St. John Fisher College

2016
Self-Study Design Plan

Submitted to
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
May 2014

St. John Fisher College 2016 Self-Study Design Plan

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

History

St. John Fisher College was founded as a Catholic college in 1948 through the combined efforts of civic leaders, the community at large, the Basilian Fathers, and the late Most Reverend James E. Kearney, then Bishop of Rochester. It was founded as a college for men under the direction of priests of the Congregation of St. Basil. In 1968, the Board of Trustees, once composed only of Basilian Fathers, was enlarged and diversified so that today the College is governed by an independent Board of Trustees that includes persons of diverse faiths and that is broadly representative of the business, professional, cultural, and academic communities of the area it serves. In 1971, the first women students were admitted. Today, St. John Fisher College is a private, independent college of the arts, sciences, and commerce for men and women of all ages.

As it progresses through the 21st century, the College remains true to its Catholic and Basilian heritage. The 154-acre campus has 24 modern, handsome buildings. The College currently enrolls more than 2,700 full-time undergraduate students, over half of whom live in residence. In addition, over 200 part-time undergraduate students and nearly 1,100 graduate students take credit courses. Full- and part-time faculty number over 350. From its beginning, St. John Fisher College has recognized its responsibility to those people and businesses of the Rochester area who have continued to give it their generous support. Accordingly, the College makes a special effort to serve this community by finding places within its classrooms for qualified local students, by attracting to Rochester from other areas faculty and students who can contribute to the life of the community, and by providing instruction of a quality that will enable its graduates to serve well in their vocations and avocations. The College also admits part-time students and transfer students from two-year and four-year colleges.

Basilian Fathers. The Basilian Fathers are an international teaching community with more than a century of experience in the work of higher education. Today, members of the Basilian community serve as regular members of the faculty and professional staff, all of whom have been chosen for their academic excellence and experience. The Basilian tradition of working in close collaboration with public and private colleges and universities continues as an established principle of St. John Fisher College.

Mission Statement

The Full Mission Statement was adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 13, 1987. As part of the Strategic Planning process, the Concise Mission Statement was updated in 2012.

Full Mission Statement. St. John Fisher College is an independent, liberal arts institution in the Catholic tradition of American higher education. Guided since its inception by the educational philosophy of the Congregation of St. Basil, the College emphasizes liberal learning both for students in traditional academic disciplines and for those in more directly career-oriented fields. In keeping with the openness that is characteristic of its Basilian heritage, Fisher welcomes qualified students, faculty and staff regardless of religious or cultural background.

As an institution of higher learning, we engage our students in the quest for knowledge and truth, believing that such engagement will equip them to make sound judgments as individuals, family members, and citizens. We provide individual guidance to students as they strive for academic excellence and develop values that will guide them in meaningful and productive lives. Our dual emphasis on intellectual and personal growth derives from our belief that learning is valuable for its own sake, for the sake of those who learn, and for the sake of society as a whole.

Concise Mission Statement. St. John Fisher College is a collaborative community dedicated to teaching, learning, and scholarship in a student-centered educational environment. The College is guided by its liberal arts tradition and its Catholic heritage, as expressed in the motto of its founders, the Basilian Fathers: "teach me goodness, discipline, and knowledge." Fisher engages individuals in lives of intellectual inquiry, professional integrity, and civic responsibility, where diversity and service to others are valued and practiced.

Vision Statement

By the end of the decade, we will be a widely recognized college in the Northeast Region that enriches student character and deepens intellectual inquiry to prepare men and women for success in a complex and diverse global community.

Institutional Profile

St. John Fisher College offers 33 academic majors in the humanities, social sciences, sciences, business, and nursing spread across five schools: School of Arts & Sciences, School of Business, Ralph C. Wilson, Jr. School of Education, the Wegmans School of Nursing, and the Wegmans School of Pharmacy. There are 11 pre-professional programs and numerous minors are available. Additionally, students may be eligible for special programs including First Generation Scholars, Foreign Study Program, Honors Program, Science Scholars, Service Scholars, and The Washington Experience. All academic programs are strongly rooted in the liberal arts. In spring 2014, there are 2719 undergraduate students in attendance.

SJFC has 106 full-time tenured faculty, and another 79 full-time tenure track faculty. Of these faculty, 176 have a terminal degree. In addition, there are 37 full-time, non-tenure track faculty and 207 adjunct faculty. The 2013-14 budget is approximately $100 million. Ninety percent of SJFC revenue is generated by tuition, room and board, and fees.

St. John Fisher College offers 9 master's programs in Business, Education, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Arts and Sciences, and 3 doctoral programs in Education, Nursing, and Pharmacy. In spring 2014, there are 1093 graduate and continuing education students in attendance.

St. John Fisher College is classified as a *Doctoral Research University* (DRU) by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In keeping with the Mission Statement of the College, however, the focus of the College is on teaching. Only one College program, the Ed.D. in Executive Leadership, is considered a research doctorate by the Carnegie Foundation. This program requires a dissertation, and has as its primary audience practitioners in the field seeking to enhance their skills using organization data to make decisions.

Accreditation. St. John Fisher College is incorporated under the authority of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York and is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104. The Middle States Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

Program accreditations. The Ralph C. Wilson, Jr. School of Education's teacher education program is currently accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) a specialized accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. NCATE is transitioning to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) as the new accrediting body for educator preparation.

The School of Business is accredited by The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB-International), a specialized accrediting agency recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The Wegmans School of Nursing is accredited by The Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE), a specialized accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education. The Mental Health Counseling program is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), a specialized accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The Wegmans School of Pharmacy is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE), a specialized accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

St. John Fisher College is included on the list of colleges and universities approved by the American Chemical Society.

Student life. There are more than 70 student-run groups that provide a wide variety of opportunities for service, leadership, social, and academic/professional opportunities. Fisher competes in 23 varsity sports in NCAA Division III as part of the Empire 8 Athletic Conference, the ECAC, and the Liberty League; additional club and intramural sports opportunities are available.

Community Engagement

As stated in the mission statement of the College's Center for Serving-Learning and Civic Engagement, St. John Fisher College provides civic engagement opportunities to "enable students to gain the knowledge, skills, and perspectives needed to become contributing citizens in a diverse and complex society. Sustained collaborations with community partners result in asset building and positive community change. The Center for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement supports students' development of academic knowledge and skills, civic and cultural awareness, and communication and professional skills, to meet course and College-wide

learning goals". Participation in service-learning, engaged scholarship, and civic engagement grant opportunities enable students and faculty to share resources and expertise, in collaboration with community partners, to develop solutions to identified issues facing local and global communities. Fisher-community partnerships enable us to live out the College's mission, which states: "The basic values we share as a community are a commitment to the life-long search for truth, a belief in the dignity of every individual, and an affirmation that service to others is a worthy expression of our humanity."

The College's Community Service Office (CSO) provides community service opportunities for all Fisher students and runs the Service Scholar and First Generation Scholars Program. In the Service Scholar program, students partner with individuals with a clear need and in communities where resources are scarce. The First Generation Scholars program is designed to support first-generation students at Fisher and motivate elementary and secondary school students to aspire to attend college. The CSO also provides opportunities for national and international service trips and advises *Students With a Vision*, the student-led volunteer club. The Center for Community Engagement (CCE) enhances non-profit leadership by strengthening the capabilities of boards of directors and professional staff. Its vision is for a strong, voluntary sector making a vital contribution to our community's quality of life through programs such as Board Leadership Seminars, Certificates in Non-Profit Management, Workshop Series, and Community Fellows.

The College is pursuing the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement to build a comprehensive story of community engagement, identify best practices through the self-study process, achieve the Community Engagement Designation to raise the profile of the institution and distinguish it among its peers, and capitalize on the full potential of community engagement. Community engagement can fulfill the College's Strategic Plan and Middle States standards, provide opportunities for academic enrichment, professional skill building, and engaged scholarship, assist with recruitment and retention of students, meet community needs, and enhance college-community relationships.

College Governance

SJFC is chartered by the Board of Regents of the State University of New York. The College's governing Board of Trustees consists of 36 Trustees plus five ex officio members. The Board has 13 committees and exercises ultimate authority over and ultimate responsibility for the College.

The President's Cabinet consists of four members who report directly to the President: The Executive Vice President, the CFO, the Provost, and the Vice President of Student Affairs and Diversity Initiatives.

Both the President and the Board recognize the faculty's role in the shared governance of the institution. The Faculty Statutes detail the faculty's authority and responsibility particularly as these relate to academics. The faculty is the primary authority on matters of instruction and curriculum development. The Faculty Assembly meets typically 6 times per semester during the academic year. All full-time faculty members and adjunct faculty meeting service requirements are eligible to vote in the Faculty Assembly.

College Wide Learning Goals

Intellectual engagement. To demonstrate their intellectual curiosity and engagement, Fisher students will work individually and with others to pose and take positions on significant questions. They will be able to defend those positions by developing reasoned arguments based on evidence.

Diversity and cultural understanding. Having reflected on their individual and cultural perspectives in the context of others, Fisher students will be able to demonstrate that they value diversity by engaging with a wide range of individuals and groups in achieving common goals in their lives as students, professionals, and citizens.

Communication. Fisher students will be able to gather information and use it to generate, understand, and convey ideas through effective listening, speaking, reading, and writing. They will also demonstrate their ability to process quantified data and understand and communicate the results, using appropriate technology.

Ethical integrity. Fisher students will examine and articulate their evolving values in the context of multiple ethical, philosophical, and religious perspectives. They will reflect their considered values by embracing ethical decision-making in their personal, professional, and civic lives.

Discourse and content of field. Fisher students will become sufficiently grounded in one or more disciplines to communicate within and about the discipline, to apply the methods and tools of the discipline to solve problems, and to understand the discipline's relationship to other modes of inquiry.

Application of knowledge. Working both individually and collaboratively, Fisher students will be able to draw on reason, experience, and academic preparation to achieve effective solutions to personal, intellectual, professional, and civic problems.

