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Institutional Overview

Fordham University, founded in 1841, is an independent, co-educational Catholic and Jesuit institution of higher learning. At the invitation of its founder, Bishop John Hughes, the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits) assumed responsibility for the original St. John’s College in 1846. In 1907 the institution achieved university status, and its name was changed to Fordham University. During the twentieth century, the University grew to encompass ten schools with residential campuses in the Bronx (Rose Hill) and Manhattan (Lincoln Center). It has an additional campus in Westchester County (Fordham Westchester) and currently administers the Louis Calder Center Biological Field Station in Armonk, New York, as well as the Fordham London Centre in the United Kingdom.

Fordham University currently enrolls 15,098 students in its four undergraduate colleges and six graduate and professional schools. Of the 8,345 undergraduates, 4,131 live in University-managed housing. There are 6,753 graduate and professional students, of whom 204 live in University-managed housing. Rose Hill, the original campus adjacent to Little Italy, the Bronx Zoo, and The New York Botanical Garden, is situated on 85 acres in the north Bronx. There are 6,814 undergraduate and graduate students who attend classes here, with 3,158 living in University housing. The Lincoln Center campus in mid-Manhattan is home to approximately 7,656 professional and undergraduate students, with 977 living in University-operated housing. Six hundred twenty-eight undergraduate and graduate commuting students attend classes at the Westchester campus in West Harrison. The spacious Louis Calder Center Biological Field Station at Armonk, New York, encompasses a ten-acre lake, laboratories, and a fairly new student residence.

In addition to these New York campuses, Fordham University operates the Fordham University London Centre on the campus of Heythrop College in Kensington Square, London, a Jesuit college that forms part of the University of London. Fordham University also operates the Ubuntu Service Learning Program at the University of Pretoria in Pretoria, South Africa, and a Granada Program in Granada, Spain. The provost headed a delegation to Beijing in June 2012 to strengthen Fordham’s strategic partnerships with Peking University. The BiMBA (Beijing International Masters of Business Administration) program at Peking is in its second decade of
operation and provides a critical Fordham gateway to Asia, just as the Fordham London Centre does to Europe.

Eighty-five percent of Fordham’s undergraduate students receive some form of financial aid, and the graduation rate is 80.8 percent. The University as a whole confers a variety of degrees and certificates: Bachelors of Arts, Science, or Fine Arts; Advanced Certificates or Professional Diplomas; Master of Social Work; Master of Business Administration; Masters of Arts, Science, Education, Fine Arts, Law, and Philosophy; Juris Doctor; Doctor of Ministry; Doctor of Education; and Doctor of Philosophy.

Fordham’s faculty consists of 744 full-time and more than 800 part-time or adjunct instructors in any given semester. Of the full-time faculty, 416 are tenured, with a 65 percent/35 percent male/female gender breakdown. Ninety-four percent of the faculty hold the Ph.D. or terminal degree in their field. The undergraduate student-to-faculty ratio is 13.7 to 1, and average class size is 23. There are 30 Jesuits currently in active service at Fordham, 26 among the faculty and four in the administration.

Based on the number of doctoral degrees awarded, research expenditures, and numbers of research staff, Fordham University is one of 297 universities in the United States that hold the Carnegie classification of Research University with High Research Activity. The multi-year amount of external funding awarded in 2012-2013 (both new and continuing awards for grants, fellowships, and contracts) was slightly over $59 million. This figure represents a 16 percent increase over the previous year and continues a five-year upward trend.

The University libraries, including the William D. Walsh Family Library, the Quinn Library, and the Law School Library house more than 2.28 million volumes, 57,000 serials and electronic journals, and more than 3.4 million microfilm units.

Finally, Fordham sponsors 22 men’s and women’s varsity sports teams. The Fordham Rams are members of the NCAA Division I and compete in the Atlantic 10 Conference in baseball, basketball, cross country, golf, indoor and outdoor track, rowing, soccer, softball, swimming, diving, tennis, and volleyball, and water polo, and in the Patriot League (Division I-AA) for football.

Fordham’s current president, the Rev. Joseph M. McShane, S.J., assumed his office in 2003; the current provost, Stephen Freedman, Ph.D., came to Fordham in 2007 as senior vice president and chief academic officer. He was subsequently promoted to the then newly created
position of provost in 2010 as part of a major reorganization of the higher administration of the University. In addition to retaining the responsibilities of his former office, the provost assumed leadership for the direction of strategic and curricular planning for all University academic units. In this capacity, he has also taken on enhanced and expanded responsibility for the planning and disbursement of all academic budgets. Appendix A outlines the organizational chart of the senior level administrative offices of Fordham University.

**University Mission and Strategic Plan Toward 2016**

Fordham University’s mission statement was reviewed and unanimously approved by the Fordham University Board of Trustees on April 28, 2005. It reads as follows:

*Fordham University, the Jesuit University of New York, is committed to the discovery of Wisdom and the transmission of Learning, through research and through undergraduate, graduate and professional education of the highest quality. Guided by its Catholic and Jesuit traditions, Fordham fosters the intellectual, moral and religious development of its students and prepares them for leadership in a global society.*

**As a University ...**

Fordham strives for excellence in research and teaching, and guarantees the freedom of inquiry required by rigorous thinking and the quest for truth.

Fordham affirms the value of a core curriculum rooted in the liberal arts and sciences. The University seeks to foster in all its students life-long habits of careful observation, critical thinking, creativity, moral reflection and articulate expression.

In order to prepare citizens for an increasingly multicultural and multinational society, Fordham seeks to develop in its students an understanding of and reverence for cultures and ways of life other than their own.

**As a Catholic University ...**

Fordham affirms the complementary roles of faith and reason in the pursuit of wisdom and learning. The University encourages the growth of a life of faith consonant with moral and intellectual development.

Fordham encourages faculty to discuss and promote an understanding of the ethical
dimension of what is being studied and what is being taught.

Fordham gives special attention to the study of the living tradition of Catholicism, and it provides a place where religious traditions may interact with each other and with contemporary cultures.

Fordham welcomes students, faculty and staff of all religious traditions and of no religious tradition as valued members of this community of study and dialogue.

As a Jesuit University ...

Fordham draws its inspiration from the dual heritage of Christian Humanism and Ignatian Spirituality, and consequently sees all disciplines as potential paths to God.

Fordham recognizes the dignity and uniqueness of each person. A Fordham education at all levels is student-centered and attentive to the development of the whole person. Such an education is based on close collaboration among students, faculty and staff.

Fordham is committed to research and education that assist in the alleviation of poverty, the promotion of justice, the protection of human rights and respect for the environment.

Jesuit education is cosmopolitan education. Therefore, education at Fordham is international in its scope and in its aspirations. The world-wide network of Jesuit universities offers Fordham faculty and students distinctive opportunities for exchange and collaboration.

As a University in New York City ...

As home to people from all over the globe, as a center of international business, communication, diplomacy, the arts and the sciences, New York City provides Fordham with a special kind of classroom. Its unparalleled resources shape and enhance Fordham’s professional and undergraduate programs.

Fordham is privileged to share a history and a destiny with New York City. The University recognizes its debt of gratitude to the City and its own responsibility to share its gifts for the enrichment of our City, our nation and our world.

This mission statement is fundamental to all that Fordham is and does. It is complemented by individual mission statements pertaining to each administrative unit as well as those pertaining to each individual school and to the various academic departments that make up each school. Throughout the University, there is an emphasis on consciously integrating mission into planning at every level, with the result that all four distinct characteristics of the University
mission continue to be reflected and incorporated into all levels of administrative planning. One striking element common to all administrative and pedagogical units of the University is their emphasis on Fordham’s continued and growing service to and engagement with its community. This in turn illustrates the close alignment between the University mission and those of its various administrative and educational units and between the goals and objectives of the current University strategic plan, titled Toward 2016, and the individual strategic plans of the various administrative units.

As the title suggests, this University plan is due for renewal the same year Fordham’s reaccreditation process takes place. For this reason the 2016 self-study will provide a wealth of information and analysis to aid the University community in its discussions concerning the strategic goals and vision of the future that will guide Fordham into the next stage of its development.

Recent Major Developments and Expectations for the Future

The years since the 2006 self-study have witnessed a number of major changes and developments at Fordham. In addition to the naming of a provost and the reorganization of the President’s Cabinet into the Administrative Council, there have been significant transitions among the University leadership: three vice presidential creations or turnovers (for Administration, for Mission and Ministry, and for Development and University Relations), nine academic school deans, a new director of University Libraries, and the appointment of a new general manager for WFUV, Fordham’s public radio station, as well as the appointment of a new director of Fordham University Press. Two schools were renamed: the former College of Business Administration was renamed the Gabelli School of Business in recognition of a very generous gift to the University, and the other name change turned the former Fordham College of Liberal Studies into the School of Professional and Continuing Studies. There will be additional decanal changes starting July 1, 2014 (not reflected in the organizational chart in Appendix A).

With specific regard to student services, the University identified the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA) in fall 2007 as an area of strategic importance and committed the first phase of strategic funding to the enhancement of the office, the staff, and the programs and services offered to students regarding diversity and inclusion. Additionally, Fordham’s
Counseling and Psychological Services (CPS) has augmented its clinical services and developed new initiatives to respond to the epidemiological shifts in college mental health. In realizing one of the transformative initiatives of the University strategic plan, the Office of Career Services has been transformed from an employer-centric career development model to a student-centric model of personal and professional development.

A number of the graduate schools have reviewed and revised their curricula, and the four undergraduate colleges revised their core curricula, at once underscoring the need to remain current in today’s educational landscape while reaffirming Fordham’s Jesuit commitment to a rigorous, broad-based, and fundamental liberal arts education. The creation and rapid expansion of an undergraduate research program across all academic disciplines, including a grants program, an undergraduate research symposium, and two undergraduate research journals, have had a major impact on moving the colleges and the University toward a more inquiry-led approach to the curriculum. Distinctive new academic and student life programs were introduced in the area of undergraduate integrated learning communities for resident students on both campuses (an effort demanding greater collaboration among the undergraduate colleges, Mission and Ministry, and Student Affairs); online education and degree programs were pioneered by the Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education as well as the Graduate School of Social Service, the School of Professional and Continuing Studies, and the Graduate School of Education; and the development of new master’s level programs of study combining the expertise and collaboration of more than one graduate school round out the curricular innovations since 2006. New and exciting major and minor liberal arts programs with a research component and hybrid enrollment were developed at Fordham College at Lincoln Center, and a branch of the undergraduate business school was officially established at the Lincoln Center campus.

