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Institutional Overview

Statement of Mission

The mission of the State University of New York at Delhi is to provide its students with academic opportunities and campus programs that yield clear thinkers and productive citizens who are prepared for service, leadership, and successful careers.

Institutional Goals

SUNY Delhi seeks to create an environment in which living and learning flourish together. Bestowing certificates as well as associate and baccalaureate degrees, Delhi combines historic strengths in modern technology with dynamic curricula in the arts, sciences, and selected professions. To this end SUNY Delhi’s faculty and staff strive to:

- provide high quality education in professional, technological, and liberal arts programs that provide students the opportunity to enter the workforce or continue their education;
- emphasize hands-on, experiential, and applied teaching and learning in small classes;
- create a student-centered campus community in which all individuals are valued and encouraged to excel;
- inspire a lifelong passion for learning so that students may better understand themselves and their changing world;
- provide opportunities in classrooms, residence halls, and campus activities for students to realize their potential in their personal, professional, and intellectual lives;
- define rigorous academic and professional standards of learning and ascertain the extent to which programs and students meet or exceed these standards.

Organizational Values

The faculty and staff of SUNY Delhi believe that the student is the most important person on campus. As a college with over fifty academic programs, SUNY Delhi serves New York State by ensuring that its students are afforded every opportunity to define, pursue, and achieve their diverse educational goals.

SUNY Delhi aggressively seeks to link its mission as an educational institution with programs that enhance the intellectual, emotional, and social development of its students. Accordingly, efforts to promote and create opportunities for student growth should animate every member of the campus community.

SUNY Delhi strives to create a culture of assessment that promises continuous self-evaluation and improvement. Programs, services, students, faculty, and staff should aspire to make the learning and living experience one that advances knowledge and enhances skills.

Description

Founded in 1913, SUNY Delhi has experienced tremendous growth over the past decade, reaching a record enrollment of over 3,100 students. Delhi is carving a unique niche in higher education by
offering a seamless education that includes specialized certificates, more than 40 associate degree programs and 13 distinctive baccalaureate programs. Several academic programs have earned state and national reputations for excellence. In 2008 SUNY Delhi was ranked among the Top 45 colleges in the North, according to the U.S. News and World Report Guide to America’s Best Colleges, and was recently named a “great college to work for” by The Chronicle of Higher Education.

SUNY Delhi started as an agricultural and technical college with certificates and two-year degrees, focusing on producing students prepared for the workforce. As the college has grown, four-year programs were developed to meet the changing demands of the workforce. Currently, SUNY Delhi boasts flagship programs in Nursing, Veterinary Science, Golf Course Management, Culinary Arts, and Hospitality. SUNY Delhi also aspires to extend some of these programs off-campus, online, and at the Master's level. Students may pursue degrees in select programs offered at Schenectady County Community College, Onondaga Community College, and Tompkins Cortland Community College, as well as online.

SUNY Delhi is located in the foothills of the Catskill Mountains; the campus is approximately 3.5 hours from New York City and less than 2 hours from the state capital of Albany. The campus consists of 625 acres with 44 buildings, including 6 residence halls. The college also owns and maintains an 18 hole golf course.

**Degrees Awarded**

Associate of Arts, Associate of Applied Science, Associate of Science, Associate of Occupational Science, Bachelor of Business Administration, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Bachelor of Technology.

**Students**

SUNY Delhi enrolls over 3,100 students representing virtually every county in New York State. The Mid-Hudson region provides the fastest growing segment of the student body and nearly 25 percent of students come from Metropolitan New York and Long Island. SUNY Delhi's student body also reflects the diversity of New York State's population with students of color accounting for nearly 25 percent of total enrollment.

**Student/Faculty Ratio**

With a ratio of 19.5 students for every faculty member, learning takes place in an environment focused on the needs and aspirations of individual students.

**Student Life**

The Division of Student Life provides a wide range of educational, social and recreational programs, and support services that foster a rich and engaging living and learning environment, facilitate the overall development of each student and enhance the sense of campus community. SUNY Delhi students can choose from over 50 clubs and 20 intercollegiate sports.

Approximately 70 percent of students live on campus, with many housed in one of the two living and learning environments specifically designed to support student success.
Accreditations

The college is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-2680, 267-284-5000. The college also maintains accreditations from the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, American Design Drafting Association, American Culinary Federation, National Institute for Automotive Service Excellence, National Automotive Technician Education Foundation, National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission, American Council for Construction Education, American Veterinary Medical Association Council on Education.

College President

Dr. Candace Vancko was named ninth president of SUNY Delhi in June 1999. Dr. Vancko has worked both in the private and the public higher education sector. She is nationally recognized as a higher education management specialist. Prior to coming to Delhi, Dr. Vancko served as Vice President for Enrollment Services at Hocking College in Nelsonville, Ohio. From 1989 to 2004 she served as Senior Associate with Noel Levitz as an enrollment management consultant for more than 10 two-year colleges.

Strategic Plan

SUNY Delhi’s smart growth plan is built on the college’s success in establishing a unique niche in the rapidly changing environment of higher education. Delhi focuses resources on delivering a select range of high quality academic programs from the certificate through the master’s degree level. These programs serve the students’ educational goals and New York State’s workforce needs in both the classroom setting and through delivery systems that overcome barriers of space and time. Smart growth envisions sustained enrollment growth based upon Delhi’s historic success in offering academic excellence, student access and exceptional educational value. Smart growth assures maximum use of campus and SUNY-wide resources by optimizing multiple opportunities to deliver premier programs. Growth consistent with this plan will generate and attract resources capable of meeting the college’s overarching goals for student success. SUNY Delhi’s strategic plan is based on the following set of six principles and aspirational goals.

- engaging students for success;
- achieving academic excellence;
- sustaining educational innovation;
- building strategic partnerships;
- promoting environmental stewardship; and
- accomplishing service excellence and operational efficiencies.

New Campus Initiatives

SUNY Delhi has undertaken a number of exciting new initiatives since the completion of its last Institutional Self-Study in 2001. The college has added two new state-of-the-art residence halls (Catskill Hall and Riverview Apartments), and renovated several others in an effort to support its growing enrollment. The college’s first capital campaign helped to fund the renovation of the Resnick Library and Learning Center, and also supported the construction of the Clark Field House.
and the Floyd L. Maines Arena. In addition, the college has developed new academic programs and curricula at the associate and baccalaureate level, and recently added the first fully online Bachelor of Science in Nursing program in New York State. Over the past several years, the college has greatly expanded its online and off-campus programs at three area campuses: Schenectady County Community College, Tompkins Cortland Community College, and Onondaga Community College. In Fall 2010, Farrell Hall will reopen as a new state-of-the-art student and community center after undergoing a $20 million renovation. Also, SUNY Delhi was one of the first campuses in the SUNY system to participate in the Master Planning process.
The Institutional Self-Study

Nature and Scope

The selection of the right self-study approach model is one of the most important decisions any steering committee must make. Shortly after its creation in the Spring of 2009, SUNY Delhi’s Middle States Steering Committee began discussing the various self-study approach options. The deliberations around this issue resulted in unanimous agreement that a comprehensive self-study, with one area of special emphasis in online and off-campus education, best suited SUNY Delhi and the goals and objectives of the institutional self-study.

SUNY Delhi has changed and grown dramatically since its last Middle States institutional self-study was completed in 2001. The mission statement has been revised and incorporated into the campus culture. New four-year degree programs have yielded a more selective class of enrolled students, and more programs are being envisioned to join these. Meanwhile, online and off-campus programs have added to the accessibility of a SUNY Delhi education. These two factors have contributed to an enrollment increase from 2,500 students to over 3,000 in the past ten years, even as selectivity has increased. It is anticipated that enrollment, selectivity, and retention rates will continue to grow in the future. The college wants to ensure that growth in enrollment and new programs can be sustained with the resources available, and that this growth does not compromise the mission and goals of the institution.