Academic Priorities

Our chief academic goals are to help students develop intellectual skills, a foundation in the liberal arts, and proficiency in a major. We especially emphasize the liberal arts, not only because they are intrinsically valuable, but also because they prepare students for life-long learning and for an ever-changing work environment.

Development of intellectual skills. Intellectual growth begins with careful attention to basic verbal and quantitative skills. By thorough preparation in these two areas, students equip themselves for the critical thinking and effective communication necessary for success in any discipline. They learn to analyze, coordinate, and synthesize information, and they increase their capacity for understanding, especially in the liberal arts, which are the core of the undergraduate experience.

Centrality of the liberal arts. Because we are a liberal arts institution, the student's educational experience at the College should above all be a broadening one. Liberal learning is

by definition free from that narrowness of interest which invites misjudgment. By taking a wide range of courses in the humanities, natural and social sciences, mathematics, philosophy and religious studies, the student learns to value intellectual curiosity and knowledge for its own sake. Study in the liberal arts also allows students to hone their fundamental intellectual skills, to understand their chosen disciplines more fully, and to recognize the validity of other approaches to intellectual inquiry.

While the core requirements at the College ensure broad exposure to the liberal arts, our emphasis on liberal learning is not confined to general education. Every educational experience at the College, both undergraduate and graduate, should contribute to liberal education by helping students understand not only the basic principles and issues of the subject matter, but also its history, its cultural and social significance, its relationship to other areas of knowledge, and its ethical and moral implications.

Proficiency in a major. In addition to general preparation in the liberal arts, all students choose a major field of study to develop more specific competence and, in some cases, to prepare for graduate or professional education. The College offers majors in the traditional liberal arts. It has also, since its beginning, offered career-oriented programs in management and accounting, and more recently in communications and other fields. These programs share in the commitment to liberal education and foster the same love of learning as more traditional disciplines. Similarly, liberal arts programs seek ways to respond to the career interests of students while preparing them to lead satisfying and intellectually active lives. We encourage students to recognize that there are many career opportunities, whatever one's major, and that the best way to take advantage of those opportunities is to choose a major one finds intellectually stimulating.

Development of values. In addition to the academic priorities outlined above, we at St. John Fisher College are committed to the development of values. This emphasis on values derives historically from our religious heritage and is expressed in the motto of the Basilian Fathers, "teach me goodness, discipline, and knowledge." The Basilian intellectual tradition stresses a fundamental openness in the search for truth, sees no ultimate conflict between religious faith and human knowing, and is receptive to other expressions of religious faith. In keeping with that tradition, the College emphasizes the role of religious studies and philosophy in the academic program. It also encourages the presence of members of the Congregation of St. Basil and provides an institutional commitment to campus ministry.

In addition to transmitting values, faculty and staff help students develop them. We believe that moral and spiritual growth comes from intellectual inquiry and critical self-awareness. The basic values we share as a community are a commitment to the life-long search for truth, a belief in the dignity of every individual, and an affirmation that service to others is a worthy expression of our humanity.

Teaching and scholarship. The major commitment of the faculty of St. John Fisher College is excellence in teaching, with an emphasis on close interaction with students. The personal attention faculty give to students is a hallmark of the Basilian educational tradition and is a significant part of their teaching commitment. This attention manifests itself as support both for students struggling to meet the challenge of academic success and for those undertaking individual study beyond the level of their peers.

To be effective in the classroom and to serve as models of academic excellence, faculty must also remain actively engaged in scholarship. When faculty share the results of their scholarship, either informally, at conferences, or in print, they not only demonstrate their intellectual vitality but also benefit from interaction with a community of scholars. Scholarship that takes the form of published, original research is especially valuable. It contributes to effective teaching, brings honor to the institution, and adds to the store of human knowledge.

Emphasis on community. Our academic priorities and our emphasis on values naturally affect the way we deal with one another and with our students. Because we believe that intellectual growth and personal growth go hand in hand, we seek to create an environment in which students, faculty and staff can reach their full human potential. We seek to overcome prejudice, including that occasioned by gender, race, age, religion, region, culture, disability, sexual orientation, or economic status. We see human diversity as positive, and we work together to set an example of tolerance and openness. By encouraging tolerance and appreciation of diversity, we help our students become useful citizens of a multi-cultural world. As a liberal arts institution, St. John Fisher College fosters growth of individuals who are free from ignorance, bigotry, and fear of the unfamiliar; individuals who are therefore free for that independence which is the fruit of knowledge and love.

II: Scope of the Self-Study

Themes of the Study

The scope of the St. John Fisher College 2016 Self-Study includes seven themes: the six goals of the College's strategic plan, *Fisher: Forward to the future. The Strategic Plan for St. John Fisher College 2012-2017,* along with a seventh area of focus on leadership, governance and administration. The process was designed to evaluate our commitment to realizing the strategic plan goals and to affirm their alignment with our institutional Mission and Vision.

The Strategic Plan for St. John Fisher College 2012-2017: Forward to the Future

> **Goal 1: Academic program development & curriculum renewal.** Consistent with our Basilian heritage of teaching goodness, discipline and knowledge, the College will strengthen its commitment to liberal arts and professional programs through purposeful curriculum renewal and innovative program development and delivery.

> *Strategy 1A.* Meet student needs for rigorous and high-quality educational opportunities while being mindful of the balance and breadth of our academic programming by pursuing mission-consistent, market-responsive, and financially viable program development.

> *Strategy 1B.*Augment opportunities and connections among faculty for program development, research and scholarly activity, and student research by providing the support and infrastructure necessary for securing and managing external funds for sponsored research and program enrichment.

> **Goal 2: Cultivating student success through academic enrichment.** Recognizing the importance to balanced curricular and co-curricular learning on academic development and personal growth, the College will expand and build on activities that intentionally integrate academic work, experiential learning, student life, and career development.

> *Strategy 2A.* By 2017, all students, regardless of level or program, will participate in one or more high-quality experiential learning opportunities before graduation.

> *Strategy 2B.* Identify opportunities for modification of current programs, extension of successful practices, and development of new programs to improve student success and retention.

> **Goal 3 Knowing Our world and each other.** To enable all campus community members to understand, appreciate, and interact effectively in today's pluralistic society, the College will develop new and enhance existing efforts to be an inclusive campus for faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the wider community.

> *Strategy 3A.* Create a welcoming and inclusive community for all Fisher students, faculty, staff and alumni.

> *Strategy 3B.* Create planned and fully integrated opportunities for diverse experiences throughout each year of students' programs.

Strategy 3C. As the first phase of efforts to increase diversity in the student population, demonstrate a steady increase in the number of incoming full-time undergraduate ALANA students (African-American, Latino, Asian, and Native American) through improved recruitment and retention.

Strategy 3D. Hire and retain diverse faculty and staff.

Goal 4: Recruitment and market expansion. Building on its strong regional reputation, the College will continue to strive for mission consistent and fiscally responsible growth.

Strategy 4A. Develop an enrollment plan for the College that identifies distinctive characteristics for the undergraduate, graduate, online, and academic alliances student segments and establishes reachable enrollment goals for each target group.

Strategy 4B. Develop initiatives to support achievement of the enrollment goals and success of students in each student segment, while assigning accountability and responsibility.

Goal 5: Living and learning environments. Considering future, as well as existing, campus facility and infrastructure needs, the College will continue to improve living and learning environments, incorporating state-of-the-market technologies, in order to promote student success and support the varied needs of our vibrant campus community.

Strategy 5A. Upgrade and maintain our technology infrastructure (wireless access, technology services available for students, faculty, and staff) to better support teaching, learning, living, communications, and research.

Strategy 5B. Based on overall enrollment projections, review campus infrastructure needs on a yearly basis, and update the campus master plan accordingly.

Strategy 5C. Continue to develop and implement a prioritized deferred maintenance plan in order to maintain the physical assets of the College.

Strategy 5D. Continue to develop and implement a student-centered infrastructure that includes student services at the appropriate time for each student segment.

Strategy 5E. Evaluate the College's current athletic and fitness opportunities—including club/intramural sports, varsity sports, and fitness facilities for students, faculty, staff—vis-à-vis other colleges in our peer set. Develop a five-year plan for these same categories.

Strategy 5F. Evaluate and enhance, as necessary, the security of campus facilities in order to provide a safe and welcoming environment for students, faculty, staff, and visitors.

Strategy 5G. Evaluate the use of socially responsible, sustainable, and cost- and energy-efficient facilities, products, and services for future projects and purchases.

Goal 6: Attaining institutional effectiveness. Demonstrating an ongoing commitment to evidence-based institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement of student learning outcomes, the College will collect, interpret, and disseminate information for ongoing strategic

analysis that is designed to inform and link decision-making, long-range planning, and resource allocation.

   Strategy 6A. Identify key performance indicators, establish benchmarks, and create and implement common reporting mechanisms to encourage transparency and promote institutional effectiveness.

   Strategy 6B. Align the current long-range planning and budgeting process with the goals and priorities of the Strategic Plan by using feedback and assessment data generated in the strategic activities articulated by the plan to inform decision-making and plan for resources that support our progress toward strategic goals.

   Strategy 6C. Continue an annual review of College-wide and integrated philanthropic priorities, to include academic strategic initiatives, capital projects, and student life improvements, for funding by major gifts and grants.

The Self-Study Model

The St. John Fisher College 2016 Self-Study presents a comprehensive model organized around the themes of the College 2012-2017 Strategic Plan: *Fisher: Forward to the future.* By aligning the goals of the Strategic Plan with the Middle States Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, we commit ourselves to continuous evaluation of our progress toward the College goals while ensuring that we meet accreditation standards.

The seven dimensions of the Self-Study mirror the six College goals identified through a collaborative strategic planning process and add a seventh theme to address leadership, governance and administration. The fourteen standards in *The Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education* are then distributed among the seven themes as illustrated in Table 1. Although the themes do not perfectly align with the standards, this alignment is used to guide the Working Groups; for simplicity the standards are assigned to the theme that most closely matches the standard. The design was selected to ensure the usefulness of the Self-Study process in monitoring our institutional growth and improvement while addressing the requirements for reaccreditation.