None of this has come without significant financial challenges. Fordham University is predominantly tuition-driven. Fortunately, Fordham’s endowment has returned to a level greater than it was before the onset of the 2008-2009 financial crisis. The University has also experienced operating surpluses every year since 2006 and earlier and throughout the financial crisis has maintained its debt rating with Moody’s and obtained an equivalent rating from Standard & Poor’s. Nevertheless, the technological revolution in higher education, cuts in federal and state financial aid programs, skyrocketing health insurance costs, the changing
demographics of the Northeast (the area from which Fordham draws most of its students), shrinking enrollments in some schools and concomitant increases in the discount rate have all complicated efforts to maintain balanced budgets. Extensive capital improvement projects have contributed to this picture: the closing (2007) and subsequent sale (2008) of Marymount College facilitated the move to the Westchester campus in September 2009 where several graduate and undergraduate programs are housed. Three major capital improvement projects at the Rose Hill campus were either primarily debt-financed (building of Campbell, and Conley and Salice Residence Halls) or primarily financed through internal resources (Hughes Hall).

Fordham’s Manhattan campus, which is home to seven schools of the University, is currently in the midst of a major construction project. The necessary governmental approvals for the Lincoln Center master plan were obtained in June 2009, and construction was financed through a combination of debt and internal sources. Once completed, this renovation will increase campus space at Lincoln Center by 56 percent. The new Law School building with its residence tower that can accommodate 430 undergraduate students is scheduled to open in mid-summer 2014 with all of the operations of Law, including those at 33 West 60th Street, housed in the new building. As Law moves out, renovations to its current location will begin as soon as possible with an ambitious target for completion in the summer of 2016. When the Schools of Business relocate, space will become available in Lowenstein for redeployment for FCLC, GSS, GSE and other operations.

Closely linked to this expansion of space is the fact that the University has purchased the College Board condominium at 45 Columbus Avenue, which ultimately will replace roughly 100K square feet of leased space at 33 West 60th Street, 1790 Broadway, and 888 Seventh Avenue. This opportunity came quite suddenly and was pursued because of the location, the quality of the space, and the financial advantages. The University will save a substantial amount in the future by owning the space as opposed to paying the ever increasing costs of leasing.

Underlying all these improvement projects is a newly conceived comprehensive academic, strategic, and financial planning process. The Office of the Provost has taken the lead in aligning academic strategic planning with operational planning and assessment protocols. Academic budgeting was decentralized across the schools and colleges, which increased the authority and responsibility delegated to the individual deans, thus positioning them as central decision makers in areas of strategic planning and budgetary control. Each dean established a
budget review planning council in 2010 – 2011 as a way to include key faculty and administrators in the process and to share strategic plans and budget narratives. This bottom-up approach gives the provost and the deans better information with which to make evidence-based decisions about more effectively allocating resources to support the University’s strategic planning. The early involvement and input from stakeholders undergirds support for innovative programmatic initiatives and collaborative projects that emerge from these planning discussions. The Office of the Provost is now better able to direct and coordinate the University’s strategic plans in the areas of faculty development and retention, research and scholarship, teaching, curricular innovation, entrepreneurial initiatives, partnerships, mission integration, and global outreach. One of the foci of the self-study will be an in-depth evaluation of how well these new and expanded responsibilities of the provost are being realized, especially within – but not limited to – the context of Standards One through Seven. The appointment of an associate vice president for academic financial planning and analysis in 2011 further solidified the new planning process.

In addition to the introduction of a new school-based budget model, the University-wide adoption of the Banner ERP integrated information system for enrollment, finance and human resources operation, and the adoption of TM-1, a tool to streamline the budget process, also enables better analysis of student enrollment and financial data and allows budget managers to view their overall budget and year-to-date activity versus budget. The data-driven instructional cost model developed by the institutional research team has been expanded to address the challenges of meeting future staffing needs in view of the changing size of entering classes, the recent implementation of the 3-2 teaching load plan, and the fiscal constraints on faculty hiring.

Under the guidance of the Office of Institutional Research and in conjunction with the University’s Strategic Plan Review Committee and the Middle States 2011 Periodic Review Task Force, the University continued to make strides in developing ongoing assessment programs at both the institutional and program levels. There are now two components to institutional assessment at Fordham: progress reports on the strategic plan and annual reports by schools and the managers of administrative units to the president. The progress reports measure the University’s success in achieving specific targets stated in Toward 2016, while the annual reports review and report on the goals of the schools and administrative units, including their work toward the University strategic goals, the actions taken, and the resultant accomplishments.
In 2010 – 2011, the dean of the faculty of arts and sciences worked closely with the University assessment officer and the arts and sciences school deans to advance the ongoing transformation of program-level annual reporting into an integrated planning-allocation-assessment-planning cycle, thus explicitly incorporating assessment into the programs’ annual planning practices. The arts and sciences deans communicated clear expectations that all degree- and certificate-granting programs establish and implement assessment measures, particularly for student learning outcomes. Continuing efforts to embed assessment of student learning outcomes in the work of all academic units link the assessment officer’s work and faculty initiatives with the schools’ strategic planning and integration of the University’s mission into all aspects of academic planning. Fordham Schools of Business have engaged in similar activities. In 2012 – 2013, all ten of the schools and colleges reported engaging in assessment activities aimed at improving their programs.

The expected (and in some cases unexpected) contraction of certain enrollment sectors has had a significant impact on institutional planning. This is particularly true for the Law School and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Law School applications have declined significantly in the last five years, with a nationwide retrenchment of 30 percent and a concomitant decline at Fordham of just over 35 percent. In order to maintain the quality of its education, the Law School has reduced its entering J.D. class from 480 in fall 2011 to 400 in fall 2013. This directly follows a previously increased LL.M class and promises to significantly affect the University’s revenue picture. Structural changes in the legal profession suggest that J.D enrollments will not rebound to prior levels, and the question facing Fordham right now is how long the recent downward trend will continue and how much it might recover. The Law School is developing strategies for maintaining market share in the J.D and LL.M programs and for developing new revenue sources.

Over the same period of time, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences has seen a 10 percent drop in its enrollment. This has led to some major programmatic changes: the Ph.D program in sociology has been suspended, admissions for the master’s programs in Latin and Latin American studies, political science, public communication, sociology, communications and media studies, and urban studies took a hiatus, and a writing concentration within the English master’s program has been introduced. Even so, applications to urban studies are once again being accepted as a result of a new focus on marketing that program. Along these same lines, the
Graduate School of Education closed two doctoral programs and added a new one in contemporary learning and interdisciplinary research.

A number of new undergraduate admissions systems have shown some promising results: the current acceptance rate for entering freshmen fell below the 50 percent mark and the discount rate stabilized in the low 40 percent range. Increased efforts also achieved a 33 percent minority representation in the enrolled freshman class, exceeding the strategic plan target of 30 percent, and the 7 percent target of international representation for undergraduate students was achieved.

A number of new international initiatives have been developed over the past five years. Collaboration with the University of Pretoria, South Africa, has expanded to include the International Political Economy and Development’s Emerging Markets Program and the 2012 launch of the Ubuntu Service Learning Program for Undergraduates. The latter’s first contingent of students enrolled in spring of 2012, taking courses and working on community service projects through a partnership with the University of Pretoria and engaging in reflection and spiritual direction through the Jesuit Institute of South Africa. Fordham London Centre further developed its relationship with Jesuit partner Heythrop College and provided assistance with logistics, planning, and implementation of Fordham’s successful and growing study abroad programs in London. These include the Gabelli School (fall, spring, and summer), London Dramatic Academy (fall and spring), Liberal Arts Semester, and various other summer programs in liberal arts, business, social service, and education. Fordham has also strategically expanded global learning opportunities and strengthened its presence in higher education in China. In 2012-2013, the Graduate School of Business Administration and the School of Law concluded agreements to promote additional partnerships with Chinese universities with the aim of developing or expanding dual degree or joint programs. The Graduate School of Social Service has partnered with China Youth University to establish a dual BSW/MSW program.

Finally, mention must be made of the various innovative partnerships and collaborations that have been established over the past decade. The October 2012 opening of the Fordham Foundry, a new small-business incubator developed in 2006 and launched in partnership with the Department of Small Business Services within the New York City mayor’s office, was one of several recent research-center initiatives that extended Fordham’s significance and relevance in tackling real-world business challenges. The Foundry, a project of the Center for Entrepreneurship, provides office space, mentoring and startup-focused coursework to Fordham
students, alumni, parents, faculty, and staff who seek to launch new ventures in the Bronx. Fordham also played a decisive role as a founding member, incorporator, and prominent institutional leader in the development of the Fordham Business Improvement District (BID). This effort was tied into the redevelopment of Fordham Plaza, which, along with Fordham’s Rose Hill campus, serves as the eastern anchor of the BID. These efforts are paralleled by Fordham’s Lincoln Square collaborations and community engagement initiatives, all of which expand Fordham’s involvement in the Lincoln Square/Columbus Circle neighborhoods surrounding the Manhattan campus. These initiatives include partners such as the Amsterdam Houses and the Amsterdam Addition, the Lincoln Square Neighborhood Center, the Lincoln Square BID, and collaborations between community schools and Fordham’s Science and Technology Entry Program (STEP). These initiatives, which started in 2006, continue to include neighborhood security and safety improvements and enhancements as well as educational, cultural, and community programs and events.

That same year also saw the formal launch and development of the Four Bronx Institutions Alliance (FBIA/The Quad), a collaborative community engagement initiative involving four world-class research, educational, and cultural institutions (The New York Botanical Garden, The Wildlife Conservation Society/Bronx Zoo, Montefiore Medical Center, and Fordham University) to create and implement a new vision for the redesign and improvement of the physical environment and public infrastructure that they collectively cohabit within the area around Bronx Park. These projects include the rezoning and re-visioning of existing land-uses on the Webster Avenue and eastern Fordham Road commercial corridors and the redesign and renewal of the “gateways” leading to Fordham University, including the Fordham Plaza and eastern Fordham Road roadway redesign and reconstruction, preliminary redesign for Moshulu Parkway, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) Fordham rail station and other select transportation infrastructure improvements, and area street tree planting and parks improvements.

Beginning in fall 2008, these four institutions as well as the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University have built academic partnerships to broaden and increase opportunities for student and faculty research and collaboration, an effort that culminated in the creation of the Bronx Science Consortium in spring 2012. Building strategically on these cooperative agreements and on its own strengths, including the Calder Center in Armonk,
Fordham began laying the foundation to become an exemplar in the fields of environmental science and urban ecology education and research. The Consortium serves as a hub of scientific excellence in New York City and beyond. These academic partnerships and affiliations contribute to Fordham’s stature as a research institution along with its visibility locally, regionally, and nationally.

Finally, the capital campaign effort titled Excelsior-Ever Upward-The Campaign for Fordham exceeded its $500 million goal a number of months before its close. These concentrated outreach efforts were facilitated by the creation of the Office of University Marketing and Communications in September 2006. Since then, the staff has developed a consistent look and feel for all University marketing materials and has developed branding and communication campaigns for the various schools, their campuses, and their academic and extra-curricular programs. It has also initiated the redesign of Fordham’s website, which will be launched in fall 2014.

**Nature and Scope of the 2016 Self-Study**

In spring 2013, two years after the Periodic Review Report and three years in advance of the reaccreditation campus visit, the provost, in consultation with the president of the University, appointed six members of the University community to the 2016 Middle States Advisory Committee and charged them to undertake the groundwork necessary for preparing for the upcoming Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) decennial self-study and reaccreditation process. This group met for a total of six meetings during the remainder of the spring 2013 semester and twice during the early part of the fall semester prior to the subsequent monthly meetings of the full steering committee, which began in October of that year.