Eleven of the twelve self-study working groups will explore subject areas within the Characteristics of Excellence. Working Group 10-Online and Off-Campus Learning is a special emphasis area that will examine the college’s strategic growth in online education and niche off-campus programs. While the Steering Committee recognizes that all the standards of excellence are important for reaccreditation, it believes that institutional effectiveness and assessment of student learning outcomes should be of particular focus and are areas in which the college has made tremendous improvement since our last self-study. To that end, a cross-functional committee is being created to coordinate and enhance the college’s ongoing assessment activities in institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes. A comprehensive document repository is also being developed to organize the college’s documents and address gaps by the functional areas and related Characteristics of Excellence.

The shift to offering online and off-campus programming presents a challenge to SUNY Delhi. Strategic growth in this area will allow the college to continue to offer niche programs to a wider audience congruent with the college’s mission, institutional goals, and scope. A special emphasis
area in online and off-campus programming will allow SUNY Delhi to plan for sustained growth
and address and integrate questions regarding mission, planning, governance, curriculum and
programmatic development, and student learning outcomes assessment.

The institutional self-study should be an open, transparent, forward-looking report that draws
conclusions and makes recommendations designed to help the college move into this next phase of
smart growth. Moreover, the self-study should help the college better assess its programs and
services, gauge its effectiveness in fulfilling its mission and institutional goals, and identify ways to
promote sustained institutional improvement.

**Intended Outcomes**

- To conduct a self-study that meets or exceeds the accreditation standards set by the Middle
  States Commission on Higher Education.
- To promote and engage the campus community in an open, transparent, and effective self-study
  process.
- To review the institution’s mission and goals to ensure that they reflect the current priorities and
  objectives of the college, namely the focus on student-centered learning, promotion of academic
  excellence, and expanding niche programs, consistent with the college’s strategic plan.
- To study the impact of off-campus and online programs on the college’s mission and
  institutional goals.
- To engage in a critical look at the institution and the impact that recent changes and
  developments (economic, demographic, personnel, resource, budgetary, and programmatic) have
  had on the institution, and how these will affect the college in the next five to ten years.
- To assess the institution’s strengths and challenges in order to produce a forward-looking
  document that serves as a vision and provides a road map for smart and sustained institutional
  growth and development.
- To make linkages between the *Standards of Excellence* and the college’s new strategic plan.
- To formulate recommendations designed to achieve the goals and objectives stated within the
  college’s new strategic plan.

**Communication to the Campus**

**Online Access to Information**

In order to create a transparent and interactive self-study process, all documents, research, and
monthly reports from working groups will be submitted through the campus wiki, Confluence.
Through Confluence, all members of the campus community can follow the self-study progress and
post relevant questions. The same attributes that allow the campus to stay informed on Confluence
will also allow working group members to communicate in an effective and efficient manner. The
Steering Committee will also be creating a web page where Middle States accreditation information,
updates, and reports can be viewed.
Meeting Face-to-Face: Workshops and Forums

Along with the online access to information, the co-chairs have taken responsibility for hosting workshops and forums for the self-study members and the campus community. A Steering Committee orientation was held in June 2009, and a working group orientation was held in January 2010. Meetings will be established to meet the specific needs of working groups.

In Fall 2009, the co-chairs visited the academic divisions, support staff, and student groups to introduce the Middle States process and timeline for the self-study and answer any questions. The co-chairs plan to host staff workshops before the beginning of each semester throughout the self-study process on selected topics and to provide the campus community with an update and a progress report. Selected topic workshops will also include the importance of institutional assessment and student learning outcomes assessment.
### Self-Study Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2009</td>
<td>President Vancko selects co-chairs for the 2011/2012 institutional self-study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>Selection of Steering Committee members. Developed wiki-space on campus-wide wiki (Confluence), self-study materials are read, and considerations for self-study approach models conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>Steering Committee Orientation: conducted discussion of roles and responsibilities, self-study approach models and working group structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td>Steering Committee refines and agrees on self-study approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October-November 2009</td>
<td>Recruitment for working group volunteers. Steering Committee designs working group structures and formulates research questions. Co-chairs host informational meetings for the campus. Co-chairs attend Middle States Self-Study Institute. Campus-wide survey about strengths and weaknesses of SUNY Delhi distributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>Orientation and first meetings for working groups. Discussion of roles and responsibilities and distribution of working group charges. Self-study design drafted by Steering Committee. Winter workshops on self-study progress, the importance of institutional effectiveness, and assessment of student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2010</td>
<td>Institutional self-study design is submitted to Middle States, preparation visit with Middle States liaison Dr. Debra Klinman. First monthly progress report from Working Groups due to Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February – June 2010</td>
<td>Working groups meet and conduct research. Revised Self-Study Design submitted to Middle States. SUNY Delhi representatives attend Middle States workshop on building a campus culture of assessment. Debra Klinman visits off-campus locations at Onondaga Community College and Tompkins Cortland Community College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2010</td>
<td>Steering Committee and Working Group Chairs meet to review progress and establish goals for the coming semester. Summer workshop for faculty and staff on progress of self-study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2010</td>
<td>Final Working Group reports due to the Steering Committee. MSCHE liaison Debra Klinman selects evaluation team chair, SUNY Delhi approves, finalizes visitation dates, and sends Self-Study Design to evaluation team chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Steering Committee compiles working group reports into a draft institutional self-study. Winter workshop for faculty and staff on progress of self-study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>Steering Committee presents self-study first draft to the campus. MSCHE liaison Debra Klinman selects evaluation team members, SUNY Delhi approves selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September/October 2011</td>
<td>Steering Committee makes changes to institutional self-study draft as requested from campus input. 2nd draft submitted to campus. Latest draft sent to evaluation team chair in preparation for preliminary visit. Campus begins to implement recommendations from institutional self-study report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>Middle States Team Visit, Evaluation Team Report, and SUNY Delhi response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-Study Members

Middle States Self-Study Steering Committee Charge Given by President Candace S. Vancko

January 2010

The Middle States Steering Committee, appointed by, and responsible to the President, will plan and oversee the self-study and reaccreditation process. Co-chairs will facilitate the Middle States Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee shall assign tasks to individuals, work groups and functional offices and otherwise supervise and coordinate the self-study process. The Steering Committee will interpret the results of the studies and deliberations, as well as formulate recommendations for institutional change and improvement. Steering Committee members will serve as liaisons to the established work groups.

Specifically, the Steering Committee’s responsibilities are to:

- Design the self-study process.
- Translate the design into tasks, roles, structures and sequences of activity that will form the self-study group.
- Define the tasks to be completed and the working groups to be used.
- Define the liaison responsibilities of Steering Committee members.
- Establish a schedule for the process, including a carefully developed sequence of activities.
- Select working group chairpersons and create working groups, providing each with a clear charge including timelines and reporting criteria.
- Coordinate and approve all data collection efforts.
- Examine interim reports from working groups and, when appropriate, arrange for general discussion of these reports.
- Provide for the editing of the self-study report.
- Participate in the campus visits by the Middle States Evaluation Team.

Selection of the Self-Study Steering Committee

Selection of the members of the Steering Committee began in Spring 2009 following President Candace Vancko’s selection of co-chairs for the self-study process. The co-chairs selected Steering Committee members in consultation with the President and other campus leaders.

No formal criteria were used in the selection process. However, rigorous efforts were made to form a Steering Committee that included a broad cross-section of the Delhi campus in order to provide a breadth of experience, skills, and perspectives to the process. Particular emphasis was placed on selecting members who had demonstrated the ability to be fully involved in the Middle States self-study, including the capacity to work with others, complete work on a timely basis, and to think honestly and constructively about the college’s ability to fulfill its mission and continuously improve.
Academics from five disciplines, non-teaching professionals, support staff, a College Council member and managerial personnel were asked to serve on the Steering Committee. The co-chairs also invited several newer members of the campus community who had distinguished themselves by their commitment to institutional improvement to join the Steering Committee. A reference librarian was selected as Steering Committee co-chair. Her professional skills, experience with all academic areas, and involvement in campus governance effectively meshed with the committee’s need for assistance in the retrieval, collection and management of data and information and intra-campus participation in the self-study process.