Table 1. St. John Fisher College 2016 Self-Study Model

Self-Study Theme	SJFC Strategic Plan Goal	MSCHE Standards
1: Program Development and Curriculum Renewal	Strategic Plan Goal 1	10, 11, 12
2: Cultivating Student Success through Academic Enrichment	Strategic Plan Goal 2	9, 13
3: Knowing our World & Each Other	Strategic Plan Goal 3	1, 6
4: Recruitment and Market Expansion	Strategic Plan Goal 4	8
5: Living and Learning Environments	Strategic Plan Goal 5	3
6: Attaining Institutional Effectiveness	Strategic Plan Goal 6	2, 7, 14
7: Leadership, Governance and Administration		4, 5

III. Goals of the Self-Study

The 2016 Self-Study is organized by the goals established through a College-wide collaborative strategic planning process. This planning process resulted in *The Strategic Plan for St. John Fisher College 2012-2017*, and includes six major goals. The thematic organization of this study highlights the College's desire to evaluate its progress in meeting these self-identified objectives while demonstrating adherence to the Characteristics of Excellence as described in the Middle States Commission on Higher Education standards for accreditation.

Objectives of the Self-Study

- Engage the campus community and its external stakeholders in the critical evaluation of its progress toward addressing each of the goals of *The Strategic Plan for St. John Fisher College 2012-2017* and their alignment with the Vision for the College.
- Demonstrate the College's commitment to the Mission Statement which guided the Strategic Planning Process
- Reinforce the culture of assessment by modeling the use of assessment data collected systematically to guide continuous improvement
- Use the results of the Self-Study to identify particular strengths of the College
- Use the results of the Self-Study to identify opportunities for the College to improve the fulfillment of its Mission and the realization of its Vision.
- Demonstrate to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education that the College meets the Characteristics of Excellence as described in the accreditation standards
- Demonstrate to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education that the College meets the requirements of affiliation

IV. Organization of the Self-Study

Executive Steering Committee

During the fall semester of 2013, it was determined that the Executive Steering Committee for the Self-Study would consist of a core of five people: the President, the Provost, the Executive Vice President for Enrollment, Advancement and Planning, and the two Self-Study Co-Chairs. This executive leadership team would meet regularly to guide, monitor and support the work of the seven working groups as led by the Co-Chairs.

Self-Study Co-Chairs

The President, Provost and Executive Vice President invited one faculty member and one assistant dean to serve as Co-Chairs of the Self-Study. They were selected to serve in this capacity based on their balanced skill set, experience level, and ability to think beyond schools and departments for the improvement of the institution as a whole. The tenured faculty member was identified from the School of Arts & Sciences. The Assistant Dean of Assessment was selected from one of the professional schools, The School of Pharmacy.

Working Group Steering Committee

It was determined that the Working Group Steering Committee would consist of the Self-Study Co-Chairs, the Provost as MSCHE Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Chair of the Board of Trustees as Trustee Liaison, a student representative, and the Chairs for the seven working groups. The Executive Steering Committee in collaboration with the Deans of the five schools within the College selected the individuals to serve as the Working Group Chairs. They were selected based on their experience level and their ability to lead their respective groups in their assigned thematic areas. Vice-Chairs were also identified for each working group so that in the event the Chair was unable to attend a Working Group Steering Committee meeting, the group would still have representation. The student member will be appointed in fall, 2014.

Working Groups

Care was taken to ensure that each working group would produce a balance of undergraduate faculty, graduate faculty and staff perspectives. Membership included representatives from the five schools as well as staff from appropriate operational units within the College.

Membership

    Executive Steering Committee Membership. The Executive Steering Committee (ESC) members are:

- Dr. Donald E. Bain, President
- Dr. Gerry J. Rooney, Executive Vice President of Enrollment, Advancement, and Planning
- Dr. Randall G. Krieg, Provost and Dean of the College
- Dr. Bernard P. Ricca, Associate Professor of Mathematical and Computing Sciences
- Dr. Jane M. Souza, Assistant Dean of Assessment, School of Pharmacy

Working Group Steering Committee Membership. The Working Group Steering Committee (SC) members are as follows:

- Co-Chair, Dr. Bernard P. Ricca, Associate Professor of Mathematical & Computing Sciences
- Co-Chair, Dr. Jane M. Souza, Assistant Dean of Assessment, School of Pharmacy
- MSCHE Accreditation Liaison Officer, Dr. Randall F. Krieg, Provost and Dean of the College
- Board of Trustees Liaison, Mr. Victor E. Salerno, Chairman of the Board of Trustees
- Chair, Working Group 1, Dr. Bruce E. Blaine, Professor of Mathematical & Computing Sciences
- Chair, Working Group 2, Dr. Eileen Lynd-Balta, Professor of Biology
- Chair, Working Group 3, Yantee Slobert, Director of Multicultural Affairs
- Chair, Working Group 4, Jose Perales, Director of Transfer and Graduate Admissions
- Chair, Working Group 5, Dr. Kristina Lantzky-Eaton, Chemistry Department Chair
- Chair, Working Group 6, Kristin T. Anderson, Coordinator, Institutional Assessment & Accreditation
- Chair, Working Group 7, Dr. Jennifer L. Mathews, Associate Professor, Pharmaceutical Sciences
- A student representative to be appointed fall, 2014

Members of the Working Groups are listed in Appendix A**.**

Process

Working Groups are, under the guidance of the Co-Chairs, responsible for determining appropriate research questions and data sources for those questions and drafting reports addressing each question (see Sections VI and VII below). In addition to the data sources listed in Section VII, student focus groups will be convened to provide additional input where appropriate. During the Self-Study, the Co-Chairs will provide the campus with regular electronic updates on the progress of the Working Groups, and will hold town hall style meetings at least once per semester, open to all campus constituencies.

V. Charges to the Committees/Working Groups

Executive Steering Committee Responsibilities

The Executive Steering Committee will meet regularly and serve as the communication vehicle through which the executive leadership of The College can guide and monitor the progress of the Self-Study as led by the Self-Study co-chairs.

Specific charges to the Executive Steering Committee include establishing the goals of the Self-Study, providing support for a successful Self-Study process, ensuring appropriate leadership and representation within each Working Group, and drafting the Profile of the Evaluation Team.

While the heart of the Self-Study will be crafted by the members of the various Working Groups, the Executive Steering Committee will provide oversight to ensure that the Self-Study is an inclusive, meaningful process that evaluates the College's progress on meeting the goals of its Strategic Plan 2012-2017 in addition to addressing the requirements for re-accreditation.

Self-Study Co-Chair Responsibilities

The Co-Chairs of the Self-Study will be charged with oversight of the Self-Study process. They will facilitate and monitor all aspects of the Self-Study including ensuring that the Steering Committees and Working Groups have the resources necessary to support a successful Self-Study. The Co-Chairs will employ the College's web-based portal, Compliance Assist, to provide easily accessible resources, a timeline for goal completion, a structure for reporting progress, and a transparent vehicle for sharing findings.

Co-Chair responsibilities will include preparing the Self-Study Design Plan, setting and monitoring the timeline for reports, ensuring an effective communication process, engaging internal and external constituents, preparing the final draft of the Self-Study, and preparing for the Middle States team visit. Additionally, the Co-Chairs will ensure that in the alignment of MSCHE Standards with the Self-Study Themes the *Fundamental Elements* of the Standards are appropriately addressed.

Working Group Steering Committee Responsibilities

The Steering Committee consisting of the Co-Chairs, the Provost, the Liaison to the Board of Trustees, and the seven Working Group Chairs will meet regularly to monitor the progress of the seven Working Groups as they address their charges. Working within the College's web-based planning program, Compliance Assist, they will ensure steady progress throughout the Self-Study process, providing effective leadership and support to the Working Groups.

The Steering Committee members will work collaboratively with the co-chairs to ensure an inclusive process, continuous communication and feedback from the campus community, and adherence to the Self-Study timeline with respect to drafting of reports.

It should be noted that Working Groups will be encouraged to work independently on their assigned strategic goals and accreditation standards. Since there is not perfect alignment between the goals and standards, a certain amount of overlap is to be expected. This committee

membership will convene to evaluate and address any redundancies in coverage. They will also coordinate collaboration between working groups where similar research questions exist. The Working Group Steering Committee will consult the MSCHE Document Roadmap in order to ensure that all standards are appropriate addressed.

Working Group Responsibilities

Working Group 1. Working Group 1 is tasked with addressing Goal 1 of the College's Strategic Plan: Consistent with our Basilian heritage of teaching goodness, discipline, and knowledge, the College will strengthen its commitment to liberal arts and professional programs through purposeful curriculum renewal and innovative program development and delivery.

In keeping with the organizational plan for the Self-Study this Working Group will study the College's progress on meeting this goal while addressing the thematically linked Middle States Standards: 10: Faculty, 11: Educational Offerings, and 12: General Education.

The Working Group will articulate the research questions necessary to demonstrate the MSCHE Standards of Excellence while considering the context of the Strategic Goal. The group will identify and assemble the evidence and artifacts necessary to respond to their research questions.

Working Group 2. Working Group 2 is tasked with addressing Goal 2 of the College's Strategic Plan: Recognizing the importance of balanced curricular and co-curricular learning on academic development and personal growth, the College will expand and build on activities that intentionally integrate academic work, experiential learning, student life, and career development.

In keeping with the organizational plan for the Self-Study this Working Group will study the College's progress on meeting this goal while addressing the thematically linked Middle States Standards: 9: Student Support Services, and 13: Related Educational Activities.

The Working Group will articulate the research questions necessary to demonstrate the MSCHE Standards of Excellence while considering the context of the Strategic Goal. The group will identify and assemble the evidence and artifacts necessary to respond to their research questions.

Working Group 3. Working Group 3 is tasked with addressing Goal 3 of the College's Strategic Plan: To enable all campus community members to understand, appreciate, and interact effectively in today's pluralistic society, the College will develop new and enhance existing efforts to be an inclusive campus for faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the wider community.