The Advisory Committee was faced with two initial tasks: (1) to identify and then invite the members of the full steering committee and (2) to formulate ideas for the focus of the self-study report. Discussions centered on the fact that Fordham was fortuitously facing a number of significant convergences: the current University strategic plan *Toward 2016* expires the same year the reaccreditation visit is scheduled, and this same year is also the 175th anniversary of the University. Fordham was thus presented with an excellent opportunity to merge three overriding purposes into one: produce a successful reaccreditation self-study report, provide data and
analyses that will contribute to effective and efficient strategic planning, and take full advantage of Fordham’s anniversary to emphasize its unique mission as the Jesuit University of New York and thus to define more closely its specific niche in the higher educational landscape. Other points of convergence were also identified, and after much discussion the Advisory Committee and the subsequently identified Steering Committee settled on the Middle States comprehensive self-study model with special emphasis. The special emphasis focuses on “Fordham University in Service to and Engagement with its Community.” The importance and value of this topic is the fact that it encompasses analysis and assessment of every aspect of the University in its efforts to fulfill the broad obligations promulgated in the University mission statement.

The composition of the full Steering Committee was finalized in early September and revised/enlarged in March 2014. The following list provides names, titles, and school/unit affiliation of each member:

Gregory Acevedo, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Graduate School of Social Service
Eileen Burchell, Ph.D., Assistant Vice President, Office of the Provost
Michele Burris, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
Anthony Cancelli, Ed.D., Professor, Graduate School of Education (Psychological and Educational Services)
Jonathan Crystal, Ph.D., Associate Vice President, Associate Chief Academic Officer and Associate Professor of Political Science; Co-Chair of Middle States Steering Committee
Peter Feigenbaum, Ph.D., Interim Director, Office of Institutional Research
Marcia Flicker, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Gabelli Schools of Business; Director, Master of Business Enterprise
Anthony Grono, CPA, CGMA, Controller, Office of Finance, Fordham University
John Harrington, Ph.D., Dean of Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Interim Dean of Fordham College at Rose Hill
Thomas Krettek, S.J., Director of the Master of Arts Philosophical Resources (MAPR)
Jason Morris, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Natural Sciences, Fordham College at Lincoln Center
Jeannine Pinto, Ph.D., Assessment Officer, Office of Institutional Research
Mary Procidano, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Psychology, Fordham College at Rose Hill
Susan Ray, Ph.D., Professor Emerita of German and Co-Chair of Middle States Steering Committee
John Shea, S.J., Director of Campus Ministry and Chaplain for the Lincoln Center Campus
Amy Tuininga, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Biological Sciences and Associate Dean of Strategic Initiatives, Partnerships and Assessment, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Ian Weinstein, J.D, Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Clinical and Experiential Programs
MaryBeth Werdel, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Religion and Religious
Education

The work of this committee will be augmented with input from members of the various constituencies of the University as the members of the Steering Committee delve more deeply into their investigations. Involved will be, in addition to various vice presidential and administrative areas, the faculty of all ten schools, members of the Faculty Senate, students, alumni, and members of the Board of Trustees. The final self-study report will be heavily faculty-driven as a result of the Steering Committee task force outreach efforts and the establishment of expanded individual working groups within the task forces.

Special Emphasis Topic: Fordham University in Service to and Engagement with its Community

The special emphasis topic for Fordham’s upcoming 2016 decennial self-study report grew in part out of the response provided by the reviewers of the Periodic Review Report that Fordham submitted in June 2011. In their report, addressed to Fr. McShane and dated August 1, 2011, the reviewers observed: “In two areas, there are particular open-ended agenda, for different reasons. Fordham is venturing strongly into international dimensions that it has hitherto pursued less enthusiastically. There is risk and opportunity in the partnerships and programs away from New York City that it is undertaking and it needs now to demonstrate that it can build and sustain that portfolio and continue to flourish.” Under Section IV of that same report, the reviewers say: “[Fordham] has taken full advantage of the ‘comeback’ of New York City in the last three decades and has positioned itself as an institution of choice for students looking for a high quality, very selective educational experience that gives them both the coherence of a residential university and the opportunities of New York.”

The defining character of Fordham as a whole is the fact that it is a Catholic, Jesuit university. One of its strengths is already expressed in its mission: “Fordham welcomes students, faculty and staff of all religious traditions and of no religious tradition as valued members of this community of study and dialogue.” Its primary mission, of course, is to educate and form its students toward the ultimate goal of helping them become “men and women for others,” i.e., individuals and future leaders dedicated to exerting their influence to further the good of society through their lives, their professions, and their service. The greatest promise of a
liberal arts education is realized in the formation of responsible and informed citizens, and this does not depend upon any specific profession of faith. On the other hand, the specifically Catholic component of Fordham’s identity is articulated in the Church’s document titled *Ex Corde Ecclesiae (From the Heart of the Church)* and involves, among other things, (a) the education and formation of an informed adult Catholic laity, (b) the development of a dialogue between Church and contemporary culture by providing a forum to address issues vital to Church and society, and (c) supporting ecumenical and interfaith dialogue. The specifically Jesuit component of Fordham’s identity rests in the continuation of the Ignatian heritage and in the distinctive tradition of a Jesuit education which seeks God in all things, promotes discernment, and “engages the world through a careful analysis of context, in dialogue with experience, evaluated through reflection, for the sake of action, and with openness, always, to evaluation” (General Congregation of the Jesuits #35 = GC35). All Jesuit institutions share the Society’s “commitment to a faith that does justice through interreligious dialogue and a creative engagement with culture” (GC 35).

Like its sister institutions, Fordham University serves its communities locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally in unique ways. As the consensus statement on mission issued by the presidents of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (2010) explains, “All of our colleges and universities serve the persistently poor, the homeless, racial minorities, the unemployed, victims of discrimination, immigrants, etc. through our students, alumni, and through a wide range of university/college programs of direct community engagement. We also educate for solidarity with and action on behalf of the globally destitute and hungry, forced migrants and refugees, the religiously oppressed, and others. Through scholarship, advocacy, and participation in associations we actively contribute in understanding and responding to local, national, and global issues and systems which impact the lives of ‘the least’ in our country and world. We are key participants in engaging the social issues of our cities, region, and country and we bring our institutional resources to bear on these issues.” Further, with specific reference to the educational mission, “the internationalization of the curriculum and experiences of students, the education of international students, the connections and exchange programs developed with universities … in other countries, the application of scholarship to global issues, and the programs of learning from and bringing educational resources to other countries are part of the global engagement which is now an essential dimension and strength of each of our
Building upon all of these observations and in the interests of further strengthening Fordham’s adherence to its Jesuit and Catholic mission, the proposed report is intended to help create a platform for progressive change and institutional improvement as well as to provide a focused decennial self-study. A comprehensive documentation of outcomes in all aspects of operation depends upon a viable, reliable, and flexible program of ongoing evaluation and continuous assessment, and this very openness to constant reflection is one of the guiding principles of a Jesuit institution. Therefore, this entire self-study depends exclusively upon a variety of assessment protocols appropriate to the activity under scrutiny, be it within the confines of an institutional context (Standards One through Seven) or under the rubric of educational effectiveness (Standards Eight through Fourteen) with special attention to student learning outcomes. As mentioned above, we have chosen the comprehensive self-study model with special emphasis. The special emphasis will be on Fordham University in Service to and Engagement with its Community, where “community” is defined not only as the immediate proximity of the Bronx and New York City as a whole, but also the nation and those global destinations where Fordham has established educational and service learning programs on the graduate and undergraduate level.

However, since ‘community’ never relates solely to geographic areas, a second but no less important emphasis of the study will be an investigation of existing as well as future distinctively intellectual and religious programs which are aimed at positioning Fordham to become in the not so distant future the leading center for Catholic dialogue and intellectual life on the East Coast. The current self-study will provide the necessary background information to help the University community engage in a conversation about this priority goal and just how well the University is doing in moving toward it.

The comprehensive treatment of this model includes an examination of Fordham’s already existing centers and institutes and the enhancement of the experiential learning programs offered by all schools of the University, as well as the fostering and improvement of its myriad study abroad and foreign service programs, whether they take place within the regular academic year or during break and vacation periods. Closer to home, the report will investigate the ties that Fordham maintains with the City’s cultural, scientific, and political institutions and quite
specifically help refine the University’s involvement in and with the Bronx as well as the Lincoln Center area of Manhattan in developing distinctive urban programs.

All four undergraduate colleges of the University as well as all graduate divisions offer internships or other experiential learning programs for their students as well as a number of volunteer opportunities focused on community service. These programs are not limited to the immediate surroundings, for many Fordham-sponsored overseas study programs involve a service and service learning component: so in London, in Pretoria, and in Granada. The Fordham Schools of Business offer free tax-filing advice to low-income families near the Bronx undergraduate campus. Fordham’s Law School runs international clinics and pro-bono community service programs for people who need legal advice and representation but are not in a position to pay for it. The Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education runs a number of outreach programs focusing on meeting the spiritual needs of various parishes and communities in the neighborhood. Additionally, although not technically a service, its newly developed online educational offerings make their programs available to students nationally and internationally, many of whom would not be able to leave their home communities to study on Fordham’s campuses. The Graduate School of Education offers teacher training and enhancement programs for public and parochial school teachers on all levels. In addition to their international initiatives, members of the Graduate School of Social Service share their expertise and experience with local community programs, either on a student level or via the running of various social assistance institutes and programs such as the Beck Institute on Religion and Poverty. The Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP), the Peer Education Program, Fordham’s C-STEP Program, and the Student Leadership and Community Development Program are all active on both the Manhattan and the Rose Hill campuses. Campus Ministry, the Curran Center for American Catholic Studies, the Fordham Center on Religion and Culture, and the office of the McGinley Professor of Religion and Society are establishing Fordham as a renowned center for contemporary Catholic and interreligious dialogue and support a number of lecture series and retreats through the year focusing on this very goal. The various schools are not the only units of Fordham actively engaged in community-focused projects, for the Office of the Vice President for Administration, among others, is also deeply involved with community-based outreach efforts.
The special emphasis model affords an excellent opportunity to examine Fordham’s adherence to the goals and aspirations of all fourteen MSCHE standards of excellence. By analyzing Fordham’s commitment to its core educational mission, including instructional innovations to the core curriculum and assessment procedures as well as a review of the results of the various assessment protocols of student learning outcomes already in place, the self-study will provide a clear and comprehensive picture of Fordham’s current strengths and strategic plans as a starting point for the broader community conversation concerning the fuller realization of this priority.