In total, a Steering Committee of sixteen members was formed in Fall 2009 and was given its charge in January 2010. By Fall 2009, all Steering Committee members were actively involved in defining the self-study goals, selecting a self-study model and design, and establishing the charges to be presented to the working groups. Each committee member serves as a liaison to one or more of these groups.
### Steering Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty &amp; Students</th>
<th>Staff, Administration, CSEA, &amp; College Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Dr. Terry Hamblin (co-chair)**  
Associate Professor, Liberal Arts & Sciences Division  
707 Evenden Tower, 607-746-4454  
hamblitr@delhi.edu | **Joe Batchelder**  
Director of Capital Construction, Physical Plant  
Wall Service Complex, 607-746-4025  
batchejb@delhi.edu |
| **Courtney Ketz**  
Student Representative  
BBA Veterinary Technology Management  
C_Ketz63 @stumail.delhi.edu | **LouAnn Matthews-Babcock**  
Coordinator of Judicial Affairs and Community Development, Student Life  
130 Bush Hall, 607-746-4443  
matthelm@delhi.edu |
| **Dr. Mary Pat Lewis**  
Professor/Chair, Nursing & Allied Health Dept, Liberal Arts & Sciences Division  
25 Sanford Hall, 607-746-4492  
lewismp@delhi.edu | **Brian Hutzley**  
Vice President for Business and Finance, Business and Finance  
175 Bush Hall, 607-746-4582  
hutzlebg@delhi.edu |
| **Dr. Monica Liddle**  
Associate Professor, Liberal Arts & Sciences  
518 Evenden Tower, 607-746-4479  
liddleml@delhi.edu | **Jo Ann Kaufman**  
Administrative Aide, College Advancement  
143 Bush Hall, 607-746-4521  
kaufmajc@delhi.edu |
| **Dr. Barrett (Bret) Meckel**  
Associate Professor, Applied Sciences & Recreation Division  
156 Farnsworth Hall, 607-746-4306  
meckelbt@delhi.edu | **Lori Osterhoudt**  
Director, Counseling & Health Services, Counseling and Health Services  
114 Foreman Hall, 607-746-4692  
osterhlb@delhi.edu |
| **Dr. Akira Odani**  
Assistant Professor, Business & Hospitality Division  
5 Sanford Hall, 607-746-4050  
odaniaaa@delhi.edu | **Jim Sands**  
Member, College Council  
JemSand@aol.com |
| **Angela Rhodes (co-chair)**  
Assistant Librarian, Resnick Library  
339 Bush Hall, 607-746-4734  
rhodesam@delhi.edu | **Nancy Smith**  
Registrar/Director of Institutional Research, Records & Registration  
122 Bush Hall, 607-746-4543  
smithnl@delhi.edu |
| **Eric Robert**  
Associate Professor, Technology Division  
14 Smith Hall, 607-746-4067  
robertep@delhi.edu | **Jeffrey (Jeff) Stedman**  
Director of Academic Advisement, Resnick Learning Center  
217 Bush Hall, 607-746-4655  
stedmajm@delhi.edu |
Selection of Working Group Members and Chairs

Campus-wide involvement in the institutional self-study was identified as one of the main objectives of the reaccreditation process. To this end, over one hundred and forty members of the campus community, including thirteen students, are serving on twelve working groups. Invitations to participate in the institutional self-study were made in the Fall 2009 semester via email, Delhi Today, the College Senate, the academic divisions, all functional areas, the President’s Cabinet, the Student Senate, the Greek Council, and the Student Programming Board.

Volunteers were asked to submit their top three choices for the working groups in which they wished to participate. In most cases, the Steering Committee sought to accommodate volunteers by matching individuals with the working group that could make the best use of their talents, interests, experience, and expertise.

Throughout the selection process, the Steering Committee went to great lengths to assure that each working group was well positioned to carry out its charge. Each working group has been assigned at least one member who is employed in that subject area to provide perspective, expertise, and information to the group. In addition to assigning experts for each working group, the Steering Committee also made sure that each working group had at least one member who was not employed in that subject area to provide an unbiased, outside perspective to the group. Moreover, each working group was assigned an individual with proven writing abilities, an individual who would question the prevailing assumptions of the area of study, and an individual who would be a motivator and positive force for the group. Attempts were made to include faculty, non-academic staff, classified staff, and students on each working group. Working group members received documents detailing their specific roles and responsibilities at the end of December 2009.

The Steering Committee was thoroughly involved in the selection of working group chairs. The selection of chairs was based on criteria similar to those that guided the selection of the Steering Committee, although particular consideration was given to experience, familiarity with the Middle States reaccreditation process, and the ability to motivate and keep a large group on task. Every effort was made to appoint chairs from both the academic and professional staff, and to tap into the reservoir of experience from the last institutional self-study. In most cases, those recruited as chairs had chosen the working groups to which they were assigned, and had also expressed a tremendous willingness to conduct an open, transparent, and forward-looking self-study that would ultimately benefit their area of study, and the college community at large.

Working group chairs received documents detailing their specific roles and responsibilities, along with copies of the Middle States publications: *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education,* and *Self Study: Creating a Useful Process.* Each worked with their liaison to develop their charge and most participated in a two-day orientation to the reaccreditation process on January 13-14, 2010.
Working Group Members

Working Group 1: Our Mission and Planning for the Future

Lori Osterhoudt (liaison), Director, Counseling and Health Services
Jim Sands (liaison), College Council
Lynn Domina (chair), Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Melissa Ackerly, Instructional Support Associate, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Sean Babcock, Complex Coordinator, Office of Residence Life
Penny Bishop (student)
Bob Gamble, Adjunct Instructor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Nicole Hoffman, EOP Associate Counselor, Resnick Learning Center
Jennifer Lusins, Instructor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Kim MacLeod, Communications and New Media Manager, College Advancement
Benjamin McGraw, Assistant Professor, Division of Applied Sciences and Recreation
Morgan McKee, Capital Construction Staff Assistant, Office of Facilities
Michael Petrillose, Dean, Division of Business and Hospitality
Jack Tessier, Associate Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Working Group 2: Institutional Assessment

Bret Meckel (liaison), Assistant Professor, Division of Applied Sciences and Recreation
Barbara Jones (co-chair), Vice President for Student Life, Division of Student Life
Pamela Peters (co-chair), Director of the Library, Resnick Library
Carol Bishop, Director of Business Affairs, Office of Business and Finance
Barbara Kaplan, Assistant to the President, Office of the President
Nilam Kotadia, Residence Hall Director, Office of Residence Life
Maureen McKenna, Senior Development Officer, College Advancement
Jamie Rotter, Dining Hall Manager, College Association at Delhi, Inc.
Danielle Schaeffer (student)
Marsha Stock, Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
John Taylor, Professor, Division of Technology

Working Group 3: Physical Plant

Joe Batchelder (liaison), Director of Capital Construction, Physical Plant
Eric Robert (liaison), Associate Professor, Division of Technology
Mark Schneider (chair), Assistant Professor, Division of Technology
Mike Branigan, Associate Professor, Division of Applied Sciences and Recreation
Jack Burgess, Instructor, Division of Technology
Colin Covitz (student)
Ladd Dawson, University Police Officer, University Police
Jason Fishner, Assistant Director of College Housing, Office of Residence Life
Kathleen Gillooley, Instructor, Division of Applied Sciences and Recreation
Marty Greenfield, Director of Student Activities/College Union, Office of Student Activities
Deb Underwood, Technology Center Coordinator, Campus Information Systems
Stephen Warren (student)

