works closely with Academic Affairs on advising and registration.
• Various aspects of student financial services, primarily student accounts and loan receivables in collaboration with the Business Office. Enrollment Services assures adherence to regulations regarding Cash Management and tax reporting for Loan Interest as well as American Opportunity and Lifelong Learning Credits.

Retention is viewed as a campus-wide effort at the College. A number of initiatives have taken place over the past decade to improve retention rates, including a Retention Task Force led by the President. The following areas on campus have contributed to the Self Study Workgroup’s research on retention: Academic Affairs, including the First Year Program; the Center for Teaching and Learning, including New York State’s Collegiate Science and Technology Entry Program (CSTEP), Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP), Office of Special Services, Project REACH (Recognizing Excellence, Achievement, Commitment and Honor), and Tutoring; and Student Life, including Athletics, Campus Activities Office, Health and Counseling Services, and Residence Life.

The overall goal for the Admissions Office and Enrollment Services is to enroll and retain students who are a true fit with Cazenovia College and, along with the rest of the College community, provide an environment that will nurture them to become successful members of society. The College is committed to offering a learning and living post-secondary experience that fulfills its Mission and Vision.

ANALYSIS

Admissions and Recruiting

Cazenovia College is not unique in its recent challenges related to recruiting students. Economic influences have caused a certain level of unpredictability in terms of the outcomes of marketing, financial aid packaging, and family circumstances. Following a surge in enrollment in fall 2008, the College has experienced declines in fall enrollment with the largest decline occurring in fall 2011. [See Figure 2]

Figure 2: Full Time Enrollment Fall 2006 to Fall 2012
As approved by the Board of Trustees in the first year of the 2007-2013 Strategic Plan, full-time fall enrollment was projected to be nearly 1,000 by fall 2011. In fall 2007, enrollment jumped to 938 from 817 the prior fall, so the target was a realistic goal according to all the indicators. In fact, the original targets were exceeded in fall 2008 and fall 2009. Strategies to improve the academic and geographic diversity of each entering class were also in place and succeeding. [See Appendix C.1 Longitudinal Freshman Profile Report.]

The challenge in meeting enrollment targets since fall 2009 has caused the College to rethink its strategies, considering the actions of other institutions vying for the same quality students. The financial aid support being offered by competing institutions has driven the discount rate up significantly. Lowered enrollment and increased discounting has resulted in a double-faceted budget challenge. In response to these challenges, the President asked a consultant from Noel-Levitiz to take the enrollment “pulse” of the College. While he complimented the staff and faculty on many efforts underway, he provided suggestions that will enhance the recruitment strategies. Many of these suggestions are being implemented for the current recruiting cycle.

With a renewed focus on retention and recruiting, the fall 2011 incoming student population rebounded from 306 in fall 2010 to 332 (including 7 readsmts), with the same results being realized in fall 2012. The total number of applications has increased steadily since 2007, growing from 2,123 to 2,607 in fall 2012. Throughout the recruiting cycle for the 2012-13 year, the Admissions Office worked with an inquiry pool of 16,102 students and an applicant pool of 2,607. Details about trends in enrollment by the program are noted in Appendix C.2.

To further address the challenging recruiting environment, the Vice President for Enrollment Management implemented new strategies for the 2012 and 2013 recruiting cycles. Developing a refocused set of strategies involved the analysis of application and enrollment data from previous years’ recruiting cycles. This included a review of types of direct mail used, the targeted populations, number of high school visits by the Admissions staff, number of campus visits by prospective students, numbers of prospects, applications, and accepted and enrolled students. Also reviewed, as it is annually, was the marketing plan that was developed in collaboration with the Communications Office. [See Integrated Marketing Plan]

The primary focus of the new recruiting effort was to increase the applicant pool with students who would benefit from a Cazenovia College education. While the applicant yield has remained relatively stable the last four years (20.07%; 17.60%; 18.93%; and 18.0% in 2012), increasing the yield rate was noted as crucial to achieving enrollment goals. Strategies in the new plan include:

- Utilizing the SMART Approach® recruiting tool from Noel-Levitiz, which incorporates qualifying prospective student names through predictive modeling prior to purchase;
- Adding an assistant director of admissions;
- Allocating more advertising to the Rochester and Pennsylvania areas;
- Incorporating Alumni support in recruiting;
- Targeted recruiting for transfer students;
- Redesigning the Academic Achievement Award Program to be more aggressive;
- Increasing engagement of the faculty in recruiting transfer students; and
- Increasing an international presence by attending virtual college fairs.
The percentage of male students has remained relatively stable at around 26% of the total population. Various efforts to increase the male population were implemented with the current planning cycle, including targeting name buying to programs that are popular with males, designing program pamphlets, and increasing promotion of athletics and the new turf field.

In November 2012, the College contracted with Zinch, a Chegg Service, which connects high school students to scholarship opportunities and colleges of interest. Through this service, the College receives information about prospective students who have expressed an interest in the College and are deemed a good match.

Further expanding the College’s international presence, efforts are underway to develop a three-year plan to increase international student enrollment, with target areas in Central and South America. In June 2012, a consultant visited the campus and the College has since joined the Council of International Schools, whose Executive Director will visit campus in September.

Admissions counselors have actively recruited from eastern Pennsylvania to southern Maine. The creation of a new counselor position enabled the Admissions Office to expand the recruiting territory to include travel to the Mid-Atlantic States. The travel areas now include, but are not limited to, northern Virginia, parts of northeastern West Virginia, Maryland, Washington DC, and Delaware. In a 10-week period, counselors visited several hundred high schools and college fairs with about 80 being in the new territory. As with any new recruiting effort, this initiative will take a few recruiting cycles to determine the impact on the profile of incoming classes.

The College has recently redesigned its website to bring a greater focus to student recruitment. The initial landing page displays information targeted to prospective students and promotes the new marketing initiative “experience Caz.” The Communications Department is now allocating more than 50% of staff efforts to admissions and student recruiting. The Vice President for Enrollment Management continues to work with the Director of Communications to improve the College’s printed recruiting materials each year. The design of the College’s home web page and the upgraded printed materials present a unified image to prospective students and families.

After each recruiting cycle, the Vice President for Enrollment Management reviews data from the entering class to analyze the outcomes of the recruitment strategies. This involves reviewing biweekly Field reports, (see Appendix C.3) and bimonthly Major and hatch mark reports in relation to recruiting efforts undertaken throughout the year. Also reviewed is data by geographic area, student grade point average and/or SAT/ACT score(s), gender, high school and/or transfer college, and the source that initiated the student contact. Final analyses are then reported in the College’s Annual Report with related adjustments to the Strategic Plan.

Many other constituents from the campus community are involved in recruiting students. Constituents from the departments of Athletics, Academic Affairs, Communications, Alumni Affairs, and Student Development are among those involved.

The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics launched an enhanced and separate website in October 2011 that is oriented to student recruitment. The site easily connects prospective students with coaches and the Athletic Director. Once a prospective student initiates contact, the
Admissions Office is notified for follow up. The installation of a synthetic turf field at the Athletic Complex has boosted recruiting. The full effect on recruitment success will be determined over the next few cycles with the website and field being recent improvements.

Another initiative, spearheaded by the Offices of Admissions and Communications, involves a saturation recruitment campaign in the Rochester, NY area with billboards, television commercials, and multiple publications developed by the Office of Communications targeting potential students. Collaborating with Alumni Affairs, the Admissions team helps prepare alumni to reach out to interested students as well.

The Office of Academic Affairs promotes recruitment efforts by meeting with students at Open Houses and by maintaining contact with those interested in particular majors. One new focus for the collaborative recruiting effort is promoting the new Biology major, which will be enhanced further once the science labs have been upgraded (Capital Campaign project).

The transfer student population is about 15-16% of the total fall incoming class and the growing transfer market presents opportunities to increase that percentage. Approximately 100 articulation agreements are in place with over 20 two-year colleges. The Admissions Transfer Coordinator is dedicated specifically to the task of recruiting transfer students, visiting feeder colleges in New York State and working on an individual basis with transfer counselors from those institutions. Cazenovia is a member of a statewide transfer organization, the New York State Transfer & Articulation Association (NYSTAA), and staff members have served on its executive board. Cazenovia has increased its advertising on the campuses of feeder colleges, particularly in student newspapers, and purchased additional names of potential students completing their two-year degrees in December (“midyear completers”). The College also purchased a new database of Phi Theta Kappa member students who are mid-year completers. (Additional detail on transfer student initiatives is included in the Resource collection.)

Four significant scholarship opportunities are available to new transfer students (for 2013-14):
- $11,500 Transfer Scholarship (for students who have an associate’s degree and a 2.5 cumulative average at the prior institution);
- $14,000 Phi Theta Kappa Scholarship (for students who are prior members of this honors organization);
- $19,000 Presidential Transfer Scholarship (per year for two consecutive years; for students who have an associate’s degree and a 3.0 cumulative average at their prior institution); and
- $25,000 Transfer Scholars Award (per year for two consecutive years; an associate degree GPA of 3.75 required for eligibility).

All these efforts enhance the College’s ability to attract a higher percentage of transfer students with increased enrollment of that population noted to be 1-2% in recent cycles.

Approximately 90% of Cazenovia College students receive some form of financial aid. Enrollment Services awards over $14.9 million in institutional aid to full-time students. The Center manages four types of institutional awards—merit, need-based, endowed, and discount—with the majority awarded being merit or need-based. The College’s Academic Achievement Award Program is a major component of the merit awards, which assist in recruitment and
retention. The College had not shifted its focus in the types of institutional financial aid offered since 2006. To assist in targeting institutional need-based financial aid, an enrollment management consulting firm specializing in financial aid leveraging, was engaged during the 2010-11 year. The College committed to implementing the Financial Aid Shopping Sheet, as recommended by the U.S. Department of Education, beginning with the 2013-14 academic year as a supplement to the award notifications to assist students and families in comparing financial aid offers from different institutions.

In addition to new recruiting strategies, additional assessment efforts are underway. The College renewed its participation in the Admitted Student Questionnaire® (ASQ) as of summer 2012. Survey results further the institution’s understanding of the factors that most influence student enrollment decisions and how admitted students compare with other colleges they considered. Perceptions of those who enrolled and those who did not are compared, including data about transfer students. Matching student information with survey data results in a deeper understanding of the admissions process for all students.

Overall, the 2011-12 cycle of Admissions for recruiting for fall 2012 opening resulted in 268 freshmen, 57 transfer students, and 7 readmits enrolled. The total fall 2012 full-time population was 884. Based on the strategies in place for the second cycle of the new plan and the fall 2012 outcome, the targets for fall 2013 will be discussed and adjusted based on the new strategic plan in development and the evolving enrollment strategies.

Retention

An aggressive recruitment strategy must be accompanied by a strong program for retaining students once they are recruited and enrolled. As with the recruitment process, all campus constituents play a role in student retention. The overall fall-to-fall retention has improved since 2006, although a decline occurred in fall 2011 as noted in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Overall Student Retention Fall to Fall 2006-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Overall Student Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall-to-fall retention of first-year students also improved since 2006; however, it dropped significantly in fall 2011 (Figure 4). The fall 2010 freshman profile revealed a weaker class than planned, contributing to the higher attrition rate. Fewer accepted students received Academic Achievement Awards than previous classes. The average high school GPA was lower as was the combined SAT score. Not surprisingly, a higher number of students from the fall 2010 first-year cohort were academically dismissed. As noted in prior years on the Withdrawal Exit Survey, students continued to state their primary reasons for leaving as “want to be closer to home” and “personal reasons not related to the college.” Other factors included finances and a preference for an urban setting.

**Figure 4:** New Student Retention Fall to Fall 2006-2012

In 2006-07, President Tierno formed a Retention Task Force to analyze retention and identify strategies for improvement. The group discussed resources that could be allocated or reallocated to improve retention rates for all eligible-to-return students, with emphasis placed on rising freshman students. The Task Force included representatives from Academic Affairs, Admissions and Enrollment Services, Student Development, and from the student body. Throughout that academic year, the group reviewed information about the student experience at Cazenovia College, particularly as it related to students’ first year. The group reviewed:

- Data from the Non-Returning Student Survey;
- The number of freshmen in classes taught by part-time faculty;
- The advising process; and
- Data on students who were eligible, but chose not to return.

In addition, the Retention Task Force conducted focus groups with students, met with First Year Seminar instructors, investigated the freshman advising experience, and identified programs that attracted higher percentages of male applicants. After analyzing pertinent information and data, the group developed four initiatives/recommendations, which were to:

- Expand the First Year Program from one semester to a full academic year;
- Increase the percentage of first-year students taught by full-time faculty;
- Enhance efforts to increase the male student population as a percentage of total student population.
- Develop a freshman housing environment that is welcoming, supportive, and participatory.

As a result of the initiatives, the First Year Program is a full-year effort, including a summer reading assignment; a comprehensive Orientation program; First Year Seminar courses taught by full-time faculty members; a spring term initiative with program faculty; and a freshman housing effort with dedicated residential staff. Data about the first-year experience is gathered through a variety of tools including the First Year Transition Survey, the HERI Your First College Year (YFCY) survey, focus groups, and student evaluations of teaching.

One expanded retention effort in residence life was the establishment of Living Learning Communities (LLCs) in 2008 to help first-year students adjust to college life and persist in their education at Cazenovia College. The divisions of Student Development and Academic Affairs collaborated to create a learning environment that would extend beyond the classroom into the residence hall and community. In each LLC, student participants enroll in a common First Year Seminar and live together. This unique living arrangement facilitates residence hall programming that supports and addresses the seminar themes, helping students create stronger connections between in-class and out-of-class experiences. Each community has a theme, coordinating programs, and specifically designed assessment materials.

Another retention initiative is the Student Observation, Assessment and Response (SOAR) program, which has three components: a fact-gathering online module allowing faculty and staff to report concerns regarding students at risk; a committee of stakeholders acting as a clearinghouse for information, reporting on interactions with the student; and a process to follow up on students through the appropriate combination of residence life, athletic, academic, student support, and counseling services. Communication with faculty and staff is coordinated via e-mail and additional information is gathered through Early Alert Referrals from faculty and staff, athletics progress reports, judicial/security reports, and residence hall reporting. Students are identified because of risk behavior in the classroom (absences, poor academic quality) and in other areas of campus life. The SOAR committee meets weekly to discuss information, coordinate use of campus resources, inform appropriate community members, and assist students with their needs. Information regarding class attendance, judicial processes, academic support sessions, and other relative matters are reviewed to gauge student needs and participation.

Information regarding the effectiveness of SOAR interventions, the nature of those interventions, and the types of problems reported are contained in an end-of-year report reviewed by the SOAR committee as a means of improving committee effectiveness. Retention rates for students reported to SOAR are compared to both first year and overall student retention rates for fall to fall and fall to spring periods. The retention rate for students reported to SOAR was 42.2% from fall 2010 to fall 2011, representing a substantial drop from a high point of 72.1% from fall 2007 to fall 2008. Part of this drop in retention was due to a spike in the academic difficulties experienced by our entering fall 2010 first year class. In all, 14.22% of the first year class was dismissed academically from fall 2010 to fall 2011 compared to 10.1% from fall 2009 to fall 2010, 7.1% from fall 2008 to 2009, and 6.6% from fall 2007 to fall 2008. Analysis of this and
other assessment data led to an increased emphasis on merit scholarships and greater academic abilities in subsequent student recruitment efforts.

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is designed to provide students with opportunities to maximize their academic potential through programming that offers a variety of alternative methods to assist in learning, such as tutoring; assistance in developing strategic learning, writing, reading, and mathematics proficiency; and college success seminars. The CTL is home to eight separate programs, which contribute to retention in significant ways.

1. The First Year Summer College (a five-week summer program to prepare students for fall semester academic life and work; also part of the First Year Program)
2. Placement testing (facilitating the placement of students in writing, reading, and mathematics courses)
3. Tutoring Place (peer and professional)
4. Study Skills Support Service (information on time management, note taking, etc.)
5. Office of Special Services (a variety of services for students with disabilities)
6. The Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP, including tutoring, as well as personal and financial counseling components)
7. The Collegiate Science and Technology Entry Program (CSTEP, assisting students in programs leading to professional licensure)
8. The REACH Program: Title IV (federally funded; for first generation college students, those in financial need, or physically/learning disabled)

Programs operating at the CTL have consistently reported above average retention rates (as compared to the general population) for students engaged in these programs.

Departments within the Division of Student Development have a direct and daily impact on retention. The Division initiates meaningful collaborations with academic colleagues, staff, students, and community partners, each serving students through structured, integrated, and purposeful opportunities for engagement in the life of the College. The Division engages students in a variety of other opportunities to promote retention, including: club sports, Residence Life programming and Residence Assistant positions, Intramural Sports, Student Government Association, Leadership programming, Fitness and Wellness programs, and 60 student clubs and organizations. In the past seven years, the Campus Activity Board has grown from offering 66 programs with an average attendance of 86 to offering 101 programs with an average attendance of 162 per event. Active and engaged students are more likely to be retained from year to year as reflected in the retention rates of student-athletes, who comprise approximately 30% of the student body. The Intercollegiate Athletic Department has reported a retention rate of over 80% for the past 10 years and a 92% rate as of fall 2012.

Enrollment Services has a direct and significant impact on student retention. Every available resource for financial aid packaging is utilized with the awarding of scholarships directly connected to retention of students. Over the past five years, the College has granted Academic Achievement Awards to 38% to 42% of the total student body. During the recruiting cycle for the fall 2010 cohort, the number of Awards granted was reduced, per the Board of Trustees, resulting in a weaker incoming class overall and subsequently lower retention rates for fall 2011.
The Office of Institutional Advancement has a role in student retention in various ways. The initiatives included in the Comprehensive Capital Campaign (Chapter 2) were designed to have a direct impact on students’ academic success and their campus life experience. There are six initiatives including:

1. Expanded facilities for the Studio Arts on South Campus;
2. Modernization of the Eckel Science Laboratories;
3. A synthetic turf Athletic Field (completed);
4. Endowed scholarships;
5. Endowed support for Academic Excellence (faculty support);
6. Programmatic/Operating Annual Fund support.

Term scholarships have also been incorporated as an option for donors.

Also in the Division of Institutional Advancement, the Parent Relations Office provides parents with support and guidance to promote healthy parent/student engagement during the college years, as well as providing a link to institutional staff and services. A wide variety of programs are offered including a presence at most College events, a parent newsletter and webpage, the Parents Council, surprise/exam packages, and more. The annual Parents Survey in 2012 revealed that 88% of parent respondents agreed or strongly agreed that Cazenovia was the right college for their son or daughter. Of those who had contacted the Parent Relations Office, 79% were satisfied or very satisfied with the services.

**Persistence to Graduation**

Cazenovia College has made tremendous progress with persistence to graduation. Looking at the 4-year graduation rates, beginning with the fall 2002 freshman cohort, the College can demonstrate very significant improvement from a rate of 34.24% to a rate 54.74% for the fall 2008 cohort. The 4-year graduation rate for all students for the same period rose from 40.38% to 56.29%. On the following page, Table 1 provides a breakdown of the 4, 5, and 6-year graduation rates for freshmen. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the rates for all students.

**Table 1: Freshmen Graduation Rates Cohorts 2003-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshmen Graduation Rates Entering Freshman Cohorts 2003 - 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Year Graduation Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Freshman Cohort: 34.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Freshman Cohort: 34.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Freshman Cohort: 39.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Freshman Cohort: 44.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Freshman Cohort: 41.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Freshman Cohort: 51.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Freshman Cohort: 54.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5-Year Graduation Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Freshman Cohort: 40.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Freshman Cohort: 38.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Freshman Cohort: 42.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Freshman Cohort: 48.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Freshman Cohort: 45.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Freshman Cohort: 56.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6-Year Graduation Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Freshman Cohort: 40.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Freshman Cohort: 39.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Freshman Cohort: 43.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Freshman Cohort: 48.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Freshman Cohort: 46.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Freshman Cohort:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Freshman Cohort:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2007-2013 Strategic Plan (Academic Affairs Indicator) included a 4-year graduation rate target of 55% as measured in fall 2012, which means the College met its goal for this strategic planning cycle. Recruiting efforts that result in students who are a good fit for Cazenovia College and retention efforts that promote success will assure that persistence to graduation continues to improve throughout the next planning cycle.

CONCLUSIONS

The College has succeeded in implementing a number of enrollment strategies that represent appropriate responses to the altered economic and market landscapes. Expanding the realm of communication about recruiting and retention efforts, has resulted in a better understanding of the role that each constituency group can play toward reaching institutional goals.

The College recognizes the challenges it faces with student retention. Options discussed during the course of self-study to bring focused attention to retention efforts included utilizing one or more elements within the governance structure, appointing another retention task force, or assigning a retention officer. A comprehensive plan will need to be developed.

Recruiting strategies for 2013-14 will continue to evolve, with a focus on increasing the number of students who apply to the College and subsequently enroll. To accomplish this, marketing efforts, technology enhancements, staffing, market analysis, financial aid, and the use of external resources will need to increase. The College has engaged in the SMART Approach® to target student recruiting whereby prospective student names are qualified through “predictive modeling” (https://www.noelleitz.com/student-recruitment-and-financial-aid/recruitment-technologies/smart-approach-recruiting-students) prior to purchase, as one example. Utilizing
the services of Zinch, Admissions will expand outreach to prospective students who have expressed an interest in Cazenovia College. Other initiatives include faculty networking with colleagues at other institutions, sending personalized letters to high school guidance counselors acknowledging their graduates who were named to the Dean’s List, increasing engagement with community colleges, and expanding the geographic areas of recruiting.

Suggestions

- Noel Levitz provides analysis for the data Cazenovia College uses with the SMART Approach® targeted recruiting tool. Annual assessment of the data should be implemented to identify changes in enrollment patterns that may have occurred as a result of using the SMART Approach® and to further develop predictive modeling.