What the Steering Committee, and by extension, the faculty and administration of the University, intends to achieve via this in-depth analysis of its chosen special emphasis topic can be summarized as follows: in addition to producing a constructive document that meets the needs of the MSCHE reaccreditation requirements, this exercise and the resultant document is intended

- to provide input to the formulation of an expanded vision and new strategic plan, including suggestions for concentration of budgetary investment;
- to deepen institutional self-understanding and advance institutional self-improvement;
- to establish a link to the last decennial self-study, especially with regard to the section titled “Fordham as Good Neighbor,” by demonstrating consistency and continuity over the years in efforts to identify and deepen Fordham’s adherence to all aspects of its mission statement;
- to analyze the directional shifts of all units of the University in light of current technological, demographic, and cultural-political change;
- to identify new opportunities for collaboration across the various schools of the University;
- to identify and analyze the risks and opportunities posed by Fordham’s extension to global locations in China, South Africa, India, and Europe;
- to provide a clear indication of Fordham’s efforts, achievements, and potential for establishing itself as center for contemporary Catholic intellectual thought and dialogue.

This last point is aimed at helping define Fordham’s niche in the new and evolving nature of higher education in a time of rapid change as it responds to the national academic agenda and an increasingly global society.
In order to carry out its investigations, the Steering Committee decided to establish a number of task forces charged with overarching topics rather than with a chronological analysis of the individual standards of excellence. Every standard will be examined in detail, but since a number of them cover the same material from different points of view, they will be combined into synergistic groupings appropriate to studying the different aspects of the topic. This is particularly true for Standards Six (Integrity) and Seven (Institutional Assessment). Although there are discrete task forces for each of these standards, many of the elements that comprise them summarize in one way or another the information being collected under all other standards. Therefore, each task force has incorporated research questions that pertain specifically to Standards Six and Seven within their individual lists of research questions, and these links have been indicated in parentheses.

What follows is a description of each task force, including its charge, its membership, its integration of the various standards of excellence within the scope of the special emphasis topic, a list of the research questions it will use to guide its investigations, and a preliminary inventory of support documents (collected as a group in appendix B). The various task forces will conduct a thorough review of the existing relevant documents; conduct interviews with key administrators, students, and faculty; conduct focus groups with a variety of students, student leaders, program participants/service users, and faculty; gather existing quantitative and qualitative assessment information; and create and administer new assessment instruments as needed. Fundamental to all investigations will be a common set of definitions clarifying the use of such markers as “benchmark,” “adequate,” “sufficient,” “appropriate,” and “excellent.” These terms will be defined before the instruments are designed and the investigations begin.

The task force on UNIVERSITY MISSION: EDUCATING LEADERS FOR A GLOBAL SOCIETY will concentrate on Standard One and combine it with an analysis of the questions surrounding (1) defining Fordham’s niche within its group of peer and aspirant institutions; (2) establishing Fordham as leading center for Catholic intellectual thought and dialogue; (3) examining existing centers of excellence with regard to their realization of the service to and engagement with aspects of the mission statement; and (4) evaluating the experiential learning/volunteer service programs offered by all schools with a view toward their
improvement and enhancement. Given its integral relation to the special emphasis topic, this standard will be discussed in detail in Part I of the self-study.

Steering Committee members include G. Acevedo, E. Burchell, A. Cancelli, P. Feigenbaum (convener), T. Krettek, M. Procidano, J. Shea, I. Weinstein.

Intended outreach partners/consultants include:
List to be identified after consultation with individuals

Research questions:
1. How effective is Fordham at promoting its distinctive Catholic, Jesuit, and geographic characteristics as an educational institution in fulfillment of its stated mission and goals?
   a) What evidence is there that Fordham is making effective use of its centers and programs to enable it to serve as the leading center of Catholic intellectual thought and dialogue in the United States?
   b) What data show that Fordham’s existing centers of excellence and experiential learning and volunteer programs are fulfilling and enhancing Fordham’s Jesuit commitment to a faith that does justice?
   c) What evidence is present in Fordham’s graduates that the educational programs and extra-curricular activities in which they participated while at Fordham served to impart the kinds of leadership skills and understanding necessary to prepare them intellectually for leadership in a global society as women and men for others?
   d) What partnerships and programs in New York City has the University entered into that have proved effective in preparing its students for responsible citizenship and for service to and engagement with its increasingly multicultural and multinational communities?
2. How are the decisions that follow from the assessment of the effectiveness of Fordham’s Catholic, Jesuit, educational, and geographic mission and goals being used
for institutional improvement, and how will they be implemented in the next planning cycle?

3. (Standard Six: Integrity)
   a) What evidence is there that the activities of the University are effectively informed by its mission statement?
   b) With respect to mission and goals, what mechanisms or structures are in place to ensure that the decisions resulting from the evaluation of integrity impact the next planning cycle?

4. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness)
   a) How effective is Fordham with respect to: clearly defining its mission and goals in guiding faculty, administration, staff, and governing bodies in making decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curriculum development, and definition of program outcomes; enlisting the support of scholarly and creative activity in developing mission and goals; developing mission and goals through collaborative participation by those who facilitate or are otherwise responsible for institutional improvement and developments; periodically evaluating and formally approving the mission and goals; relating its mission and goals to external as well as internal contexts and constituencies; reflecting on the consistency between institutional goals and mission; and using its resources to full advantage in the accomplishment of its mission and its goals?
   b) What evidence shows that all levels of the University make planning decisions, resource allocation decisions, program and curriculum development decisions, and outcome assessment judgments that are in consonance with the University’s mission and goals, and what mechanisms are in place for re-evaluating the mission, goals, and decision-making processes?
   c) How are the results of the assessment of the effectiveness of Fordham’s mission development and goal-setting being used for institutional improvement?

Available data and resources: see Appendix B
The task force on PLANNING AND RESOURCES: A FOUNDATION FOR EXCELLENCE will concentrate on Standards Two and Three as they apply in general to the day-to-day operations of the University as a whole and to their specific role in strategic planning processes. Since they do not directly relate to the special emphasis topic, these standards will be discussed in Part II of the self-study.

Steering Committee members include J. Crystal (convener), A. Grono, M. Procidano, I. Weinstein.

Intended outreach partners/consultants include:
List to be identified after consultation with individuals

Research questions:
Re: Planning
1. (Standard Six: Integrity) How effective is Fordham at articulating and prioritizing goals and strategies that are linked to mission and that generate observable and measurable outcomes? To what extent does the institutional planning and resource allocation reflect those goals and strategies?
2. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How and to what extent do these planning processes incorporate the input of various constituencies? In what ways does the planning that takes place at various units and levels reflect integration and consideration of the University’s overall goals? How are the roles and responsibilities of these constituencies, as well as the policies and procedures related to these processes, communicated, articulated, and made accessible to the University community? How does the planning process reflect the documentation and integration of assessment results at various levels?
3. What lessons were drawn from the current Strategic Plan? How are these lessons being incorporated into the planning for the next Strategic Plan?
4. How influential has the assessment of student learning outcomes been in establishing resource allocation priorities?

Re: Resources
5. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How does Fordham measure and assess the degree to which institutional resources are adequate to support the institution’s mission and goals? Are there adequate institutional controls in place that effectively measure whether those resources are used efficiently? In what ways and to what extent do those controls provide oversight of all operations and are there rational, consistent policies and procedures to determine allocation of assets?

6. How are infrastructure, facilities, technology, and personnel plans formulated and implemented? How well do they help Fordham achieve its mission and goals? Are the resources available sufficient to allow the University (and its units) to achieve the outcomes that have been identified as goals? How effectively has Fordham worked to control costs, improve efficiency, re-direct resources, and develop new revenue streams to support the University’s mission and goals?

7. How are allocation policies and procedures developed and modified as the needs of the University and its constituents evolve? How does Fordham react to unexpected opportunities or challenges? How well does the University respond to financial uncertainty and risk?

8. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How effective is the University’s school-based allocation model (used to allocate revenues and costs and expenses)? What lessons have come out of past revisions and how have those lessons been incorporated into subsequent models? How does the approach to budgeting contribute to Fordham’s ability to achieve its goals?

9. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How is the documentation and evaluation of these activities, and the policies and procedures governing them, being used for institutional improvement?

10. To what extent has the University achieved the goals of the current Strategic Plan related to “Transforming Initiative IV: Developing Resources” and “Transforming Initiative VII: Growth and Wise Stewardship of Enabling Resources”? What lessons have been learned and how are these lessons being incorporated into overall institutional planning?

Available data and resources: see Appendix B
The task force on LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION: MOVING FORWARD TOGETHER will concentrate on Standards Four and Five with a particular view toward assessment of the current leadership and governance structure of the higher administration. Again, since this is not directly related to the special emphasis topic, these standards will be treated in detail in Part II of the self-study.

Steering Committee members include J. Crystal, J. Morris (convener) and J. Shea.

Intended outreach partners/consultants include:
List to be identified after consultation with individuals

Research questions:
1. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How effective is the Board of Trustees in promoting the mission, goals, and objectives of the University? Is the size, composition, and structure of the Board appropriate to its tasks? How is its effectiveness assessed?
2. (Standard Six: Integrity) Is there sufficient and timely information flow among the Board, the administration, the faculty, and the students for effective shared University governance and for building trust within the University? How is transparency promoted and to what extent have these efforts been successful? To what extent are official communications widely perceived as honest and trustworthy by the University community?
3. (Standard Six: Integrity and Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How is governance shared? What are the roles of the students, the faculty (including the Faculty Senate), the vice presidents, the provost, the president, and the Board of Trustees in decision-making? To what degree are these roles, responsibilities, and decision-making procedures clearly articulated and easily accessible? Do decision-making processes in practice respect University statutes? How closely are the University statutes applied/followed in ensuring the effective participation of the Faculty Senate in the policy-development and decision-making activities of the institution? How effective is the current structure in contributing to decisions that are widely perceived as legitimate and beneficial to the University? What impact has reflection on the effectiveness of the
governance structure had on Fordham’s future plans regarding governance and leadership policies and procedures?

4. How effectively do administrative officials carry out their responsibilities and functions? Is there adequate staffing, information, and systems in place to support their work?

5. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) With respect to academic administration, to what degree has the establishment of a Provost Office in 2010 and its activities since then achieved the intended goals? Is the current decanal structure effective in advancing the mission of the schools and the University more generally?

6. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How is University leadership and administrations (at all levels) assessed in a manner appropriate to Fordham? What recommendations have come out of those assessments, and to what extent have those recommendations been followed? To what extent have these results been used (or can they be used more fully) to consider ways in which existing structures and processes can serve the institution going forward, given Fordham’s aspirations, constraints, and opportunities?

7. (Standard Six: Integrity) To what extent have the findings of the Faculty Senate Survey on Administrative Effectiveness been disseminated and implemented?

8. How effective and how widely distributed is the assessment protocol involving the higher administrative level (provost, chief financial officer, president, for example)?

Available data and resources: see Appendix B

The task force on INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY will concentrate on Standard Six (“[e]ducational institutions should exemplify within their own working environment those qualities that they endeavor to impart to their students”). In addition, it will incorporate into its findings the research questions pertaining to this standard that are being investigated by the other task forces. Those questions are flagged by an introductory reference in parentheses. Since the components of this standard affect the special emphasis topic of the self-study only indirectly, it and its findings will be discussed in Part II of the final report.