**Working Group 4: Human Resources: The People of Delhi: Faculty, Administration, and Staff**

Jo Ann Kaufman (liaison), Administrative Aide, Office of College Advancement
Angela Rhodes (liaison), Systems and Instruction Librarian, Resnick Library
Bonnie Martin (chair), Director of Administrative Services

Joan Erickson, Assistant Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Denise Holcomb, Access Services Assistant, Resnick Library
Patti Hoyt, Human Resources Manager, College Association at Delhi, Inc.
Dawn Norwood, Secretary, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Miriam Sharick, Instructor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences

**Working Group 5: Integrity, Governance, and Leadership**

Akira Odani (liaison), Assistant Professor, Division of Business and Hospitality
Barb Sturdevant (chair), Professor, Division of Business and Hospitality

Jeff Abraham (student)
Nana-Yaw Andoh, Assistant Professor, Division of Technology
Peter Clement, Assistant Professor, Division of Business and Hospitality
Julee Miller, Instructor, Division of Business and Hospitality
Tassha Rathbone, Instructor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Christian Vesterfelt, Counselor, Counseling and Health Services

**Working Group 6: Education at Delhi**

Terry Hamblin (liaison), Associate Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Patti May (chair), Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Peter Daempfle, Associate Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Jan Elwell, Administrative Aide, Human Resources
Lee Heron, Instructor, Division of Business and Hospitality
Courtney Ketz (student)
Michael Miller, Professor, Division of Technology
Thomas Philion, Assistant Professor, Director of Professional Golf Management, Division of Applied Sciences and Recreation
Z. I. Sanchez, Assistant Professor, Division of Technology
Carolyn Scobie, Instructional Support Associate, Division of Applied Sciences and Recreation
Lisa Wehner, Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Working Group 7: Academic Support Services

LouAnn Matthews-Babcock (liaison and co-chair), Coordinator of Judicial Affairs and Community Development
Dunstan McNutt (co-chair), Reference and Instruction Librarian, Resnick Library

Tom Banks, Testing Coordinator, Resnick Learning Center
Peter Campbell, Instructor, Division of Technology
Donna Dougherty, Technology Support Assistant, Campus Information Systems
Kenny Fass, Programmer/Analyst, Campus Information Systems
Jodi Krzyston, Instructor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Cristina Ludden, BSN Program Assistant, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Lori Mongillo, College Accountant, Office of Accounting
George Nassar (student)
Anna Reed, Access and Services Library, Resnick Library
Lou Shields, Director of Career, Transfer and Veteran Services, Resnick Learning Center

Working Group 8: Non-Academic Student Support Services

Jeff Stedman (liaison), Director, Academic Advisement and Retention
Kerry Maroney, (co-chair), Assistant Athletic Director, Department of Athletics
Karen Gabriel (co-chair), Nurse Practitioner, Clinic Supervisor, Counseling and Health Services

Teresa Bryant (student)
Kathryn DeZur, Associate Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Kristy Fitch, Systems Administrator, Campus Information Systems
John Huber, Assistant Director, Student Activities
Timothy Ludden, University Policy Officer, University Police
John Kolodziej, Aquatics Coordinator/Swimming Coach, Department of Athletics
Douglas McKee, Instructor, Division of Applied Sciences and Recreation
John Padovani, Director of Residence Life, Office of Residence Life

Working Group 9: Student Admissions and Retention

Nancy Smith (liaison), Registrar, Director of Institutional Research
Mary Wake (chair), Assistant Director of Counseling Services, Counseling and Health Services

Jennifer Aikens, Assistant Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Beth Beaudet, Assistant Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
David Bloom (student)
David Brower, Assistant Professor, Division of Business and Hospitality
Amy Brown, Manager, Purchasing and Accounts Payable
Erin Hodges, Enrollment Counselor, Office of Enrollment Services
Denise McLean, Secretary, Division of Student Life
John Reecher, Assistant Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Glenda Roberts, Director, Business and Community Services
Jan Sohns, Associate Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Linda Weinberg, Coordinator, Disabilities Services, Resnick Learning Center
Working Group 10: Online and Off-Campus Learning

Mary Pat Lewis (liaison), Chair, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Tracey Caponera (co-chair), Assistant Professor and Coordinator, Schenectady County Community College
Amber Tatnall (co-chair), Assistant Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Mistelle Davis, Online Counselor, Office of Enrollment Services
Cindy Healy, Bursar, Student Accounts
Cheryle Levitt, Assistant Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Grady Miller, Assistant Coordinator of Online Education, Campus Information Systems
Clark Shah-Nelson, Coordinator of Online Education, Campus Information Systems
Clarissa Robinson (student)

Working Group 11: Resource Allocation, Funding and Budget, Institutional Resources

Brian Hutzley (liaison), Vice President for Business and Finance
Shawn Brislin (chair), Manager, Client Support Services, Campus Information Systems

Adriene Clifford, Instructor, Division of Business and Hospitality
Patricia Heath, General Manager, College Association at Delhi, Inc.
Pamela Hilton, Enrollment Counselor, Office of Enrollment Services
Daniel Klossner, Assistant Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Dave Loveland, Physical Plant Director
Susan Mackay, Lead Accountant, College Foundation
Kathy Markham, Staff Assistant, Office of Residence Life
Brian Melendez (student)
Susan Poe, Assistant Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Jared Yando, Instructor, Division of Technology

Working Group 12: Assessment of Student Learning

Monica Liddle (liaison), Associate Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Mike McKenna (chair), Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Deb Adelman, Associate Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Nick Benjamin (student)
Janet Billek, Clerk, Accounts Payable
Susan Greenwood, Assistant Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
James Lees, PGM Internship Coordinator, Division of Applied Sciences and Recreation
Steve McKeegan, Professor, Division of Technology
Kathleen Ogborn, Assistant Professor, Division of Applied Sciences and Recreation
Penny Pardoe, Assistant Professor, Division of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Roles and Responsibilities

The following roles and responsibilities have been laid out to create a successful and organized self-study process.

Expectations and Responsibilities for all Self-Study Members

The duties of all self-study members are to:

- review SUNY Delhi's mission statement and institutional goals;
- review the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s *Characteristics of Excellence and Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report* documents;
- promote open dialogue and respect dissent;
- adhere to group etiquette;
- create a pleasant and fun working environment;
- share information, research, and results with other working groups; and
- communicate with members of the campus about the self-study process.

The Role of Self-Study Co-Chairs and their Responsibilities

The duties of the co-chairs are to:

- lead and organize the Steering Committee;
- serve as liaison to Middle States;
- serve as liaison to College Administration: President, College Council, and Cabinet, as well as the College Senate, and Campus Community;
- have a complete understanding of the Middle States self-study process;
- attend MSCHE workshops when appropriate;
- schedule campus visits;
- communicate with the Steering Committee and working groups;
- be responsible for the completion of the self-study design and report;
- organize materials;
- assist the Steering Committee and working groups in carrying out their charges; and
- meet the needs and expectations of the campus in the self-study.

The Role of Self-Study Steering Committee Members and their Responsibilities

The Steering Committee members' role in the self-study process is to be an administrative committee that oversees the self-study process. The co-chairs are considered Steering Committee members as well. The duties of the Steering Committee members are to:

- assist in the selection of a self-study approach, the working group structures, the assigning of members to working groups, and the creation of a draft working group charge to be edited and approved by each working group;
- meet deadlines;
- bring feedback and ideas to the Steering Committee;
- communicate effectively with working groups and Steering Committee members;
- be a liaison to working groups for ideas and information;
- create working group structure; and
- assist in the creation of the self-study design, due by February 4, 2010, and self-study report, due by Summer 2011.