- Develop enrollment targets and tracking measures for the OEL students with Enrollment Management and OEL working closely together to improve processes and ensure consistency in policy administration.

- Analyze retention efforts to better coordinate activities and develop informed goals for the next strategic planning cycle.

Recommendation

- As an enrollment-driven institution, the College must focus on recruitment and retention as key components of the next strategic plan.
CHAPTER 5

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES (Standard 9)

The Workgroup assigned to Standard 9 examined services supporting students’ academic and campus life needs and reviewed documents relating to student life, academic support services, advising, and other areas to establish evidence that the College meets students’ expectations and educational goals. The group’s research included relating elements in Standard 9 to the College’s Mission and to elements of integrity and communication. The group focused on four areas of student support service including

- Academic Services that Support Students;
- Student Development Services that Support Students;
- Collaborative Programs that Support Students; and
- Other Services.

CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS

Cazenovia College defines support services as programs that help students remain enrolled and succeed in their academic pursuit while experiencing intellectual, social and ethical growth, developing the knowledge and skills necessary for success in the classroom, workplace, and the community. Each department or program designed to provide direct support services (academic and non-academic) to students is discussed in this Chapter. The discussion pertains primarily to services obtained by full-time students. The Office of Extended Learning generally supports the part-time student population.

Academic Services that Support Students

Cazenovia College provides a wide range of academic student support services directly related to the Mission Statement, particularly the goal of “embracing student success as its primary mission” and the core approach that a “dedicated team of faculty and staff provide for an individualized educational experience that balances academic and student life.” Academic Support Services are primarily in the purview of Academic Affairs. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Associate Dean of the Faculty/Dean of the First Year Program, faculty, and staff in the Center for Teaching and Learning, Office of Special Services, Office of Extended Learning, and the Witherill Library, work collaboratively to provide academic support services.

Academic Advising

Student advisement relates to the goal in the Mission Statement to “provide for an individualized educational experience that balances academic and student life.” Advisors identify valuable educational experiences for advisees, support opportunities for educational and professional growth, and serve as guides to College resources that will benefit students’ personal growth. Advisor/advisee relationships evolve as student needs change. Academic advisors work with other faculty and staff to meet several key objectives:
• Growth of students’ skills and knowledge within their chosen major and the College’s general education program;
• Increased maturity and self-confidence;
• Enhanced capacity for independent, self-sustained learning; and
• Identification and clarification of personal educational and career goals.

The steps in the advisement process are set forth in Advising Guidelines 2011. Academic advisors are available to students throughout the academic year with the typical maximum advisee load being 25 students. The procedures for academic advisement and registration are subject to ongoing review and assessment by Enrollment Services, Academic Cabinet, Faculty Council, and the Academic Divisions. Data collected by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment were utilized for improvements such as providing student registration appointments based on academic standing, moving the registration setting to a larger venue, and ensuring that adequate faculty and ICT support are available at the registration site.

According to Alumni Survey results from 2004 to 2011, a range of 71% to 84% agreed or strongly agreed that advising contributed to an overall successful college experience. For currently enrolled students, the results were slightly lower. In the HERI College Senior Survey (CSS), respondents over the last five years indicated they were satisfied or very satisfied with Academic Advising: 2008 - 65.8%; 2009 - 59.7%; 2010 - 51.2%; 2011- 60.2%; 2012 – 62.2%.

Curricular changes implemented in fall 2010 sought to streamline and simplify the curriculum. Curricular PULSE Surveys (conducted September 2010 and February 2011) provided insights as to student understanding of the curriculum and the effectiveness of the advisement process. Seventy-four percent of student respondents said the College’s curriculum for spring 2011 was easy or very easy to understand, and 77% said they had a good or thorough understanding of the College’s spring 2011 curriculum. Regarding clarity, in spring 2011, 64% of respondents said the College’s requirements for the degree plan were clear or very clear, and 65% of student respondents said they had good or thorough understanding of the requirements for their degree plan. The survey indicated that 76% of student respondents said it was easy or very easy to declare a minor in spring 2011, and 42% said it was easy or very easy to declare a dual major. These findings are evidence of improvement from fall 2010, but also indicate room for growth in support for students who desire to major in more than one area.

Going forward, the College may consider including an option for registration online with appropriate support and participation by the academic advisor. The College will remain vigilant about the provision of adequate course offerings and sections of required courses each semester. Striking a balance between efficiency in the curriculum and satisfying student needs is important for student success, satisfaction, retention, and ease of admission for transfer students.

Comments from the February 2011 PULSE Surveys related to Curricular Changes provide data in support of these areas.

The Center for Teaching and Learning

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is a unique facility staffed with professional educators and students who provide service to students in need of help in their college work.
The CTL offers a variety of methods to assist in strategic learning, such as one-on-one or small group tutoring; and assistance in developing proficiency in writing, reading, and mathematics. The CTL also works closely with the faculty and Student Life staff to support the efforts of the SOAR Committee and students with disabilities. In the 2011-12 Annual Report on the Strategic Plan it was noted that the CTL had 4,670 student contacts covering tutoring, workshops, study groups, and academic counseling. This is a slight decrease from the previous year of 4,848 student contacts.

Cazenovia College has been a pioneer in its commitment to serving students with learning and other disabilities. As part of the CTL, the staff of the Office of Special Services provides support services to help students with disabilities to function independently at the College and to advocate for themselves. The Office of Special Services is in compliance with all applicable regulations and assists in submitting an annual compliance report to the NYSED. A database was established in Datatel to track and report students with disabilities as defined by NYSED. Health Services now inputs data on all students, which contributes to the final compliance report. The number of documented students was 113 for 2010-11 and increased sharply to 214 in 2011-12 as a result of improved tracking.

The First Year Summer College Program is designed to help students from high-risk populations transition from high school to college. The five-week program includes intensive instruction, advising, tutoring, residential experience, opportunities to develop a network of relationships on campus, and excursions to cultural events and local areas of interest. Of the 27 students enrolled in the 2011 Summer College, 19 completed the academic year (71.4%). Of the 43 students enrolled in the 2010 Summer College, 16 withdrew as of summer 2012 (61.8% retention).

Career Services

Career Services provides a full range of services to students and alumni. Services and programming are generally based on an accepted career services model that supports a natural developmental progression from self-knowledge in the freshman year to implementation of decisions in the senior year. The current Career Services Model, based on the work of theorist Donald Super, is detailed on the Career Services web page. In spring 2007, the College shifted the primary focus of the office from internships to developing resources for all students and alumni in career development, expanding outreach activities and programs.

The number of student contacts over the past five years has grown steadily. As part of the career development process, the Office also provides the administrative services for internships, which are discussed more fully in Chapter 7. Based on a survey conducted by the Career Service Office, the numbers of those employed or in graduate school within six months of graduation has been steadily increasing, from 61% for the Class of 2008 to 84% from the Class of 2011 (see Appendix C.4).

In 2010, the staff in the Career Services Office included a director and a full-time career coordinator. Due to budget adjustments, the coordinator position was eliminated, with staff members in other departments intending to pick up some of the workload. Due to the demands in other areas of Academic Affairs, the Director has continued, on her own, to provide the full
range of services; however, this has not allowed for adequate coverage of increased student activity or for expanding services or programming.

The Alumni Survey includes questions about graduates’ satisfaction with Career Services in the areas of preparation for transition to employment and/or graduate school. Results have fluctuated over the past five years with ratings decreasing significantly in 2010. The 2011 results, though, did indicate improved satisfaction in both categories. A number of improvements have taken place since 2010. Currently enrolled students have had the benefit of consistent services for several years and in the 2012 HERI CSS survey, 52.3% of respondents rated satisfaction with Career Counseling and Advising as “satisfied” or “very satisfied” compared to 45.4% in 2009 and 44.2% in 2010. (Student Support Services Data, Appendix D.1)

The Witherill Library

The Witherill Library is an academic study facility offering services to students in multiple formats. Many resources are digitized allowing easy and remote access through databases. Students, faculty, and staff have access to a wider range of academic resources through consortium membership in ConnectNY. Faculty members utilize the Library for teaching classes, instructing students on research methods, and for academic courses that encourage group work. Additional information regarding the Library can be found in Chapters 7 and 8.

Technology Support Services

The Information and Communication Technologies Department (ICT) supports the institutional mission of embracing student success by providing students with access to technology for academic and campus life needs. General use computer workstations and workstations with specialized software are available. Each student receives a College e-mail account for personal and official College communications, along with a Student Resource Guide outlining computer network policies, procedures, and resources. Students’ understanding of the Guide is assessed in a general education computer competency measure. Wireless access to the Internet and College Intranet is available across most of the campus. Full cable service is also available throughout campus. Students can access a Support Desk staff member in person or by phone during established hours, or by submitting written documentation of issues, questions, or concerns regarding technology services through an online “footprint” submission. Additional information regarding academic technology services is included in Chapter 7.

Study Abroad

The primary study abroad opportunity at Cazenovia College is a semester-long program in collaboration with Canterbury Christ Church University in the United Kingdom. This experience is typically undertaken in the fall semester of the junior year. Students participating in this program live in Canterbury, England, and attend Canterbury Christ Church University. About 20-25 students participate each year with a faculty mentor accompanying the group for academic, social, and cultural support. Other initiatives include the June 2012 experience in Ireland for 12 participants. Additional information regarding the Study Abroad Program appears in Chapters 7 and 8.
Student Development Services that Support Students

The Division of Student Development focuses on initiating meaningful collaborations with academic colleagues, staff, students, and community partners that serve students through the creation and offering of structured, integrated, and purposeful opportunities for them to be engaged in the life of the College. The division provides students with out-of-class activities and opportunities for involvement including, but not limited to, institutional governance, leadership, and involvement in community service.

The College’s Student Handbook is accessible on the College’s website. Topics regarding alcohol and drugs, anti-harassment, discrimination, hate crimes, smoking, weapons, and sexual assault along with various policies, procedures, and resources are provided in the Handbook. The College’s Code of Conduct for Students is outlined along with the community’s expectations and standards. Detailed information regarding the judicial process and hearing procedures, academic misconduct, and Residence Life policies are shared along with general information. The Student Handbook content is updated annually.

The Student Development Division is comprised of seven departments working collaboratively to provide a comprehensive and multi-disciplinary approach to student support.

Counseling Center

The Counseling Center, provides services that help each student grow and develop emotionally, interpersonally, and intellectually. The Center provides consultations; individual, group and couples counseling; substance abuse evaluation; treatment and crisis intervention; and a self-help resource library. In addition, the staff present at faculty meetings, monitor SOAR reports, and distribute information about services to heighten faculty and staff awareness about appropriate referrals. The five-year average of student utilization of the Center is 16%; however, all students have the potential to benefit from the Center’s outreach and educational programs.

The Counseling Center spearheaded use of the CORE Survey to assess behavior and attitudes about substance use, but in 2002, changed to the National College Health Assessment (NCHA) to gain a broader perspective about health and risk behaviors of college students. Survey results have been used to prioritize student and programming needs, allocate resources, and identify protective and risk factors that affect academic performance. Due to cost and the slight year-to-year variances in the data, the survey is now conducted every four to five years instead of annually. In the interim years, the HERI UCLA surveys provide valuable data about key risk behaviors and mental health indicators.

Health Center

The Health Services’ goal is to create and maintain an optimum campus environment for students to pursue their academic work and personal development with a minimum of health-related interference. Services reach all students through educational outreach, dissemination of health education materials, assistance with state and institutional health requirements, and direct healthcare. Health insurance coverage is mandatory for full-time students. Enrollment and
waiver processes are now managed through a web-based service with the insurance brokers. The average of the population receiving direct patient services is 62%.

Health Services utilizes many assessment tools such as the annual Student Health Survey; the Patient Exit Survey; and the HERI YFCY and CSS surveys, which include health-related questions, all of which are analyzed to improve services. The NCHA survey has also provided a wealth of data to guide program and service changes. All survey results have been utilized to implement new privacy policies, culturally sensitive delivery of healthcare, and insurance offerings. Results led to collaboration with Dining Services to improve nutrition in meal plan offerings. Participation in Colby Sawyer’s Health Services Benchmarking study (fall 2011) provided information about provider-to-patient ratios, typical costs, health trends, and health initiatives. The New York State Immunization Audit, conducted by the state every three years, is used to assure compliance with state laws. Although no violations were noted, the auditor’s suggestions resulted in an improved database.

Student Leadership and Engagement

The Student Leadership and Engagement Office is the hub for campus leadership development programs and all resources and services offered to student organizations. Through formal training, experiential opportunities, and faculty/staff interactions, students develop and enhance a personal philosophy of leadership; gain varied leadership experiences; and use multiple leadership techniques, theories and models. Over the past 10 years, there has been significant growth and development of programs and initiatives in this area. Participation in a number of student leadership programs have increased. Student organizations have increased from 32 in 2002 to 60 in 2012-13. As the number of organizations increased, so did the number of Alumni indicating positively that the participation in clubs and student organization contributed to the overall successful college experience (55% in 2009 to 86% in 2010, 71% in 2011). The Campus Activity Board (CAB) Programs and Attendance have increased with overall programming satisfaction exceeding 80% for the last three years. [See CAB Satisfaction Survey 2009-2012.]

The Student Leadership and Engagement Office has established assessment protocols and reviews initiatives on a regular basis. Annual programmatic changes and new/revised policies and procedures are developed in response to findings. For example, as a result of the President’s Retention Task Force work, in fall 2007 CAB implemented a revised programming modeling focused on weekend and late-night programming in an effort to create a more vibrant campus for students. Events increased from 77 to 96 in one year, along with increased attendance.

The Student Government Association (SGA) has seen steady progress in serving as the “voice” for student matters. Elected SGA leaders have demonstrated their commitment to academic excellence, with their average GPA being 3.37. The SGA has effectively utilized the prescribed governance system to submit numerous proposals that directly impact student needs/satisfaction. The most significant example was the addition of a student center in Chapman Hall.

All other areas within the Student Leadership and Engagement Office assess and implement programmatic change to better meet the needs/desires of students. The Alternative Breaks @ Cazenovia (ABC) program places students in communities to engage in community service and
experiential learning during their spring breaks. Being completely immersed in diverse environments enables participants to experience, discuss, and understand social issues in a significant way. Based on feedback from the ABC Participation Survey, the first international service trip to the Dominican Republic was implemented in March 2012.

Student organizations such as the Human Rights Club, Campus Crusade for Christ, You Are Not Alone, Human Services Club, and Students of Ethnic Diversity hold events and programs during the year to promote diversity. Although the Multicultural Committee was fairly inactive in 2011-12, in the past it has sponsored cross-cultural dialogue among students, staff, and faculty through discussions sparked by movies or other current events. Every three years, the SGA administers the Multicultural Survey to all students. Quantitative and qualitative data are reviewed and used to identify issues and provide insight into possible initiatives. Based on the survey results, past actions have included SGA partnering with CAB to sponsor more cultural events on campus; highlighting cultural groups on club registration day (Quad Day); and SGA continuing to work on disability issues and accessibility concerns. Despite numerous initiatives and programming in place to address diversity, students feel more could be done to address cultural diversity. The reactivation of the College’s Multicultural Committee to increase educational outreach on campus is suggested.

The student impact of the programs and initiatives described above can be evidenced in the Alumni Survey. Only 4% of the 2011 respondents reported that they did not participate in co-curricular/leadership programs, compared to 31% in 2005. A majority (mean of 65%) of alumni “agreed or strongly agreed” that the co-curricular and/leadership programs offered by the College improved their attitude toward learning.

Residence Life

The Residence Life Program plays a significant role in student development. Residence Life staff members focus their attention on the intellectual, social, personal, cultural and ethical development of students, and on the creation of a living environment that supports the learning mission of Cazenovia College. The residence halls are supervised by professional full-time, live-in staff members and by head residents and resident advisors (RA) who are students having demonstrated excellent leadership skills. Available 24 hours a day, the staff works to provide a welcoming and secure environment. In fall 2012, all RAs were trained as Certified Peer Educators through the BACCHUS Network. RAs meet regularly with students to address maintenance concerns, security issues, and lifestyle and personal challenges typical to most college students. Members of the Residence Life staff are responsible for designing, planning, and implementing social and educational programs that encourage students to become engaged in the life of the College. The RA, as outlined in the Resident Advisor Manual, is required to plan, facilitate, and evaluate a minimum of 13 programs each year, with eight based on the Wellness Programming Model and five as social programs. The student Environmental Assessment survey identifies opportunities for programming improvements. Residence Life conducts specialized surveys for housing and program preferences, with Substance Free Housing and Living Learning Communities added in response.
Commuter students have all the privileges of residential students and play an important part in campus life. Their full participation in college activities—social, cultural, athletic, and academic—enriches the total program for all students. Commuter students have their own representation on SGA to ensure their voices are heard.

**Athletics**

Cazenovia College participates in NCAA Division III athletics and is a member of the North Eastern Athletic Conference (NEAC). The department’s goal focuses on the NCAA Division III philosophy “to integrate a student’s athletic activities as a complement to the prioritization of their academic/educational experience.” The NEAC mirrors these expectations and commitment to providing a well-rounded college experience for student-athletes. With similar ethical and educational standards, Cazenovia College is a founding member of the NEAC and a model member of NCAA Division III Athletics. The College is also an active member of the Intercollegiate Horse Show Association (IHSA) and Intercollegiate Dressage Association (IDA).

There are currently eight women’s and seven men’s NCAA Division III athletic teams with strong participation in intercollegiate athletics among the student body. Student-athletes typically represent about 30% of the total student population. Cazenovia College students are not limited to NCAA opportunities as the College has other intercollegiate opportunities such as men’s and women’s rowing, equestrian, cheerleading and tennis. In 2012-13, the men and women’s club tennis teams are slated to become NCAA Division III programs. The College has formed six new NCAA programs over the last 10 years, highlighting the opportunities being created for men and women as well as the support provided by the trustees, administration, faculty, and staff to provide these programs.

Over the past decade, the Athletic Department implemented the RACE (Recruiting, Retention, Academics, Alumni, Coaching, Community, Evaluation, Efficiency) philosophy to ensure that the needs of student-athletes were being met both athletically and academically. The Athletic Department cultivates the achievement of the student-athlete through formal documentation that tracks progress. All student-athletes must complete an Academic Progress Report for each of their classes, with results shared with their coaches, establishing communication between student-athletes, professors, and coaches. This has contributed to their academic success, noting that the cumulative GPA for student-athletes has exceeded that of the general student population. Successful learning outcomes in the classroom correlate with retention rates for student-athletes. The increased number of NCAA sports over the last several years; the opportunity to play sports at the college level; and the support and expectation to achieve academic success have likely contributed to a retention rate of 92% for student-athletes.

The Academic Athletic Advisory Council meets on a monthly basis during the academic year to review academic and other institutional issues relevant to student-athlete welfare. The Council, chaired by the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), is composed of representative faculty and student-athletes, the Athletics Director and Assistant AD, a coach, and a student-athlete’s parent. The FAR, appointed by and reporting to the President, represents the College and its faculty in relationships with the NCAA and athletic conferences, assists in maintaining balance between being a student and an athlete, and participates on committees such as SOAR.
In late 2011, a new synthetic turf field was installed thanks to generous donors to the Capital Campaign. In the past, due to poor field conditions, games needed to be held off site. The field benefits student-athletes by giving them excellent facilities to practice and compete on; it fosters College spirit by allowing home contests on campus and provides yet another tool for recruiting. Intramural programs utilize the field affording benefits to all students.

As improvements have been made over the years, the satisfaction level expressed by former students as they reflect on their experience at Cazenovia College has drastically improved. In the Alumni Survey, respondents were asked if they felt participation in athletics contributed to an overall successful college experience: As of 2010, 66% “agreed” or “strongly agreed” compared to a low of 25% in 2007; although, the figure dropped back to 41% in 2011.

Fitness and Wellness

The Fitness and Wellness area offers programming for campus constituents and the greater Cazenovia community. In addition to its varsity sports teams, Cazenovia College offers a wide variety of intramural and club sports to its students. The intramural and club sports program gives students a way to pursue an active lifestyle and enjoy the spirit of competition. Intramural participation has increased over the last three years from 1,001 to 1,136 in 2010-11. These figures include intramural, club sports, and fitness programs participation.

Interfaith Programs

Currently, the College collaborates with Hillel at Syracuse University. Transportation is provided to students requesting to attend religious services outside the Cazenovia area. The Interfaith Office has a Facebook page and reaches out to students via Resident Advisors, study breaks, and notifications of religious observances through campus e-mail. To assess the needs of students, data are examined from the various surveys that include questions about related topics. In the 2010 Alumni Survey, respondents were asked about religious groups or organized religious activities contributing to an overall successful college experience and 24% “agreed or strongly agreed.” In the HERI CSS survey, respondents were asked to indicate the personal importance of integrating spirituality into their life. Results ranged from 24.1% in 2009 to 36.1% in 2012 indicating that it was “essential or very important.” Respondents were also asked to indicate how often they engaged in attending a religious service in the past year. Responses in the 2011 survey for “not at all” were 60.4% and 68.9% in 2012, which indicates this area may not be a high priority for comprehensive student support services. [See Student Support Services Data.]

Collaborative Programs that Support Students

Several support services are multi-disciplinary in nature. Though some of these programs are recognized as Academic or Non-academic, they have multiple offices involved in their success. These offices work collaboratively to ensure favorable student outcomes.
First Year Program

The Cazenovia College First Year Program helps students adjust to college life, understand general academic expectations in the first term, and degree program or major expectations as of the second term. Student Development staff, First Year faculty, and the Dean of the First Year Program collaborate in helping students adjust to college life and succeed as Cazenovia College students. Additional information on the First Year Program can be found in Chapters 4 and 7.