Steering Committee members include T. Krettek (convener) and J. Morris
Intended outreach partners/consultants include:
List to be identified after consultation with individuals

Research questions:

1. Given Fordham’s guarantee of freedom of inquiry, is there a pattern of faculty grievances giving evidence that their academic freedom has been infringed upon in their classroom teaching (i.e. courses not approved or censored on political, religious, or ideological grounds, for example)?

2. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) What has been the pattern of actions by the Office of Research and the Office of Sponsored Programs in safeguarding the academic freedom of scholarly research and intellectual property rights?

3. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How effectively has the Office of Research and the Office of Sponsored Programs acted to safeguard research carried out by Fordham faculty from conflicts of interest?

4. How effectively are faculty encouraged to discuss and promote an understanding of the ethical dimension of what is being taught in their courses?

5. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) What patterns, if any, are evident regarding student grievances over the past five years? How does the University address academic honesty issues, such as plagiarism, involving students? To what extent has Fordham created fair and impartial processes, published and widely available, to address student grievances? To what extent are student grievances addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably? (link to Standard Nine)

6. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) What patterns, if any, are evident regarding faculty and staff grievances over the past five years? To what extent does Fordham have fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation, and dismissal of employees? (link to Standard Ten)

7. Given Fordham’s commitment to sharing its gifts for the enrichment of New York City, the United States, and the world, how effective is the institution’s mechanism for responsibly handling relationships with those outside the institution, for example a) its mentoring, internship and service programs,
b) its educational affiliations in the neighborhood, in New York City, and globally,
c) its contractual relationships with vendors and businesses?

8. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How effectively has Fordham maintained its standards of integrity with regard to its communications in the following areas:

a) promoting honesty and truthfulness in public relations announcements, advertisements, and recruiting and admissions materials and practices;
b) ensuring reasonable, continuing student access to well-indexed paper or electronic catalogs; (link to Standard Eight)
c) disclosing accurately and in a timely manner to the University community, to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, the New York State Department of Education, and to any other appropriate regulatory bodies any changes and issues affecting institutional mission, goals, sites, programs, operations, and other material changes;
d) making publicly available to the University community factual information about the institution, such as the Middle States Commission on Higher Education annual data reporting, the MSCHE self-study or periodic review report, its evaluation team report and the Commission’s subsequent action, and reports and results of professional school accrediting agencies, all accurately reported;
e) making available in the appropriate manner to prospective students and to the public information on institution-wide assessments, including the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, the self-study or periodic review report, the evaluation team report, the Commission’s action, reports from professional school accrediting agencies, graduation, retention, certification and licensing pass rates, and other outcomes as appropriate to the programs offered;
f) fulfilling all applicable standards and reporting requirements of the various accrediting agencies for all schools of the University?

9. How effectively has Fordham assessed the integrity evidenced in institutional policies, processes, and practices, and the manner in which they are implemented, and then used these assessments to make institutional improvements?
Follow-up questions to the 2006 Self-Study:

1. To what extent has the University effectively publicized its intellectual property policy as requested in the 2006 self-study?
2. To what extent has the Office of Sponsored Programs facilitated the commercialization of research findings by crafting partnerships with commercial entities and by providing assistance with patent applications as requested in the 2006 self-study?
3. How effective has the Management Development Series 1 program been in creating a positive employee relations atmosphere and in facilitating the managing of problematic employees (requested by the 2006 self-study)?
4. How effective has the Integrity Hotline been in providing a process for anonymous reporting of issues affecting the integrity of the University (as requested in the 2006 self-study)?
5. How effective has the rollout been for the analysis of administrative pay structure?

Available data and resources: see Appendix B

The task force on INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT/EFFECTIVENESS will concentrate on Standard Seven and, like the task force on INTEGRITY, will incorporate into its findings the research questions pertaining to this standard that are being investigated by the other task forces. Again, those questions are flagged by an introductory reference in parentheses. This standard, too, will be discussed in detail in Part II of the self-study, and, in combination with Standards two through Six, will provide the basis for an evaluation of the degree to which the reorganization of the higher administrative structure of the University has met its expanded responsibilities and integrated the various constituents of the University into the strategic planning process.

Steering Committee member: P. Feigenbaum

Intended outreach partners/consultants include:
List to be identified after consultation with individuals
Research questions:

1. How effectively has Fordham developed a documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve the total range of programs and services and the achievement of institutional mission, goals, and plans, one that is in compliance with accreditation standards that meet the following criteria:
   a) a foundation in the institution’s mission and clearly articulated institutional, unit-level, and program-level goals that encompass all programs, services, and initiatives and are appropriately integrated with one another;
   b) systematic, sustained, and thorough use of multiple qualitative and/or quantitative measures that maximize the use of existing data and information, clearly and purposefully relate to the goals they are assessing, and are of sufficient quality that results can be used with confidence to inform decisions;
   c) clear, realistic guidelines and a timetable, supported by appropriate investment of institutional resources;
   d) sufficient simplicity, practicality, detail, and ownership to be sustainable; and
   e) periodic evaluation of the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the institution’s assessment process?

2. How well is Fordham communicating the results of its planning-assessment cycles that are generated at the unit level to the highest administrative levels, where decisions (such as strategic planning and budget allocation) are made on behalf of the institution as a whole as well as for each unit?

3. How adequate is the support for institutional assessment with regard to: policies and governance structures; administrative, technical, and financial resources; and the expectations, understanding, and participation of the entire Fordham community?

4. How well does the documentation of the assessment of institutional effectiveness demonstrate coherence among all of the University’s assessment efforts, which includes student learning outcomes as well as the assessment results from other areas?

5. (Standard Six: Integrity) How effectively does Fordham safeguard the integrity of its self-assessments in:
   a) collecting and analyzing data,
   b) making appropriate recommendations, and
c) carrying out those recommendations?

**Available data and resources:** see Appendix B

**The task force on ADMISSIONS AND RETENTION** will concentrate on Standard Eight, again with a view toward the many ways in which the components of this standard apply to strategic planning and affect the evolving definition of Fordham’s niche in the higher education landscape. Since this is integrally related to the special emphasis topic, this standard will be treated in detail in Part I of the self-study.

**Steering Committee members** include M. Burris, J. Buckley (Associate Vice President for Enrollment), and P. Feigenbaum as convener.

**Intended outreach partners/consultants include:**
List to be identified after consultation with individuals

**Research questions:**

**Re effectiveness of admissions activities:**

1. How effective is Fordham’s admissions policy with regard to marketing, recruiting, and selecting the undergraduate, graduate, and professional students whom the University’s mission aims to serve?
   a) How well integrated and consistent are Fordham’s undergraduate and graduate admissions practices, processes, and recruitment materials with its mission and strategic goals?
   b) How successful is Fordham in providing sufficient financial aid to meet the challenges of the mission and the strategic plan?
   c) How well does the University coordinate its enrollment and financial projections?
   d) How effective is Fordham in ensuring that prospective and enrolled students are informed about admissions policies, programs, and services so that they can accomplish their personal goals and achieve academic success?

**Re effectiveness of retention activities:**
1. How effective is Fordham at identifying students at risk of leaving the University before graduation, and how effective are the practices, processes, and programming that have been instituted to increase the retention rate? (link to Standard Nine)
   a) How well integrated and consistent are Fordham’s undergraduate and graduate retention practices, processes, and programs with its mission and strategic goals?
   b) How successful is Fordham in providing sufficient financial aid to meet the challenges of retention and attrition?
   c) How well does the University coordinate its retention and financial projections?
   d) How effective is Fordham in ensuring that prospective and enrolled students are informed about retention policies, programs, and services so that they can accomplish their personal goals and achieve academic success? (link to Standard Six)

Re use of assessment results:

1. How are the decisions that resulted from the assessment of the effectiveness of Fordham’s undergraduate and graduate admissions, retention, and financial aid policies being implemented in the next planning cycle?
   a) How is the evaluation of Fordham’s admissions, enrollment, retention, and graduation activities (compared to those of similar schools and aspirants) being used to plan for the future?
   b) How are the decisions that flowed from the evaluation of the correlation of student learning outcomes with financial need being used to assess the success of Fordham’s financial aid practices?
   c) Are Fordham’s enrollment projections sufficiently realistic to support its financial projections, and how are the results from the assessment of this issue being used in strategic planning?
   d) How well is Fordham positioning itself to handle any anticipated demographic changes, and what adjustments (if any) are being considered in the next planning cycle as a result of this evaluation?

Re Standards Six (Integrity) and Seven (Institutional Effectiveness):

1. Integrity
   a) How effective has Fordham been with regard to analyzing its recruiting materials and admissions processes to see that they are coordinated and geared towards recruiting
and retaining undergraduate and graduate students and creating a demographic profile of students to meet its goal of preparing leaders for a global society? How effective has Fordham been at recruiting and retaining students who can exercise leadership in a global society, and at developing a student body profile that reflects such leadership? (link to Standard One)

b) Having assessed the data on the effectiveness of Fordham’s admissions and retention policies over the past five years, what should be done to make improvements over the next five years?

2. Institutional Effectiveness
   a) How well has Fordham succeeded in: developing and implementing undergraduate and graduate admissions policies and criteria that support and reflect the mission of the institution; making admissions policies and criteria available to assist the prospective student in making informed decisions; providing programs and services to ensure that admitted students who marginally meet or do not meet the institution’s qualifications achieve expected learning goals and higher education outcomes at appropriate points; providing accurate and comprehensive information regarding academic programs, including any required placement or diagnostic testing; making available to prospective students statements of expected student learning outcomes and information on institution-wide assessment results, as appropriate to the program offered; providing accurate and comprehensive information, and advice where appropriate, regarding financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, and refunds; publishing and implementing policies and procedures regarding transfer credit and credit for extra-institutional college level learning; and conducting ongoing assessment of student success, including but not necessarily limited to retention, that evaluates the match between the attributes of admitted students and the institution’s mission and programs, and reflects its findings in its admissions, remediation, and other related policies?

b) What adjustments ought to be made in the next planning-assessment cycle to improve the undergraduate and graduate admission, retention, and financial aid processes from the perspective of the institution as a whole?
The task force on STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES: CURA PERSONALIS will concentrate on Standard Nine, recognizing again the importance of this standard not only with regard to current students, but also with regard to defining Fordham’s specific niche in the higher education landscape and therefore its adherence to all aspects of its mission statement. In this sense it will work closely with the members of the EDUCATING LEADERS FOR A GLOBAL SOCIETY (Standard One) task force. The CURA PERSONALIS group will study and assess the following areas, offices and/or departments using the self-study questions below: Athletics, Campus Ministry, Career Services, Commuter Student Services, Counseling and Psychological Services, Dining Services, Disability Services, Dorothy Day Center for Service and Justice, Global Outreach, Health Services, Judicial Affairs, Multicultural Affairs, Residential Life Student Leadership and Community Development, Substance Abuse Prevention and Student Support, Campus Security, and Transportation Services. Given its integral relation to the special emphasis topic, this standard will be treated in detail in Part I of the self-study.