In keeping with the organizational plan for the Self-Study this Working Group will study the College's progress on meeting this goal while addressing the thematically linked Middle States Standards: 1: Mission and Goals, and 6; Integrity.

The Working Group will articulate the research questions necessary to demonstrate the MSCHE Standards of Excellence while considering the context of the Strategic Goal. The group will identify and assemble the evidence and artifacts necessary to respond to their research questions.

Working Group 4. Working Group 4 is tasked with addressing Goal 4 of the College's Strategic Plan: Building on its strong regional reputation, the College will continue to strive for mission-consistent and fiscally responsible growth.

In keeping with the organizational plan for the Self-Study this Working Group will study the College's progress on meeting this goal while addressing the thematically linked Middle States Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention.

The Working Group will articulate the research questions necessary to demonstrate the MSCHE Standards of Excellence while considering the context of the Strategic Goal. The group will identify and assemble the evidence and artifacts necessary to respond to their research questions.

Working Group 5. Working Group 5 is tasked with addressing Goal 5 of the College's Strategic Plan: Considering future, as well as existing, campus facility and infrastructure needs, the College will continue to improve living and learning environments, incorporating state-of-the-market technologies, in order to promote student success and support the varied needs of our vibrant campus community.

In keeping with the organizational plan for the Self-Study this Working Group will study the College's progress on meeting this goal while addressing the thematically linked Middle States Standard 3: Institutional Resources.

The Working Group will articulate the research questions necessary to demonstrate the MSCHE Standards of Excellence while considering the context of the Strategic Goal. The group will identify and assemble the evidence and artifacts necessary to respond to their research questions.

Working Group 6. Working Group 6 is tasked with addressing Goal 6 of the College's Strategic Plan: Demonstrating an ongoing commitment to evidence-based institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement of student learning outcomes, the College will collect, interpret, and disseminate information for ongoing strategic analysis that is designed to inform and link decision-making , long-range planning, and resource allocation.

In keeping with the organizational plan for the Self-Study this Working Group will study the College's progress on meeting this goal while addressing the thematically linked Middle States Standards 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal; Standard 7: Institutional Assessment; and Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning.

The Working Group will articulate the research questions necessary to demonstrate the MSCHE Standards of Excellence while considering the context of the Strategic Goal. The group will identify and assemble the evidence and artifacts necessary to respond to their research questions.

Working Group 7. In keeping with the organizational plan for the Self-Study this Working Group will articulate the research questions necessary to demonstrate the MSCHE Standards of Excellence 4: Leadership and Governance; and 5: Administration.

The Working Group will articulate the research questions necessary to demonstrate the MSCHE Standards of Excellence. The group will identify and assemble the evidence and artifacts necessary to respond to their research questions.

VI: Research Questions

Alignment of the Strategic Plan Goals and MSCHE Standards

As outlined above, the Working Groups were tasked with generating research questions based on the Strategic Plan Goal to which they were assigned and the thematically linked Middles States standards in the 2006 *Characteristics of Excellence*. (Where appropriate, Working Group members were encouraged to reflect on any changes underway in anticipation of the 2016 Middle States revised standards.) The thematic approach was designed to evaluate our commitment to realizing the strategic plan goals and to affirm their alignment with our institutional Mission and Vision throughout the Self-Study process.

Working Groups were encouraged to work independently on their assigned strategic goals and accreditation standards. Since there is not perfect alignment between the goals and standards, a certain amount of overlap is to be expected. Any redundancies will be addressed by the Working Group Steering Committee during the Self-Study process. The MSCHE Document Roadmap will be consulted to ensure that all standards are address appropriately.

Working Group Questions

      Scope of Questions.

Except where explicitly noted otherwise, all questions concerning academic programs include both undergraduate and graduate programs. Questions involving student support and services include resident students and commuter students at the Rochester campus, Ed.D. students at the extension sites, and online students.

      Working Group 1 Research Questions. Theme: Program development and curriculum renewal, MSCHE Standards 10, 11, 12.

    General academic program review.

1. How does the institution review and drive improvement of existing programs? What is the process for revising existing programs such that they continue to reflect the College mission, goals, and expected student outcomes, and general education and relevant/essential competencies for graduates?
2. How does the institution promote and drive the development, implementation, and evaluation of new, viable and innovative academic programs? What processes are in place to ensure that programs are developed in a manner that is consistent with the College's liberal arts tradition, with the Strategic Plan, and with expected student outcomes?
3. How effectively do faculty currently collaborate on course and program development?
4. How has the Strategic Plan impacted the use of learning tools and strategies?
5. How are faculty engaging in curriculum and course evaluation to continuously improve student/program outcomes? How effective is the faculty support for this process of continuous improvement?

6. How are resources allocated to assist faculty, departments and programs in their assessment of academic programs, and to use those assessments to revise programs (including Core Curriculum, and First-Year Academic Programs)?
7. How are pedagogical practices and teaching-learning environments supporting the achievement of expected student outcomes?

The first year experience.

1. How do the goals and practices of the First Year Academic Programs (e.g., Learning Communities (LC), Research-Based Writing ("199")) support the mission of the College including the commitment to liberal arts?
2. How do Learning Community and Research-Based Writing core assessment data of the knowledge and skills students have obtained inform faculty development in these programs? How do these data inform LC and 199 curricular revisions?
3. Do the learning communities and 199 Programs offer students "rigorous" (as defined with first-year students in mind) and "high quality" educational opportunities?
4. How, and to what extent, has the Strategic Plan guided curricular developments and renewal in the LC, 199, and high enrolling first-year courses (e.g., ACCT 101, BIOL 120, etc.)?
5. How are the recommendations from the Foundations of Excellence self-study being implemented to optimize student success?

Liberal Arts core curriculum.

1. How, and to what extent, does the Core Curriculum "express the educational philosophy of the institution" (MSCHE Standard 12) and the mission of the College?
2. How is the development and implementation of the Core Curriculum connected to student learning outcomes?
3. How, and to what extent, does the Core teach knowledge/skills considered foundational to a robust general education curriculum?
4. What knowledge/skills do students demonstrably obtain in the Core Curriculum? How is assessment of such knowledge/skills accomplished?
5. How and to what extent does the institution pursue new opportunities for the Core Curriculum (e.g., curricular enhancements, assessment tools, pedagogical strategies)? How and to what extent are those pursuits encouraged, funded, and prioritized?
6. How effective are the processes for Core Curriculum revision to ensure that they depend on systematic feedback from students and/or assessment data?
7. What types of faculty development opportunities are available for instructors of Core Curriculum courses? Are existing faculty development programs in this regard effective?
8. How are Core Curriculum expectations (e.g., with respect to course content, assessment obligations) formally communicated (e.g., contractually) to instructors of Core Curriculum courses? Are these expectations routinely met?
9. How and to what extent are instructors of Core Curriculum courses committed to professional growth that could enhance the quality of their Core Curriculum instruction? How are instructors supported in their growth?

Faculty development.

1. What tools, funding, and development opportunities are available to support faculty and staff teaching, learning, and advising? How are these assessed? How is support for these determined? Are these sufficient to the needs of faculty?
2. How and to what extent are faculty engaged in professional skills development and renewal through professional development? How does this improve the teaching practices of faculty?
3. How are professional development budgets, at the department, school or college level, determined?
4. How do PETAL programs for faculty development connect with the educational philosophy and strategic initiatives of the university? How is institutional support for PETAL determined? How are PETAL's needs and outcomes assessed?
5. How is support for faculty enrichment opportunities (e.g. faculty exchanges, fellowships, etc.) determined? How are such opportunities chosen?
6. How is technology support made available to faculty to support pedagogical efforts?
7. How does the institution improve educational technology and stay with current best practices? How does the institution educate faculty and staff on the effective use of educational technology and on current trends?
8. How are full-time and part-time faculty qualifications to provide quality educational programming assessed? How are the results of those assessments used?

Research and Scholarly Activity.

1. How effective is the college support for faculty scholarship?
2. How does the institution currently monitor research equipment/facility capacity? Are the processes consistent and equitable across campus? What needs are not being met?
3. What is the perceived function of a research director and how will the new position enhance the sponsored research efforts at the College?
4. To what extent do faculty currently collaborate on research and scholarly activity? To what extent are the faculty collaborations carried on within schools?

Grants.

1. How are the grant-seeking professional development opportunities offered to faculty/staff assessed?
2. How does the institution promote and support internal and external funding opportunities? Are institutional efforts to encourage, recognize, and value grant-seeking among faculty/staff and academic programs sufficient to meet the goals of the Strategic Plan? How is grant-seeking incentivized?
3. How are faculty using existing grant-seeking resources? Are these resources sufficient to meet faculty needs and the goals of the Strategic Plan? If not, what additional resources are necessary?
4. How are official grant policies developed, maintained and enforced?

Working Group 2 Research Questions. Theme: Cultivating student success through academic enrichment, MSCHE Standards 9, 13.

Experiential learning, service learning, and civic engagement.

1. What personal, social, professional, and civic development attributes, skills, and competencies does the College want to foster in its students? What types of programs and services are available to foster this development? Based on the College's commitment to both the academic achievement and the personal growth of each student, how effective are the programs and services to support this development?
2. How does the College define experiential learning and differentiate different types, e.g., service learning, internships, student research and study abroad? In addition to definitions, what are the criteria for inclusion to ensure successful outcomes? What are the best practices for experiential learning that have been identified at the institution, school and/or discipline-level? What desired competencies for experiential learning have been articulated at the institution, school and/or discipline level? What are the mechanisms for communication at the College to facilitate information sharing regarding these programs?
3. How does the institution integrate student life activities, service learning, experiential learning, academics, and career development? How does this foster students' development (academic, personal, social, civic, and professional)?
4. How do we measure the effectiveness and the impact of experiential learning? Who is responsible for tracking participation, recording learning outcome measures, and evaluating experiential learning (e.g., service learning, student research, internships, and study abroad) and its impact on students, faculty, and community partners? Is there an appropriate assessment tool/electronic database to record this information and is it centralized? What resources, e.g., financial and administrative support, are adequate for the ongoing assessment of experiential learning?
5. Based on data of effectiveness and impact, what further development/expansion of experiential learning should be considered and what resources would be necessary to support this?