SOAR

In 2003-04 the Student Observation, Assessment and Response (SOAR) committee was established as a component of the First Year Program to address high attrition rates amongst first year students, and was expanded to include all students at academic risk. As discussed in Chapter 4 in the context of retention, the SOAR Committee has a three-part focus: a fact-gathering online module allowing faculty and staff to report concerns regarding students at risk; a committee of stakeholders acting as a clearinghouse for information, reporting on interactions with the student; and following up with the student through the appropriate combination of residence life, athletic, academic, student support, and counseling services. Assessment data pertaining to the at-risk student population as well as campus-wide retention data, information concerning class attendance, judicial processes, academic support sessions and counseling sessions are used to gauge student needs and participation. Data reveal that the SOAR Committee is successful in encouraging faculty to use the SOAR report to identify students who may benefit from intervention. The SOAR Committee assesses itself annually and provides statistics on students referred, actions taken, majors and class standings of those referred as well as the percentage of dismissed students based on SOAR referrals. Aggregated data on the SOAR Program can be found in the SOAR Summary Report.

Living Learning Communities

As discussed in Chapter 4 in the context of retention, Living Learning Communities (LLCs) began in the fall of 2008. Each LLC is linked to a First Year Seminar. The communities are designed to enhance the learning experience in and out of the classroom by coordinating classroom curriculum and Resident Advisor programming. In fall 2009 focus groups were conducted by the Director of the First Year Residential Program to gain feedback from freshmen about their experiences within the communities.

Student feedback from the focus groups suggested that communication to incoming freshmen needed to improve regarding the LLCs and that students wanted to at least be in the same building as others in their First Year Seminar. To improve communication, handouts regarding the LLCs were available during the summer orientation sessions and descriptions of the communities were provided to the faculty for reference during the registration process. A calendar of LLC events is also being developed. The Residence Life funding of an additional $200 per Living Learning Community was maintained based on the results of the Transition Survey. Results also indicated that the LLCs allowed students to feel more connected to the campus community, which contributes to retention.
Co-Curricular Transcript Program

The Co-Curricular Transcript Program was developed to help identify and track skill development within broad categories linked directly to the ten (10) institutional core competencies used in assessing student learning in the classroom. The Transcript intended to provide a record of students’ campus involvement, professional and educational development and honors and recognition. It was designed to support the College’s mission to balance academic and student life by integrating these two components in one document. The development of such a transcript encourages students to reflect upon the general education skills and values they learn through out-of-class involvement. Despite numerous initiatives to encourage students to utilize the Transcript, participation has fallen extremely short. While the program is online and accessible to students, it is moderately user-friendly and not currently in a format that is attractive to students. A co-curricular transcript is not a College requirement, and graduate schools and employers do not require this type of documentation about learning outcomes. These factors have significantly hindered implementation as desired.

Orientation

To provide a range of opportunities for academic, personal, and professional success in a supportive and rewarding environment, the College engages new students in a five-day Orientation Program. The Program, assisted by 100+ student Orientation Leaders, helps new students learn about the social and academic aspects of being a college student. It is also a time when students become engaged in the College’s history and traditions. During the President’s Welcome, all new students publicly introduce themselves and sign their names into a registry book as members of the Cazenovia College community. Other programs include First Night Ceremony, ROPES Challenge Course, Class Olympics, and academic orientation activities all culminating in Convocation. Students report that the Orientation Program creates excitement about learning and helps develop a sense of belonging to the Cazenovia College community. Modifications to the program are implemented each year based on feedback.

As noted in Chapter 4, transfer students comprise about 15-16% of the fall incoming class. With the enhanced recruiting efforts underway to increase that population, the Orientation Program should be closely evaluated and modified to address their specific needs.

Other Services that Support Students

Campus Safety

Campus Safety is responsible for providing direct and general security services to the campus population. In addition, Campus Safety has primary responsibility for providing continuous patrol and traffic coverage on campus property. The department became an in-house operation in 2001 providing 24-hour service. In the past 10 years, the department added services and staff to address the needs of constituents and the increasingly regulated environment.

Campus Safety works with various offices on Emergency Response planning. The procedures regarding emergency response and evacuation are outlined in the department’s Annual Report.
and included in an institutional *Emergency Response Plan*. Campus Safety issues security alerts and warnings, and when warranted, the emergency notification system, *CazAlert*, may be activated including text, phone, and e-mail messages. Cameras are located in various locations on campus, as are emergency “blue light” phones. Campus Safety developed a plan, in collaboration with the ICT Department, to expand electronic security measures.

During Orientation, a copy of *Your Personal Guide to Cazenovia Campus Safety and Security* is provided to new students and to newly hired employees. Crime prevention awareness and sexual assault prevention programming are provided periodically during the academic year. Residence Advisors are recognized by the Clery Act as campus security authorities (CSA) and Campus Safety provides training to RAs about their responsibilities as CSAs. This program will be expanded to include other categories of CSAs and to educate about Title IX. Prevention programming on theft and sexual assault is available to students and staff. Escort services for students and staff, Operation Identification and the emergency “blue light” phones, and access control systems in the residence halls are other programs and measures provided by the department. Campus Safety issues an Annual Report, including the required disclosure of statistics per the Clery Act, by e-mail each year to all students, faculty, and staff, which is also posted on the College’s website. The Campus Safety Office is in compliance with Article 129, a New York State Education Law requiring colleges to assemble a representative campus security committee to review policies and data annually.

SGA reviews the Annual Campus Safety Report and the director of Campus Safety attends SGA meetings to hear student feedback and comments at least once a year. In February 2010, SGA submitted a proposal to seek two additional Emergency Call boxes at the Athletic Complex. This was accomplished by fall 2010. In fall 2011, SGA raised concerns regarding the brightness and visibility of the blue lights located around campus to the Campus Safety Office. By January 2012, the issue had been addressed.

**Dining Services**

Dining Services is managed in-house with a full meal plan program in the main Dining Hall and complementary programs in the Sayford Cyber Café and Late Nite operation, which was implemented in direct response to students requesting dining services to be offered after 7 p.m. The Sayford Cyber Café provides a café dining experience in the J.M. McDonald Student Center. The flexibility afforded with the meal plan structure provides students with access and value that suits their busy schedules. In collaboration with Health Services, Dining Services offers a therapeutic nutrition program to accommodate special dietary needs such as gluten and lactose intolerance, Vegan, vegetarian, and diabetic plans. To assess student needs, the Director of Dining meets regularly with the SGA and provides a suggestion box for feedback.

**Parent Relations Office**

The Parent Relations Office works collaboratively with many offices on campus to engage parents in the Cazenovia College experience. The Parent Relations Office spearheads the parent session at Summer Orientation, Parents Council and publishes a newsletter that is sent via e-mail and posted on the website, along with other helpful publications. In January 2011, the office
implemented the annual Parent Survey. In the first year, 75% of parent respondents indicated that they were not familiar with the Parents Council. Efforts to raise awareness were initiated and the 2012 Survey indicated improvements (63%). Through the Council, parents can engage in leadership roles to further enhance the sense of community among that constituency group.

Student Support Professionals

Cazenovia College is dedicated to hiring qualified professionals. Many policies and procedures are in place that addresses hiring, training and evaluations.

Human Resources

As discussed in Chapter 3, the College has guidelines in place that address hiring and recruiting of all employees. Student Support personnel are highly engaged in professional activities that serve to enrich the quality of their service to students. As noted in Chapter 3, some staff and administrative positions were eliminated, restructured, or put on hold due to past budget constraints. Athletics, Residence Life, Career Services, and the Interfaith Office were some of the areas affected by the reduction in resources. Assessing the student and employee impact of these adjustments will be required to help establish priorities for restoring resources as enrollment and budget targets are met.

Student Support Communications

The College communicates with students through College e-mail, the College’s Website, campus-wide bulletin boards, Dining Hall table tents, campus mail, mail to home addresses, campus display boxes, individual contact, officially recognized Facebook pages and the Caz Alert system. Students also are notified about various student events and programs through the student newspaper, The Quad; Toilet Paper Times; and door-knocker hangers. Students’ achievements are celebrated, documented, and communicated in many ways. The College’s Communications Office posts many student achievements on the College’s website on CazNet, the College’s Facebook page, departmental newsletters, and in the Cazenovia College Magazine. The Communications Office issues press releases to local media outlets and students’ hometown papers to highlight their achievements. The Athletics Department posts athletic achievements on its website and press releases may be sent to media outlets. There are many awards ceremonies and dinners that are hosted throughout the year to honor various student academic, athletic, and leadership achievements.

Collection and Recording of Student Grievances

Students can express complaints and grievances through several departments. Campus Services and the ICT Department provide an online “footprint” system for students to report needed facility repairs or request computing assistance. Campus Safety provides 24-hour service. Residence Life provides four live-in professional staff and 36 paraprofessional staff who interact with resident students on a daily basis. Community meetings are held at least four times a year providing personal feedback to staff. The staff surveys all residential students each semester directly soliciting feedback on the staff, facilities, and policies. Students receive a two-page
newsletter at the beginning of each semester and before breaks with the contact information for professional staff and an invitation to raise any concerns or questions. The SGA offers students the opportunity to present complaints and grievances at their weekly meetings and conducts electronic surveys on a regular basis. SGA also provides opportunity for students to share direct feedback through the CazNet system. The Academic Affairs Office and Enrollment Services address student complaints and grievances regarding academic issues. Guidelines for grade and other academic appeals are outlined on the College’s website. The College’s Judicial System addresses student complaints and grievances regarding violations of the Code of Conduct, per the Student Handbook. Cases are adjudicated by College administrators and referrals are made to the Judicial Board when suspension or dismissal is considered.

Confidentiality of Student Records and Information

As discussed in Chapter 1 on Integrity, all student records across campus are maintained under the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA). A form is available to allow students to release information to an individual. Records for judicial affairs, academics, health and counseling, disabilities, employment, career services, financial aid and admissions, student accounts, and others are secured, maintained, and retained according to regulations. Access is limited to those with a need to know. Policies on confidentiality are issued and signed by personnel and training is provided to new employees.

CONCLUSIONS

In support of its mission to “provide for an individualized educational experience that balances academic and student life,” Cazenovia College offers an array of student support services designed to help students remain enrolled and succeed in their academic pursuit while experiencing intellectual, social and ethical growth. Over the past ten years, the institution has made a commitment to developing, enhancing and balancing academic, student life and collaborative programs and initiatives to ensure student success that balances academic and student life.

During the next several years recruitment and retention will remain a challenge and focus of Cazenovia College. Student support services develop the knowledge and skills necessary for success in the classroom, workplace and community and play a vital role in enrollment management. Our focus needs to remain on initiating meaningful collaborations with academic colleagues, staff, students, and community partners that serve students through the creation and offering of structured, integrated and purposeful opportunities. With that goal in mind, areas for improvement, noted as a result of the self-study review, are identified below.

Suggestions

- The College should explore all options for the academic registration process including the possibilities available through an online format.
- The Multicultural Committee should become more active to increase educational outreach on campus.
• The Co-Curricular Transcript program should be assessed and possibly re-conceptualized to include a variety of experiential aspects based on information provided by Career Services, employers, graduate schools, and students.

Recommendations

• The upcoming strategic planning process should include establishing a comprehensive review process for the transfer student population, including needs for student support services.

• Staffing for the Career Services operation should be a priority in terms of allocating and/or reallocating institutional resources. The office is currently operating at capacity and further development of programs, as outlined in the career development model, will be a challenge without additional resources.
CHAPTER 6

FACULTY (Standard 10)

Members of the faculty play a crucial role in promoting the primary mission of the College, enhancing student success, and in achieving the institutional Goal of creating “a community of learning that is uncompromisingly excellent.” The Workgroup assigned to study the Faculty Standard focused its examination on four primary areas that are necessary for the faculty to successfully fulfill its role: 1) recruitment and retention of qualified faculty; 2) support of faculty; 3) evaluation of faculty; and 4) participation of faculty in governance.

CONTEXT

As of fall 2012, there were 59 full-time and 64 adjunct faculty members working at the main campus. An additional 25 adjunct instructors have taught classes since 2009 at Clinton, Erie and Hudson Valley Community Colleges, which Cazenovia established as additional locations. Faculty members teaching at those locations must meet the same standards as adjunct faculty members on the main campus. Chapter 8 will examine the unique aspects of their roles.

Members of the faculty work within one of four academic divisions: Art and Design, Business and Management, Humanities and Natural Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. Within the Divisions, 18 full-time faculty members are professors, 15 are associate professors, 15 are assistant professors including an artist-in-residence, and 11 are term appointments. Forty-eight faculty members are tenured or in tenure-track positions.

Full-time faculty members at Cazenovia College are required to fulfill a workload comprised of a teaching component and a service component, as well as the expected work on scholarship and professional development. The typical teaching load for full-time faculty is 21 credits, which is below the maximum suggested for effective instruction by the AAUP. This translates to different numbers of course sections depending on the type of class, i.e., lecture, studio, or lab. [For a complete description see Academic Workload Standards 2009, Appendix D.2] Faculty members are expected to teach up to two independent study students per semester, and be a second reader for up to four Senior Capstone projects as a part of their base load.

There is a service component included in the faculty load (part of the base salary), which has two aspects. First, all full-time faculty members are expected to serve on at least one or two standing Councils and/or Committees, occasionally as chair or secretary. Other assignments may include serving on ad hoc committees, such as for employment searches, and accreditation workgroups. All full-time faculty members serve as academic advisors and many advise student clubs and organizations.

The second aspect of the service component involves fulfilling administrative roles, such as Program Director or Division Chair. In 2011-12, 46% of full-time tenured or tenure track faculty served as Program Directors and/or Division Chairs. These responsibilities are outside the base load and qualify for additional compensation, load reductions, or both. In addition, faculty
members are expected to continue to develop their professional competence through scholarly, artistic, or other professional achievements. This work is required for tenure and promotion, and is supported by the professional development programs outlined in this chapter.

ANALYSIS

Recruitment and Retention of Faculty

There have been 24 searches for tenure-track faculty conducted in the last five years. Of those, 13 have resulted in successful hires, four were unsuccessful, and seven were temporarily suspended due to budgetary constraints. Since 2007, 12 tenured and tenure-track faculty members separated from employment at the College for a variety of reasons, including denial of tenure, disability, retirement, or personal reasons. Of the 10 candidates who were eligible for tenure between 2007 and 2012, seven applications were granted and three were denied. According to data from the Exit Interview Questionnaire maintained by Human Resources, the overwhelming majority of faculty members who left the institution did not do so because of job dissatisfaction. In terms of continuing faculty and length of service as an indicator of job satisfaction, 42% have been with the College for more than 20 years and 16% for 10-20 years. The remaining 42% have been with the College less than 10 years.

One indicator where the quality of the faculty has shown steady improvement during the five-year period from 2006 to 2012 is the percentage of full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members who held terminal degrees, rising from 73% to 77%. In the area of diversity of the faculty, the results are mixed. The institution’s Mission Statement and Vision Statement speak of the importance of diversity. Cazenovia College recruits, hires, retains, and promotes (as well as granting tenure to faculty) all employees without regard to race, color, creed, religion, sex, gender, national origin, citizenship, ethnicity, marital status, age, disability, sexual orientation or identity, veteran status, or any other status protected by applicable law to the extent prohibited by law. To ensure a broad pool of candidates, without using preference programs, faculty search announcements are placed in various online and hardcopy higher education journals, national trade association publications, and other traditional sources. Through this process the College has achieved diversity in several key areas, including gender, age, and geographic location.

Despite the well-documented and persistent gender gap among faculty nationwide, full-time faculty at Cazenovia College is comprised of 68% females and 32% males. Moreover, faculty come to Cazenovia College from a diverse group of institutions throughout the country (and internationally), adding their viewpoints and experiences to help ensure that, as the Mission Statement claims, “[g]raduates of Cazenovia College possess the knowledge and skills necessary to become informed and successful participants in the global community.”

Attempts to further diversify the faculty in terms of underrepresented populations have proved challenging. The current percentage for minorities among the full-time faculty is 5.1%, which is slightly above the College’s overall employee figure of 3.2%. A number of possible reasons for the challenges stem from difficulties creating a support structure for minority faculty members in a county where, according to the U.S. Census (2010), 95% of the population identifies
themselves as white, to the lack of sufficient resources to compete with other institutions for the most talented minority instructors. Creating a more diverse faculty along racial and ethnic lines is a work in process, manifested, among other ways, through the publication of the College’s Affirmative Action Plan. To facilitate the recruitment of racial and ethnic minorities at the College, it is suggested that position announcements be placed in media that are likely to be read by minority applicants, and intra-College communication about the need for commitment to diversity principles be reinforced at all levels.

Support of Faculty

The ability of the College to recruit and retain qualified faculty, and to enable and encourage them to maintain and enhance those qualifications, depends on the support it provides. At the most basic level this support is provided by competitive, or at least adequate, compensation. Beyond this is the institutional support for faculty development in each of the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship/research.

Faculty Salaries

The economic downturn during the current strategic planning cycle disrupted plans to improve faculty salaries to the 50th percentile (AAUP cohort). Despite drastic measures at other institutions, Cazenovia College did not lay off a single full-time faculty member during this period. However, other cost-saving measures, such as moderating pay increases, suspending faculty searches, and reducing the institutional contribution to TIAA-CREF for all employees, were necessary. Despite these measures, the average yearly base salaries (in thousands) for Cazenovia College faculty increased overall in every rank from 2006-07 to 2012-13.

Table 3: Faculty Average Salaries 2006-07 to 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PROFESSOR</th>
<th>ASSOCIATE</th>
<th>ASSISTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2010, the College adjusted faculty salaries to alleviate pressures brought to bear due to compression and/or inversion. The figures on faculty salaries contained in this Report represent the contracted salary excluding summer teaching, stipends, extra load, or other forms of remuneration. Benefits, such as retirement contribution, health care insurance, tuition for faculty dependents, and government mandated payroll contributions are not included.

The College’s Strategic Plan called for the establishment of equitable compensation for faculty to be in place by the end of Year Five of the Plan, and targeted average compensation to be in the 50th percentile by that time. For fiscal year 2011-12, the average had reached the 40th percentile among peer institutions (list established in 2008-09), and exceeded the 50th percentile nationally.
for IIB institutions (AAUP). [See Faculty Salary with Combined Average 2011 and 2012.]

Although the target of the 50th percentile among peer colleges was not reached, progress has been made in advancing base salaries, considering the past and present budget challenges. Low salaries at the assistant level affect the College’s ability to attract new junior faculty who bring state-of-the-art skills, fresh ideas, and intellectual vibrancy to the campus. It is suggested that faculty compensation levels continue to be assessed in the upcoming strategic planning process to ensure that the College is able to attract and retain qualified faculty.

Adjunct faculty members are appointed by contract on a semester basis. Adjunct faculty contracts are initiated by the Office of Academic Affairs with compensation paid out only during the semester of assignment. The current salary rate for courses taught by adjunct faculty ranges from $2,200 for a standard 3-credit lecture class to $2,933 for a class with six contact hours, e.g., studio art and design classes. Faculty teaching courses beyond their standard teaching load or during the summer are paid at the rate for an adjunct instructor. A complete description of the policy on adjunct faculty compensation can be found in the Academic Affairs Policy Manual.

Evidence from “A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members,” a report on part-time faculty created by The Coalition on the Academic Workforce, indicates that colleges in this region generally pay more than $2,200, with the median rate being $3,000 per 3-credit course. Data collected by the Adjunct Project reinforces this. Given the importance of attracting the best-qualified adjunct faculty, it is suggested that adjunct compensation levels be addressed in the next strategic planning cycle.

Support for Professional Development

Beyond the support provided through base compensation, the College supports faculty work through training and assistance, funds to support developmental activities, reduction in teaching load, and compensation for additional work. This support begins immediately, as every new full-time faculty member is assigned a seasoned mentor, generally a tenured faculty member who serves as an additional support person. The Vice President of Academic Affairs in consultation with Division Chairs appoints the mentors. Moreover, the mentor and new faculty member meet at Faculty Orientation prior to the commencement of the academic year, and spend a day together bonding, which includes horse and rider exercises at the College’s equine facility and sharing insights on teaching techniques and the College’s culture.

A variety of workshops and opportunities for training are provided during the year. These have ranged from workshops offered during annual staff development days to an off-campus retreat for faculty. In 2011, faculty training and development were expanded through an ongoing series of activities coordinated by The Teaching Development Faculty Steering Committee. In January 2012, a series of ‘lunch and learn’ sessions led by faculty members was begun. At the first session, two faculty members presented a seminar on the College’s Fair Use Doctrine relating to copyright to promote educational objectives in the pursuit of teaching excellence. In addition, each semester the technology staff provides a training session to the faculty on Blackboard, the course management platform provided by the campus. Training on other equipment is provided upon installation and as requested by faculty. Programs that support other development activities are described in the following sections.
Sabbatical Program

A cornerstone of the professional development support for faculty is the sabbatical program. Faculty may apply for a one-semester leave, at regular compensation and benefits, following five years of service. It is also possible to take a full-year leave at half the regular compensation [see Faculty Handbook section 17.4]. The sabbatical is granted based upon a proposed scholarly project. For instance, one faculty member applied her sabbatical in conjunction with a Fulbright Scholarship/Award opportunity in Africa. The faculty as a whole benefits from individual sabbaticals because the returning members generally present their research and findings at the monthly faculty meeting. The College has shown steadfast commitment to the program, granting 100% of requests in the last five years. [See Sabbatical Program Cost Summary.]

Faculty Development Funds

The College operates a Faculty Development Fund to which faculty may apply for support for activities that further professional development in line with goals identified in their individual faculty development plans. Faculty development funds are available to full-time faculty and to full-time staff in Academic Affairs. Requests must be reviewed by the Division Chairs (or supervisors for staff) and by the VP for Academic Affairs in advance of the expenditure. Faculty development funds are typically applied to the cost of professional development activities that can be, but are not limited to, conference attendance, professional membership fees, or supplies and materials related to the production of a professional development project.