The Role of Self-Study Working Group Chairs and their Responsibilities

The Working Group Chairs were selected by the Steering Committee liaisons in the Fall of 2009. The duties of the Working Group Chairs are to:

- ensure that all parts of the working group charge are completed;
- ensure that all timelines and deadlines are met;
- address any and all concerns within their working group and inform their liaisons and the Steering Committee of any potential issues within their working groups;
- distribute relevant materials to working group members;
- assist in the writing and editing of the working group's final report that will be part of the self-study draft due by November 1, 2010;
- submit monthly written reports on the working group's progress to the Steering Committee, beginning in February 2010; these reports must be posted in Confluence;
- keep minutes of every working group meeting;
- communicate regularly with their working groups, their liaisons, and the co-chairs of the Steering Committee;
- schedule regular meetings and communicate these to their working group liaisons and Steering Committee co-chairs; and
- assign tasks and divide work and responsibilities among working group members.

The Role of Self-Study Working Group Members and their Responsibilities

The Working Group members were asked to volunteer to be a part of the self-study process in the Fall 2009. The duties of working group member are to:

- ensure that their working group charge is addressed;
- gather and/or generate data to answer working group charge requirements;
- assist in the working group report to be turned in to the Steering Committee for inclusion in the self-study report;
- ensure that the working group is kept on task; and
- bring any unresolved issues to their chair or liaison.
Working Group Orientation: January 13-Thursday, January 14

Schedule: Wednesday, January 13th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Room and Remote Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 AM – 10:30 AM</td>
<td>Refreshments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evenden Tower Lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM – 10:45 AM</td>
<td>Welcome and Introduction</td>
<td>President Candace Vancko and Provost John Nader</td>
<td>Evenden 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 AM – 11:45 AM</td>
<td>Introduction to Middle States and the Reaccreditation Process</td>
<td>Dr. Terry Hamblin &amp; Angela Rhodes (Co-chairs of Middle States Self Study)</td>
<td>Evenden 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 PM – 1 PM</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td>MacDonald Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 PM – 3:00 PM</td>
<td>How to Assess What You Value and Satisfy External Assessment Expectations</td>
<td>Guest Speaker: Dr. Patty Francis of SUNY Oneonta, Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment &amp; Effectiveness</td>
<td>Evenden 104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction to Middle States and the Reaccreditation Process

Presented by Dr. Terry Hamblin and Angela Rhodes

This presentation will give working group members a foundation into what Middle States is, the process of reaffirming our accreditation, SUNY Delhi’s timeline for completing the self-study for reaccreditation, and what the self-study should encompass. The roles of working group liaisons, chairs, and members will also be discussed.

How to Assess What You Value and Satisfy External Assessment Expectations

Presented by Dr. Patty Francis, Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness, SUNY Oneonta,

This presentation will provide an overview on the value of institutional and student learning outcomes assessment as it relates to SUNY and Middle States accreditation. Building and sustaining a culture of assessment will also be discussed, as will strategies for preparing for SUNY Delhi’s upcoming institutional self-study.
### Schedule: Thursday, January 14th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Room and Remote Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 AM – 9:45 AM</td>
<td>Steering Committee Meeting with Liaisons &amp; Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evenden 303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 AM – 12 PM | Breakout Sessions: Working Group Meetings           | Steering Committee Liaisons and Working Group Chairs | Evenden Tower Rooms:  
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 1: 310                    |
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 2: 203                    |
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 3: 204                    |
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 4: 205                    |
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 5: 208                    |
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 6: 301                    |
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 7: 302                    |
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 8: 311                    |
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 9: 304                    |
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 10: 124                   |
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 11: 306                   |
|               |                                                     |                              | WG 12: 303                   |
| 1 PM – 3 PM   | OPTIONAL: Confluence Training                       | Angela Rhodes & Patrick Masson | Sanford Computer Labs:  
|               |                                                     |                              | 016 with Patrick             |
|               |                                                     |                              | 121 with Angela              |

### Steering Committee Meeting with Liaisons and Chairs

All Steering Committee liaisons and working group chairs are asked to attend this meeting. Discussion will include deadlines and timelines for working group documents and drafts, finishing touches for working group charges, and the self-study design.

### Breakout Session for Working Groups

All working group members, along with their liaisons and chairs, will come together for their first official meeting. An official scribe should be assigned to record and submit meeting minutes before discussion starts. Discussion topics will include a draft presentation of the working group charges, a refinement of working group research questions, the gathering of materials to answer research questions, and submission deadlines for the self-study design.
Self-Study Working Group Charges

General Working Group Charge

The Steering Committee asks that each working group examine the areas below and the extent to which the college meets its mission and institutional goals, and the relevant standards from the *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*. The historical issues, research questions, and inventory of supporting documents will further enhance the value of the study to the college, and are intended as a starting point for its research and analysis.

Each working group's final report should address the following criteria as per the Middle States Commission on Higher Education guidelines (*Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report)*:

- an overview of the group's charge, and the questions it addressed;
- an analytical discussion of the inquiry undertaken and the outcomes of that inquiry, including strengths and challenges;
- an explanation of how the group's findings and conclusions relate to the Commission's standards;
- discussion of the connection of the group's topic with those of other groups, and of any collaboration between groups that took place; and
- recommendations for improvement.
Working Group 1 – Our Mission and Planning for the Future

Working Group 1 Objectives

The college's mission is the impetus behind all that the institution does. It is the overarching, all encompassing statement of what the institution is, and what it aspires to be. This working group will take a comprehensive look at where the institution has been, where the institution is, and most importantly, where the institution hopes to go. We will ask broad-based questions about the institution and will seek to ensure that the college’s mission statement is accurate and that the institutional goals reflect that mission, and provide opportunities for smart, sustainable growth.

Relevant Standards

The following standards are drawn from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education document. The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation.” The working group’s final report should examine the extent to which the institution complies with or exceeds these standards.

Standard 1: Mission & Goals

- Clearly defined mission and goals that:
  - guide faculty, administration, staff and governing bodies in making decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curriculum development, and definition of program outcomes;
  - include support of scholarly and creative activity, at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution’s purposes and character;
  - are developed through collaborative participation by those who facilitate or are otherwise responsible for institutional improvement and developments;
  - are periodically evaluated and formally approved;
  - are publicized and widely known by the institution’s members;
- mission and goals that relate to external as well as internal contexts and constituencies;
- institutional goals that are consistent with mission; and
- goals that focus on student learning, other outcomes, and institutional improvement.

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

- Goals and objectives or strategies, both institution-wide and for individual units that are clearly stated, reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results, are linked to mission and goal achievement, and are used for planning and resource allocation at the institutional and unit levels;
- planning and improvement processes that are clearly communicated, provide for constituent participation, and incorporate the use of assessment results;
- well defined decision-making processes and authority that facilitates planning and renewal;
- the assignment of responsibility for improvements and assurance of accountability;
- a record of institutional and unit improvement efforts and their results; and
periodic assessment of the effectiveness of planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes.

**Standard 3: Institutional Resources**

- A financial planning and budgeting process aligned with the institution’s mission, goals, and plan.

**Standard 7: Institutional Assessment**

- Documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve the total range of programs and services; achievement of institutional mission, goals, and plans; and compliance with accreditation standard.

**Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention**

- Admissions policies, developed and implemented, that support and reflect the mission of the institution.

**Standard 9: Student Support Services**

- A program of student support services appropriate to student strengths and needs, reflective of institutional mission, consistent with student learning expectations, and available regardless of place or method of delivery.

**Standard 11: Educational Offerings**

- Educational offerings congruent with its mission.

**Historic Issues and Areas of Focus**

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

The 2001 Institutional Self-Study discussed how Delhi altered its mission in response to external institutional threats, enrollment problems, and loss of state support. As a result, Delhi developed a number of niche academic programs in traditional areas of strength, such as hospitality management, nursing, and veterinary science. The college also continued to emphasize small class size, individual attention, and higher selectivity. Additionally, the college addressed stagnant enrollment in certain programs, and identified a need to better focus on growth and improved student retention.