Internships and career services.

1. What are the criteria used to consider an internship for academic credit and are the same criteria used across programs? What are the different means by which students participate in internships? What is the process for developing and maintaining internship sites across academic departments? What are the mechanisms for evaluating an internship site and assessing student learning, and how are these evaluations and assessments used? Is there a centralized process for monitoring and tracking internships? What resources are needed to expand internship opportunities and to facilitate placement of more students interested in internships?
2. How can career development be integrated into the curriculum to promote early career exploration? What resources are needed to support career exploration for students including alumni collaborations with academic departments? Who are key partners in business, industry, and the community and how can these be leveraged to expand career exploration activities?
3. What is the existing infrastructure and resources for developing and promoting career opportunities for students? How is information shared among academic departments, career services and alumni relations? What resources and infrastructure are needed to track student outcomes post-graduation? Is the existing infrastructure adequate for expanding career opportunities?

Study abroad.

1. What mechanisms are in place to support existing and build additional opportunities for study abroad? What type of Fisher-sponsored programs and/or inter-institutional programs should the College develop? How could the College explore opportunities to combine international experiential learning, e.g., service-learning, community service or an internship, as a component of a study abroad program? Are there adequate infrastructure and resources to maintain and/or expand study abroad opportunities? How is the impact of study abroad programs on student development assessed, and how are the results of that assessment used?

Service learning and civic engagement.

1. How effectively is the information gathered from the Carnegie Classification for Student Engagement Self-Study being used to maintain and expand service learning and civic engagement? In what ways might civic engagement curriculum, scholarship, and assessment foster students' academic, personal, social, professional, and civic development?
2. What is the definition, criteria, and best practices for service-learning? What is the number of faculty and students that report development and implementation of service learning and how many community partners are benefitting? Has there been a shift toward placing a high value on engaged scholarship at the College?
3. What infrastructure is adequate to maintain and expand service learning? What administrative structure is needed to facilitate community partners, train and support faculty and students, track and assess service learning, and promote and reward positive civic engagement outcomes?

Student research.

1. What are the learning goals articulated for faculty-mentored student research projects and are they disseminated to faculty and students? What percentage of faculty report collaborative research with students? Has there been a shift toward placing a high value on this type of scholarship at the College? What procedures exist, or should be put in place, to formally value collaborative research and engaged scholarship, e.g., in the rank and tenure process? How is the impact of student research on student learning assessed, and how are the results of that assessment used?
2. Are there mechanisms to support the products and outcomes of students' research, e.g., through conference presentations or publication? What resources exist to support current and build additional opportunities for student research?

Student support services and retention.

1. When was the most recent review of the adequacy and effectiveness of student learning support services for all student populations (e.g., undergraduate and graduate students on-site, at extension sites, online, or in certificate programs)? How does the College assure that support services for graduate students at extension sites or in online programs are comparable to those offered on-site? How does the College provide support to enrolled

students who are identified as being at-risk? What kind of support services are provided to student athletes? Are there specific interventions for student athletes that are academically at-risk? How does the College provide support to enrolled students who are identified as being non-traditional i.e., adult learners? How does our population of students with disabilities compare with peer institutions? How effective are the support services provided to students with disabilities?

2. What outcomes will tell us that support services are effective in supporting all student populations? Have deficiencies been identified and addressed? Are there support services that peer institutions provide that SJFC does not? Which services should be improved, added, expanded or eliminated? How should changes be implemented?
3. How are data regarding retention rates, including rates for at-risk sub-populations, used to improve student support services?
4. How has the first-year experience changed over time? How are the recommendations from the Foundations of Excellence self-study being implemented to optimize student success? How have academic and student support programs been improved as a result?
5. What evidence is there that adequate advising is provided to undergraduate and graduate students?
6. How are alumni being involved in student mentoring programs? Which programs/departments use mentoring programs involving alumni? How are they defining and measuring the success of their programs?
7. How effective, well understood, and consistently implemented are the College's procedures and policies relative to the privacy of student information?
8. Is the process for addressing student complaints or grievances adequate and effective?

Working Group 3 Research Questions. Theme: Knowing our world and each other, MSCHE Standards 1, 6.

Campus climate.

1. What steps have been taken to implement the Climate Study recommendations across campus, particularly in the areas of orientation, creation of new initiatives and the inclusion of staff in decision making? How have decisions regarding this implementation been made?
2. In what ways have the SJFC website and other communication materials used within the schools displayed diversity? How are decisions about what is displayed in communication materials made?
3. How have the assessment of diversity efforts been communicated across campus and how have they informed decisions regarding diversity?
4. What evidence is there that demonstrates the institution's support for initiatives that encourage diverse programs or experiences, both as a college and at the individual school level? How has that evidence been used to determine funding priorities?

Connection to curriculum.

1. To what extent has the Office of Multicultural Affairs and the individual schools collaborated to promote diversity in the curriculum? What co-curricular impact have these recommendations had?

2. In what ways have diversity related courses within the core and majors impacted student learning and attitudes?
3. In what ways has the college developed and increased support for programs that encourage student/faculty exchanges or other experiences that aid in educating the SJFC community about diversity?

Programming and impact.

1. What types of opportunities exist for students to have diverse experiences throughout their programs at SJFC? What are those experiences and what impact have they had on students? How do those experiences
2. In what ways has the institution increased its diversity efforts since the college's climate study? How are these efforts assessed? How have the results of those efforts been used to determine, prioritize, and fund further efforts? How are these results used to direct admissions efforts?
3. What is the current retention rate of ALANA students? What programs have been implemented to improve the retention of ALANA students? Have they been successful? What evidence is there to measure this success? How is that evidence used to determine support for these programs?
4. At what level (average percentage per year) has diversity increased in the incoming undergraduate, among graduate students, and online students, and how has this been accomplished? How is this information used to direct admissions efforts?
5. What types of programs and support services does SJFC have that helps to maintain or increase the number of ALANA students in undergraduate and graduate programs?

Faculty and staff.

1. What specific projects, plans and/or actions have been or should be developed by departments to achieve measurable progress towards hiring and retaining a diverse faculty and staff? How do we know that those actions work?
2. Are there sufficient resources (financial, time or other) available to make diversity efforts achievable? How are decisions about resources for these diversity efforts made?
3. What measurements or metrics have been be used to evaluate progress and success in recruiting diverse faculty and staff?
4. At what rate has the level of "diversity" among faculty and staff increased? To what can that increase be attributed?
5. How effectively has the college demonstrated growth in positive student, faculty and staff attitudes and knowledge about diversity? What evidence is there to demonstrate this?

Working Group 4 Research Questions. Theme: Recruitment and market expansion, MSCHE Standard 8.

Consideration is given to undergraduate and graduate student populations, as well as online and satellite programs when addressing the research questions that follow.

Student recruitment and admissions.

1. How do the College's admissions policies and recruitment efforts ensure that admitted students support and reflect the mission of St. John Fisher College? Besides standardized testing and academic grade point averages, what additional evaluative processes are utilized when selecting admissions candidates? How are those evaluation processes determined?
2. How does the College assess and use the resulting data to amend practices of recruitment, admission, financial aid, and retention?
3. How does the College recruit, nurture and retain ALANA students? What relationships are being cultivated by the College to help with these recruitment efforts? How are those efforts evaluated, and how does that evaluation assist revision of those efforts?
4. How are admissions criteria and policies made available to prospective students to assist them in making informed decisions? How do prospective students interact with this information? How are these policies updated?
5. How are the mission and values of the College reflected in the admissions marketing materials? How are Fisher's recruitment efforts (particularly on-campus ones such as Open Houses and career days) and recruitment publications consistent with its mission?
6. How does the College provides prospective students, families, secondary schools and community colleges with the most comprehensive information regarding cost of attendance and financial aid availability (scholarships, grants, work, loan)? How are those efforts assessed?

Communication of curricular expectations.

1. How is accurate and comprehensive information regarding the learning outcomes and expectations of each program communicated with prospective students? How is this communication assessed, and how are the results of that assessment used?
2. What placement criteria are available to students regarding academic program and specific course levels?
3. How are prerequisite and curricular details shared with prospective students? How are those efforts assessed?

Student success.

1. How does the College track students' progress throughout their programs and identify if and when remediation is necessary?
2. What does the College do to ensure that marginally qualified students who are admitted achieve success while enrolled? How does the College identify marginal students? What characteristics are used to define marginal? How does the College provide student support to marginal students once identified?

Outcomes and alumni.

1. In what ways does the College communicate student learning outcomes, assessment results, and alumni results with prospective students?
2. In what ways does the College capture and use certification and licensure exam results?
3. What are job placement numbers and rates and graduate/professional school acceptance numbers and rates for graduates of the College?

Credit earned outside St. John Fisher College.

1. How does the College publish and implement policies and procedures regarding Advanced Placement and college transfer credit? How are those efforts assessed?
2. How are articulation agreements with community college partners communicated to prospective students considering formally entering these agreements? How are these articulation agreements made and assessed?

Market changes.

1. How is the College positioning itself to address anticipated changes in demographics? How are those positions determined?
2. What are the demographic trends for each of the four student segments (i.e., undergraduate students, graduate students, online students, and academic alliances) the College is targeting? How are those trends used to form recruitment and admissions policies? What changes to current recruitment practices are being made given the decreasing number of students in our target recruitment area?
3. How have demographic trends been factored into the enrollment goals for each segment? What new initiatives have been developed to support achievement of the established enrollment goals? How are those initiatives assessed, and how are those assessments used to refine those initiatives?
4. How are we identifying and recruiting students that meet admissions criterion from areas outside of the primary service area? How is the College assessing the success of its recruitment expansion efforts? How are those assessments used to modify these efforts?
5. How is the College identifying academic program offerings and alternate modalities that support enrollments of students outside of its traditional reach? How does the College ensure that new academic programs and/or formats developed are both mission consistent and market responsive? How are those offerings and modalities assessed? How do those assessments inform revisions?
6. How are financial plans related directly to enrollment goals and objectives? How are limited financial resources allocated to prioritize changing demographics? How are these allocations determined?