Each full-time faculty member has been eligible to apply for faculty development funds up to $640. The 2007-2013 Strategic Plan called for an increase in the funding to $1,500 by the 2007-2008 academic year. In light of budget constraints, however, it was difficult to justify the increase when significant portions of the budgeted funds went unspent at the end of each fiscal year. An average of 66% of budgeted funds were expended in the period from 2007-2011. Faculty expressed concern that the amount available to each individual was inadequate to allow for travel, and therefore they did not apply for funding. The Vice President for Academic Affairs brought the matter to the Faculty Council. After examining the issue the Council proposed a revision to the policy concerning the distribution of funds in order to make more effective use of the available funds. As proposed, rather than setting aside $640 for each faculty member, faculty would be encouraged to list the full amount of needed funds on their application. The Dean of the Faculty would notify the full faculty of the total amount of excess funds by April 1 and these funds would be distributed evenly among faculty whose proposals exceeded $640, up to the amount they actually spent. The proposed revision to the policy was approved by the President and implemented in 2011-12. As anticipated, the program was better utilized with the entire budgeted amount being expended during the year and noted benefits to those faculty who received funding. It is suggested that the amount of funding be analyzed during the next strategic planning process with a goal of continuing to improve the support offered to faculty for scholarly pursuits.

The Pinet Fund

The Pinet Fund was established by a donor to support full-time faculty and staff who present at professional conferences of regional or broader scope with awards of up to $750. Presentations
at conferences not only serve to satisfy professional development requirements for advancement in tenure and rank, but enhance the College’s reputation. Since summer 2009, the Pinet Fund has awarded grants three times per year and faculty may apply for multiple awards each year. Applications are submitted by faculty directly to the VP for Academic Affairs, who reviews the applications. The Pinet Fund was not originally set up as an endowed fund, but in conjunction with the College’s Capital Campaign, it is now established as such with funding again being available within a few years.

The Teaching Development Faculty Steering Committee Mini-Grants

The Teaching Development Faculty Steering Committee is responsible for evaluating faculty grant proposals designed to improve and enhance teaching. The Committee also plans workshops on topics such as understanding the state of higher education today and fair use of copyrighted material in the classroom (already presented). Full-time faculty may apply for up to $500, annually through this program and faculty from different divisions may pool their funds to apply for up to $1,000. Part-time faculty members are not eligible to participate in this program, though full-time faculty may apply for funds that will benefit the teaching of a part-time faculty member. A total of $10,000 was available in the first year and $9,000 in 2011-12 for grants and workshops. Each proposal specifies how the project will be assessed and must show clear measurable indicators. There are also expectations that each faculty member will publically present the results of his or her completed proposal to help foster a community of shared teaching and learning scholarship. Examples of mini-grants from 2011-12 include funds to pay for student entry fees for a design competition; to defray costs and expenses associated with field trips to Boston and New York City; to make improvements to the lighting laboratory; and to purchase Spanish language learning software for future study abroad programs.

Great Minds Lecture Series

Donations from a College alumna, Doris Eversfield Webster (Class of 1946), support an annual lecture series, The Great Minds Great Ideas Faculty Lecture Series. The Series offers several lectures, with lecturing faculty members receiving a stipend to present a lecture at two local libraries. The College’s Communications Office promotes the Series while a faculty member provides the administrative support. The lectures inform the community about the lives and work of important thinkers who opened doors of opportunity for the human spirit, fostering the town-gown relationship and enhancing the reputation of the faculty and the College in the community at large.

21st Century Fund for Innovation

Cazenovia College established the 21st Century Fund for Innovation in 1989 to stimulate professional initiative, creativity, and innovation among all members of the staff, faculty, and administration. This fund provides financial support for the exploration and implementation of new ideas and projects which will improve the teaching, learning, or operational environment within the College in the 21st Century.
There are multiple sources of development funding that have come available to faculty over the years. Since 2004, the Pinet Fund, 21st Century Fund, and Teaching Development Faculty Steering Committee Mini-Grants have supported $129,834 of additional faculty professional development activities not including the $640 per full-time faculty member also budgeted each year. This six-figure total is aside from the costs associated with supporting a very active Faculty Sabbatical Program, which is being funded by the College's operations budget.

When determining the budgeted costs expended in support of our well-subscribed Faculty Sabbatical Program, the most direct dollar amounts expended include each faculty member's compensation for each semester of sabbatical plus the costs for adjunct faculty to cover essential course instruction. In 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12, the College expended a total of $638,113 in direct costs in support of the Sabbatical Program for full-time faculty. [See Supplemental Faculty Development Funding and Sabbatical Cost Summary.]

Support of Service Activities

One of the hallmarks of faculty involvement at the College comes in the form of service. As noted earlier, all full-time faculty members serve on Councils and Committees. Faculty members at the College tend to go beyond minimum service requirements and lend their time and support to activities such as student recruiting and the registration process (beyond advising and mentoring). Service to the College is, of course, one of the fundamental criteria for tenure and promotion in rank.

Division Chairs, under the general direction of the Dean of the Faculty, serve on the Academic Cabinet and lead their respective divisions in collaboratively developing and implementing plans, goals, and policies consistent with the Mission and Strategic Plan of the College. [See Faculty Handbook 5.1.2 and Academic Affairs Policy Manual.] Chairs are elected by a majority vote of the faculty members of their respective academic divisions and, subject to the approval of the Dean and the President, serve three-year terms. They have responsibility, along with Program Directors, for making recommendations to the Dean related to the scheduling, staffing, monitoring, and delivery of the programs and courses offered by the academic division. Division Chairs receive additional compensation and a reduction in teaching load to twelve teaching credits per academic year (see Academic Workload Standards, Appendix D.2).

Program Directors are appointed by the Dean in consultation with their respective Division Chair. In general, the Program Director works with faculty and with the Division Chair and supervisory officers, officials, and regulatory bodies to maintain and improve their respective programs and personnel. [See Faculty Handbook section 5.1.2 and Academic Affairs Policy Manual.] Faculty members are responsible to design, update, and maintain curricula as part of their core requirements for teaching effectiveness and the Program Directors are required to supervise these efforts by reviewing course syllabi from all faculty members within their program. The syllabi are also reviewed by the Division Chair and forwarded to Academic Affairs. Moreover, Program Directors meet with new students (both freshmen and transfer students); attend Open Houses for student recruitment in both fall and spring terms; help negotiate, draft, and maintain Articulation Agreements with various colleges throughout the region in conjunction with Admissions, the Registrar’s Office, and Academic Affairs; and write curriculum proposals for changes to programs and creation of minors. In addition, to further
ensure curricula cohesion, some programs, such as the writing program, require that all instructors within the program use the same syllabus. The First Year Program Committee, as another example, performs an extensive review of all of the syllabi for each course taught as a First Year Seminar.

Program Directors have the potential to earn additional annual compensation depending upon the number of students in their program from a minimum of $616 for up to 20 students to a maximum of $4,400 for greater than 80 students (see Academic Workload Standards), but they have no control over the size of the enrollment of their respective programs. Some programs have student enrollment that exceeds 100 students, which brings increased administrative responsibilities. Accordingly, it is suggested that compensation for Program Directors be re-evaluated as a part of the next strategic planning cycle.

Evaluation of Faculty

In evaluating faculty, the College has been careful to recognize that evaluations have both a formative and a summative role. In its formative role, the evaluation serves as another means of support for faculty members, providing feedback to assist them in maintaining and improving their qualifications as faculty. By providing early and regular feedback, the formative aspect also serves to enhance the fairness of the summative role, which is ultimately designed to ensure that faculty members are qualified. In addition, the Faculty Handbook requires that faculty members be formally evaluated during their third year, upon application for tenure, and upon application for advancement in rank. Student evaluations and evaluations from peers are also mandated to support a faculty member’s third-year review and applications for rank and tenure.

Annual Report

As part of the ongoing process of review, full-time faculty must submit annual reports to their respective Division Chair at the conclusion of each academic year. [See Faculty Annual Report Form]. The report requires faculty members to detail their activities during the academic year, focusing on evidence of successful work in each of four core elements 1) Teaching and Advisement Effectiveness; 2) Professional and Scholarly Growth and Achievement; 3) Service to the College; and 4) Leadership Among the Faculty and Ability to Relate to Students and Colleagues. These are the core criteria used in tenure and promotion decisions. The report also asks for a comparison of the current year’s outcomes with the prior year’s long-range plan, a proposal for the next year’s activities, and a projection for the next five years. The progress of a faculty member at the College, in terms of support of the College’s programs and Mission, is monitored on a yearly basis by the Division Chair and the Dean. Feedback is usually presented at a meeting with each faculty member of the Division. All annual reports completed by a faculty member are required to be submitted simultaneously with the third-year review letter and application for tenure and/or rank. To further reinforce the developmental aspects of the process, faculty members are expected to link their requests for sabbaticals and professional development funds with the long-range plans identified in their annual reports.
Third Year Review

Tenure-track faculty members who are approaching their scheduled third-year review submit a Third Year Review Letter addressing the four core elements discussed in their annual reports. The faculty members up for review attend a meeting to assess the Letter and to receive oral comment and criticism directly from the Dean and from other faculty members who comprise the third-year review committee, typically, the Division Chair and another tenured faculty member such as the Program Director. The faculty member under review receives a detailed written appraisal from the Dean, which sets forth any items that are deficient so that the faculty member is given an opportunity to make adjustments and keep on track for tenure.

Applications for Tenure and/or Rank

Section 11.2 of the Faculty Handbook sets forth the procedures for the submission of a Letter of Request for Tenure and Promotion in Rank and accompanying materials (the “Application”). The Application must address the four core elements, which have been integral to the ongoing assessment process; namely, 1) Teaching and Advisement Effectiveness; 2) Professional and Scholarly Growth and Achievement; 3) Service to the College; and 4) Leadership Among the Faculty and Ability to Relate to Students and Colleagues.

The application and supporting materials are reviewed by each member of the Rank and Tenure Committee. The Rank and Tenure Committee consists of five faculty members, one representative elected by the entire faculty from eligible faculty in each of the four academic Divisions, plus one eligible faculty member elected at large. Faculty members serving as Division Chairs are excluded from membership on the Rank and Tenure Committee to prevent a conflict of interest. All other faculty members in at least their seventh year of full-time service at Cazenovia College are eligible to serve on the Committee.

After its review, the Rank and Tenure Committee votes to either recommend or deny promotion in rank and/or tenure to the applicant. The Faculty Handbook mandates that the recommendation be based on whether the applicant has established worthiness to be granted tenure and/or rank based solely upon evidence of teaching and advisement effectiveness, professional and scholarly growth and achievement, service to the College, and leadership among the faculty and ability to relate to students and colleagues. To that end, an applicant must provide all student evaluations for each class taught. The student evaluation tool is campus-specific, though consistent with nationally used instruments, involving both Likert scale questions and open-ended questions. In addition, the faculty applicant must submit peer reviews, annual reports, the Third-Year Review letter with the Dean’s written appraisal, and evidence of excellence in teaching, advising, research/scholarship, and service.

After the Rank and Tenure Committee makes its recommendation, the Dean of the Faculty is charged with a formal review of the application and supporting materials. The Dean is responsible to concur, or not, with the Committee’s recommendation. The Dean then forwards his or her recommendation, with the Committee recommendations and portfolios of the candidates, to the President for review and comment. The President may either accept or reverse the Dean’s recommendation. Finally, the President’s recommendation to grant tenure then goes
to the Board of Trustees for approval. All of the deliberations and review processes of the Committee, the Dean, the President, and the Board of Trustees are confidential and not open to the public. Faculty who are denied tenure or rank have the right to appeal an adverse decision to the Faculty Grievance Committee, which reviews whether due process was accorded but not the merits of the decision. No faculty who were denied tenure or rank in the past five years have exercised this right.

Not all applications for tenure and/or rank are met favorably. By enforcing the requirements for rank and tenure as set forth in the Faculty Handbook, the College maintains a qualified faculty. Affording applicants who were denied tenure or rank the right to file a grievance and have their appeal be adjudicated by their peers further ensures the integrity of the system.

In addition to the formal procedures and standards that are published and disseminated to the faculty concerning the rank and tenure process, Division Chairs and Program Directors meet with junior faculty on a regular basis and review their portfolios and answer questions on the process. Moreover, senior faculty members hold tenure workshops on a periodic basis.

Review of Adjunct Faculty

To help orient adjunct faculty, the College provides an online Adjunct Faculty Handbook. The Handbook contains a checklist, which guides adjuncts making them feel welcome and ease their transition into the classroom. During the first year of teaching, adjunct faculty are reviewed by a full-time faculty member attending a class and observing teaching effectiveness. No other formal evaluations are required unless the teacher applies for promotion in rank. Further, no procedure has been established to evaluate faculty who teach at off-site locations. To ensure that part-time professors both on campus and at additional locations maintain effective teaching, it is recommended that increased in-class observations and evaluations be implemented.

Participation of Faculty in Governance

Faculty members serve on all of the Councils that make up the system of shared governance at the College. [See Councils and Committees 2012-13.] A comprehensive examination of shared governance can be found in Chapter 3. The focus in this Chapter will be on those aspects of governance that are closely connected to faculty, especially the design and maintenance of the curricula and the review of the Faculty Handbook.

Of particular importance to the faculty is the Faculty Council. The Council provides the President with recommendations and counsel on policies, procedures, and practices relating to the academic enterprise. The Faculty Council is staffed by 14 voting members, including 12 full-time faculty – 3 from each of the academic divisions serving staggered terms of three years, and 2 adjunct faculty elected at large. The Faculty Council is charged with various duties, including recommending 1) approval of additions, deletions, and/or revisions of academic courses, curricula, programs and graduation requirements, including degree and certificate programs, as well as all credit-bearing experiences; 2) policies on matters of evaluating student placement—including evaluation for credit of transferred courses and non-traditional learning—and on standards for progress and achievement; 3) policies relating to professional growth and
development of faculty; and 4) policies and procedures as they affect the academic enterprise of Cazenovia College. [See Shared Governance Document 2011.] All resolutions and recommendations approved by the Council are advisory to the Dean and the President and, through the President, to the Board of Trustees.

One of the functions of the Faculty Council is to review the Faculty Handbook at least every three years, and recommend revisions as needed. It should be noted that the Faculty Handbook is the document that, among other things, describes the procedures to obtain tenure and promotion. Over the years, it has seen some small revisions, but a comprehensive review has not been conducted since 2006. Among other things, institutional and employment policy updates that now appear in the Employee Handbook should be incorporated, as well as the annual review process for faculty, which has been significantly improved. A thorough review by the Faculty Council was underway as of fall 2012 with proposed changes expected to be submitted to the President in spring 2013.

Committees

Faculty members also serve on one or more standing committees. Many of these committees serve a crucial role in the development, maintenance, and assessment of the curriculum. For example, the General Education Committee and the Program Assessment Committee each regularly review the curriculum and make recommendations for revision to the Faculty Council.

Faculty Meetings

As part of the governance structure, in addition to Council participation, the “faculty meets and acts as a committee of the whole when deliberating on College-wide issues or conducting faculty business” (see Faculty Handbook section 6.2). These meetings are required during “each of the terms of the academic year” and all faculty members are “encouraged to attend.” All full-time faculty members are allowed to vote, as are “adjunct faculty with three consecutive years of full-time teaching at Caz...” Matters are generally “decided by majority vote of those present and voting.”

In sum, as participants in the shared governance system through membership on Councils and Committees, faculty members make recommendations to the President that are intended to embrace “student success” by fostering “intellectual, social, and ethical growth” in fulfillment of the institution’s primary mission. Clearly, faculty participation in institutional planning such as on the Council on Long Range Planning, curriculum review such as on the First Year Committee and Faculty Council, and other governance roles as described above are appropriate recognition of faculty’s professional competence and commitment to the College’s Mission and Vision. The participation of the faculty on the various Councils and Committees complements the faculty’s primary responsibilities for teaching, research, and scholarship. Indeed, the institution’s system of shared governance is clearly a positive aspect of the working environment.
CONCLUSIONS

The results of the self-assessment process of the faculty’s role in and fulfillment of the College’s Mission generally bode well for the College, but some areas need attention. For example, although the College has achieved diversity in several key areas, including gender, age, and geographic origin, attempts to further diversify the faculty in terms of racial and ethnic minorities have proved to be challenging. Moreover, while the College has made improvement in the amount of annual salary paid to full-time faculty during the last five years, the goal of achieving equitable compensation with respect to peer institutions has not been realized. And, while the College has granted 100% of sabbatical requests in the last five years and implemented a system for more efficiently and effectively allocating professional development funds, nevertheless, basic per capita faculty development funding has been constant.

In light of these observations, and those detailed throughout the Chapter, the self-assessment process has led to the following suggestions and recommendation:

Suggestions

- Additional position announcements should be placed in media that are likely to be read by minority applicants, and intra-College communication about the need for commitment to diversity principles be reinforced at all levels.
- Compensation for both full-time and part-time faculty should be addressed in the upcoming strategic planning process to ensure that the College is able to attract and retain qualified faculty who can deliver the curriculum and foster a robust academic environment.
- Address the needs expressed by faculty for additional clerical support.
- Compensation for Program Directors should be re-evaluated as a part of the next strategic planning cycle.
- The amount of funding to support professional development for members of the faculty should be analyzed during the next strategic planning process with a view towards continuing to improve the support offered to faculty for scholarly pursuits.

Recommendation

- Policies and procedures in connection with the evaluation and support of part-time faculty both on campus and at additional locations should be reviewed and, if required, modified to enhance the delivery of the curricula and to monitor the performance of such faculty.
CHAPTER 7

EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS AND GENERAL EDUCATION: (Standards 11 & 12)

The Workgroup assigned to study educational offerings and General Education reviewed all relevant institutional and academic documents, and discussed elements of assessment and resources in collaboration with the Workgroups responsible for Student Support Services, Related Educational Offerings, and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes.

CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS

Educational Offerings and General Education are driven by the College’s Mission and Vision Statements, and have evolved considerably since the 2003 Self Study Report. In 2001, the College changed its academic focus from one granting both associate and baccalaureate degrees to an almost exclusively baccalaureate degree granting institution.

The unique offering of baccalaureate degree programs in both liberal and professional studies creates the very fabric of Cazenovia College. It also contributes to “…an individualized educational experience” (Mission) in that students may choose from 33 Baccalaureate Programs including concentration and specializations within majors. The Programs are housed in one of four divisions: Humanities and Natural Sciences, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Art and Design, and Business and Management. Students’ choices can lead to one of the following degrees: Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Fine Arts, or Bachelor of Professional Studies. In addition, students may pursue one or more of the 25 minors and one or more of the three certificate programs available to enhance their college careers. Embedded within several of the degree programs are a variety of specializations or concentrations. The only associate degrees offered by Cazenovia College are obtained through the Office of Extended Learning. A list of all degree programs and minors may be found on the College website including a list of current concentrations, specializations, and certificate programs.

The composition of programs within the four academic divisions changed slightly in 2011 when, after review by the Faculty Council, the Education program was moved from the Division of Humanities, Natural Science and Education to the Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences, allowing a more consistent fit of the Education program with other programs housed within that Division. In addition, several modifications were made to the Education programs. Because the Early Childhood Program Administration program did not lead to certification and was experiencing declining enrollment, it was phased out. The final student completed coursework through the Office of Extended Learning and graduated in 2012. Changes were made to the Early Childhood Teacher Education (ECTE) and Inclusive Elementary Education (IEE) programs to allow more access to open electives and permit students to participate in the junior year study abroad program. In 2011, special education certification was added to the Early Childhood Teacher Education program and the program was renamed the Inclusive Early Childhood Education program. Other significant programmatic changes include the additions of degrees in 2011 of a Bachelor of Arts in Biology, a Bachelor of Science in Environmental Biology, and a dual major in Criminal Justice and Homeland Security Studies and Psychology.
Cazenovia College offers a unique academic structure through its All-College Competencies and General Education program. The All-College Competencies guide both General Education and degree program learning outcomes and provide a common set of assessment points for student learning from the freshman through senior years. The General Education Program helps ensure that regardless of the degree or program pursued, all students receive an education that is grounded in the liberal arts, while offering the flexibility to pursue a professional career.

**All-College Competencies and the General Education Program**

In the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) report, *Defining and Assessing Learning: Exploring Competency-Based Initiatives*, the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative Working Group on Competency-Based Initiatives in Postsecondary Education defines a competency as “a combination of skills, abilities, and knowledge needed to perform a specific task.” Competency based initiatives, then, are “those purposeful actions undertaken by postsecondary institutions directed at defining, teaching, and assessing competencies across their system.” The Cazenovia College Competencies take a somewhat broader approach, but retain the focus on “skills, abilities, and knowledge” identified in the DOE report. The All-College Competencies are integrated across all Cazenovia College degree programs (majors) as well as co-curricular and extra-curricular programs. Depending on major, required coursework within academic programs fosters significant further development in the All-College Competencies beyond the desired student learning outcomes established in the General Education Program.

The All-College Competencies include: 1) Written Communication; 2) Spoken and Interpersonal Communication; 3) Computer Literacy; 4) Ethics; 5) Quantitative Literacy; 6) Cultural Literacy; 7) Scientific Literacy; 8) Diversity and Social Consciousness; 9) Visual Literacy; and 10) Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Information Literacy. The General Education Program is structured around these Competencies, offering a series of gateway courses or assessments in each category. All students at Cazenovia College, including transfer students and adult learners, must complete or transfer in satisfactory equivalent credits to fulfill each of the ten All-College Competencies in the General Education Program.

Development of the All-College Competencies continues through the student’s program of study, where program goals are stated in terms of learning outcomes related to the Competency requirements. Finally, faculty members include expected learning outcomes addressed in the course within the course syllabus. Course content is updated to reflect current approaches of fulfilling the All-College Competencies, to satisfy NYS requirements, and to provide a common learning experience across the curriculum.