Steering Committee members include G. Acevedo and M. Burris as convener.

Intended outreach partners/consultants include:
List to be identified after consultation with individuals

Research questions:

1. What student support services are provided at Fordham and how are these services reflective of the University’s mission? How do student support services at Fordham promote the comprehensive development of the student and how effective are these services in response to the full spectrum of diverse student populations, needs, and abilities?

2. How does Fordham provide support to students who are identified as being “at risk”? How effective are these support services and how can they be improved?

3. (Standard Six: Integrity) How effective, well understood, and consistently implemented are Fordham’s procedures and policies regarding privacy of student information?
4. (Standard Six: Integrity) What are Fordham’s policies and procedures for equitably addressing student complaints and grievances and how are these policies and procedures assessed? How widely and effectively is information about these procedures disseminated and how are records kept?

5. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) What assessment methods are utilized to assess student support services? How do these assessment results drive change and improvement?

6. How are Fordham’s athletic programs (intercollegiate, club, intramural, and recreational) consistent with and supportive of the University’s mission and goals? How are the athletic programs regulated by the same academic, fiscal, and administrative principles, norms, and procedures that govern other institutional programs? How are the athletic programs assessed?

7. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) What changes in the provision of student services have been implemented over the past five years and how effective were these changes? Which of these changes were guided by the University’s strategic plan? What evidence is there that these changes were based on assessment results?

8. What contribution can Student Support Services make to deliberations informing strategic planning?

9. Which student support services should be improved, added, expanded, or eliminated? How should these changes be implemented? What resources are needed?

Available data and resources: see Appendix B

The task force on FACULTY: SCHOLAR-TEACHERS AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS will concentrate on Standard Ten and investigate its components in light of the elements informing Standards Four and Five (Leadership, Governance and Administration) and Standard Six (Integrity). The analysis of this standard will appear in Part II of the self-study.

Steering Committee members include J. Harrington, M. Flicker (convener), M. Tilley, and I. Weinstein.
Intended outreach partners/consultants include:
List to be identified after consultation with individuals

Research questions:

1. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) Who are Fordham’s faculty?
   a) How effective has Fordham been at: hiring faculty members who are appropriately prepared and qualified for their positions; hiring a sufficiently large number to fulfill their roles and responsibilities appropriately; hiring faculty qualified to design and maintain educational curricula; hiring faculty who demonstrate excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, and service?
   • How does the University define “faculty”? Is the percentage of tenured/tenure track faculty appropriate to the needs (teaching, research, and service) of the University?
   • What are the credentials, qualifications, and achievements of the faculty and instructional staff?
   • How do faculty and instructional staff credentials and numbers relate to their respective roles, responsibilities, and the mission of the University?
   b) How is Fordham using the results of the assessment of these areas to institute improvements?

2. How is faculty excellence supported, recognized, and assessed? How effective is Fordham at providing faculty with institutional support for their advancement and development; at recognizing linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, research, and service, appropriate to the strategic goals of the University?
   a) What is the faculty/instructor role in developing, delivering, and assessing curricula and programs?
   b) How is faculty scholarship developed and assessed? How do the level and kinds of support relate to the mission and strategic plan of the University?
   c) How is faculty/instructor service supported? How do the level and kinds of support relate to the University’s mission?

3. (Standard Six: Integrity) What are the personnel policies and procedures governing faculty? How prominently does Fordham publish fair and equitable standards and
procedures regarding appointments, promotion, tenure, grievance, discipline, and dismissal?

a) Does Fordham implement these policies equitably and transparently?

b) How does Fordham know that its policies and practices effectively enable it to recruit, develop, retain, and promote faculty in support of the teacher/scholar model and its goal of excellence in research and teaching?

c) Does the University articulate and administer equitable procedures and criteria for reviewing all individuals who have responsibility for the educational programs? What are faculty self-governing policies and procedures, and how are they assessed?

d) Does Fordham apply criteria for the appointment, supervision, and review of teaching effectiveness for part-time, adjunct, and other faculty consistent with those for full-time faculty?

e) How does the faculty participate in the governance of the University? How is its relationship to the University administration assessed and modified?

f) How is academic freedom protected at the University level and within the schools and departments/areas? What evidence is there that the institution effectively supports its goal of guaranteeing the freedom of inquiry? What have been the challenges to that goal during the past five years? How have they been resolved? What does the University want the data to show five years from now?

Available data and resources: see Appendix B

Standards Eleven and Twelve are the focus of the task force on FORMAL CURRICULA: EDUCATION FOR EXCELLENCE. Certificate programs, though listed in Standard Thirteen, will be handled with all other formal academic curricula by this task force, which plans to use the self-study process as an opportunity to engage each academic unit in a review and renewal of its mission and mission statement and to reflect upon the ways in which its work advances the University’s mission. In this sense, the findings of the task force on FORMAL CURRICULA: EDUCATION FOR EXCELLENCE will provide an organic link to the investigations undertaken by the task force on Standard One, EDUCATING LEADERS FOR A GLOBAL SOCIETY. The academic deans will be involved in this process and will be invited
to serve as leaders of this effort within their schools. Student perspectives will be obtained first, and most broadly, from student surveys, with focus groups or targeted surveys to follow up as needed. The success of the curricula (in distinction to their formal composition) as reflected in student learning and other student outcomes will be addressed by the task force on STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT: ACHIEVING THE EDUCATIONAL MISSION. Given their direct relation to Standard One and the special emphasis topic, these standards will be dealt with in depth in Part I of the self-study.

Steering Committee members include E. Burchell, J. Pinto (convener), and M-B. Werdel

Intended outreach partners/consultants include:
List to be identified after consultation with individuals

Research questions:
1. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How effective are our formal curricula and co-curricula (degree and certificate programs, core curriculum) in promoting student engagement with and service to their communities and in advancing the University mission generally? In other words, how does a Fordham education reflect its underlying values as articulated in the mission statement? Are there aspects of the mission that Fordham’s curricula should be addressing better than they currently do? How do these considerations inform future strategic planning?

2. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How is the contemporary student’s need for information literacy incorporated into the educational mission of the University and its commitment to educate students with sound judgment? To what extent do faculty and library staff collaborate in promoting information literacy in students at all levels?

3. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) What evidence demonstrates that Fordham’s curricula are sufficiently coherent and rigorous, as appropriate to the degree level(s) of the programs? How is coherence and rigor assured within a program and school? To what extent do program learning goals reflect and express that coherence and rigor?
4. What opportunities are provided for student development and for enabling students to reflect upon and understand their own educational progress? How are these opportunities evaluated? How effective are they?

5. How effectively is course scheduling planned, ensuring the availability of required courses for degree and certificate programs as well as for the undergraduate core curriculum?

6. To what extent are resources (e.g. instructional staff, facilities, instructional equipment, library services) sufficient, at the University, school, and program levels, to achieve Fordham’s stated academic goals? Is allocation of resources optimal? Where are additional resources needed?

7. (Standard Six: Integrity) How effective has Fordham been in updating course catalogs and program descriptions to maintain their accuracy? Have updates been timely, complete, and accurate themselves?

8. (Standard Six: Integrity) How effective is the University in serving adult learners generally and military veterans more specifically?

9. (Standard Six: Integrity) How well does Fordham accommodate students who return to complete their degree programs? Are accessible archives of course catalogs, degree requirements, and student transcripts created and maintained?

10. In what ways and for what reasons has the core curriculum been changed over the past ten years? How has the impact of those changes been assessed? How have those assessments informed revision to or implementation of the core curriculum?

Available data and resources: see Appendix B

The task force RELATED EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS: SET THE WORLD ON FIRE will consider the elements comprising Standard Thirteen as well as undertake a specific analysis of the risks and opportunities posed by Fordham’s growing number of international partnerships and programs. This last component is in response to the 2011 Periodic Review Report Evaluation Team’s recommendation that Fordham take a close and detailed look at its expanding presence on the global education scene, and for this reason this standard will be covered in detail in Part I of the self-study.
Steering Committee members include M. Flicker, J. Harrington, J. Pinto, A. Tuininga, M-B. Werdel (convener).

Intended outreach partners/consultants include:
List to be identified after consultation with individuals

Research questions:
Re all programs:
For each of the elements falling within the charge of this Standard (basic skills, experiential learning, non-credit offerings, branch campuses, partnerships with other instructional sites, distance learning opportunities), the task force will address the following questions:

1. How well does the program help advance Fordham’s mission? What effective elements can be found across programs? What suggestions can be made to improve the quality of the educational activities that Fordham offers? How can these suggestions be integrated into future strategic planning exercises?

Basic skills:
1. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How effective is Fordham at instituting systematic procedures for identifying students who require additional academic support to succeed in college level study at Fordham, and at providing them with the necessary support services? (link to Standard Nine)
2. How is the success of each program (e.g. HEOP, CSTEP, IALC) assessed in relation to student achievement and in light of the University’s mission? What becomes of those who have taken part in such programs?
3. (Standard Six: Integrity) Do these programs meet the expectations of students who participate in them? Do they meet the expectations of non-program faculty who teach these students?

Experiential learning:
Credit for prior learning:
1. How is prior learning evaluated? How frequently and in what ways is the process examined to ensure that the learning recognized is appropriate in level, quality, and quantity to justify the credit granted?

2. (Standard Six: Integrity) How effective are published policies and procedures in conveying to students appropriate expectations for the recognition of their prior learning?

3. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How efficient is the evaluation of prior learning and how effective is the timing of the components of the process?

4. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) Are the resources available to evaluate prior learning, including knowledgeable evaluators, methods, and documentation, adequate?

*College internships and field placements:*

5. How is the academic value of an internship (level, quality, and quantity of learning) defined and evaluated? What suggestions can be made to improve these processes?

**Non-credit offerings:**

1. What non-credit offerings does Fordham maintain and promote? What is the purpose and value of these offerings/programs?

**Branch campuses, additional locations, and other instructional sites:**

1. What provisions are in place to ensure a Fordham quality experience (academic rigor, quality of instruction) when students study abroad in a program Fordham sponsors or promotes? How is the educational effectiveness of these programs assessed relative to appropriate learning objectives?

2. What are the benefits and risks of the study tours and study abroad programs and practices that Fordham maintains and promotes? Are there risk analyses (e.g. SWOT or PEST) of the programs Fordham sponsors overseas and, if so, how have the risk analyses been used to assess the tours and programs? Have enrollment projections and student satisfaction met program goals?

3. What criteria does Fordham use for choosing locations for off-site and international educational opportunities? How does it balance the potential student/faculty growth opportunities and risks common to international ventures: political and legal (in)stability; economic hardship or less-developed infrastructure and technology; and unfamiliar social and cultural systems?
4. What outcomes does Fordham strive to achieve with its study abroad and exchange programs for students and faculty? How are these achievements measured?