Working Group 5 Research Questions. Theme: Living and learning environments, MSCHE Standard 3.

Processes to facilitate planning.

1. What processes are in place to facilitate planning at the institutional and department levels? How are the College's mission and the Strategic Plan used for planning at the institutional and department levels?
2. How do we know if planning and improvement processes are sufficiently communicated and understood?
3. Do planning and improvement processes provide for constituent participation?
4. Are the processes for decision-making on all issues well defined? Are those processes communicated to all stakeholders?

5. How is assessment incorporated in the planning and improvement process? Do goals and objectives reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results?

Plans for acquisitions.

1. Do existing plans for acquisition of technology and other equipment meet educational, academic, and administrative needs?
2. How do existing plans provide for the growth of the college?
3. Is that plan forward-looking with regard to developing future technologies? Does the plan provide for the maintenance and replacement of acquired technology and equipment? Is there an assessment mechanism to determine the effectiveness of acquired technology and equipment?
4. How are faculty and staff trained to use new technology?

Budgeting.

1. How are annual and multi-year budget projections prepared for the College and for individual departments?
2. How are assumptions developed to support financial projections?
3. How has deferred maintenance been included in the annual budget process?
4. How is the Facilities Master Plan included in the annual budget process?

Assessment of planning.

1. How are the planning for facilities, resource allocation, and utilization of these facilities assessed?
2. Are responsibility and accountability for improvements clearly assigned?
3. How are improvement efforts and assessment results tracked and recorded?
4. Are these assessments conducted systematically?
5. How are decisions tracked with respect to impact on the students?

Serving students with disabilities.

1. What are the processes for providing quality living and learning environments for students with academic and physical disabilities?
2. What support is provided for faculty and staff to support these students?
3. What are the learning spaces available for student accommodations and how is the effectiveness of these spaces being assessed?
4. How do the academic support systems (library, Office of Information Technology, fitness facilities, etc.) plan for financial implications of students with extensive needs?
5. How do the academic support systems ensure that they can provide the proper support for students with academic and physical disabilities?

Support for new initiatives.

1. How is the allocation of faculty, staff and administration to support new campus initiatives balanced with the need to support current initiatives?

2. How is the planning and fiscal allocation for human resources clearly communicated to campus constituent groups?
3. What is the method for assessment of appropriate faculty and staff employees to maintain services as the campus grows?
4. How have resource allocations changed to reflect the growth and changes of the College over the last 10 years?

Serving non-traditional students.

1. What are the processes for providing quality living and learning environments for non-traditional students (adult learners, commuters, online students, students at satellite campuses, etc…)?
2. What support is provided for faculty and staff to support these students?
3. What learning spaces are available for non-traditional students and how is the effectiveness of these spaces assessed?
4. How do the academic support systems (library, Office of Information Technology, fitness facilities, food services, etc.) plan for financial implications of non-traditional students?
5. How do the academic support systems ensure that they can provide the proper support for non-traditional students?

Assessing support services.

1. How are the planning for student support services, resource allocation, and utilization of these services assessed?
2. Does every support service have a mission and strategic plan which aligns with the College's Mission and Strategic Plan and if so, how was it developed?
3. Are there systematic assessment plans that support services which include sharing results and tracking improvements?

Grant funding and fundraising.

1. How do grant funding and fundraising activities support the College's mission, goals and strategic plan?
2. How are ongoing costs planned for to sustain grant funded initiatives beyond the grant period?
3. How are faculty and staff supported to seek grants and pursue fundraising activities?

Independent audits.

1. How are the results of annual independent audits used?
2. What process is in place to ensure that items included in the audit's management letter are addressed?

Safety and security.

1. How and to what extent is are the Safety and Security of campus facilities monitored and assessed? What changes have been made based on this assessment?

2. How are safety plans shared with faculty staff and students?
3. How has campus security maintained emergency, safety and security plans as the College has grown over the last 10 years?

Working Group 6 Research Questions. Theme: Attaining institutional effectiveness, MSCHE Standards 2, 7, 14.

Promoting institutional effectiveness.

1. How do the College, schools, programs, and departments collect and aggregate assessment data to inform college decision making in keeping with the mission, vision, and Strategic Plan?
2. How does the College document and organize the assessment processes (i.e. student learning outcomes, key performance indicators, benchmarks) to create an evidence-based system that is efficient and purposeful to evaluate and improve student learning?
3. How have assessment processes and dissemination strategies changed as the College has grown and programs have been added?
4. How does the College support collaboration and information sharing across campus and with stakeholders for effective decision making, long-range planning, and resource allocation? Is this effective?
5. What evidence demonstrates that assessment processes support communication, evaluation, and improvement of programs and services?
6. Is there a sufficient infrastructure in place to support the demands of assessment, data analysis and evidence-based continuous improvement?
7. What process is in place to review the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the Strategic Plan and assessment processes across campus?
8. What communication strategy is employed to keep all constituents informed of progress on meeting strategic plan goals? Is it sufficient?
9. What changes have been made, or recommended, based on the evidence gathered throughout the above processes?
10. How might the current assessment structures prepare us for anticipated changes to the accreditation standards?

Budgeting and Decision Making.

1. What is the charge of the Long-Range Planning and Budgeting Committee (LRP&BC), and how was it developed?
2. What is the process by which LRP&BC aligns decisions and allocations, including the role of feedback and assessment data, with Strategic Plan goals?
3. What changes have been made, or recommended, based on the evidence gathered throughout the above processes?
4. To what extent is the College integrating assessment, budgeting, and planning cycles, in accordance with the process and goals outlined in the Strategic Plan? What is the process for prioritizing initiatives and ranking budget requests to facilitate evidence-based changes?
5. How does the College evaluate the effectiveness of the long-range planning and budgeting process?

Review and communication.

1. How does the College align philanthropic priorities (including academic strategic initiatives, capital projects, and student life activities) with the College's mission and vision and the initiatives identified in the Strategic Plan?
2. How are the priorities communicated with the campus community and stakeholders for decision-making, long-range planning, and resource allocation?
3. How are the decisions made in LRP&BC documented along with the corresponding supporting evidence?

Working Group 7 Research Questions. Theme: Leadership, governance and administration, MSCHE Standards 4, 5.

Governance.

1. What strategies are in place to support the inclusion of students and staff in the governance structure and how are we assessing if the current strategies are effective?
2. How have committees or organizational structures changed in the past 5 years? How have these changes enhanced the College's ability to fulfill its mission, vision and goals?
3. What opportunities are made available for student input regarding College policy and decisions that affect them?
4. How are the ongoing changes in leadership demands being addressed at the various School levels of administrative function (Deans, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, Chairs, and Program Directors)?
5. What communication processes are in place to foster exchange of crucial information between the academic leaders (Deans) and the Board? How effective are those processes?
6. How does the Board access and use information from faculty and staff to reflect the current practice and climate at the College?
7. How does the Board evaluate itself in terms of policy development, financial oversight, resource development, self-governance, and the evaluation of the President? How are these processes connected to the strategic plan of the college?
8. What mechanisms ensure transparency in decision making at all levels of the College?

Strategic Plan, Mission, Vision.

1. How do governance and educational policy facilitate the processes to align academic and administrative goals with strategic plan goals?
2. How do the roles and governance of academic and non-academic operations support the mission of the institution?
3. How do governance structures currently in place facilitate effective planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal?

Diversity.

1. What actions is the Board taking to identify, recruit and cultivate more women and underrepresented groups to diversify its membership?
2. What training regarding diversity is available to Board members?

3. What procedures does the College use to identify, recruit and retain administration, faculty, staff and students with respect to diversity? How effective are those procedures? How can we create recruitment pipelines for minority and disadvantaged graduate students?

Quality Improvement.

1. What is the process for evaluating the Board and senior leadership and how is the data used to support quality improvement?
2. How does senior leadership ensure programmatic effectiveness of the curriculum is assessed and adapted?
3. How does senior leadership identify administrative supports and barriers to quality improvement of programs and operations on the SJFC campus?
4. How do programs measure administrative support for improving the learning of SJFC students?
5. How have College policies or operational changes occurred as a result of student recommendations?

Resource Management.

1. What evidence does the Board report related to financial planning? What resources are committed to fulfillment of the strategic plan? How are the outcomes of the board's financial planning communicated to the college community (stakeholders)?
2. What processes exist to evaluate options and determine how best to allocate institutional resources to meet both immediate operational goals as well as long-term strategic initiatives?
3. How often and in what context does the College evaluate its programs and services to assess their fidelity to the institution's mission?
4. How does the College determine its needs with respect to faculty and administrative staffing?