Student learning assessment has become more organized, institutionalized, and routine since the 2003 Middle States visit within the conceptual framework provided by the All-College Competencies. Significant efforts have been made in the different arenas of student learning since the original development of the College’s Assessment Plan to implement and use a common language based on the All-College Competencies. The College established clear expectations for outcomes in the General Education Program and then used those expectations as the basis for establishing desired outcomes in academic programs, creating a critical element within the Cazenovia Educational model. [Appendix D.3 provides a sample assessment grid]
Advisors and other institutional constituents use the All-College Competencies as a common language to advise and communicate student expectations (Advising Guidelines).

The General Education Program is an important and essential part of the curricular offerings at Cazenovia College. The continued emphasis on the General Education Program, its impact on curriculum and the significance of the ten All-College Competencies has helped to create a common thread of educational experiences for all students, regardless of major.

The General Education Program’s goals, each of which reflects elements of the College’s Mission, are four-fold:

1) To help students develop the knowledge and skills necessary for success in the classroom;
2) To emphasize the interrelatedness of liberal and professional education;
3) To prepare students to become lifelong learners in both their professional and personal lives; and
4) To develop leadership abilities that allow students to become successful members of the College and ultimately the global community.

General Education points out intellectual connections and demonstrates that learning takes place, not in isolation, but within large intellectual and social contexts. Making these connections, students can begin to understand that knowledge of one subject or career area is related to what they know of others, that there are always more things to know and more connections to make, and that their ability to make these connections enhances the way they work and live. Students are encouraged to link their General Education studies to life outside the classroom by participating in co-curricular activities that provide opportunities to demonstrate leadership and other qualities fostered by the General Education Program. In addition to the gateway courses for the All-College Competencies, the General Education Program includes courses that initiate (First Year Seminar) and culminate (Senior Capstone) a student’s college experience. The Senior Capstone is the culmination of the students’ learning in both General Education and their program of study. It is discussed further below.

The combined curricular, co-curricular and extracurricular relationships with the General Education Program help foster “intellectual, social and ethical growth” (Mission). From the First Year Program to internship experiences to the Capstone project, General Education competencies are reviewed, reflected and emphasized by faculty, staff, administration, coaches and external personnel such as internship site supervisors. (College Catalog, 2011-13; 72-75)

The First Year Program is an integral part of the curriculum for freshmen students. Each incoming freshman participates in one of the themed First Year Seminars. Each year, a few First Year Seminars are constructed as Living Learning Communities, connecting the student’s academic experience to his or her residential experience. The Residence Life staff work with the First Year Program and the participating faculty members to build communities based on the theme of the First Year Seminar. The number of fall seminars and the program-based second-semester First Year courses has been fairly consistent with 18-20 course offerings each semester. All first-year students benefit from a yearly summer reading program, which includes an essay competition, the availability of The New York Times, and the support from one or two master students for every First Year Seminar.
The Senior Capstone is the culminating educational experience for Cazenovia College students. It is designed to apply knowledge gained from course work within the major and from the General Education Program courses along with experiential and co-curricular experiences toward a written or visual exercise. The research methods course within each program is the gateway course for the capstone course and fulfills the critical thinking component for the General Education requirement. Capstone projects are kept in the College library where they are available to anyone interested in reviewing and learning from them. Capstone projects are also used during the program assessment process to ascertain the outcomes of the General Education curriculum as assessed through the General Education Committee.

The College is always looking for ways to use the conceptual framework provided by the All-College Competencies to link more areas of the curriculum, and thereby increase the linkages between General Education and the rest of the curriculum. Internships provide a good example of where attempts have been made to emphasize this linkage. Internship opportunities have been a part of the Cazenovia College experience for many years. Of the 33 degree programs listed in the 2011-13 Catalog, 24 have an internship requirement. Academic credit requirements vary by programs. Some majors require one three-credit hour internship, and others require as many as nine credit-hour internships. Internships and the associated credit-hours can be counted as elective credits toward graduation for those students whose degree programs do not require internships. Academic Program Directors and/or faculty internship coordinators have the responsibility of supervising the interns on the academic side while internship sites supervise the work and mentoring of the student interns.

During the 2011-12 academic year, a series of guidelines and a common syllabus for all internship courses was adopted by Faculty Council and approved by the President. The new guidelines standardize the assessment processes and allow for assessment of student experiences through the Annual Report of Internship Evaluations. The Internship Site Supervisor Evaluation is loosely aligned with the All-College Competencies. It is suggested that this alignment be enhanced to more thoroughly and accurately reflect student interns’ achievement in response to the General Education curriculum. Additionally, student internship evaluation criteria should be aligned with those in the Internship Site Supervisor Evaluation, to allow a direct comparison of how student perceptions of success align with supervisor evaluations of General Education competencies.

The College’s mission of embracing student success is also reflected in the work of the Center for Teaching and Learning and the All-College Honors Program with each program reaching out to a different student population.

**The Center for Teaching and Learning**

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is a unique facility staffed with professional educators and students who provide service to all students who need extra help in their college work. The CTL offers a variety of alternative methods to assist in learning, such as one-on-one or small group tutoring; and assistance in developing strategic learning, and proficiency in writing, reading, and mathematics. Details about the CTL are included in Chapter 5.
The All-College Honors Program

The All-College Honors Program facilitates student success and fosters intellectual and social growth of our best students. The carefully designed and innovative honors curriculum increases the breadth and academic rigor of the courses offered to the honors cohort. Following the Strategic Plan initiative to continue to develop the All-College Honors Program, the program underwent reorganization during the 2005-06 academic year. By 2011, it had grown to include 53 students in all majors, or 5.8% of the student population, which is in keeping with the recommendations of the National Collegiate Honors Council (NCHC) for small colleges. The budget of the program also grew from the total of $3,600 in 2005-06 to $5,000 operating and $3,000 instructional in 2011-12. The program facilitates student success and fosters intellectual and social growth of our best students through honors course offerings in General Education (Academic Writing I and II; Effective Speaking); honors seminars proposed by faculty and chosen by students through a voting process; and one-on-one work with faculty members via contract courses. Each year honors seniors participate in an Honors Symposium. In this public forum, the students present their honors capstones, discuss their honors experience, and respond to the audience’s questions and comments.

Since the Program’s reorganization, honors graduation rates are strong. All honors students graduated in 3 ½ or 4 years, but not all of them achieved the All-College Honors diploma. In 2009, 71% of honors students earned the honors diploma, in 2010, 100% and in 2011, 92%. A 2010 snapshot of the divisional representation of students in the All-College Honors Program identifies 34% of them as enrolled in the Division for Art and Design, 28% in the Division for Humanities and Natural Sciences, 22% in the Division for Business Management, and 16% in the Division for Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Honors coursework is also supported by program-sponsored cultural events on campus such as lectures, meetings with authors (for example Dianne Ackerman, Suzanne Strempek Shea, W.S. Penn), film screenings (Miss Representation), etc.; as well as events and travel off campus. Honors students presented papers at the “Literature and Culture Conference at Le Moyne College in 2007 and at the Mid-Atlantic Consortium for Human Services meeting in Baltimore in 2010; were involved in “The City as Text Exploration” of New York City in 2007; visited the Holocaust Museums in New York City and Washington, D.C. in 2009; explored the American Museum of Natural History in New York in 2010; and enjoyed “Spiderman” on Broadway in 2011 among other activities. The Honors Program organized a “short-study abroad” tour to Italy and Greece in January 2010. Students also participated in community service and human rights initiatives, such as helping with an after-school reading program at the Cazenovia Public Library, serving meals at the Syracuse Rescue Mission, walking dogs for the NYSPCA, and raising funds for earthquake relief for Japan and schools in Africa.

In addition to the All College Honors program, other honors-related opportunities include Dean’s List designation and invited membership in several honor societies. A description of requirements for achievement of Dean’s List, All-College Honors requirements and opportunities and descriptions and membership requirements for the College’s honor societies can be found on the College’s website and in the Resource collection.
Chapter 7 – Standards 11 and 12

Taken together the Education Offerings, General Education programs and all supporting programs of the College work together to provide students “the high-level abilities—analytical, communicative, practical, and ethical—required for active, responsible participation in both public and private life” (Vision Statement).

Comprehensive Curricular Changes

In spring and summer 2010, a major revision to the curricular offerings by program area was undertaken. The process was handled in two stages: first, a review of the General Education curriculum and second, a review of the academic degree programs. The purpose of this two-part task was to ensure that all students, regardless of their program of study, were 1) receiving the proper number of credits in liberal arts courses required of a liberal arts degree— or in a broader sense, the correct balance of liberal arts and professional credits required by each type of degree offered at Cazenovia College (B.A.,B.S., B.P.S., B.F.A.), using the NYSED requirements as a reference; 2) that all students were receiving a common academic experience of course work through their 30 credit-hours of General Education courses – all of which must adhere to a liberal arts definition; and 3) that an efficiency of course sections was offered. This last goal was accomplished by substituting electives for specific requirements in majors or allowing students to take more electives instead of courses in the major, making the curriculum more flexible and therefore less expensive to deliver. The overall result of the effort was an increase in elective course opportunities within majors, the chance to take more electives outside the majors, and more opportunities to take minors and double majors. The effort also ensured that all General Education courses within each of the ten General Education categories provided a common educational experience. The goal of cost savings was achieved as well. The Academic Affairs Division reported a savings of roughly $285,404 for the 2010-11 academic year and $199,280 for the 2011-12 year as a result of the curricular changes. The curricular effort continued in 2010-11 with the development and adoption of changes in the Spoken and Interpersonal Communications General Education Competency requirements to allow students greater choice within that curriculum. The College is working towards further analysis of the curriculum through participation in the Delaware Study. Continued review of courses that comply with the General Education requirements as well as numbers of course sections offered will be important in order to ensure adequate opportunities for students.

Accreditations

The Education programs at the College have been accredited through the Regents Accreditation of Teacher Education (RATE) system offered through the New York State Education Department. In 2010 the Education Department decided that it no longer had the financial and human capacity to offer RATE accreditation and informed institutions that they must choose either the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) as their accrediting organization. The Education faculty, in consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President, chose to apply for candidacy for accreditation through the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). Application for this accreditation was filed in fall 2011. The Education program faculty members compiled an Inquiry Brief and audit system, which was submitted to TEAC for initial review in October 2012.
In addition to accreditation for the Education programs, the Business and Management Programs received accreditation by the International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education (IACBE) in May 2005. This accreditation pertained to all B.S. and B.P.S. degrees offered through the Management Division as well as the AAS degree in Business Management offered through the Office of Extended Learning. Curricular revisions within the Management Division were made at the time of accreditation in order to fulfill the required common core of 16 management courses. The Division complies with IACBE standards such as yearly evaluations, senior projects (referred to as capstone projects at Cazenovia College) and administering a comprehensive exam to all seniors. The IACBE requirement that tenured faculty instruct the core management courses cannot be entirely fulfilled due to the relatively small number of total (10) and tenured (8) faculty compared to the student enrollment (287 in fall 2011) in the Management Division. It is suggested that the need for additional faculty to fulfill accreditation requirements (IACBE), as well as the mission of the College, be examined in the next Strategic Planning cycle. Accreditations such as IACBE, which impose national standards, can be used as benchmarks for curricular development and enhancements.

Establishment of Student Expectations

Cazenovia College’s Mission Statement includes the College’s commitment to the liberal arts as well as to professional studies. Student success is embodied within the individualized educational experience; the multiple experiential education opportunities associated with individual courses and programs; and within co- and extra-curricular activities.

Clear expectations for student learning at all levels and across disciplines are written and communicated through multiple avenues and are used to improve teaching and learning at every level, through course syllabi, faculty course evaluations, faculty annual reports, third-year reviews, the tenure and promotion review process, program assessment review, and Faculty Council review of new programs and courses. Effective student learning outcomes are a benchmark of successful curriculum and educational offerings. Individual program descriptions included in the College Catalog address the fundamental element regarding the establishment of program goals in terms of student learning outcomes. Course syllabi include expected learning outcomes.

Resources

In 2011, the dollar amount allocated to Instructional and Academic Support was $8,450 per FTE, which translated into 53.90% of Total Educational and General Expenses, an increase of over 7% from 46% reported in the Self Study Report of January 2003. Both the percentage and the dollar amount per FTE place Cazenovia College at the higher end of the 19 institutions in the IPEDS comparison group where the range was $4,321 (26.32%) at the low end; and $11,722 (45.38%) at the high end of the scale. Overall, the comparison group of colleges in 2011 averaged 51% of total expenses that were used for Instructional and Academic Support. Cazenovia spent about 3% more than its comparison group average. The financial resources allocated to supporting educational offerings congruent with the College’s Mission reflect the recognition of students and student learning as its primary focus. Resource allocation is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.
Library

The College’s Strategic Plan formulates an initiative to develop the Library as a focal point of student learning integrally linked to curriculum and specifically to the Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Information Literacy competency. The Faculty Council created a Library Task Force to examine the role of the library and make recommendations for moving forward on the initiative. The College also sought new ideas for improvement in this area from two consultants. In 2004, Himmel and Wilson Library Consultants and in 2009, Scott Bennett Library Spaces Planning Consultant presented reports (see Designing the Cazenovia College Library for Learning and Cazenovia College Learning Spaces Survey Report 2009). A preliminary report from the Library Task force was presented in April 2008 (see Library Task Force Report).

In addition to these assessment efforts, the Library developed a series of new initiatives. In 2005, the Library introduced its new JAVA-platform version of its 1996 DOS-based Innovative Interfaces, Inc. software allowing it to go beyond the four walls of its building offering unlimited access to its catalog and databases. This allowed the Library to gain membership in ConnectNY, a consortia of 18 academic libraries within New York State that utilizes end-user requests via the local library catalog to acquire print volumes from over five million available titles. The system has expanded into direct access to e-book titles and scholarly journal articles delivered electronically to the end user.

In 2008, the Library was among the original members of the live, online reference service known as “Ask-Us 24/7” within the CLRC region with connections nationally and internationally. A member of 24/7 provides one-on-one service after hours and during vacation breaks and is available to students attending at remote locations. The most recent addition gained through ConnectNY is new software called RapidILL, an article-requesting service developed by Colorado State University. It offers 24-hour turnaround and electronic delivery of journal articles. While funds for the RapidILL software required some reduction in the book-buying budget, the end-result was a significant expansion in the availability of resources for the students.

An analysis of the General Library Surveys indicates that students overall are satisfied with the resources provided through the Library. For example, in the surveys student users of ConnectNY indicated overwhelmingly that they found it useful and easy to use.

The Library’s capital budget for monograph purchases has held steady at $85,000 per year, which has been adequate to meet demand. Staff rescissions have resulted in the restructuring of duties for remaining personnel. While this has been difficult, it also has provided an opportunity to consider cross training. The Library has recently been made a member of the ConnectNY Collection Analysis Project. This effort seeks to develop a strategic plan for collection management for the members of the group, including identifying redundancies among institutional collections where centralized storage could provide common access, freeing space in crowded library buildings for other purposes. Through ConnectNY, the Library has been active in a consortia e-book acquisition project. This, in conjunction with increasing demand for digital access to materials, offers the opportunity for reconsideration of both capital and operating budgets with a focus on providing improved library services economically, perhaps
even at reduced expense. With the Library Director having retired at the end of spring term 2012, the Office of Academic Affairs is taking the opportunity to closely review all aspects of library services as the search for a replacement is implemented.

Facilities

The College’s 2007-2013 Strategic Plan, congruent with the College’s vision to provide an excellent physical environment for its students, identified an initiative to provide appropriate and functional academic infrastructure through monitoring and improvement of classroom space. The addition of Reisman Hall in the fall of 2004, a state-of-the-art facility ($4,350,800) for art and design programs, represented the first new academic building constructed in over 40 years and supports a large segment of the student population. It also houses an art gallery and as one of the few air-conditioned academic buildings on campus, it has also been consistently used for Summer College courses. Plans have been developed to add academic space at South Campus through the support of the Capital Campaign. The new addition will enhance the Studio Art offerings and improve faculty offices.

The percentage of media-enhanced (equipped with a computer, LCD projector and sound system, or LED flat screen TV) classrooms increased dramatically from academic year 2002-03 to 2011-12 (15% to 64%), and currently there are two classrooms with state-of-the-art Smart Boards. The College has one large space designated for certain events and meetings (Morgan Room), which may not be sufficient to appropriately handle all the various activities. The Library has challenges in space utilization and with the development of new programs in adolescent education and biology, there is an urgent need for new laboratories for both science and education, with a number of classrooms still needing technology upgrades. Fortunately, the planned $1.5 million science upgrade included in the Capital Campaign should help reach the goal of better facilities, both in quality and quantity, to deliver the curriculum. Recent upgrades to the College’s Catherine Cummings Theatre and Equine Educational Center (arena heating in particular) have also contributed to improving the delivery of the curriculum.

One of the most significant changes to facilities is the addition of elevators for greater access to faculty offices and classrooms in Williams, Eddy, and Hubbard Halls. Nonetheless, options for further improvements in accessibility should be examined in the next strategic planning process.

Technology

There are ten computer classrooms each of which has about 20 computers; all but one classroom are dual boot MAC/PC labs, allowing support for a greater variety of curricular needs. New computer laboratories with 36 dual boot computers were installed in the Library in 2010. A ratio of 4:1 of College computers to students has been achieved. An Apple specialist was also hired to make sure courses would run smoothly due to high technology needs in some of the art and design courses. Every year the Academic Cabinet prioritizes the curriculum software needs presented by the faculty. The majority of the needs are met within a three-year time period. Despite these purchases, there is still a need for updated smart technology in the classrooms, including interactive white boards and large TV screens for multipurpose use, greatly enhancing
the teaching experience and allowing faculty to have more seamless use of various delivery systems.

Office computers are upgraded on a yearly basis with the most recent campus-wide replacement in summer 2012. The College has made a concentrated effort to extend wireless access to all parts of the campus; however, there are areas where wireless is not available or not stable. The ICT Department is looking into updates. For approximately five years, ICT members met regularly with the Academic Cabinet to discuss computer needs. While the meetings went a long way toward establishing open communication and timely response to technological problems associated with delivering the curriculum, staffing needs led to decreasing the frequency and regularity of the meetings. Currently, communication is mostly ad hoc, with additional attention and close coordination between Academic Affairs and ICT focusing on software and hardware needs as the annual budget is developed. The retirement of the College’s long-time Director of Library Services offers a further opportunity to assess the role of technology and the place of the Library in this element of the College’s future.

Use of the Blackboard learning management system has helped faculty to integrate technology into the classroom. In 2006, approximately 14 faculty members used Blackboard to help deliver 26 courses. That number has grown yearly and in spring of 2012, 37 faculty members used the Blackboard management system to help deliver 80 or more courses. Every semester ICT offers instruction to all faculty members in order to ensure familiarity with the latest version available.

Though limited by budget considerations, Cazenovia College has been striving to meet the technological challenges and advancements related to the curriculum. During summer 2012, seven classrooms were upgraded with new sound and video equipment. While there are some unfulfilled technology needs, according to the YFCY Survey, in 2006 57.6% of Cazenovia students were satisfied or highly satisfied with computer facilities/labs, compared to 75.4% in 2012, which is similar to the national average. Further assessment will determine how the College can better meet the needs of all students and understand the differences in perceptions of first-year students compared to others.

CONCLUSIONS

Educational Offerings

Assessment tools and data analyzed show that educational offerings are congruent with the College’s Mission with sufficient content, breadth and length, and levels of rigor appropriate to the programs and degrees offered. Analyzing the range of documents where expectations are stated, demonstrates that programs leading to a degree foster a coherent student learning experience with a synthesis of learning. Program goals are stated in terms of student learning outcomes. Periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of student learning outcomes and the utilization of evaluation results are the basis for improving student development and for enabling students to understand their own educational progress. Assessment of student learning and program outcomes are relative to the goals and objectives of the programs and the College uses
the results of course evaluations, program assessments, and a range of assessment tools such as the *ETS Proficiency Profile* to improve student learning and program effectiveness.

**General Education**

The College offers a General Education program of sufficient scope to enhance students’ intellectual growth, and equivalent to at least 30 semester hours for baccalaureate programs where the skills and abilities developed are applied in the major or concentration, leading to an application of those skills and abilities within the major or concentration. Consistent with the College’s Mission, the General Education program incorporates study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives assuring that, upon degree completion, students are proficient in oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, and technological competency appropriate to the discipline. The achievement of such competencies is demonstrated within the institution’s overall plan for ongoing assessment of student learning. Assessment results are utilized for curricular improvement.

**Resources**

The analysis of resources available and data from both strategic plans and annual reports, along with student satisfaction surveys, provide evidence that there is sufficient support for successful learning outcomes. The analysis of the evidence further suggests some improvements of resources would ensure that the students are getting the best education possible.

**Assessment**

The program assessments highlight the desire to present a coherent learning experience for all students, in all programs of study, through a focus on a set of core competencies meant to promote synthesis of learning.

**Suggestions**

- As part of the upcoming strategic planning cycle, assess the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty and the impact on student learning outcomes.
- Revise the Internship Evaluation to align more closely with the All-College Competencies and include student perceptions in the course of evaluation.
- Implement the full version of the Proficiency Profile, which would permit the examination of individual scores and facilitate a more comprehensive analysis of student learning.
- Expand the Honors Program.
- Systematically incorporate student and faculty perceptions in the assessment of technological offerings.
CHAPTER 8

RELATED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES (Standard 13)

The Workgroup assigned to Standard 13 examined the College’s provisions for the development of basic skills, including developmental courses, and policies and procedures for placement into those courses. Certificate programs, experiential learning policies, non-credit offerings, and the Study Abroad Program were also examined. Finally, educational offerings at additional locations and other instructional sites, supervised by the Office of Extended Learning, and courses offered through distance learning were reviewed.

CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS

Cazenovia College is, in keeping with its Mission, a small, close-knit community, and as a result there is no clear separation of the activities examined here from the rest of the College. While the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) provides the home for tutors and professional support staff, faculty members teaching developmental courses, attend the same division meetings as other faculty; submit course proposals through the same governance processes; follow the same promotion and tenure procedures as other faculty members; and are supervised by the same Division Chairs. Similarly, programs and courses offered through the Office of Extended Learning (OEL), including those offered through distance learning, are reviewed by the same Division Chairs and Program Directors as those offered to day students. Analysis of those general policies and procedures can be found in Chapters 6 and 7. This Chapter will provide a review of the College’s status relative to Standard 13.

Basic Skills

Cazenovia College students are expected to succeed in a challenging intellectual environment. It is not unusual for a student to need help in gaining and maintaining an adequate level of academic performance. Recognizing this, the CTL at Cazenovia College is designed to provide students with opportunities to maximize their academic potential. The Center is a unique facility staffed with both professional educators and students (peer tutors) who provide service to all students who need additional support in their college work. The convenient location and hours are designed to meet the needs of all students. The focus in this Chapter will be on the basic skills programs with additional information on the Center located in Chapter 5.

The academic support programs help students remain enrolled and succeed in their academic pursuits, as well as in co-curricular activities. These programs and services include two basic skills programs, Developmental Writing and Developmental Mathematics. Students are placed in academic support programs through a variety of assessment procedures including incoming placement exams and admissions review. Placement in either the Developmental Writing or Developmental Mathematics program includes enrollment in EN100D Fundamentals of College Writing or SM100D Fundamentals of College Mathematics, respectively. Each of these courses awards three non-degree credits. Students have one academic year, or two attempts, to pass
either of these courses. Student who do not meet this requirement are dismissed from the College at the end of that academic year. Some students are required by their grant programs (HEOP, CSTEP, etc.) to be tested and take developmental courses, if necessary, through the Summer College program, and some students not eligible for grant programs have paid to take developmental courses through Summer College.

The most recent description of the process used to place students can be found in *Summer 2012 Mathematics and Writing Placement Process*. This newly revised process is the result of several years of discussion and describes who is required to take placement measures, who is exempt from the placement measures, who creates and grades the measures, and the systems to allow the placement decisions and academic support programs to be more effectively assessed.

The *Mathematics and Writing Placement* policy is designed to assist in the examination of program outcomes indicating whether services delivered to students, including basic skills courses, are supporting students’ successful acquisition of Written Communication and Quantitative Reasoning competencies. At this time, students enrolled in the Developmental Writing and Developmental Mathematics programs are receiving the support they need to realize their academic goal of readiness for college level work. It is suggested that, using the more comprehensive data provided by the new placement process, the placement process and basic skills courses continue to be assessed.

**Certificate Programs**

The process of developing, offering and evaluating certificate programs across the institution is overseen by the Office of Academic Affairs, Academic divisions, and Faculty Council, and follows the current College governance policies and procedures. Any Academic division may research and recommend certificate programs.

Cazenovia College’s three certificate programs, Equine Reproductive Management, Management and Supervision, and Purchasing Management, are offered through the Division of Business and Management. Each program is overseen by the Program Directors, Division Chair and the Registrar’s Office. All application and completion data is a registrar function. The courses follow all program/curriculum requirements as well as the International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education (IACBE) requirements. Most certificate courses exist as part of the core program requirements with supplemental elective course offerings. Students enrolled are given access to all College support programs and advisement. The certificate opportunities are published in the College Catalog and full-time faculty members teach most courses.

**Experiential Learning**

Because experiential learning in the way of Internships is often a required part of degree programs, they are discussed in Chapter 7. This section will focus on the reward of credit for prior learning. Published and implemented policies regarding the award of credit for prior learning can be found in the College Catalog under “Alternative Approaches to Earning Credit or Fulfilling a Degree Requirement.” The current policy, which was revised in 2011-12, permits two options, credit for professional experience, and credit by examination or challenge.
examination. Students may attempt an alternative approach to earning credit only one time per course. A maximum of 30 credits toward the baccalaureate degree may be derived from any combination of these two options.

A student seeking credit for professional experience creates a portfolio, including a rationale specified by the Program Director, developed for this purpose. The student submits the portfolio for review by the appropriate Program Director. Following the review, the Program Director specifies the number of credits (if any) to be awarded to the student and how these credits meet program requirements. The Registrar’s Office will then apply the specified credits to the student’s transcript. The per-credit-hour fee for credits awarded for professional experience is listed in the Financial Services section of the Catalog.

Students may also apply for credit by presenting results of examinations offered through CLEP (College Learning Examination Program), ACE (American Council on Education), LOMA (Life Office Management Association), PONSI (Program on Non-collegiate Sponsored Instruction) or AP (Advanced Placement) Exams. Information on minimally acceptable scores on these exams may be obtained from Enrollment Services. Students must provide official transcripts of test results. For courses that do not have a comparable CLEP, ACE, LOMA, PONSI or AP exam a challenge examination may be made available, at the discretion of the Program Director, and only for 100 or 200 level courses. It should be noted that these alternative avenues for earning credit have been used very infrequently.

Non-Credit Offerings

There are three categories of non-credit courses offered by the College. The first are non-credit courses offered by degree programs and noncredit education courses required for the Education Program. The most significant examples are ED090 Identification and Reporting of Child Abuse, Maltreatment, and Neglect; ED091 Workshop in Substance Abuse and HIV-AIDS Education; and ED092 Workshop in School Violence Prevention and Intervention. While these courses were at one time offered primarily through the Office of Extended Learning (OEL), they are now included in regular campus offerings and reviewed as a part of the regular curriculum (see Chapter 7). An exception to this is a course in Adult, Child and Infant CPR, which is still offered through Extended Learning. The course is run using American Red Cross (ARC) mandates for certification and taught by an ARC-certified instructor. Instructors are recertified in accordance with ARC guidelines and classes are administered under the auspices of that agency. The CPR course may be taken for personal enrichment as a non-credit course, or the certification may be used as a substitution for the one-credit class HE 110, Community First Aid and Safety. Oversight of the class falls is the jurisdiction of Academic Affairs and the class is held to the standards of all Cazenovia classes. All students may enroll in the class, although Sport Management and Inclusive Elementary Education majors are required to complete it.

The second category includes approximately 25 non-credit courses offered each semester through the OEL, for fees that vary depending on the course. The courses are designed by each individual instructor and approved and administered by the OEL. Periodic evaluation of the classes occurs at the class sites and these observations, along with written student evaluations are reviewed by the Director and discussed with Academic Affairs on a regular basis. The majority
of students are adults from the surrounding community. Courses are designed to enhance and enrich the lives of participants; expectations for student learning vary by topic; generally the expectation is simple enjoyment, sharing information or exploring new interests. Typical examples are courses in cooking, fine arts, crafts, photography, gardening, personal finance, and computer use. Offering enriching classes to the local community, at very reasonable fees, is a form of outreach to our non-academic neighbors that increases their sense of belonging within the community, brings vibrancy to the College community, and fosters dialogue and understanding between groups and generations. Non-credit offerings help to bridge what some in academia describe as the “town and gown” chasm.

The third category of non-credit courses includes those offered through the College’s Phase I Pre-Employment Police Academy. The Academy is an official, approved Zone 7 site of the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) and is overseen by the Office of Extended Learning. Accreditation and standards for the site, the administration, the instructors and the curriculum fall under the auspices of the DCJS. The Academy accreditation was updated in July 2012. Information is online at http://www.criminaljustice.ny.gov/. Work completed while enrolled in the Academy may count for up to 15 credits of college course work and is evaluated under the standards for “credit for professional experience.” The process begins with a request by a graduate of the Program to the OEL to review the student’s portfolio, which was maintained during the course of study. The Director of the Criminal Justice and Homeland Security Studies program reviews the portfolio for content and form. Based upon that review, the breadth and length of the curriculum within the Program, and that the instructors are certified by New York State, up to 15 credits can be awarded for Introduction to Criminal Justice and Homeland Security Studies, Crime Scene Investigation, Criminal Law and Procedure, and Internship.

Staff members of the OEL are the direct administrators of the non-credit classes. The OEL Director meets with the Dean of Academic Affairs a minimum of twice per year to discuss non-credit offerings. Discussions include a budgetary analysis, planning for future offerings, and assessments of the impact of non-credit programs and classes on the institution’s resources. The non-credit offerings are self-supporting and in recent years have generated net revenues in excess of $10,000 per semester. The Police Academy revenue adds another $50,000 per year.

**Study Abroad Program**

The Canterbury Study Abroad Program is a cooperative program between Cazenovia College and Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) in Kent, England. Students participating in the Canterbury Study Abroad Program take classes at CCCU, the largest of the University’s five campuses which is an hour from London by train. A World Heritage Site and home to England’s oldest cathedral, the city of Canterbury provides an endless source of historical, architectural and cultural inspiration. This international study experience takes place during the fall semester and is designed primarily for students who are in their junior year, though students who are seniors may also participate. All interested students are invited to attend a series of informational meetings prior to applying. The Program, which attracts 20-25 participants each year, is selective and students must complete an application process. Students who have achieved a 3.0 or higher cumulative GPA are encouraged to apply. Those who have achieved a 2.75 to 2.99
cumulative GPA are given consideration. Applicants must meet with their faculty advisors and obtain a degree audit from the Registrar’s Office to determine the courses they will take in Canterbury.

Those who are accepted into the Canterbury Program remain registered Cazenovia College students and must enroll in OS-301-01 Overseas Study. The 16 semester-hour course load taken by all students who participate in the Program includes five courses of three semester-hours each, plus a one semester-hour weekly seminar. The courses include:

- Modern Britain (3 credit hours) – a comparison course between the United States and Great Britain, which covers contemporary topics on politics, society, culture, health care, media, etc.;
- Either British History, Romans to Civil War or British Literature, Chaucer to Dickens (3 credit hours)
- Three additional courses selected from the CCCU curriculum that satisfy Cazenovia College degree requirements (3 credit hours each), and;
- A weekly seminar convened by the Cazenovia College faculty member who accompanies the students during their stay in Canterbury (1 credit hour).

Courses taken fulfill Major course requirements, General Education requirements or electives. Careful review of the degree audit and course selection assures that students remain on track for graduation with their respective class.

Students are required to purchase round-trip airfare and travel insurance as part of a group travel purchase. All Cazenovia College scholarships, grants, and other financial aid arrangements are maintained. Students are housed in assigned Canterbury Christ Church University student housing at the Parham Road Student Village with other international students. This enables them to develop friendships and learn first-hand about customs and cultures beyond Cazenovia College.

While studying in Canterbury, students have the opportunity to travel across Europe. In addition to organized field trips that correspond to students’ courses of study, there is also time for the students to travel in small groups on their own time and expense.

The international experience broadens the horizons of the students who participate. Some participants have gone on to attend graduate schools in the U.K., returned to work in England, and sought out global opportunities such as the Peace Corps.

**Additional Locations and Other Instructional Sites**

Students enrolled through the OEL take classes on a part-time basis. These students are divided into two groups: 1) those within the local Cazenovia and Syracuse area, and 2) those attending at additional locations and/or instructional sites, e.g., New York State Unified Teachers (NYSUT). The OEL is the administrative body in charge of offerings at various locations across the state. At each additional location, the population served is overwhelmingly non-traditional place-bound students with strong ties to their community, most of whom are employed and rely heavily
on the support system of family and friends in their home location. The program’s policies and practices encompass flexibility and sensitivity to the busy lives of adult learners, which are appropriately supportive while enforcing the high standards and academic rigors to which traditional on-campus students are held. Classes are designed in a flexible format, geared for working adults and offered on a part-time basis in the evenings. Students take between six and nine credits per semester. For students, this means they can receive their schooling while employed and still have time for family and community involvement.

The students who enroll in a degree program at an additional location are required to have an associate’s degree with proper lower division prerequisites, or 60+ transferrable credits, also with the proper prerequisites. Some students must enroll in lower division classes in order to fulfill General Education requirements for a Cazenovia degree. Academic standards for content, breadth and length of courses, as well as levels of rigor appropriate to the programs and degrees offered, are the same whether on the Cazenovia College campus or at additional locations. Cazenovia’s Program Directors guide and advise faculty members and liaisons at the off-campus locations. The bulk of direct student advisement is conducted by the OEL.

To ensure program quality and on-site guidance, the OEL employed “site liaisons” at Erie Community College, Hudson Valley Community College, and Clinton Community College. Each liaison is an adjunct of Cazenovia College, has been fully vetted by the Program Directors and Division Chairs, and has served as a faculty member of the host institution. The purpose of the liaison is to have an on-site contact person for student questions or concerns and to serve as a mentor. Each liaison is a professor and professional in his/her area, with many years of experience in the classroom and in the field. The network of connections that liaisons have in their community assists students in their internship placements. To guide the liaisons, the OEL works in conjunction with the respective on-campus program directors, and each liaison has developed a deep understanding of the Cazenovia Mission, Vision, Goals and expectations. Phone calls, emails, and Skype sessions are frequently used in communication with the liaisons, often multiple times per week. The Director of the OEL travels to each site at least every six months to conduct new student orientations; group advisement sessions; individual advisement sessions; and hold discussions with host-institution administration, liaisons, and faculty.

The OEL and individual Program Directors run the off-site programs on a collaborative model. For example, the Cazenovia Human Service Program Director has been a substantial architect of the Human Services Bachelor’s Degree Program available through the Hudson Valley Community College and Clinton Community College programs. The Director, in collaboration with the site liaison, sets up and oversees the same standards and requirements as those for the on-campus students. Similarly, the Bachelor’s Degree in Criminal Justice and Homeland Security Studies, available through Erie Community College, is overseen by the Program Director on the main campus in cooperation with the site liaison at that location.

The OEL hires current full-time and adjunct faculty to teach classes. New adjunct faculty members hired through the OEL are required to submit curriculum vitae, which are vetted by Division Chairs and Program Directors, using the same standards as those for campus hiring. Potential adjuncts who meet the criteria and standards of the College and the applicable Division Chairs and Program Directors are interviewed by the OEL. Division Chairs, Program Directors
and applicable administrators are invited to join in the interview process. Once a potential adjunct is agreed upon by all those involved in the process, an invitation to instruct is extended to the candidate. Upon acceptance, the candidate proceeds through the standard hiring procedures as administered by Cazenovia’s Human Resources Office. The OEL maintains the same standards for administrative review as are applied to on-campus adjunct faculty members (for more information see Chapter 6). Compensation for OEL adjunct faculty is commensurate with the rates applied by Academic Affairs.

All criteria for entrance to the programs are published on the College’s website. Each potential student first reaches out to the OEL and is instructed in the application process. In initial phone contact with potential students, the criteria are reiterated. After receipt of proof of high school completion and college transcripts, the transcripts are initially reviewed by the OEL. Students whose transcripts do not meet the criteria, as outlined in each Substantive Request to MSCHE, are informed of the classes that must be completed prior to enrollment, and the standards which must be met for entrance into the particular program. Student transcripts that meet the criteria are reviewed by the appropriate Program Director. Students who have met the criteria, are invited to matriculate into the program. The Program Directors, in keeping with the Articulation Agreements between the lower-division institutions and Cazenovia College, acknowledge the transferrable units, which are input into the Cazenovia College database. In the rare instance where there is no current Articulation Agreement with a potential student’s lower division institution(s), Enrollment Services is consulted, and the determination of credit transferability is made following a review. Once vetted by the Program Directors and Enrollment Services, students are encouraged to fill out a FAFSA, and are guided by the Financial Aid staff through the aid process. The OEL guides and advises the students on their class registrations and path to graduation. [See Transfer of Credit Policy.]

The Program Directors, under the auspices of the College, have designed the curricula for the on-campus programs, and the same curricula are offered at the off-site programs. Students are held to the same standards, and follow the same path to graduation as transfer students matriculated on the Cazenovia campus. Students are required to complete the General Education requirements, including the Senior Capstone. Similar to transfer students on the campus, however, they are not required to complete a “first year seminar” since they enter the program with upper-division standing. Students’ work is reviewed and graded by the instructors, with tests and random papers being sent to the OEL for inspection. Student Senior Capstone materials are added to the Library’s collection and available to the campus community. Seniors complete their Capstone under the guidance of their course professor, the Program Director, and up to three “readers.” In most cases, the readers are members of the full-time Cazenovia College faculty/staff and all readers possess advanced degrees. The Senior Capstone projects for students at additional locations are judged on the same standards as those for the on-campus students.

Students involved with New York State Unified Teachers (NYSUT) classes are not on the Cazenovia campus, nor are they matriculated or working toward a Cazenovia College degree. The classes held for NYSUT are Cazenovia for-credit classes, but are offered to a discrete demographic of students already employed by New York State in teaching capacities. http://www.nysut.org/cps/rde/xchg/nysut/hs.xsl/elt.htm
Resources Which Exist to Support the Delivery of the Curriculum at Locations Other than On-Campus

Advisement: The “open door policy” of the OEL includes frequent contact outside normal business hours. Student calls are answered or returned at times which are convenient for them—often on weekends and evenings, if requested by the student. All students are supplied with the OEL director’s cell phone number.

Office of Special Services: The campus at Cazenovia houses the Office of Special Services, which attends to the needs of students who fall under the auspices of the ADA and 504 for accommodations and needs in the postsecondary academic setting. The Office of Special Services has a strong commitment to all Cazenovia students, including those off-site, and work with the OEL, site liaisons, host campuses and off-site students when the need arises.

Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL): Local part-time students, like their full-time, on-campus counterparts, are able to physically access the CTL. Cazenovia College students at additional locations enter with junior-level status. Since they have completed the lower-division General Education classes/prerequisites for the field, need for developmental course work is not an issue. Availability of tutoring services at other sites is being explored and agreements will be formulated as necessary with institutions providing classroom space.

Library Resources: Students taking classes through the OEL can use the College’s Library. (A more general description of Library resources can be found in Chapter 7.) Those students who take classes at additional locations located on community college campuses may usually use the host college’s library, since those are open to the public. In addition, students may access the Cazenovia College Library resources from remote sites. The Library, in the spirit of Information Literacy, acts as a support service to the academic endeavors of students at other sites via an expanding set of online resources, providing unlimited access to its catalog including 6,479 e-books that are available directly. The circulating print collection can be accessed through inter-library loan in the usual manner. The Library also offers remote access to its online databases per a proxy server for students who are off campus. Thus, all of its online resources can be reached via authentication. Likewise, a real-time, online reference librarian can be utilized 24/7, 365 days per year via the “Ask-Us 24–7” reference consortium service of which Cazenovia College Library is a member. It is particularly useful after hours when the Library is closed or as a distant learning resource. The RapidILL service via the ConnectNY consortium allows an end-user, on or off campus, to directly request scholarly articles not included in its databases. The article is delivered to the user’s e-mail account electronically within 24 hours.

Career Services: Career Services staff helps students develop self-knowledge related to career choice and work performance, and who also maintain the database for internships. Help from Career Services staff can be accessed via the Internet, email, and phone communication.

The majority of students enrolled at additional locations are on track for completion. Students who must take time off for personal reasons are informed they are welcome back to the program and many have returned to pick up their studies at the point where they left. No students from the Hudson Valley Community College (HVCC), Clinton Community College (CCC), or Erie
Community College (ECC) sites have been dismissed or put on warning for failing to meet the “Satisfactory Academic Progress” policies of Cazenovia College.

The programs are relatively new, with CCC starting in 2008, HVCC opening in fall 2009, and ECC commencing in fall 2011. In December 2011, 10 students who graduated from the CCC additional location were invited to attend Cazenovia’s December Graduation Tea. Twelve more students graduated from the HVCC additional location in May 2012. All were invited to the May Commencement ceremony and attendance was significant.

Assessment of the additional locations takes place on a near-daily basis with communication between the OEL, Program Directors, site faculty and liaisons. The vision to create solid, high quality programs off campus has been well served by dedicated staff and faculty, guiding the daily tasks of running the locations, as well as seeking new collaborative efforts. At least twice yearly, Academic Affairs, the OEL and Program Directors gauge the needs of the students, the programs and the College with change occurring as needed. For example, in a recent assessment meeting, the Director of the Human Services programs and the OEL approached Academic Affairs, to point out growth in the off-site Human Services Programs and request additional resources.

The College has expanded its operations at additional locations in recent years and more locations may be added such as the recently approved site at Herkimer County Community College. As this expansion has occurred, less formal systems of assessment have developed, often involving regular review by the Director of the OEL, Division Chairs, and Program Directors. It is suggested that a specific written policy be designed to reaffirm the assessments already in place, expand in areas of formal policy (set meetings, specific data), and integrate them into the overall institutional and student learning assessment system.

**Distance Education**

Cazenovia College offers a few select courses through online delivery, two to six per semester, but no degree can be accomplished wholly by distance education. Online courses are designed by Cazenovia College faculty, using Cazenovia Curriculum. All new faculty teaching online courses are vetted by Division Chairs and Program Directors; a vast majority is already full-time or adjunct faculty members. Professors teaching online courses meet or exceed the qualifications for regular Cazenovia adjunct faculty.

Online courses replicate on-campus classes as closely as possible, including use of the same textbooks, topics, and pace. However, the expectation for student discussion and input is likely higher in the online offerings than for a traditional class. Each online student must complete the readings and, based upon those readings and critical thought, respond to the professor’s questions on a discussion board, which is moderated by the instructor. The instructors require thoughtful statements reflecting critical thinking and an engagement with the material, as they would for on-campus students. Student work is submitted with time lines and expectations clearly outlined in the syllabi. Occasionally, a student may be granted additional time for submission. The high quality and standards for the online courses are also evident in the amount of time instructors spend responding to student input on the discussion boards. After consulting
with Division Chairs and Program Directors, the OEL acted upon their recommendations and has capped most online classes at 15-17 students per section.