The 2007 Periodic Review Report noted that SUNY Delhi made significant progress in fulfilling goals from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study. This included substantial enrollment growth, increased selectivity and retention, improved assessment, the addition of a uniform online course syllabus, increased resources, improved satisfaction among students, online learning, improved facilities and physical plant, improved budget and planning processes, and greater state and regional visibility and recognition.
Our mission statement should be reexamined in light of significant growth in online programs and other distance learning programs. The institution has grown significantly in recent years, adding residence halls and new programs.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were developed as areas of interest to the college:

- How is the new strategic plan tied to the college's mission and goals, and what is the process for updating the broader institutional goals?
- How do our mission and goals permit us to be flexible in the face of changes in academia and the world at large?
- How does the growth in online and off-campus programming fit with the institution’s mission?
- How is the mission of the college disseminated to new employees?
- How is the mission of the college integrated into unit and departmental planning?
- What criteria are used to determine if the institution is fulfilling its mission?
- How does SUNY Delhi ensure integration of unit-level plans such that resources, opportunities for growth, and strategic planning occur in the most comprehensive way possible?
- How does the SUNY Delhi mission integrate with the SUNY mission? Are they compatible and mutually supportive?
- How do the institution’s mission and goals maintain the very characteristics that have made the college successful? Is there an optimum level of enrollment?
- How is the growth of campus facilities, residence halls, enrollment, and programs informed by the institution’s mission and goals?
- How does the process for distributing resources align with the college's mission and goals and assessment of their success?

**Conclusions/Recommendations**

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Working Group 2 – Institutional Assessment

Working Group 2 Objectives

The Institutional Assessment working group will review documentation, research assessment tools and strategies, and summarize findings and suggestions regarding the assessment of SUNY Delhi as a successful institution of higher learning. This work will include the following:

- review the *Characteristics of Excellence* developed by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education;
- review the comments and recommendations by Middle States regarding institutional assessment from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study and the 2007 Periodic Review Report, and internal self assessment documents;
- summarize and document the college's efforts in the area of institutional assessment over the past five years;
- address a group of introspective questions that pertain to the process of institutional assessment at SUNY Delhi; and
- develop recommendations for institutional assessment at SUNY Delhi.

Relevant Standards

The following standards are drawn from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education* document. The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation.”

Each of the Standards of Excellence is relevant in determining how an institution assesses its own success. It will be in terms of these standards that this group will assess Delhi’s success as an institution of higher learning. A thorough review and understanding of the Standards of Excellence is essential for the working members of this group.

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

- Goals that focus on student learning, other outcomes, and institutional improvement.

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

- The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

Related broad, institutional standards include:

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

- Planning and improvement processes that are clearly communicated....and incorporate the use of assessment results;
- goals and objectives or strategies, both institution-wide and for individual units that are clearly stated, and reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results;
- assignment of responsibility for improvements and assurance of accountability;
a record of institutional and unit improvement efforts and their results; and

periodic assessment of effectiveness of planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal process.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Documented use of student learning assessment information as part of institutional assessment.

Historic Issues and Areas of Focus

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

- assessment results should be readily available to those who need data for ongoing improvement;
- program review documents need to clearly show improvement is based on outcomes assessment data;
- address effectiveness of planning and implementing new programs;
- Budget and Planning Committee formed to address Middle States concern about the lack of campus-based planning tied to college mission;
- how facilities and capital improvement planning are evaluated; and
- how the assessment of technology (infrastructure and academic/instructional applications) is evaluated and used for improvement.

Research Questions

The following research questions were developed as areas of interest to the college:

- Is Delhi's mission and planning process congruent with the SUNY-wide mission and planning process?
- How are unit and program level goals and objectives developed to support institutional goals? How are these goals and activities communicated and assessed? Is there transparency in the assessment of all functional areas?
- How is institutional assessment reflected in campus wide goals, the mission and values statement, and performance expectations for departments and individuals?
- How does the college assess institutional effectiveness while meeting its stated mission and goals?
- How does SUNY Delhi promote a "culture of assessment"? How does the institution value and support assessment? What policies and governance structures support institutional assessment? How are individuals and departments held accountable and rewarded for assessment activities?
- How are institutional assessment activities coordinated and organized on the campus?
- How are data pertaining to assessment activities collected, archived and shared?
- How is institutional assessment data used to review and improve programs, and guide future planning?
- How can we ensure assessment practices are effective? How often do we review our practices?
- How can SUNY Delhi improve its institutional assessment?
Conclusions/Recommendations

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Working Group 3 – Physical Plant

Working Group 3 Objectives

A diverse group of bright professionals at SUNY Delhi will work together to perform a self-study on the effective use of the institution’s resources and their relationship to the academic mission, as part of a broader group formed to achieve the goal of accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. This working group will study the effective use of institutional resources, including human, financial, technical, facilities and other resources, and the planning and utilization of them.

The campus currently uses many methods for planning and tracking resource allocation. This working group will assemble data from departments across campus, relevant journal publications, and other such applicable sources, in its investigation. Some examples of existing processes for resource allocation and planning are: Unit Plan submissions, SUNY Capital Planning Cycles, the Campus Master Plan, the Student Opinion Survey, and special meetings called to address pressing or unforeseen issues.

Adhering to and exceeding the standards of excellence required by Middle States, this working group has also developed several additional research questions designed to address the fundamental elements of planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal. We must work to answer each of these questions in a manner that demonstrates SUNY Delhi’s ability to utilize its resources effectively towards supporting our academic mission.

Some tasks will be performed independently or in smaller sub-groups, however collaboration will be essential as the group draws conclusions on our final research questions.

Relevant Standards

The following standards are drawn from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education document. The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation.”

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

- Goals and objectives or strategies, both institution-wide and for individual units that are clearly stated, reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results, are linked to mission and goal achievement, and are used for planning and resource allocation at the institutional and unit levels;
- a record of institutional and unit improvement efforts and their results; and
- periodic assessment of the effectiveness of planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

- Strategies to measure and assess the level of, and efficient utilization of, institutional resources required to support the institution’s mission and goals;
- a comprehensive infrastructure or facilities master plan and facilities/infrastructure life-cycle management plan, as appropriate to SUNY Delhi’s mission, and evidence of its implementation;
recognition in the comprehensive plan that facilities, such as learning resources fundamental to all educational and research programs and the library, are adequately supported and staffed to accomplish the institution’s objectives for student learning, both on campuses and at a distance; and

an educational and other equipment acquisition and replacement process and plan, including provision for current and future technology, as appropriate to the educational programs and support services.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

- Learning resources, facilities, instructional equipment, library services, and professional library staff adequate to support the institution’s educational programs.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

- Adequate technical and physical plant facilities, including appropriate staffing and technical assistance, to support electronic offerings; and
- Periodic assessment of the impact of distance learning on the institution’s resources (human, fiscal, physical, etc.) and its ability to fulfill its institutional mission and goals.

Historic Issues and Areas of Focus

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

- The need for additional student housing on campus, including a more diverse housing stock;
- The need for updated academic equipment (other than computers);
- Adequacy of the preventive maintenance schedule;
- Appropriate master and capital planning processes with involvement of the campus community to prioritize projects;
- Efficiency of customer service in fulfilling work requests for physical plant maintenance support;
- Appropriate alignment of custodial staff schedules and staffing patterns with use of campus buildings;
- Appropriate documentation of safety training such as OSHA mandated training on campus; and
- Adequacy of outdoor lighting and emergency phones for campus safety.

The following physical resources will be included in the focus of this working group:

- Academic Classroom & Laboratory Facilities;
- Athletic Facilities & Grounds;
- Resnick Learning Center;
- Computer Information Services;
- Campus Residence Halls;
- Dining Halls/Eateries;
- Student Life and Supporting Dept. Facilities;
- Maintenance/Grounds and Central Utility Plant (CUP);
• Recreational Property and Amenities including the Arboretum, Outdoor Education Center, and College Golf Course.