VII. Data Sources

- Academic Affairs records
- Budget Analysis Committee Minutes
- 2006 St. John Fisher College Self-Study
- 2011 Periodic Review Report
- 2011 Period Review Report Response
- 2012 Monitoring Report
- Academic intervention policies
- Academic program descriptions
- Accreditation Reports – All Schools
- Accreditation Requirements for Programs- All Schools
- Admissions criteria – undergraduate, graduate, transfer, etc…
- Admissions Data, undergraduate, graduate, transfer, etc…
- Advancement Meeting Agendas and Meeting Minutes
- ALANA recruitment initiatives detail
- Alumni Board Meeting Minutes
- Alumni Newsletters and other communications
- Alumni Survey Information
- Appropriate sections of Program Reviews
- Appropriate sections of the Board of Trustees Reports
- Articulation Agreements
- Assessment Committee Members, Meeting Agendas, and Meeting Minutes
- Assessment coordinator information
- Assessment Leadership Team Minutes
- Assessment Plans and Timelines – All Schools
- Audit, Bond Rating
- Board Committees: composition
- Board Evaluation Instruments
- Board of Trustees Bylaws
- Budget Development Documents for Deans
- Budget projections
- Budget Reports to Board of Trustees
- Budgets of programs
- Budgets, Deans
- Campus Climate Study & Recommendations
- Campus Life (organizations)
- Campus Ministry
- Campus Webmaster
- Cardinal Courier

- Career Services - Career and Graduate School data
- Carnegie Self-Study Report
- Center for Academic Excellence Report
- Chairs and/or Program Director Data
- Charge of Long Range Planning & Budgeting Committee
- Core assessment data
- Core workshop data
- Course Evaluation - Samples
- Course Syllabi Mapped to Competencies
- Enrollment and Retention Data
- Curricular review
- Curriculum & Instruction Committee Data
- Curriculum Maps
- Database of alumni, business, industry and/or community partners
- Deans
- Deferred Maintenance Plan
- Delaware Study
- Department budgets
- Disabilities Services Statistical Reports
- Ed Tech White Paper
- Educational Technologist: interview
- Employee Handbook
- Enrollment Fact Book
- Enrollment Management Reports - freshman, transfer, graduate
- Evaluation of current student support services for all student populations
- Facilities Master Plan
- Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
- Faculty Development Off-campus tools available and utilized
- Faculty Development Data: PETAL, faculty workshops, professional conferences
- Faculty Handbook
- Faculty Qualifications – All Schools
- Faculty Statutes
- Faculty survey of how they made changes to teaching-learning practices
- Financial Aid information (web and print)
- Financial Aid Net Price Calculator (web)
- Fisher Digital Publications Statistics
- Focus Group - composed of faculty and students
- Form for policies and procedures for adding or closing academic programs
- Foundation Grants Office Records
- Foundations of Excellence Self-Study Report
- Funded strategic initiatives

- Fundraising plans
- Goals, Outcomes, Key Performance Indicators, Benchmarks for each department
- GPC Graduate Student Survey 2006
- Graduate Bulletin
- Graduate Catalog
- Graduate marketing materials (web and print)
- Graduate Program Council Minutes
- Grants Office Data
- Higher Education Opportunity Program Admissions Procedures
- Human Resources Policies
- Information Technology Multi-Year Plan
- Institution Assessment Flow Chart
- Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes
- Institutional Research Data
- Integration of educational technology to support course learning outcomes
- Investment/Endowment Report
- Learning Community and 199 Goals and Mission statement
- Leadership Organizational Chart
- Library Annual Report
- Library Assessment Plan
- Library Information Literacy Statistics
- Library – interlibrary loan statistics
- Library IPEDS comparisons and benchmarks
- Library Mission and Vision
- Library Services for Ed.D. Student Survey 2014
- Library Space Survey
- Library Strategic Plan
- Library Use Statistics, include research help and attendance
- List Standing Committees
- Long Range Budget and Planning Committee budget processes
- LRP&BC Members, Meeting Agendas, Meeting Minutes
- Market research studies considering new programs and/or modality changes
- Marketing and Communications
- Math Center Documents
- SJFC Mission Statement
- MSCHE, Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report
- Multicultural Affairs and Diversity Programs (OMADP)
- New program development processes
- NSEE 8 Principles of Good Practice for EL
- Number of diverse programs administered
- Office of Institutional Research

- Office on Information Technology Policies
- President Evaluation Process/Instrument
- President's Reports to the College
- Prospective Student Applications
- Provost's Office
- Public Relations
- Recruitment efforts in diverse populations (Admissions)
- Recruitment Materials
- Reference peer institutions
- Research equipment use and maintenance records
- Residence Life, Housing and Meal Plan Information
- Retention Data
- Retention efforts (Student Affairs, Multicultural Affairs)
- Review of Core policies and procedures
- Review of new program applications
- Sample curriculum plans from College bulletin
- Sample new curricula development process
- Senior Leadership Meeting Minutes
- Service-Learning Activity Log
- SJFC Strategic Plan 2012-2017
- Staff Advisory Council
- Staff Council Minutes
- Staffing Requests and Supporting Documents
- Strategic Initiatives Sub-Committee Members and Meeting Minutes
- Strategic Peer Set Study Documents
- Strategic Plan Goal 2 documents that defines EL
- Strategic Planning Committee/Administrators
- Strategic Plans – All Schools
- Strategic Review Committee Membership and Processes
- Student Consumer Information (web)
- Student Government Association Focus Groups
- Student Handbook
- Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes
- Study Abroad Coordinator
- Survey of chairs to determine LGs and outcomes of student research
- Survey of faculty & staff, Annual Evaluation data/department reports
- Survey of faculty to determine record of UG research mentoring and products of such
- Termination of Programs Process
- Tracking student outcomes post-graduation
- Tracking student participation in experiential learning
- Undergraduate Catalog

- Vice President of Student Affairs and Diversity Initiatives
- VP for Finance/CFO,
- Wellness Center Information
- Writing Center Documents

VIII. Organization of the Self-Study Report

The Self-Study report will be organized as follows:

Executive Summary

The Executive Summary will consist of a brief description of the major findings and recommendations of the Self-Study.

Sections

Section I: Background.

- Chapter 1: An introduction to the St. John Fisher College Self-Study, including a description and history of St. John Fisher College, a brief summary of the 2006 Middle States Self-Study Report (and responses), a brief summary of the 2011 Periodic Review Report (and responses), and a presentation of the St. John Fisher College Strategic Plan 2012-2017.

Section II: Working Group findings. Each of the seven working groups will contribute a chapter detailing the data that pertain to their research questions, and analyzing those data to answer the research questions.

- Chapter 2: Working Group 1 - Program Development and Curriculum Renewal
- Chapter 3: Working Group 2 - Cultivating Student Success through Academic Enrichment
- Chapter 4: Working Group 3 – Knowing our World and Each Other
- Chapter 5: Working Group 4 – Recruitment and Market Expansion
- Chapter 6: Working Group 5 – Living and Learning Environments
- Chapter 7: Working Group 6 – Attaining Institutional Effectiveness
- Chapter 8: Working Group 7 – Leadership, Governance and Administration

Section III: Conclusions and recommendations.

- Chapter 9: Summary of the findings of the Working Groups
- Chapter 10: Recommendations for future actions, based on the findings of the Working Groups
- Chapter 11: Conclusions

Appendices will be used as appropriate.

IX. Self-Study Format

Mechanics for Writing

The report will address the standards as outlined in the *Characteristics of Excellence*, and will be organized according to the *SJFC Strategic Plan 2012-2017*. Although the report will be a thorough examination of the research questions, it will also be interesting to read and succinct. The report will largely follow APA guidelines regarding seriation and grammar. This means that the report will:

- Use Times New Roman font type, with a 12 point size.
- Use one-inch margins
- APA Level One Heading: centered, boldface, upper and lower case
- APA Level Two Heading: left-aligned, boldface, upper and lower case
- APA Level Three Heading: indented, boldface, lower case with a period
- APA Level Four Heading: indented, boldface, italicized, lower case with a period
- Follow a consistent format and numbering for figures and tables
- Introduce abbreviations upon their first occurrence
- Use the active voice, except where passive voice would improve clarity
- Follow a consistent format for numbered and bulleted lists
- Follow a consistent format for cited references

To assist in the readability of the manuscript, the following deviations from APA format will be used:

- Single spaced text
- No indentation of the first line of paragraphs, except for headings as noted above and lists
- Additional vertical white spacing between paragraphs

In addition, the report will:

- Refer to individuals by the position titles and offices or departments rather than the individuals' names.
- Describe all programs, services, initiatives under examination
- Clearly connect the analysis and impact to the research question being addressed
- Focus on current and recent activities and accomplishments. Future plans may be included, but only where necessary
- Carefully warrant all conclusions

To facilitate the process of exchanging information across groups and compiling the final report, all working documents will be edited using the Microsoft Office suite of products, and will be shared on SJFC's *Compliance Assist* web-site.

Editorial Process

Working Group reports will be submitted through their chairs to the Co-Chairs of the Self-Study for assembling into the unified narrative. The Steering Committee which includes the Co-Chairs, the Provost as MSCHE Liaison Officer, the representative from the Board of Trustees, and the Working Group Chairs, will review and comment on the first draft of the narrative. Their edited draft will be referred back the Working Groups for comment before it is submitted to the Executive Steering Committee for review and comment.

To ensure a high-quality and readable final report, an external editor will be employed.

X. Timeline

The timeline for this Self-Study will largely follow the *Self-Study Timetable* (Figure 3 of the MSCHE publication *Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report*).

Summer 2013

- MSCHE reminds institution of the pending evaluation and invites it to The Self-Study Institute.

Fall 2013

- Self-Study Institute held to orient institutions beginning self-study
- MSCHE staff liaison schedules self-study preparation visit to the institution

Spring 2014

- Steering Committee Chair(s) and members chosen
- Institution chooses its self-study model
- Institution determines types of working groups that will be needed
- Draft Self-Study Design finalized, including charge and questions for working groups
- Draft Self-Study Design submitted to MSCHE staff liaison (*April 16, 2014*)

Summer 2014

- MSCHE staff liaison conducts self-study preparation visit (*May 16, 2014*)
- Staff liaison approves institution's Self-Study Design
- Working Groups begin Self-Study
- Town Hall meeting to provide updates to College constituencies

Fall 2014

- MSCHE selects the evaluation team Chair
- Chair and institution select dates for team visit and for the Chairs preliminary visit
- Institution sends a copy of the Self-Study Design to the team Chair
- Town Hall meeting to provide updates to College constituencies

Fall 2014 - Spring 2015

- Steering Committee oversees research and reporting by working groups
- Working groups involve the community
- Working groups submit regular reports and drafts to the Co-Chairs

Spring 2015

- Town Hall meeting to provide updates to College constituencies

Spring-Summer 2015

- MSCHE selects evaluation team members. and the institution comments on the selection if necessary (e.g., for conflicts of interest)

Summer 2015

- Steering Committee receives drafts text from working groups and develops a draft Self-Study Report
- Town Hall meeting to provide updates to College constituencies

Fall 2015

- Campus community reviews draft Self-Study Report
- Executive Steering Committee reviews draft Self-Study Report
- Evaluation team Chair reviews draft Self-Study Report
- SJFC Board of Trustees reviews draft Self-Study Report
- Institution sends draft Self-Study Report to evaluation team Chair, prior to Chair's preliminary visit
- Team Chair makes preliminary visit at least four months prior to team visit
- Institution prepares final version of the Self-Study Report
- Institution sends final Report to evaluation team and to MSCHE at least six weeks prior to team visit
- Town Hall meeting to provide updates to College constituencies

Spring 2016

- Team visit (prior to April 15)
- Team report
- Institutional response

Summer or Fall 2016

- Committee on Evaluation Reports meets
- Commission action

XI. Profile of the Evaluation Team

St. John Fisher College is an independent institution guided by its liberal arts tradition and Catholic heritage. It is a collaborative community dedicated to teaching, learning and scholarship in a student-centered environment. Full time enrollment is approximately four thousand students. These students are enrolled in 33 undergraduate academic majors, 11 undergraduate pre-professional programs, 9 masters programs, and 3 doctoral programs across five schools: The School of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business, the School of Education, the School of Nursing, and the School of Pharmacy.