Courses are delivered through the College learning management system (currently Blackboard). Students access the system using a secure password issued by the College, and are required to update the password every 90 days. Because degree programs cannot be completed exclusively online, nearly all students taking online courses have also taken courses from the College in a traditional classroom setting, which further addresses questions of identity verification. The Program Directors and faculty know the students and their work from other contexts. The full policy is described in the Student Identity Verification Policy. Policies and procedures to address other aspects of the Higher Education Authorization Act regarding distance education are under review by the Faculty Council and the President.

CONCLUSIONS

The close integration of the programs and practices discussed here ensures that consistent standards, policies, and procedures are followed across all of the College’s academic offerings. Two areas of continued scrutiny include the following suggestions:

- The placement process and basic skills courses should continue to be assessed using the more comprehensive data provided by the new placement process
- As additional instructional sites are opened and more online classes developed, the assessment needs of these new offerings should be carefully considered.
CHAPTER 9

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (Standard 14)

The Workgroup for Standards 7 and 14 was charged with examining all aspects of the College’s formal and informal system of assessment. The group reviewed documents and made inquiries to evaluate linkages between the institution’s Strategic Plan, assessment processes, planning efforts, communication and documentation with respect to both Standard 7: Institutional Assessment and Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning. This Chapter focuses on Standard 14: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment.

CONTEXT

All divisions and departments at the College are involved in assessment activities. Leadership, planning, and communication strategies are in place to support sustained assessment practices. Among these strategies have been the creation of a written Institutional Assessment Plan; an annual reporting process for every administrative division based on institutional goals and objectives; the establishment of the Committee for Institutional Assessment; the establishment of an Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Plan (SLO Plan); and the establishment of a Program Assessment Committee to execute and assess that plan in conjunction with the First Year Committee and the General Education Committee.

The Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Plan (SLO Plan) was adopted in 2003 and modified in 2008. This Plan, driven by institutional goals based on the College’s Mission, Vision and values as developed from the Institutional Assessment Plan, provided for a five-year cycle of assessment measures at both the General Education and Program levels.

The 2003 SLO Plan included an Institutional Core Values Statement as a guide for the plan and basis for assessment. This statement was modified in 2008 to emphasize four key points:

Cazenovia College has traditionally been and will continue to be a community focused on learning, nourished by diversity, and strengthened by integrity.

The 2003 SLO plan provided this Institutional Statement of Student Learning Goals:

Students at Cazenovia College become educated, involved, and productive citizens, well-prepared to act as leaders in the global community. Through the general education curriculum beginning with the first year program; professionally-oriented and liberal arts curricula; and co- and extra-curricular programs; they experience intellectual, social, and ethical growth, developing the knowledge and skills necessary for success in the classroom, the workplace, and the community.

In 2008, this section of the Plan was modified to include these learning goals provided in the institution’s Vision Statement:

Graduates of Cazenovia College will be empowered by an innovative combination of liberal and professional education. By connecting theory with insights gained from practice, they will be able to solve concrete problems in the world around them. Our alumni will possess the high-level abilities – analytical, communicative, practical,
and ethical – required for active, responsible participation in both public and private life. With skills that are transferable from discipline to discipline, career to career, and one environment to another, Cazenovia College graduates will possess the abilities to work in their chosen fields as well as fields not yet imagined.

Finally, the Plan included the following principles to guide the assessment process:
1. The purpose of assessing student learning is to improve student learning.
2. Assessment must be clearly linked to the institution’s Mission, Goals, and Core Values through the Institutional Statement of Student Learning Goals.
3. Assessment results and analysis will be used to improve institutional effectiveness through the strategic budgeting and planning process.
4. Whenever possible, assessment practices should take advantage of structures and opportunities already in place, and assessment activities should be embedded into regular practices, not added on.
5. Assessment must show evidence of broad involvement and responsibility.
6. Assessment results should be widely shared with all stakeholders.
7. Assessment efforts should be supported by appropriate resources.
8. Effective assessment uses a variety of measures.
9. Assessment of student learning must be a continuous and comprehensive process that considers all aspects of student learning at the College.
10. The College’s program of assessment practices will itself require routine assessment.

The Plan assigns responsibility for the Assessment of Student Learning in the divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Development, assisted by the Director for Institutional Research and Development. Student learning assessment includes five categories: Overall Student Performance, General Education, Academic Programs, First Year Program, and Co- and Extra-Curricular Programs. Annual assessment results are noted in various year-end reports.

**ANALYSIS**

The 2003 SLO Plan recognized the ten All-College General Education Competencies. In 2008, this term was modified to reflect the distribution of the All-College Competencies across the College, including General Education, academic programs and co- and extra-curricular activities. The 2008 SLO plan provides that:

All education at Cazenovia College is based on the common language provided by the All-College Competencies. Students are introduced to the Competencies in the First Year Program, encounter the Competencies in the General Education Program curriculum, achieve further growth in the Competencies through their academic programs, and have the opportunity to demonstrate their command of these Competencies in co- and extra-curricular programs.

This continuity between General Education and Program curricula through the All-College Competencies is a critical element in the Cazenovia educational model. When the model originated, very few colleges could point to such a linkage between these elements of a
student’s education. This common language and linkage between General Education and Academic Programs allows for common language in the assessment of student learning across all five assessment areas. [See Appendix D.4 Overview of General Education Committee Assessment Documents/Evidence 2003-2012.]

All students at Cazenovia College must complete or transfer in satisfactory equivalent credits to fulfill the General Education requirements related to the ten All-College Competencies. (Cazenovia’s online Computer Competency Measure is required of all students). Internal assessment of student performance in the General Education Program is the responsibility of the Division of Academic Affairs and carried out by the General Education Committee and the Program Assessment Committee. Assessment of student development in the All-College Competencies continues through a series of national and college-developed assessment measures. Examples of state or national measures include:

1) ETS Proficiency Profile scores and gains;
2) New York State Teacher Certification Exam scores and pass rates;
3) GRE scores; and
4) UCLA HERI Surveys.

Examples of College-developed assessments include:

1) Internship evaluations;
2) Letters to the Dean;
3) Portfolios of student work;
4) Capstones scored with a rubric
5) Course grade distributions;
6) Alumni Surveys;
7) Honors, awards, and scholarships; and
8) Online computer competency measure.

Other indicators considered in the assessment of student learning include graduation rates, retention rates, and academic progress.

The ETS Proficiency Profile is a useful tool and, given the value of the measure and a desire for more sophisticated data analyses, it is suggested that the College implement use of the full test form (see Chapter 10 for more details). The additional information would facilitate assessment of transfer students as a separate population, allowing the College to identify the unique needs of these students. In addition, the Profile should be administered to a larger sample from the senior class, ideally including the entire class.

External accrediting agencies have program-specific requirements and the College conducts additional assessments and/or reporting on those assessments to satisfy the requirements. Currently, the IACBE provides accreditation for the Business and Management programs and preliminary work has begun toward National Association of Schools of Art and Design accreditation. Local professionals assess Senior Capstone projects in Business Management, and Visual Communications and Studio Art are subject to external assessment when feasible. The Education Program is currently working toward TEAC accreditation, due to the recent discontinuance of the New York State RATE program. (See Chapter 7 for details.)
Assessment tools have also been implemented for student co- and extra-curricular activities, as well as for student internships. The Division of Student Development includes assessment of students in leadership and engagement activities (see Chapter 5). Internship assessment was significantly updated in fall 2010 when an online internship evaluation for site managers replaced the previous paper process. The new format allows for more efficient collection of data. The *Annual Report of Internships* was implemented in order to provide a summary of internship sites and student intern evaluations. The All-College Competencies should be more thoroughly integrated into the evaluation form, though, providing expanded data for the assessment of the General Education Program. The students’ assessment of their internship should parallel that of the site supervisor, allowing for a direct comparison of how students’ perceptions of success align with supervisors’ evaluations of the All-College Competencies.

The General Education and Program Assessment Committees were guided by the five-year assessment plan established in fall 2007 that identified specific initiatives for each year of the cycle. [See *SLO Academic Program Assessment Procedures*.] Both committees organized their work by academic program, so that the programs under review by the Program Assessment Committee were the same programs providing data for the General Education review. Program Directors were asked to provide their program assessment plans along with assessment data to the Program Assessment Committee and to provide sample Capstone projects for a portion of the assessment done by the General Education Committee. The General Education Committee also worked on assessments of each All-College Competency in rotation. This portion of the assessment was not dependent on sampling from programs. The All-College Competencies were addressed by the entire curriculum in the 2007 Competency Survey. Subsequent assessment was divided between the Program Assessment Committee and the General Education Committee.

The use of the Senior Capstone as an assessment starting point emerged in the 2003 SLO Plan after an external panel review during the Asheville Institute on General Education. The Senior Capstone project is the culmination of the student’s undergraduate experience for both General Education and the student’s program of study. The Capstone assessment project was designed to assess how the All-College Competencies addressed by the General Education Program were demonstrated in these senior projects, with the goal of assessing the effectiveness of the General Education curriculum and its sustenance through the student’s program experiences, as provided in the 2003 SLO plan:

While every student must demonstrate baseline competence in each of the competencies (as defined in the General Education Requirements), a specific program should, whenever possible, define its learning goals in terms of higher levels of development in selected areas of the competencies. This, in turn, will enable course syllabi and other documents to clearly connect specific activities and experiences to programmatic, general education, and institutional learning goals in support of the College’s overall Mission.

For the Capstone assessment project, Program Directors were asked to provide three sample Capstones from the previous semester’s Capstone course, ranging in quality from good to weak. These were reviewed for evidence of the students’ achievement of the All-College
Competencies. The General Education Committee recognized that not all ten of the Competencies could be evaluated from a written Capstone project alone. For example, the Spoken and Interpersonal Communication Competency cannot be assessed through a written project. Similarly, the Capstone projects for some programs involve two stages, of which the written report is only one part. The assessment process included follow-up visits with Program Directors and review of additional senior Capstone artifacts where appropriate. A report of the Committee’s findings and recommendations was prepared for each program and shared with the Program Director, with an invitation for discussion and feedback. Finalized reports are used for future planning in the General Education Program.

It is suggested that the General Education Committee review the evidence from the Capstone reviews in the last cycle and use that experience as the basis for a discussion to clarify student expectations, to establish links between the Program Assessment Committee and General Education Committee review processes, and to clarify and possibly restructure the assessment model for the next cycle. In addition, the Committee should consider whether the use of external professionals to assist in the evaluation process could be applied to all divisions. Both Committees’ reports should be provided annually to the College Institutional Assessment Committee and be more widely available for review and discussion.

The First Year Program also followed a five-year initiative driven plan for assessment of its four major objectives (introduction to college expectations, integration into college, integration into degree program, and transition). Student learning outcomes for co- and extra-curricular studies followed a five-year assessment cycle that included initiatives related to the Co-Curricular Transcript, while the Office of Residence Life had a five-year plan related to Residential Life Learning Communities.

The 2003 Middle States Evaluation Team Report to the College anticipated the realization of a new information literacy initiative assessing student knowledge and understanding of library resources. To guide assessment, the Library professionals refer to Developing Research Communication Skills: Guidelines for Information Literacy in the Curriculum (MSCHE). There are five substantial assessment points that are important to the Library: the library information literacy assessments that are conducted in EN101, EN201 and the designated research methods course; the Annual Library Report; and the senior capstones. The three information literacy assessments help Library personnel, faculty, and students to understand the growth in information literacy as students move from incoming freshmen to upperclassmen. The Annual Library Report generates an overall picture of the library function and includes the three information literacy assessments. Perhaps most important, Senior Capstone projects are collected, bound, and catalogued in the Library. All annual library reports are bound, catalogued and available in the Library, the Cazenovia College Sharepoint and the report is emailed to the College community upon completion.

The five-year plans for the Program Assessment Committee and the General Education Committee were interrupted by the College-wide curriculum assessment and reform initiative. While this initiative was not one of the items specifically incorporated in the Strategic Plan, it was a way for the College to address an assumption of the Plan, namely “Institutional effectiveness requires a curriculum and student body appropriately matched to
institutional resources and goals.” This effort was also an occasion where two of our institutional goals, “Achieve financial stability” and “Improve curricular and co-curricular offerings while improving recruitment and retention efforts” intersected.

In 2009, a major curricular assessment and reform project was undertaken by the College faculty following an initial curricular review by the College’s Academic Cabinet and a subsequent Presidential directive to Faculty Council to address the programmatic and General Education changes necessitated by the findings of an overall review of the College curriculum done by the College’s Academic Cabinet (see Curriculum Revision Justification and Charge memorandum, March 29, 2009). Specifically, the President directed the Faculty Council to direct “timely, substantive efforts at both the Divisional and Program levels to recommend changes that would improve curricular efficiency as well as assure compliance with State regulations in the delivery of the College’s baccalaureate curricula.” While the major portion of this project was completed in spring and summer of 2010, related work on the General Education curriculum continued into the 2010-11 academic year.

As part of the review process, the Academic Cabinet assessed the efficiency of the curriculum from a financial perspective. During the 2008-09 academic year, 564 class sections were offered and the average fall-spring enrollment was 937 full-time students. Average class size was 15.75, against a target of 18 (per Strategic Plan 2007-2012). Given an average student load of five courses per term (spring 2010, as verified by the Registrar’s Office), if the target average class size had been attained, 521 (937*10)/18 class sections would have been expected to be required. If the 2009-10 targeted average class size of 20 had been in place, 469 (937*10)/20 sections would be expected. Thus, the effort required to deliver the curriculum at Cazenovia College exceeds course section expectations by 8% to 20%. Further, assuming the cost of teaching an average section, by adjunct faculty or through overloads is $2,300, an additional approximate instructional expense of between $99,900 and $217,000 was incurred.

The Cabinet identified conceptual and pedagogical challenges in many of the curricula. The NYSED mandates certain minimum requirements for liberal arts courses as a component of varying types of undergraduate degrees recognizing this is essential in realizing the College’s stated vision of offering an innovative combination of professional and liberal education. This demanded a rigorous and critical appraisal of requirements for all degrees. Some of the College’s career-oriented programs were almost entirely prescriptive regarding the subject matter to which students were exposed, leaving little opportunity for meaningful exploration of subjects beyond the immediate major. At the same time, a General Education model focused on Competencies allowed many programs to lay claim to satisfying those Competencies within major-specific courses. When few General Education choices combined with a paucity (both numbers of courses and diversity of subject matter) of elective credit opportunities, the potential result is a student body with little opportunity for shared experience or knowledge, either personal or intellectual.

The Academic Cabinet noted that these regulatory, fiscal and conceptual challenges were intertwined. All the while, a burdensome economic environment presented both an opportunity and a sense of immediacy to tackle problems. Seizing this chance enabled us to
achieve substantial gains not only in the College’s fiscal sustainability, but also in the formulation of an education that significantly enhances the realization of our institutional vision for student learning.

The first step in the process of curriculum review was made by the General Education Committee, responding to two charges from the Faculty Council:

1) Review all current courses that satisfy General Education requirements and identify those courses that do not satisfy the NYSED regulations for inclusion in the General Education Program; and

2) Identify a range of courses that provide adequate choice for students to complete the General Education Program while
   o Prohibiting students from fulfilling General Education requirements by using required courses within their major; and
   o Promoting a common curricular experience, i.e., programs may not prescribe specific General Education courses for their students.

By the end of April 2010, the General Education Committee submitted its recommendations to Faculty Council, using the following parameters in addition to those incorporated in the two charges from Faculty Council:

1. The General Education Program will contain a total of 30 arts and sciences credits, thus satisfying the basic arts and sciences requirement for BPS and BFA programs. Three courses within the General Education Program, First Year Seminars, Research Methods, and Capstone, may be either arts and sciences or program-specific courses.

2. General Education courses will be open to all students on a first come, first serve basis.

3. We relied on the College Catalog for current listings of General Education courses when there were discrepancies (primarily the Cultural Literacy course listings) with an online list on the College website.

4. Based on Board and administrative instructions, we disregarded NYSED use of the conditional “generally” when evaluating which current General Education courses did not conform to NYSED regulations regarding classification as liberal arts courses.

5. Removal of infrequently offered courses will not on its own meet our goal, but may help promote a common curricular experience.

6. In most instances, we considered for inclusion in the General Education Program those courses that either have no college-level prerequisites or only an all-college requirement such as Academic Writing I, Effective Speaking, or College Algebra.

7. Students may take a course to satisfy General Education requirements that other students are taking as a part of their major.

8. Courses with enrollment restrictions due to their required status within a major or courses offered on an infrequent basis were considered inappropriate for inclusion in the General Education curriculum.

9. Limiting the number of courses within the General Education curriculum may not on its own lead to a corresponding decrease in the number of sections offered.

10. We anticipate further review and possible modification of the General Education curriculum in the 2010-11 academic year and in the regular assessment cycle.
General Education Committee recommendations were accepted by Faculty Council, the administration and subsequently, Board of Trustees. The revised program reduced courses within the General Education Program from 109 to 55 eligible courses, cutting a total of 54 courses (See Overview of General Education Curriculum as Approved by Board of Trustees, May 13, 2010). A subsequent revision of the Spoken and Interpersonal Communication curriculum allowed for greater flexibility in how students satisfied that requirement.

Concurrent with the General Education Committee assessment process and then continuing into summer 2010, academic Program Directors engaged in an assessment of their curricula to identify necessary modifications in terms of appropriate size based on a standard adopted by Faculty Council, and to adjust program requirements in response to changes in the General Education Program approved by the Council. By summer’s end, all academic programs had submitted revised curricula that were approved by the Trustees’ Executive Committee of and then the full Board. The template developed at that time has subsequently become a standard element in all proposals for new academic programs (See Comprehensive Curriculum Revision at Cazenovia College, August 18, 2010).

Following implementation of the revised curriculum, a PULSE survey was deployed to assess academic advising in the new model. The survey showed that students experienced no significant difficulties in advising or registration due to the changes and, in fact, reported that it was easier to declare minors and/or double majors. This is one example of new assessments implemented during the current strategic planning cycle. Recognizing that assessment points may have shifted after the 2010 curriculum reform, the Program Assessment and General Education Committee should assess existing tools and make such modifications as may be necessary to ensure appropriate assessment of the new curriculum.

CONCLUSIONS

The College has made substantial progress in establishing systems for assessing student learning outcomes. These assessments have resulted in some significant changes, some narrowly focused and others as comprehensive as the recent curriculum revisions. The following suggestions would continue this trajectory:

- Expand the use of external peer reviews for academic programs, including the General Education curriculum.
- Maximize the availability and use of assessments to improve teaching and learning, and inform planning and resource allocation decisions. Such efforts would include creating a series of Dashboards that contain student learning outcomes data and information related to General Education and Academic Program assessment, as well as specific student populations such as transfer Extended Learning students.
- Revise the Student Learning Outcomes Plan to more fully integrate and clearly articulate General Education and Program Assessment activities including competency-specific assessment tools as needed.
CHAPTER 10

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT/INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (Standard 7)

The Workgroup for Standards 7 and 14 examined all aspects of the College’s formal and informal systems of assessment. The group reviewed documents and made inquiries to evaluate linkages between the institution’s Strategic Plan, assessment processes, planning efforts, communication and documentation with respect to both Standards. Collaboration took place with the Workgroup researching Educational Offerings and General Education to report on Standard 14 in Chapter 9.

CONTEXT

The Culture of Assessment Established Since the Last Self Study

The Committee for All-College Assessment convened in February 2003 to establish institutional and student learning outcomes assessment. Based on Evaluation Team recommendations from the 2003 accreditation visit that these functions be split, the Committee developed a Student Learning Outcomes Plan, which specified the creation of a committee housed within Academic Affairs to execute the plan. In spring 2003, the Institutional Assessment Plan and the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Plan were developed. The Plans were expected to cover five years of assessment activities and served as the foundation for establishing sound assessment practices. In fall 2003, the Program Assessment Committee was established. This committee worked in conjunction with the General Education and First Year Program Committees to create and implement student learning outcome assessments across the four Academic divisions of the College.

Reflected in the 2003 Middle States Report was the Evaluation Team’s belief that many College faculty and staff did not fully comprehend what assessment was or its importance to the College. The revised Planning Indicators, with direct relation to the Strategic Plan and the annual reporting process addressed this concern by including all administrative divisions and their respective faculty and staff members in the assessment process. Further, the implementation of the Program Assessment cycle and the General Education Competency review cycle (discussed in the separate report on Standard 14) has heightened awareness of the assessment process and its significance for faculty in all programs reviewed to date. This cycle is being revised to reflect the findings of the original cycle and to incorporate changes made as a result of the 2009-10 curriculum revision.

In May 2008, the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Plan was revised. The Plan outlined the offices responsible for student learning assessment, the institutional statement of student learning goals—derived from the institution’s Mission and values—the principles governing student learning assessment, and the establishment of the common language of the All-College Competencies for the student experience in both curricular and extra-curricular activities. The impact of this Plan and the subsequent assessment activities related to Student Learning Outcomes is discussed in Chapter 9.
Institutional assessment at the College is based on the *Institutional Assessment Plan* as developed in 2003 and updated every five years. The most recent version of the Plan was reviewed and approved by the (renamed) Committee for Institutional Assessment in February 2008. The Plan requires each administrative division to select, collect, and report data; to analyze performance results; and to utilize this data and analysis as the basis for further strategic budgeting and planning. The Plan also includes a five-year timetable of goals, actions and outcomes tied to both the strategic planning process and our continuing responsibilities to Middle States. All divisions are required to report on assessment activities in their *Annual Report on the Strategic Plan*. The *Assessment Tool Inventory* and *Assessment Worksheets* are used as a way to promote a common language about assessment and link results to improvements and planning. These documents also improve communications across campus about assessment efforts. A decade later, the decision to proceed with separate plans for institutional efforts and student learning efforts, as recommended by the 2003 Evaluation Team, is under review.