**Distance learning:**
1. (Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness) How effective is Fordham in offering online courses that meet institutional standards for quality of instruction, articulated expectations of student learning, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness? How effective is Fordham at measuring assurances of learning in online courses?
2. (Standard Six: Integrity) How does Fordham develop and maintain online offerings that are in accordance with applicable legal and regulatory requirements and respect intellectual property rights?
3. How does Fordham ensure admitted students are able to complete the degree or certificate in a publicized time frame?
4. How does Fordham ensure that any resources used for Fordham courses and degrees but developed outside the University are validated by faculty?
5. How effective is Fordham in maintaining adequate technical facilities to support online learning?

**Contractual relationships and affiliated providers:**
1. How do Fordham’s specific contractual relationships (e.g. MOUs, Affiliation Agreements, and Articulation Agreements) influence the quality of education available to students at Fordham? How do they affect the opportunities and resources available to them? How frequently and in what ways are these relationships reviewed and evaluated?
2. (Standard Six: Integrity) How effective is the institutional oversight of programs offered through partnerships with local and international entities at ensuring that they adequately adhere to the standards of quality expected of on-campus programs so that they positively contribute to shaping and enhancing the Fordham programs that utilize them as well as reflect the values of a Fordham education?

**Available data and resources:** see Appendix B

Finally, the **task force on ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING:** **ACHIEVING THE EDUCATIONAL MISSION** will concentrate on Standard Fourteen as it
pertains to every school within the University. Perhaps the most important standard from Fordham’s point of view, it and the data it provides will form the basis of an overarching analysis of the effectiveness of Fordham’s educational programs on the undergraduate, post-secondary certificate, and graduate level, relate that analysis to the special emphasis topic of the self-study, and close the circle by referring back to the discussion and analysis of Standard Seven, which is being investigated by each of the other task forces as it pertains to their area of investigation.

One of the most persistent obstacles Fordham faces in assessing its effectiveness in fulfilling its mission is that it has not, as a whole, unpacked its mission or its identity as a Jesuit university in language that connects to its academic programs. The task force on ACHIEVING THE EDUCATIONAL MISSION, therefore, proposes to use this self-study process as an opportunity to generate such a conversation throughout the University. It will invite each school to develop, deepen, or renew its understanding of the University’s mission and that mission’s relevance to the work they do, and evaluate how they assess the achievement of their students with regard to that mission. The task force will involve student representatives at all levels in a parallel conversation to ascertain their understanding of Fordham’s mission and how they believe it manifests in their intellectual development, attitudes, choices, and values. Student representatives will be invited to sit on the task force. In addition, task force membership will be expanded to include a faculty member from each school not already represented on the task force or the steering committee as well as an active member of the newly established Task Force on the Future of the Liberal Arts. The results of these deliberations will be offered as contribution to future strategic planning with respect to supporting and promoting adherence to mission in all aspects of the “business” of Fordham University. Since it is directly related to mission as well as to the special emphasis topic, analysis of Standard Fourteen will close Part I and serve as organic segue into Part II of the self-study.

Steering Committee members include A. Cancelli, P. Feigenbaum, J. Pinto (convener), and A. Tuininga.

Intended outreach partners/consultants include:
List to be identified after consultation with individuals
Research questions (all refer to Standard Seven: Institutional Effectiveness; the focus will be primarily, but not exclusively, on the program level across all schools)

Program level assessment:

1. Program level student learning goals: How well has the program articulated student learning goals that capture its learning priorities? To what extent do those goals reflect Fordham’s mission and specific disciplinary or professional standards and expectations, as appropriate? How frequently and by what means have program goals been reviewed, renewed, and revised? Are goals readily available to current and prospective students (e.g. via the web, undergraduate bulletin, etc)?

2. Assessment of student learning: How frequently and by what means has the program faculty ascertained whether students are meeting its program goals? To what extent have routine assessments addressed the full breadth of stated program goals or objectives? How representative of the student population are the data used in assessments?

3. Use of assessment results: In what ways have program-level assessments been used to improve the academic, advising, and co-curricular elements of the program? Have old goals been revised or new ones established based upon the review of how well the program is meeting its goals? How has the program allocated existing resources or advocated for additional resources to make the improvements the program believes it needs to make? How well have programs communicated their goals and the results of their assessments to higher administrative levels, where decisions (such as strategic planning and budget allocation) are made on behalf of the University, school, and programs? Are the results of program level assessments shared with current or prospective students?

School level assessment:

1. School level student learning goals: How clearly has the school articulated its student learning goals? Are goals easily available to current and prospective students (e.g. via the web)? How frequently and by what means have school goals been reviewed, renewed, and revised?

2. Assessment of student learning: What evidence does the school use to determine whether students are meeting its goals?
3. Use of assessment results: How does the school use the results of student learning assessment to improve student outcomes? How well have schools communicated their goals and the results of their assessments to higher administrative levels for the purpose of planning and decision-making?

Course level assessment:

1. Course level student learning goals: Are course-level learning objectives and desired outcomes sufficiently aligned with program, school, and University learning objectives to substantiate the goals of those higher units? To what extent do the learning objectives and desired outcomes support or reinforce one or more of the five University goals identified in its mission statement (intellectual excellence, moral values, religious concerns, humanistic component of every discipline, and active engagement in the contemporary world)? Are these clearly articulated in course syllabi or understood by the students enrolled in the courses?

2. Assessment of student learning: What evidence is there that students have acquired the knowledge, skill, and competencies articulated in the learning objectives of the course? During the course term, how frequently and in what manner are students provided with feedback to improve their performance prior to the completion of the course? What, if any, oversight is provided to adjunct, junior, and senior faculty in maintaining educational effectiveness of courses?

3. Use of assessment results: What evidence is there that faculty use assessment results to improve student learning at the course level?

Assessment of the assessment process:

1. (Standard Six: Integrity) Do the processes currently being used for assessment of student learning outcomes at Fordham – at the University, school, and program levels – work for the institution? What evidence is there that the current processes have improved student learning at the course, program, school, or University levels? How efficient are these processes? Has Fordham struck an optimal balance between standardization and flexibility? At what levels does standardization occur? How might the institution improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its assessment processes? How comprehensive and effective are its ways of training faculty in the methods of assessment?
Integrity of the assessment processes:

1. (Standard Six: Integrity) To what extent has Fordham made sufficient resources available to train faculty and to support them in student learning and other forms of student outcomes assessment? Is the use of the assessments, the gathering of data, and the use of the assessment results being done with fidelity/integrity? How many people are involved? What percentage of the faculty in a program are involved in collecting the information, using the information, trusting the information? Is the process meaningful to the faculty and do they consider it valid?

Available data and resources: see Appendix B

Appendix B provides a preliminary inventory of the support documents identified by the various task forces. We expect this list to be augmented with the additional assessment instruments the various task forces devise as they pursue their investigations and can foresee that a good number of them will join the ranks of ongoing and continuing assessment tools. With this last component, then, it should be clear that the comprehensive self-study with special emphasis approach will prove to be useful, attuned to current and future institutional needs and priorities, and focused on the teaching and learning process. Not only will the resulting report satisfy Middle States requirements for reaccreditation, but it should also simultaneously provide the students, faculty, administration, and members of the Board of Trustees with a detailed analysis of where the institution has been and currently is and thus help ground the University community’s vision for moving Fordham forward.

Organization and Structure of the Self-Study Report

As envisioned at this point, the self-study report itself will be divided into two sections, the first concentrating on the special emphasis topic and the standards that relate directly to it, and the second dealing individually with those specific standards that were not treated in detail in the first section. As has been demonstrated, all task forces incorporate questions referring to Standards Six and Seven as well as questions regarding the special emphasis topic to the degree applicable. By plotting these and other elements on a preliminary spreadsheet, the clear division
of the self-study report into Parts I and II emerged as if by itself. Part I, concentrating on those standards that directly address the special emphasis topic, will cover Standards 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, and 14. Standard 14 provides an organic link back to Standard 7, closing the circle, as it were, and introduces Part II. Part II, in turn, will cover Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 10. One unexpected but fortuitous outcome of this division is the fact that each section of the self-study covers seven standards; in other words, both parts of the self-study are of equal weight. Various hyperlinks embedded throughout the text will bring the reader to specific appendices or resource materials that contain additional substantiating data, be it in table, chart or narrative form.

Tables, graphs, and charts will be employed wherever possible within the body of the report in order to provide the significant data in a concise and summary form; the bulk of the narrative will concentrate on the analysis of that data and suggestions/recommendations for improvement. A comprehensive summary analysis of how Fordham measures up to the various elements of the special emphasis topic of service to and engagement with its community will be appended to Part II and conclude the self-study.

A list of the preferred commonly used editorial conventions and acronyms for the various units and divisions of the University are outlined in the Fordham University Editorial Style Guide, which is available in its entirety on the University website.

University-specific abbreviations/acronyms commonly used throughout the report are:

FCLC (Fordham College at Lincoln Center)
FCRH (Fordham College at Rose Hill)
GBA (Graduate School of Business Administration)
GRE (Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education)
GSAS (Graduate School of Arts and Sciences)
GSB (Gabelli School of Business, previously known as the College of Business Administration)
GSE (Graduate School of Education)
GSS (Graduate School of Social Service)
LAW (School of Law)
PCS (Fordham School of Professional and Continuing Studies)
Projected Timetable

Appendix C presents the proposed timetable for the completion of the various aspects of the self-study report. Understood throughout is the commitment to keep the University community as a whole informed and updated about the progress of the self-study process. This will be accomplished by a variety of means: regular oral presentations and updates at monthly Faculty Senate meetings and quarterly meetings of the Board of Trustees; timely email news blasts to the faculty, administration, students, and staff concerning the progress of and specific stages of self-study investigation, including invitations to open fora for community discussion; the creation of a dedicated website for the dissemination of information concerning the purpose and importance of Middle States accreditation as well as progress reports specific to Fordham’s current self-study process; and periodic articles of interest pertaining to the purpose and process published in student newspapers, on University electronic bulletin boards, and in alumni magazines.

List of Fordham’s Peer and Aspirant Institutions and Suggested Profile of Evaluating Team

Fordham’s list of peer and aspirant institutions includes the following:
Peers: George Washington University, Boston University, Northeastern, Syracuse, Loyola Chicago, and Villanova.
Aspirants: Northwestern, Notre Dame, Georgetown, Boston College, New York University.

As far as the profile of the evaluation team is concerned, Fordham asks that the Middle States Commission consider the following suggestions:
1. The chair of the evaluation team should be an experienced team chair, presidential level and from a peer institution with a mission and goals similar to those of Fordham University. It is assumed that the Middle States Association staff will work closely with the president of Fordham in selecting the chair.
2. The chair as well as some of the team members should understand the Catholic and Jesuit character of the University.
3. It would be helpful if a few of the team members were skilled in institutional assessment as well as strategic planning.

4. Some of the evaluation team members should be from institutions with several schools; undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree programs; and with multiple campuses. As a whole, the team should comprise members representing the financial and student life areas, including residential life; institutions that have a large full-time undergraduate student body; institutions heavily dependent upon tuition; and institutions where primary emphasis is placed on developing a distinguished faculty of teacher/scholars.