St. John Fisher College is classified as a *Doctoral Research University* (DRU) by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. However, because of the College's focus on teacher rather than research, the Evaluation Team should be chosen with a teaching focus in mind. Appendix B lists the institutions that the College uses as peer and aspirant groups, and this list should be helpful in guiding the choice of Evaluation Team members.

In keeping with the College motto of *Teach me goodness, discipline and knowledge,* the College aspires to achieve Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Classification for Community Engagement.

The Executive Steering Committee requests that the visiting evaluation team include members with experience working with the following:

- Independent colleges of similar size and a wide range of educational programs and delivery methods
- colleges which have both a strong liberal arts grounding and strong professional programs
- colleges with a student-centered focus
- colleges which have experienced recent growth in the number and diversity of academic programs offered
- colleges presenting a comprehensive self-study with a thematic approach, such as through the lens of a strategic plan
- It would be helpful to the institution to have representative(s) on the team from institution(s) having achieved Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement. (The 2010 list of Carnegie Classified Campuses is available at: http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/comm_eng_classified_campuses.php; if the 2015 list of Classified Campuses is available before the visiting evaluation team is chosen, it will be forwarded to MSCHE.)

Appendix A: Working Group Membership

Working Group 1 Membership: Program Development and Curriculum Renewal (MSCHE Standards 10, 11, 12)

- Chair, Dr. Bruce E. Blaine, Professor of Mathematical & Computing Sciences
- Vice-Chair, Maya A. C. Temperley, Director of Corporate Funding & Government Relations
- Diane V. Dugan, Assistant Controller
- Dr. Monica A. Hodis, Assistant Professor of Management
- Stacy Ledermann, Director of Freshman Admissions
- Dr. Barbara J. Lowe, Associate Professor, Associate Dean of the School of Arts & Sciences
- Dr. Melinda E. Lull, Assistant Professor of Pharmaceutical Sciences
- Dr. James E. Schwartz, Professor of Education
- Dr. Charlene M. Smith, Professor of Nursing
- Dr. Ryan Thibodeau, Assistant Professor of Psychology

Working Group 2 Membership: Cultivating Student Success through Academic Enrichment (MSCHE Standards 9, 13)

- Chair, Dr. Eileen L. Lynd-Balta, Professor of Biology
- Vice-Chair, Dr. Lynn M. Donahue, Director of the Center for Service Learning & Experiential Learning
- Dr. Katrina Arndt, Associate Professor of Education
- Matthew Cardin, Director of Career Services
- Dr. Christine Nelson-Tuttle, Associate Professor of Nursing
- Dr. Richard O'Brocta, Associate Dean of the School of Pharmacy
- Dr. Kristin F. Picardo, Associate Professor of Biology
- Sally J. Vaughan, Director of Community Service

Working Group 3 Membership: Knowing our World and Each Other (MSCHE Standards 1, 6)

- Chair, Yantee Slobert, Director of Multicultural Affairs
- Vice-Chair, Dr. Christine R. Birnie, Associate Professor, Chair of Pharmaceutical Sciences
- Dr. Kathleen A Broikou, Associate Professor of Education
- David DiCaro, Director of Safety& Security
- Dr. Jeannine Dingus Eason, Associate Professor of Education
- David T. Roberts, Associate Director of Freshman Admissions
- Douglas J. Stewart, Assistant Vice President of Human Resources

Working Group 4 Membership: Recruitment and Market Expansion (MSCHE Standard 8)

- Chair, Jose Perales, Director of Transfer & Graduate Admissions
- Vice-Chair, Dr. Lynn Mucenski-Keck, Assistant Professor of Accounting & Finance
- Robert Curtis, Alumni Representative
- Anne R. Geer, Director of Marketing & Communications
- Dr. Rachel A. Jordan, Associate Professor of Mental Health Counseling
- Jill McCabe, Associate Director of Athletics
- Dr. David McCaffrey, Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, School of Pharmacy
- Angela B. Monnat, Director of Financial Aid
- Dr. Michael Robinson, Site Director, Ed.D. Program at New Rochelle
- Dr. Deborah Uman, Associate Professor of English

Group 5 Membership: Living and Learning Environments (MSCHE Standard 3)

- Chair, Dr. Kristina M. Lantzky-Eaton, Assistant Professor, Chemistry Department Chair
- Vice-Chair, Terri L. Travaglini, Assistant Dean of Students & Residence Life
- Dr. Jason Berman, Professor of Business Administration
- Larry P. Jacobson, Director of Physical Plant
- Melissa E. Jadlos, Director of Library
- Katie McDonald, Education Technologist
- Dr. Guillermo Montes, Associate Professor of Education
- Dr. Ramil E. Sapinoro, Assistant Professor of Pharmaceutical Sciences
- Stacy S. Slocum, Chief Information Officer
- Bob A Ward, Athletic Director,

Working Group 6 Membership: Attaining Institutional Effectiveness (MSCHE Standards 2, 7, 14)

- Chair, Kristin T. Anderson, Coordinator, Institutional Assessment & Accreditation
- Vice-Chair, Dr. Cathy S. Sweet, Assessment Coordinator, School of Arts & Sciences
- Dr. Caroline A. Critchlow, Assessment Coordinator, School of Nursing and School of Education
- Dr. Marilyn Dollinger, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, School of Nursing
- Dr. Susan Hildenbrand, Assistant Professor, School of Education
- Robert E. Moline, Executive Director for Alumni Engagement
- Dr. Angela Nagel, Assistant Professor of Pharmacy Practice & Administration
- Dr. Raymond Shady, Visiting Assistant Professor of Management
- Linda M. Steinkirchner, Associate Vice President of Financial Affairs
- Kelly L. Sudol, Assistant Director of Institutional Research & Assessment
- Dr. Deborah VanderBilt, Professor of English

Working Group 7 Membership: Leadership, Governance and Administration (MSCHE Standards 4, 5)

- Chair, Dr. Jennifer L. Mathews, Associate Professor of Pharmaceutical Sciences
- Vice- Chair, Dr. Carolyn S. Vacca, Associate Professor of History
- Dr. Marie E. Cianca, Associate Professor of Education
- Dr. Richard DeJesús-Rueff, Vice President, Student Affairs and Diversity Initiatives
- Lori A. Hollenbeck, Assistant Dean for Administration, School of Business
- Elizabeth Lachance, Director of Institutional Research
- Dr. Cynthia McCloskey, Associate Professor of Nursing
- Dr. Karl G. Williams, Associate Professor of Pharmacy Administration
- Dr. Michael W. Wischnowski, Dean, School of Education

Appendix B: St. John Fisher College Strategic Comparison Group

St. John Fisher College uses the following institutions for strategic comparisons:

Name	2010 Carnegie Classification	Similar Professional Programs (Degrees)
Peer Institutions		
Adelphi University (NY)	DRU	Education (B,M), Business (MBA), Nursing (D)
Assumption College (MA)	Master's M	Education, Business
Bellarmine University (KY)	Master's L	Education (B,M), Business (MBA), Nursing (DNP)
Belmont University (TN)	Master's L	Education (B,M), Business (MBA), Nursing (DNP), Pharmacy (PharmD)
Butler University (IN)	Master's M	Education (B.M), Business (MBA), Pharmacy (PharmD)
Saint Mary's University of Minnesota	DRU	Education (B,M,EdD), Business (MBA), Nursing (B,M)
Samford University (AL)	Master's M	Education (B,M,EdD), Business (MBA), Nursing (B,M,DNP), Pharmacy (PharmD)
Seton Hall University (NJ)	DRU	Education (B,M,EdD), Business (MBA), Nursing (B,M,RN-BS on-line,DNP)
The College of Saint Rose (NY)	Master's L	Education, Business
University of Portland (OR)	Master's L	Education (B,M,EdD), Business (MBA), Nursing (B,M,DNP)
University of St Thomas (MN)	DRU	Education (B,M,EdD), Business (MBA)
Valparaiso University (IN)	Master's L	Education (B,M), Business (MBA), Nursing (B,M,DNP)
Wilkes University (PA)	Master's L	Education, Business, Nursing, Pharmacy
Aspirant Institutions		
Fairfield University (CT)	Master's L	Education (M), Business (MBA,MS) , Nursing (B,M,DNP)
Ithaca College (NY)	Master's L	Education (B,M), Business (MBA)
Marist College (NY)	Master's L	Education, Business
Quinnipiac University (CT)	Master's L	Education (M), Business (MBA), Nursing (B,M,DNP)
Competitor Institutions		
Canisius College (NY)	Master's L	Education, Business, Nursing
D'Youville College (NY)	Master's L	Education (M,EdD), Business (MBA), Nursing (B,M,DNP), Pharmacy (PharmD)
Gannon University (PA)	Master's L	Education, Business
John Carroll University (OH)	Master's L	Education, Business, Nursing
Le Moyne College (NY)	Master's L	Education, Business
Mercyhurst College (PA)	Master's S	Education, Business, Nursing (BS only)
Nazareth College (NY)	Master's L	Nursing, Education, Business
Niagara University (NY)	Master's L	Education, Business, Nursing (BS only)
Saint Bonaventure University (NY)	Master's L	Education, Business