As noted, institutional assessment is conducted through the College’s strategic planning process via annual reports, tracking of selected Performance Indicators, and annual SWOT analysis (the *Strategic Plan* is discussed in more detail in Chapter 2). With the initiation of the current *Strategic Plan 2007-2013*, divisional assessment plans draw directly from institutional goals and objectives; assessment plans at the departmental and individual levels, draw directly from divisional, and in turn, institutional goals. This approach provides for coordinated assessment that is linked with institutional priorities and ensures that all efforts are directed toward common goals and priorities. During the annual reporting process, divisions and departments provide data in their assessment worksheets from the execution of their assessment plans for that year and make revisions to plans for the coming year.

Data sharing occurs routinely, serving the interests of different constituencies within the campus population. Institutional assessment data is routinely shared with the Board of Trustees to assist in governance decision-making. In addition, the President hosts State of the College addresses for all constituents where he presents institutional assessment data on certain topics of importance to the campus community. Over the past two years, a wealth of data has been added to an Intranet Sharepoint dedicated to this purpose. Institutional data, tools, and analysis reports produced by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment are made accessible to the College community. Data that are specific to certain programs, services, or student groups might be shared only with those who have a vested interest.

As confirmed by the Workgroup researching this Standard, establishing routine assessment in every area on campus has been a major strategic action item since the last self-study in 2002-03. All divisions and departments at the College are involved in assessment activities. Leadership, planning, and communication strategies have been implemented to support sustained assessment practices. Among these strategies was the creation of a written Institutional Assessment Plan; an annual reporting process for every administrative division based on institutional goals and objectives; the establishment of the Committee for Institutional Assessment; the establishment of a Student Learning Outcomes Plan (SLO); and the establishment of a Program Assessment Committee to execute and assess the SLO Plan in conjunction with the First Year Committee and the General Education Committee.
ANALYSIS

Institutional assessment is driven by the College’s Strategic Plan, which is grounded in the College’s Mission, Vision, and Values. The current Strategic Plan, like the one before it, was developed through an inclusive process involving over 90 trustee, faculty, staff, alumni, and student participants. This planning process was guided by clearly stated assumptions, including the understanding that “accomplishing the institution’s goals requires consistent and ongoing planning, based upon assessment.” This particular emphasis on assessment is further established in the Strategic Plan’s objective to “implement effective assessment across the institution.”

The establishment of a continuous, systematic, and sustained planning cycle was guided by three primary goals, all directly related to the Characteristics of Excellence (MSCHE). During the current planning cycle, the written plan for institutional assessment was updated to incorporate changes made during the previous planning cycle when the original plan was created. Institutional assessment takes place on a regular basis through the strategic planning and annual reporting process. Each year, the Annual Report provides the campus with a thorough review of the institution as a whole and the divisions and various departments, among others, that contribute to the institution’s success. The Institutional Assessment Plan incorporates the Assessment Tool Inventory that supports the divisions and departments in their assessment efforts for their respective areas of responsibility. These efforts are assisted by the College’s Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, and are reported annually with measures of target performance indicators given by the Strategic Plan.

Assessment data collected during the last strategic planning cycle was used heavily to inform development of the current Strategic Plan. This evidence resulted in numerous changes campus-wide: significant capital improvements, new faculty hires, a reversal of a downturn in student retention and a return to a July 1-June 30 fiscal year, to name a few. Twenty-nine performance indicators were tracked throughout the 2002-2007 strategic planning cycle and subsequent evaluation of the usefulness and applicability of all 29 indicators in relation to the institution’s new goals and objectives resulted in revision of performance indicators for the current planning cycle. The 12 current Planning Indicators are Fall Enrollment; Percent Male Enrollment; Retention-Total Population; Retention-First Year Population; 6 Year Graduation Rate; First Year Courses Taught by Full-Time Faculty; Faculty Average Salary; Alumni Giving Rate; Debt to Expendable Net Assets; Operational Cash to Cover Debt Principal/Capital; Net Tuition Revenue per Average Full-Time Student, and; Number of Graduates Employed or in Advanced Study. These Indicators not only allow the institution to focus on specific assessment points that correlate to the institutional Goals and Objectives, but allow the institution to accurately assess itself in comparison to other institutions. This new approach directly supports the revised institutional Vision Statement of becoming “one of the nation’s leading independent colleges.”

The documentation of these assessment processes provides evidence of institutional effectiveness relating to how well Cazenovia College is fulfilling its Mission, achieving its Goals, and using the assessment results to improve student learning, improve services and programs, and inform planning and resource allocation as part of the College’s overall
Mission, Vision, Values, and Strategic Plan. As part of the institution’s current self-study, the College surveyed faculty, staff, and administrators as to their knowledge and understanding of the College’s efforts with respect to Standards 1 through 7 of the *Characteristics of Excellence*. Results were published for campus review and discussion in spring 2012. The *Survey* generated 112 responses, evenly distributed across the categories of Faculty, Staff, and Administration. The results indicated that the majority of participants reported adequate or strong understanding of the institution’s planning, and found the *Strategic Plan* adequate or strong. Additional questions concerning resource allocation and use of assessment results indicated a need for further dissemination and discussion of assessment results and connections to future plans. A detailed analysis of the results, compiled by the Director of Institutional Research, is included in the resource documents. A second survey on Standards 8 through 14 was deployed in fall 2012 with results pending.

In fall 2003, a full-time director of Institutional Research and Assessment was added to the staff of the College. Subsequent turnover in the position and a reduction of the position to part-time status in 2004 limited progress on assessment initiatives temporarily, but the position was returned to full-time status in fiscal year 2008-09. Since the current Director of Institutional Research and Assessment (IRA) was hired, a number of assessment initiatives have been added to the College’s overall assessment process. The following are changes to the institutional research assessments in the last five years highlighting that the new efforts have provided opportunities to benchmark and increase collaboration with other offices and departments.

- CIRP Freshman Survey
- Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ)
- Focus Groups with First Year Students
- Interviews with Graduating Seniors
- Annual Report of Internships and Internship Evaluations
- Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) -- online
- PULSE Surveys
- NCCP COSES Survey
- Graduate Employment/Graduate School Enrollment Study
- Parent Survey
- Delaware Study of Institutional Costs and Productivity
- NACUBO Tuition Discounting Survey
- HEADS Survey
- Institutional Self-Assessment Survey
- NCAA Graduation Rate Data Survey
- First Year Students Beginning College Perceptions and Experiences
- Freshmen Profile
- Freshmen Origin & Status Report
- Graduates Fact Sheet
- GPA and Enrollment Status by Housing
- Alumni Survey – online
- Noel Levitz Cost of Recruitment Survey
- Freshmen Attrition Risk Model and Report
First Year Seminar Workshop Evaluation  
Non-Returners Survey  
The Chronicle’s Great Colleges to Work For survey  
Colleges of Distinction Profile  
Teacher Education Program Alumni Survey  
Master Student Evaluation  
Dashboards  
IR Sharepoint  
IR Webpage  
First Year Transition Survey  
Environmental Assessment Survey and follow-up Ten Questions for $100 Survey  
Reunion Weekend Survey  
CAZCash Survey  

Since 2009-10, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment has made significant gains in three main areas and specifics of the ongoing improvements are summarized below.

1. Increase and improve use of online/web-based survey instruments, including but not limited to use of Qualtrics across campus  
   a. Improve timeliness of results;  
   b. Reduce labor hours needed for data input;  
   c. Increase labor hours available for data analysis and collaboration; and  
   d. Expand the use of assessment results.  
      (Examples: Proficiency Profile; CIRP; PULSE Surveys; Alumni Survey)  

2. Collaborate with other offices and departments across campus  
   a. Reduce duplicative efforts;  
   b. Increase the methods used for assessment, focus groups, etc.;  
   c. Minimize unintentional collection of duplicate information and data;  
   d. Improve the quality of the assessments in use through collaboration;  
   e. Create a common standard for assessments at the College;  
   f. Achieve the ability to combine datasets for more complex analyses; and  
   g. Expand use of assessment results.  
      (Examples: Internship Evaluation; Environmental Assessment Survey; First Year Transition Survey; Freshmen Focus Groups; Parent Survey; Dashboards)  

3. Increase and improve opportunities to Benchmark  
   a. Create context for survey and assessment results;  
   b. Increase knowledge and understanding of strengths and opportunities;  
   c. Increase knowledge and understanding of external environment, including but not limited to competition and peer groups;  
   d. Increase knowledge and understanding of best practices; and  
   e. Expand the use of assessment results.  
      (Examples: Delaware Study; NACUBO Tuition Discounting Survey; The Chronicle’s Great Colleges to Work For survey)  

As a standard practice, the College produces annual institutional accountability reports that describe the characteristics of its students; types of degrees conferred by demographic data; graduation rates; characteristics of faculty and trustees; an institutional profile; and major
capital projects. The purpose of these reports is to state openly and transparently how the College is accomplishing what it proffers. The ongoing process of student learning outcomes assessment, in conjunction with other components of assessment and MSCHE standards, enables Cazenovia College to gauge its success in maintaining academic quality, helping students to improve their skills, and enhancing institutional effectiveness.

**Review of Assessment Tools and Methods**

In 2009 after completion of a full-year assessment cycle, the Director for Institutional Research and Assessment began operationalizing assessment of the assessment tools, methods, and practices used by that office in order to evaluate the efficiency and efficacy of each and make improvements where desirable and feasible. This process is ongoing and conducted as part of the routine process of administration of each assessment. During administration of each assessment, she notes the outcomes and what could be improved upon regarding the process of administration, the tool, the method, and samples. Comments, suggestions, and requests received in response to assessment results are retained, considered and/or incorporated in order to improve the quality of the overall assessment process. Prior to the administration of each assessment, the instrument, together with the prior year’s results, historical data, notes from the previous administration as well comments, requests and feedback from the campus community, are reviewed in order to improve on the instrument, process or method of sharing results. Specifically, there is an attempt to eliminate unintentional duplicate questions, clarify vague or confusing language, and evaluate adequacy of scales and options for open-ended responses. Each assessment is considered including whether there is cross-sectional or longitudinal data as well as benchmarking opportunities in place.

As part of the process, the Director identified three areas of opportunity for assessment within the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment including the need for:

1. Implementation of web-based instruments;
2. Increased collaboration across campus, specifically with regard to assessment; and
3. Increased and improved benchmarking opportunities.

The ETS Proficiency Profile scores are a good example of this process. The method of administration was changed to gain efficiency and efficacy, shifting from paper to web-based resulted in easier administration with the results being available almost immediately rather than 30 to 60 days later. Collaboration with Academic Affairs has increased significantly. Results are shared widely with institutional leaders and faculty. The *ETS Cross-sectional Analysis of Scores* in place since 2003 has been maintained (see Appendix D.5). In 2009, the mean scores of freshmen and seniors at all participating baccalaureate institutions nationally were added to create an external benchmarking opportunity. In 2011, a custom comparison group was created within the ETS system, presenting an added benchmarking opportunity. In 2012, the size of the sample of seniors tested was expanded from 60 to 100 providing the obvious benefit of improving the sample size and, therefore, reliability. It also provides an opportunity to expand upon the detailed research conducted in 2011-12. The larger sample will permit disaggregation of scores by division and in some cases by program, to provide data and information about freshmen and seniors by program and/or division.
The Workgroup researching Standard 7 for this Self Study Report conducted its own assessment of divisional and departmental uses of various tools and methods. The Workgroup developed a series of questions to evaluate various documents as indicators of institutional assessment and the effectiveness of the assessment process with emphasis on connection to the Strategic Plan and resource allocation. Beginning with the 2003 Self Study Report, the Workgroup looked for assessment developments and practices established, implemented, reviewed and updated from that time to the present inquiry. These reports provided specific markers against which the self-study questions could be measured.

Reports from most divisions clearly indicated the use of multiple measures from the Assessment Tool Inventory. The report from Student Development and the report from the offices of the Executive VP and Institutional Research and Assessment each showed that over 25 different measures from the Inventory were in use and results shared with a wide range of constituencies. The latter report noted that some of the measures on the Assessment Tool Inventory might be better labeled “evidence” than assessment to better clarify their use. Further, this report noted that the Inventory might not be serving the purpose for which it was originally intended, as discussed below. The report from Institutional Advancement listed fewer of the Tools, but those listed were appropriate to that office’s function.

The Offices of Business and Finance and Information and Communication Technologies reported using measures that were not from the Assessment Tool Inventory, but that did allow for ongoing assessment. The Business Office utilizes revenue analytic worksheets to budget student revenue resources and an action item worksheet to consider new cost initiatives. These worksheets are compared with baseline spending from previous years and together these help frame the annual Operating Budget. Each cycle, all budget managers monitor their spending within the Our Budget” tool, providing real time information about budgeted versus actual expenditures/revenue. Budget versus actual monitoring is reported in total at the end of each month to area Vice Presidents for the entire College as it progresses through the fiscal year. Audits ensure maintenance of sound financial records as well as providing a measure for assessing whether resources were used and accounted for as intended.

The report from the Enrollment Management area listed over a dozen measures and indicated that most were effective for their intended purpose. The report from areas within Student Support Services indicated use of some of the Tools on the Inventory, such as HERI Surveys, PULSE surveys, Graduate and Alumni Surveys; use of other assessment tools not specified on the Inventory; and specified that the Annual Report was very helpful and of value.

The report from Academic Affairs indicated that the Strategic Plan and its Indicators guided assessment efforts from this division (similarly for all the other administrative divisions), and that the extent of the assessments utilized by Academic Affairs “significantly exceeds” the measures outlined in the Tool Inventory. The Academic Affairs Assessment Worksheet indicates 11 Initiatives, each with sub-points for assessment. This Worksheet is updated annually within the scope of a five-year plan (now extended through 2013). Most, if not all, of the assessment tools used for these Initiatives are not part of the Tool Inventory, but are appropriate tools and reporting structures for the initiatives being assessed.
The Assessment Workgroup found some ambiguity in the roles of the Institutional Assessment Plan and the Strategic Plan as they meet in the reporting tool of the Annual Report from each administrative division. The Workgroup found that even where tools from the Inventory were in use, the reporting mechanism related to the Strategic Plan and its Indicators. This suggests that the Strategic Plan has become more of an assessment tool than originally contemplated. More importantly, it provides evidence that the College has indeed developed a culture of assessment, and the reporting divisions who carry the responsibility for assessment, as outlined in the Institutional Assessment Plan, have organically developed methods and measures to more confidently and accurately assess their progress toward overall institutional goals. It is clear that while the assessment process has developed differently than expected, it is no less developed and is a continually evolving process.

The documents reviewed included reference to the Committee on Institutional Assessment, but they were not clear on its current activity or authority. This suggests that the role and function of this committee in the formal governance structure needs to be clarified.

CONCLUSIONS

Tremendous progress has been made with respect to establishing a culture of assessment on campus. It was important that the College move toward an assessment culture of greater transparency and accessibility. We have noted an institutional shift in a willingness to acknowledge and share data that indicate areas of needed improvement.

Ironically, the aspects of assessment that have improved over the past decade are also the areas that require continued development. The College has seen a steady progression in assessment in four main areas:

1. Communication and sharing; (see Institutional Assessment Calendar Appendix D.6)
2. Variety of instruments and methods;
3. Comprehensiveness of analyses; and
4. Utilization of data to drive decision making.

The continued improvements that are required in each area above include:

1. Assuring communications are systematic, timely, and accessible;
2. Eliminating duplication of efforts in the use of assessment tools and methods; honing in on the most useful and cost-effective methods;
3. Adding time series reporting and disaggregation of data to analyses; utilizing higher levels of technology for analysis and reporting; and
4. Implementing technologic strategies to further promote assessment and user-friendly applications of the data.

Specific Suggestions

- Provide campus-wide discussion of a new Institutional Assessment Plan with leadership from the Committee on Institutional Assessment within the governance structure.
• Update the annual reporting process to have administrative divisions include references to the assessment tools utilized to create the report, including a bibliography (or list).

• Complete the implementation of Dashboards for strategic planning indicators and other assessment points.

• Establish more pro-active means of communicating assessment measures and implementing a feedback loop on assessment indicators such as a process of Sharepoint discussions.

• Explore increasing resource allocation for the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

• Ensure the College is using a common language of assessment and that constituency groups are aware of, understand, and utilize the common language in assessment reporting. Incorporating the All-College Competencies provides a basis for a common language.
CONCLUDING LIST OF SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Suggestions

Standard 1: Mission and Goals
1. In the course of strategic planning, the College should establish clear links for the Mission Statement to the Strategic Plan, assessment plans, All-College Competencies, and resource allocation procedures.

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Standard 3: Institutional Resources
1. The goals within the Strategic Plan should be clearly measurable if they are to provide useful information in further planning.
2. Opportunities for further transparency in the budgeting and resource allocation processes should be identified and implemented in conjunction with the planning process.
3. In light of the recent and current economic trends, the strategic plan may be more relative and effective if it were prepared on a three-year cycle rather than a five-year cycle.
4. Institutional assessment processes and methods should be identified and implemented to address specifically any shortfalls in achieving institutional goals.
5. The functionality or usefulness of the Strategic Plan itself should be assessed and the assessment should be used to improve the development of future plans to ensure that it meets the planning needs of the College.
6. To strengthen the transparency of the governance system, documentation of the decision making processes that occur should be more thoroughly reported as opposed to just reporting on the results of the decisions.
7. A master plan for staffing, staff support, and training should be developed and implemented.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

Standard 5: Administration
1. The College should strive to achieve a high percentage of completed annual reviews, particularly for those in leadership roles.
2. Develop a readily accessible master calendar that includes all aspects of campus events, governance meetings, Board meetings, divisional/departmental meetings, and issue-specific meetings.
3. Analyze results of the PULSE Communication survey and identify opportunities to improve internal communications.
4. Improve governance Councils’ communications to constituents.

Standard 6: Integrity
1. As a compliance matter, the information currently included in the Directory of Consumer Information should be integrated into a more readily-accessible and interactive webpage within the College’s website.
Standard 7: Institutional Assessment
1. Provide campus-wide discussion of a new Institutional Assessment Plan with leadership from the Committee on Institutional Assessment within the governance structure.
2. Update the annual reporting process to have administrative divisions include references to the assessment tools utilized to create the report, including a bibliography (or list).
3. Complete the implementation of Dashboards for strategic planning indicators and other assessment points.
4. Establish more pro-active means of communicating assessment measures and implementing a feedback loop on assessment indicators such as a process of Sharepoint discussions.
5. Explore increasing resource allocation for the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.
6. Ensure the College is using a common language of assessment and that constituency groups are aware of, understand, and utilize the common language in assessment reporting. Incorporating the All-College Competencies provides a basis for a common language.

Standard 8: Admissions and Retention
1. Implement methods to assess the impact of utilizing the SMART Approach® for targeted recruiting.
2. Develop enrollment targets and tracking measures for the OEL students with Enrollment Management and OEL working closely together to improve processes and ensure consistency in policy administration.
3. Analyze retention efforts to better coordinate activities and develop informed goals for the next strategic planning cycle.

Standard 9: Student Support Services
1. The College should explore all options for the academic registration process including the possibilities available through an online format.
2. The Multicultural Committee should become more active to increase educational outreach on campus.
3. The Co-Curricular Transcript program should be assessed and possibly re-conceptualized to include a variety of experiential aspects based on information provided by Career Services, employers, graduate schools, and students.

Standard 10: Faculty
1. Additional position announcements should be placed in media that are likely to be read by minority applicants, and intra-College communication about the need for commitment to diversity principles be reinforced at all levels.
2. Compensation for both full-time and part-time faculty should be addressed in the upcoming strategic planning process to ensure that the College is able to attract and retain qualified faculty who can deliver the curriculum and foster a robust academic environment.
3. Address the needs expressed by faculty for additional clerical support.
4. Compensation for Program Directors should be re-evaluated as a part of the next strategic planning cycle.
5. The amount of funding to support professional development for members of the faculty should be analyzed during the next strategic planning process with a view towards continuing to improve the support offered to faculty for scholarly pursuits.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

Standard 12: General Education
1. As part of the upcoming strategic planning cycle, assess the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty and the impact on student learning outcomes.
2. Revise the Internship Evaluation to align more closely with the All-College Competencies and include student perceptions in the course of evaluation.
3. Implement the full version of the Proficiency Profile, which would permit the examination of individual scores and facilitate a more comprehensive analysis of student learning.
4. Expand the Honors Program.
5. Systematically incorporate student and faculty perceptions in the assessment of technological offerings.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities
1. The placement process and basic skills courses should continue to be assessed using the more comprehensive data provided by the new placement process.
2. As additional instructional sites are opened and more online classes developed, the assessment needs of these new offerings should be carefully considered.

Standard 14: Student Learning Assessment
1. Maximize the availability and use of assessments to improve teaching and learning, and inform planning and resource allocation decisions. Such efforts would include creating a series of Dashboards that contain student learning outcomes data and information related to General Education and Academic Program assessment, as well as specific student populations such as transfer Extended Learning students.
2. Revise the Student Learning Outcomes Plan to more fully integrate and clearly articulate General Education and Program Assessment activities including competency-specific assessment tools as needed.
3. Expand the use of external peer reviews for academic programs, including the General Education curriculum.

Recommendations

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Standard 3: Institutional Resources
1. Working through the governance system and established resource allocation processes, the College should establish priorities for reinstating needed resources as enrollment targets are met or exceeded.
Standard 8: Admissions and Retention
1. As an enrollment-driven institution, the College must focus on admissions and retention as key components of the next strategic plan.

Standard 9: Student Support Services
1. The upcoming strategic planning process should include establishing a comprehensive review process for the transfer student population, including needs for student support services.
2. Staffing for the Career Services operation should be a priority in terms of allocating and/or reallocating institutional resources. The office is currently operating at capacity and further development of programs, as outlined in the career development model, will be a challenge without additional resources.

Standard 10: Faculty
1. Policies and procedures in connection with the evaluation and support of part-time faculty both on campus and at additional locations should be reviewed and, if required, modified to enhance the delivery of the curricula and to monitor the performance of such faculty.