Research Questions

The following research questions were developed by this working group as an area of interest to the college:

• What are the current capital needs facing the campus? How are those needs being addressed?
• Does the Capital Master Plan follow the mission and goals of the college?
• If on-campus growth is part of the mission, does the current plan address those needs? Parking? Residence hall space?
• What is the relationship of the use of resources to institutional goals?
• How energy efficient is the campus? What energy efficient measures are currently being practiced? What plans are there to improve energy efficiency and green construction?
• What grants and/or incentives might be available to assist the institution towards pursuing energy and green initiatives?
• What is the process for establishing and prioritizing capital infrastructure projects?
• What reports and data are available from the facilities management system used for work orders and preventive maintenance?
• How is student feedback gathered and used in determining physical plant needs and resource management?

Conclusions/Recommendations

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Working Group 4 – Human Resources: The People of Delhi

Working Group 4 Objectives

The administration, faculty, and staff are all part of how the mission of SUNY Delhi is accomplished. An examination of “The People of Delhi” should give evidence of a campus culture in which all faculty and staff are treated with respect; that they are given the appropriate resources needed to complete their roles; that they are given appropriate opportunities for advancement, continued education, and involvement in campus activities and decision-making (applicable to their role); and that they possess the quality of skills and/or education that meet or exceed SUNY Delhi's expectations. There should also be an appropriate amount of documentation for the conduct and procedures for all faculty, administration and staff; an established organizational chart and chain of command; and a clear understanding of the roles needed in order to accomplish SUNY Delhi's mission and planning objectives.

Relevant Standards

The following standards are drawn from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education document. The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation.”

Standard 5: Administration

- A chief executive whose primary responsibility is to lead the institution toward the achievement of its goals and with responsibility for administration of the institution;
- a chief executive with the combination of academic background, professional training, and/or other qualities appropriate to an institution of higher education and the institution's mission;
- administrative leaders with appropriate skills, degrees and training to carry out their responsibilities and functions;
- qualified staffing appropriate to the goals, type, size, and complexity of the institution;
- adequate information and decision-making systems to support the work of administrative leaders;
- clear documentation of the lines of organization and authority; and
- periodic assessment of the effectiveness of administrative structures and services.

Standard 6: Integrity

- Fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation, and dismissal of employees; and
- equitable and appropriately consistent treatment of constituencies, as evident in such areas as ... grievance procedures, faculty promotion, tenure, and administrative review.

Standard 10: Faculty

- Faculty and other professionals appropriately prepared and qualified for the positions they hold, with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and sufficiently numerous to fulfill those roles appropriately;
- educational curricula designed, maintained, and updated by faculty and other professionals who are academically prepared and qualified;
- faculty and other professionals, including teaching assistants, who demonstrate excellence in teaching and other activities, and who demonstrate continued growth;
- appropriate institutional support for the advancement and development of faculty, including teaching, research, scholarship, and service;
- recognition of appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, research, and service;
- published and implemented standards and procedures for all faculty and other professionals, for actions such as appointment, promotion, tenure, grievance, discipline and dismissal, based on principles of fairness with due regard for the rights of all persons;
- carefully articulated, equitable, and implemented procedures and criteria for reviewing all individuals who have responsibility for the educational program of the institution;
- criteria for the appointment, supervision, and review of teaching effectiveness for part-time, adjunct, and other faculty consistent with those for full-time faculty;
- adherence to the principles of academic freedom, within the context of institutional mission; and
- assessment of policies and procedures to ensure the use of qualified professionals to support the institution's programs.

**Historic Issues and Areas of Focus**

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

- efforts toward hiring a diverse faculty, staff and administration;
- standardized and scheduled faculty (full-time and adjunct) evaluations (peer and student);
- efforts in search committees to attract and recruit faculty, staff, and administration with credentials of a higher caliber and standard;
- clear tenure and advancement procedures;
- job satisfaction and morale;
- share of sections taught by adjunct faculty;
- appropriate staffing for distance and branch programs;
- staffing in general education: English/communications, math, history, political science, language, and arts;
- diversity, impact, and involvement of advisory councils; and
- evidence suggesting that administrative efficiency is improved.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were developed by the working group as an area of interest to the college:

- How does the institution ensure faculty is prepared and qualified?
- What standards are in place for advancement qualifications for faculty and staff?
- How does the institution encourage, require, and provide ongoing professional development for faculty and staff?
• Are the current performance evaluation processes for faculty, staff and administration adequate and effective?
• What percentage of courses is taught by adjunct faculty? How does this compare with other institutions? What is the effect?
• How are adjunct faculty selected, evaluated and compensated?
• How does SUNY Delhi recruit a diverse staff? What percentage are minorities?
• How do Delhi staffing ratios compare with other institutions in the SUNY system?

**Conclusions/Recommendations**

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Working Group 5 – Integrity, Leadership and Governance

Working Group 5 Objectives

Working Group 5 will examine areas of the institution from the viewpoint of integrity, leadership and governance. The majority of our study will be focused on Standards 4 and 6. Research questions from Standard 1 will also be studied from the viewpoint of “Integrity, Governance and Leadership”.

Standard 4 Leadership and Governance structures will be studied by examining the administration, faculty and professional staff, and student points of view. The integrity of each structure will be studied and how it fulfills its responsibilities in policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

Integrity and Ethical Behavior, Standard 6, is inherent in all standards and in every aspect of the institution including its programs, activities, policies, contract, and commitments. Research will be conducted including but not limited to these areas.

Relevant Standards

The following standards are drawn from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education document. The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation.”

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

- A well defined system of collegial governance including written policies outlining governance responsibilities of administration and faculty and readily available to the campus community;
- written governing documents such as a constitution, by-laws, enabling legislation, charter or other similar documents that:
  - delineate the governance structure and provide for collegial governance and the structure's composition, duties and responsibilities;
  - assign authority and accountability for policy development and decision making, including a process for the involvement of appropriate institutional constituencies in policy development and decision making;
- appropriate opportunity for student input regarding decisions that affect them;
- a governing body capable of reflecting constituent and public interest and of an appropriate size to fulfill all its responsibilities and which includes members with sufficient expertise to assure that the body's fiduciary responsibilities can be fulfilled;
- a governing body not chaired by the chief executive officer;
- a governing body that certifies to the Commission that the institution is in compliance; with the eligibility requirements, accreditation standards and policies of the Commission; describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting and regulatory agencies; communicates any changes in its accredited status; and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities, including levels of governing body compensation, if any;
- a conflict of interest policy for the governing body (and fiduciary body members, if such a body exists), which addresses matters such as remuneration, contractual relationships, employment, family, financial or other interests that could pose conflicts of interest and that assures that those
interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution;

- a governing body that assists in generating resources needed to sustain and improve the institution;
- a process for orienting new members and providing continuing updates for current members of the governing body on the institution’s mission, organization and academic programs and objectives;
- a procedure in place for the periodic objective assessment of the governing body in meeting stated governing body objectives;
- a chief executive officer, appointed by the governing board, with primary responsibility to the institution; and
- periodic assessment of the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance.