5. Members of the evaluation team should be familiar with the challenges brought about by changes in student demographics, in enrollment on the undergraduate and graduate levels, and in the evolving educational landscape.
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INVENTORY OF AVAILABLE SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

MAJOR UNIVERSITY DOCUMENTS

Mission Statement of Fordham University (1979, 2005)
Table on Mission Integration (all units of University)
Service and Engagement Inventory (2010/2011 onward)
*Fordham in the World* website (list of formal international partnerships and programs)
Administrative Organizational Chart
University Fact Books
University Statutes and By-Laws
Composition and Committee Structure of the Board of Trustees
University Strategic Plan: *Toward 2016* (April 2005)
The Strategic Plan Review Committee Report, January 2011, and Presidential Response
Facilities Master Plans
Annual Audited Financial Statements (2006 to present)
Five-Year Financial Plans and Projections
Instructions for Developing and Submitting Budgets
Annual Reports from Vice Presidential Units (2010/2011 onward)
Annual Reports from Deans (2010/2011 onward)
Annual Reports from Departments and Programs (2010/2011 onward)
Quarterly and Annual Reports for all Student Support Services Departments
Departmental Self-Studies and External Review Responses
Faculty Handbook
Student Handbook (Graduate and Undergraduate)
Residential Life Handbook
Campus Assault and Relationship (CARE) Brochure
Administrators’ Handbook
Staff Handbook
Policies and Procedures for Hiring and Promoting Faculty
Policies and Procedures for Hiring and Promoting Staff
Policies and Procedures for Recruiting and Selecting Graduate Students
Policies and Procedures for Recruiting and Selecting Undergraduate Students
Policies on Student Records and Release of Information
Student Complaint and Grievance Procedures, Dissemination Procedures and Recordkeeping
Student Affairs Training Documents (New Staff Orientation, Divisional Training Day Agendas, Striving for *Magis* Professional Development Series)
Alumni Directory
Marketing Materials and Student Publications (Graduate and Undergraduate)
*Inside Fordham, Fordham Magazine, The Ram, The Observer*
University Website
Graduate and Undergraduate Bulletins
Course Syllabi and assessments for all formally-organized internships, fieldwork, practica, and clinical placements
Fordham University Editorial Style Guide

MIDDLE STATES DOCUMENTS

2006 Middle States Self-Study and Response
2011 Middle States Periodic Review Report and Response
Middle States Annual Institutional Profiles (2006 to present)
Middle States Publications
  Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education
  Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report
  Assessing Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness
  Conducting and Hosting an Evaluation Visit
  Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations

OTHER ACCREDITATION REPORTS

American Bar Association Accreditation Report (School of Law)
NCATE Accreditation Report (Graduate School of Education)
American Psychological Association Accreditation Report (Graduate School of Education – School Psychology)
American Psychological Association Accreditation Report (Graduate School of Education – Counseling Psychology)
AACSB Accreditation Reports for the Schools of Business
CSWE Accreditation Report
Health Services Accreditation Report

INSTITUTIONAL SURVEYS AND REPORTS

University Rankings and Listings
Faculty/SEEQ Evaluations
Common Data Set, 2009 – 2013 (Office of Institutional Research)
CUE (Committee on Undergraduate Enrollment) and WGUR (Working Group on Undergraduate Retention) reports on retention and graduation rates
STAR Report
CICU Survey
Higher Education Research Institute: “Your First College Year” Survey and Results
Higher Education Research Institute: “College Senior Survey” Survey and Results
FIPSE Core Alcohol and Drug Survey and Results
IPEDS Surveys 2009 – 2013 (degree completions; graduation rates)
ACUHO-EBI Survey
NSSE Survey on Student Engagement
Admission Reports and Surveys (Class Profiles 2009 – 2013)
Admission Office Event and Tour Survey Report
Admission Survey of Applicants
Admitted Students Questionnaires
OASIS User Satisfaction Survey
Registrar Response Time Report
Faculty Senate 2010 Survey on Assessment of the Administration (follow-up 2013)
Senate Committee on Faculty Life reports
Career Planning and Placement Annual Surveys of Graduates (2006 through 2013)
Student Affairs Assessment Initiatives Report
Athletic Reports and Relevant Data
Student Affairs Assessment Documents: Annual Department Assessment Presentations, Department Summary Reports, Assessment Questions Database, Assessment Calendar
Relevant Results of Internal Student Affairs Surveys, Department Satisfaction Surveys and Utilization Information, Campus Labs Institutional/Departmental Surveys, Campus Labs Benchmark Surveys
Dean Nancy Busch’s remarks on Discernment, delivered at the fall 2012 GSAS orientation

BOARDS’, COUNCILS’ AND COMMITTEES’ DOCUMENTS

List of Specialized Advisory Boards and Responsibilities
Minutes of the Faculty Senate (2011 onward)
Minutes and Reports of Board of Trustees and Committee Meetings (2011 onward)
Arts and Sciences Council Constitution, Minutes and Subcommittee Reports
Minutes of 2016 Middle States Self-Study Steering Committee
Minutes of School Curriculum Committees
Fordham University Committee on Justice in Higher Education Report (May 2011)
FCJHE Inventories (March 2011): Academics, Student Affairs, USG, and VPs

AJCU AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

The Jesuit, Catholic Mission of U.S. Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU)
A History Rooted in Mission: Jesuit Higher Education in the United States (AJCU, 2010)
Busch, Nancy. Remarks on Discernment, delivered by the Dean at GSAS Orientation (Fall 2012)
Combs, Mary Beth and Patricia Ruggiano Schmidt, eds. Transforming Ourselves, Transforming the World: Justice in Jesuit Higher Education (Fordham University Press, 2013)
Fried, Adam. “Using your Moral Compass to Navigate the College Experience.” Address presented in August 2013 by assistant director of the Fordham Center For Ethics Education at the Academic Convocation for the Fordham College at Rose Hill Class of 2017. To read transcript, click paper
Catholic Higher Education Research Cooperative (CHERC) and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s Community Engagement Elective Classification
### APPENDIX C

**Anticipated Middle States Timetable (3/31/2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Set up task forces and preliminary consideration of how to approach the individual standards; task forces meet as groups and devise study questions, etc.</td>
<td>1) Meet with Andrea Lex on February 11th, incorporate her suggestions and revised proposed to Middle States for final approval by end of March or early April</td>
<td>Complete work on service to and engagement with spreadsheets up to current year’s submission of annual reports</td>
<td>1) Task forces identify and invite participating faculty, administrators and students and gather data and substantiating documentation, begin writing up their preliminary reports</td>
<td>1) Further collection of task force data and documentation; preliminary task force reports should be written up and vetted by the Steering Committee</td>
<td>1) All information and supporting documentation (graphs, tables, questionnaires, survey summaries, focus group analyses, etc.) must be submitted to co-chair by July 1st at the latest unless otherwise determined</td>
<td>1) Steering Committee sets draft of self-study and makes editorial suggestions as sections are completed</td>
<td>1) Complete draft of the final report must be done by late January or early February at the latest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Co-chair writes and circulates for SC and then wider community (deans, vps, faculty senate, president, provost) the draft of the Self-Study Design Proposal and submits by late January to MS Liaison (Dr. Andrea Lex)</td>
<td>2) Task forces start work by reviewing research questions in line with Andrea’s suggestions, identifying the difficulties and problems they encounter, and bringing them to the full Steering Committee for discussion and resolution prior to full implementation of data collection in AY ’14-'15; further discussion of definitions and what instruments will be used and who will be addressed (questionnaire, focus groups, interviews, student involvement, etc.) when</td>
<td>2) Various individual offices/units should be requested to provide individual reports on those standards which need significant outsourcing</td>
<td>2) Co-chair continues to write draft of self-study report and submit sections to Steering Committee for discussion, emendation, editing as they emerge.</td>
<td>2) Co-chair compiles information and continues to write draft of self-study report</td>
<td>2) Whatever data and documentation materials are still outstanding must be submitted as soon as possible.</td>
<td>2) Final draft of the self-study report must be submitted to evaluation team chair and members at least six weeks prior to the visit. If the visit is in April, this means everything must be ready to go by mid-February.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Set up campus meeting with Dr. Lex (Steering Committee, Fr. McShane, Dr. Freedman, faculty, students, Board of Trustees representatives) in early January, meeting is scheduled for February 11, 2014.</td>
<td>3) Task forces submit their proposed assessment instruments along with a list of already existing substantiating documentation as such information becomes available (ongoing procedure throughout the entire exercise). These new instruments will be standardized by the Director of evaluation to ensure validity and comparability of data.</td>
<td>3) Ongoing discussion by entire Steering Committee of newly arising questions, challenges, problems, data collection protocols, etc.</td>
<td>3) Update president, faculty senate, Bob Howe, and entire University community on self-study progress</td>
<td>3) An open forum (students, faculty, administration and staff) on both campuses (maybe all three?) should be scheduled as soon as the draft self-study has been approved by the Steering Committee (September). Requests for suggestions, emendations, etc. should be submitted by October at the latest to give the Steering Committee time to incorporate them into the preliminary final draft.</td>
<td>3) Logistics of evaluation team visit must be worked out, hotel reservations and travel arrangements made, etc. Maybe invite team to come on Saturday, get a rest, then use Sunday to meet with president, provost and BoT members, reception dinner early on Sunday evening so they can do whatever preliminary work they have to do prior to Monday's and Tuesday's visit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) SC decides upon a schedule for investigation so that the Fordham community will be least inconvenienced by repeated task force requests for information. Standards 8 and 9 should be submitted in early Fall 2015, 14 preferably in July of 2015, latest early Fall 2015.</td>
<td>4) Start work with task force on mission in updating the mission integration spreadsheet</td>
<td>4) Start work with task force on mission in updating the mission integration spreadsheet</td>
<td>4) Co-chair finalizes the self-study draft and shares it with the Steering Committee chair and members at least six weeks prior to the visit. If the visit is in April, this means everything must be ready to go by mid-February.</td>
<td>4) Co-chair finalizes the self-study draft and shares it with the Steering Committee chair and members at least six weeks prior to the visit. If the visit is in April, this means everything must be ready to go by mid-February.</td>
<td>4) Evaluation team exit interview/report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Involve Bob Howe, Senior Director of Communications, in informing the University community about what Middle States is, what it does and why it is important (set up special dedicated webpage, keep the faculty senate, the deans, vps and department/unit chairs informed on an ongoing basis)</td>
<td>5) President and faculty senate should be updated on self-study progress. Bob Howe should be asked to publish a progress report to the University community</td>
<td>5) President and faculty senate should be updated on self-study progress. Bob Howe should be asked to publish a progress report to the University community</td>
<td>5) Confer with Fr. McShane and Stephen Freedman re possible nominations for evaluation team</td>
<td>5) Confer with Fr. McShane and Stephen Freedman re possible nominations for evaluation team</td>
<td>4) Evaluation team exit interview/report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>