Standard 6: Integrity

- Fair and impartial processes, published and widely available to address student grievances such as alleged violations of institutional policies. The institution assures that student grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately and equitably;
- fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation and dismissal of employees;
- sound ethical practices and respect for individuals through its teaching;
- scholarship/research, service and administrative practice, including the avoidance of conflict of interest or the appearance of such conflict in all activities and among all its constituents;
- equitable and appropriately consistent treatment of constituencies as evident in such areas as the application of academic requirements and policies, student discipline, student evaluation, grievance procedures, faculty promotion, tenure, retention and compensation, administrative review, curricular improvement and institutional governance and management;
- a climate of academic inquiry and engagement supported by widely disseminated policies regarding academic and intellectual freedom;
- an institutional commitment to principles of protecting intellectual property rights
- a climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff and administration for a range of backgrounds, ideas and perspectives;
- honesty and truthfulness in public relations announcements, advertisements and recruiting and admissions materials and practices;
- required and elective courses that are sufficiently available to allow students to graduate within the published program length;
- reasonable continuing student access to paper or electronic catalogs;
- when catalogs are available only electronically, the institution’s web page provides a guide or index to catalog information for each catalog available electronically;
- when catalogs are available only electronically, the institution archives copies of the catalogs as sections or policies are updated;
- changes and issues affecting institutional mission, goals, sites, programs, operations and other material changes are disclosed accurately and in a timely manner to the institution’s community, to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education and to any other appropriate regulatory bodies;
- availability of factual information about the institution, such as the Middle States Commission on Higher Education annual data reporting, the self-study or periodic review report, the team
report and the Commission’s action, accurately reported and made publicity available to the institution’s community;

- information on institution-wide assessments available to prospective students, including graduation, retention, certification and licensing pass rates and other outcomes as appropriate to the programs offered;
- institutional information provided in a manner that ensures student and public access such as print, electronic or video presentation;
- fulfillment of all applicable standards and reporting and other requirements of the commission; and
- periodic assessment of the integrity evidenced in institutional policies, process, practices and the manner in which they are implemented.

**Historic Issues and Areas of Focus**

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

- internal communication;
- shared governance;
- academic integrity; and
- ethical behavior.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were developed by the working groups as areas of interest to the college:

- How does the institution ensure impartiality and freedom of expression?
- How does the institution promote shared governance?
- Do we have a climate in which we encourage respect, and adhere to strict administrative and ethical procedures when dealing with our stakeholders?
- How does the institution promote academic integrity, and how are ethical standards addressed and adhered to?
- Is SUNY Delhi’s mission being carried out with integrity or consistency?
- Is SUNY Delhi’s mission key institutional goals being expressed with integrity, sound leadership and governing structure?
- Does SUNY Delhi have a fair and standardized evaluation process for promotion, tenure, and dismissal of employees?
- Do instructors present academic information objectively, respecting diversity of opinion?

**Conclusions/Recommendations**

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Working Group 6 – Education at Delhi

Working Group 6 Objectives

Education is the foundation and the cornerstone of a college’s mission. This working group will examine the institution’s educational offerings to ensure that they are consistent with the college’s mission and institutional goals. Since SUNY Delhi is a teaching centered institution that values its student-focused approach to education, this working group will also examine the programmatic goals within each course of study to ensure that they meet the highest standards. Furthermore, in examining the institution’s programs and curricula, this working group will investigate the ability of the institution to identify student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for all of its educational offerings.

In addition, this working group will examine SUNY Delhi’s general education curriculum. Specifically, this group will examine SUNY Delhi’s general education program to ensure that it is in compliance with both Middle States and SUNY general education standards.

Lastly, this working group will examine the role that internships, certificate programs, and non-credit offerings play within the mission and institutional goals of the college.

Relevant Standards

The following standards are drawn from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education document. The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation.”

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

- The institution's educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings;
- educational offerings and academic programs congruent with our mission;
- formal undergraduate degree programs designed to foster a coherent student learning experience;
- program goals that are stated in terms of student learning outcomes;
- periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of any curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences that the institution provides its students and the utilization of evaluation results as a basis for improving its student development program and for enabling students to understand their own educational progress;
- learning resources, facilities, instructional equipment, library services, and professional library staff adequate to support the institution's educational programs;
- collaboration among faculty, professional staff, and administrators in fostering information literacy and technological competency across the curriculum;
- provision of comparable quality of teaching/instruction, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness of the institution's courses and programs regardless of the location or delivery mode;
- published and implemented policies and procedures regarding transfer credit. The consideration of transfer credit or recognition of degrees will not be determined exclusively on the basis of the
accreditation of the sending institution or the mode of delivery, but, rather, will consider course equivalencies, including expected learning outcomes, with those of the receiving institution's curricula and standards. Such criteria will be fair, consistently applied, and publicly communicated;

- policies and procedures to assure that the educational expectations, rigor, and student learning within any accelerated degree program are comparable to those that characterize more traditional program formats;
- consistent with the institution's education programs and student cohorts, practices and policies that reflect the needs of adult learners;
- course syllabi that incorporate expected student learning outcomes; and
- assessment of student learning and program outcomes relative to the goals and objectives of undergraduate programs.

Standard 12: General Education

- A program of general education sufficient in scope to enhance students' intellectual growth;
- a program of general education where the skills and abilities developed in general education are applied in the major or concentration;
- a program of general education that incorporates the study of values, ethics, diverse perspectives, and is consistent with the institution's mission;
- institutional requirements assuring that, upon degree completion, students are proficient in oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, and technological competency appropriate to the discipline; and
- general education requirements that are clearly and accurately described in the official publications and on the website of the institution.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

- Systematic procedures for identifying students who are not fully prepared for college level study;
- provision of or referral to relevant courses and support services for admitted under-prepared students;
- developmental or pre-collegiate level courses that do not carry academic degree credit;
- certificate programs, consistent with institutional mission, that have clearly articulated program goals, objectives and expectations of student learning and that are designed, approved, administered, and periodically evaluated under established institutional procedures;
- published certificate program objectives, requirements, and curricular sequence;
- certificate program learning goals consistent with national criteria, as appropriate;
- available and effective student support services;
- if courses completed within a certificate program are applicable to a degree program offered by the institution, academic oversight assures the comparability and appropriate transferability of such courses;
- credit awarded for experiential learning that is supported by evidence in the form of an evaluation of the level, quality and quantity of that learning;
- published and implemented policies and procedures defining the methods by which prior learning can be evaluated and the level and amount of credit available by evaluation;
published and implemented policies and procedures regarding the awarding of credit for prior learning that define the acceptance of such credit based on the institution's curricula and standards;

published and implemented procedures regarding the recording of evaluated prior learning by the awarding institution;

credit awarded appropriate to the subject and the degree context into which it is accepted;

evaluators of experiential learning who are knowledgeable about the subject matter and about the institution's criteria for the granting of college credit; non-credit offerings consistent with institutional mission and goals;

non-credit offerings consistent with institutional mission and goals;

clearly articulated program or course goals, objectives, and expectations of student learning that are designed, approved, administered, and periodically evaluated under established institutional procedures;

academic oversight assuring the comparability and appropriate transferability of such courses, if courses completed within a non-credit or certificate program are applicable to a degree program offered by the institution; and

periodic assessment of the impact of non-credit programs on the institution's resources (human, fiscal, physical, etc.) and its ability to fulfill its institutional mission and goals.

Historic Issues and Areas of Focus

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

uniformity in course syllabi information;

quality of academic program reviews;

future curriculum and academic program planning;

use of remedial and developmental courses;

development of new curricula and programs based on ongoing need, enrollment, and relevance to mission;

level of faculty involvement in the development of new program options;

strategy for development of new programs and elimination of ineffective ones;

implementation of water-testing laboratory- expansion/improvement of programs in the sciences; and

the development of internships related to specific curriculum and program offerings.
Research Questions

The following research questions were developed as areas of interest to the college:

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

- Are curricular and programmatic goals consistent with the college mission and institutional goals? If so, how is this congruence demonstrated?
- What is the process for developing new programs and curricula?
- How has our external accreditation process expanded? What are the criteria for seeking external accreditations?
- Are course, program, and college policies clearly and accurately described in SUNY Delhi's official publications, and on SUNY Delhi's website? What is the process to update such documentation?
- Do course syllabi clearly articulate learning objectives and outcomes?
- Regarding honors courses: Are there adequate offerings? How do they fit into the college mission? Is the process for developing these courses the same as that for traditional offerings?
- What is the process for implementing change in curricula based on suggestions from advisory councils?
- Is the implementation of new educational initiatives consistent with the college mission and institutional goals?

Standard 12: General Education

- Is the general education curriculum consistent with the institutional mission? Does the general education curriculum incorporate the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives? If so, how does it and what is the measure for accomplishing it?
- How are individual curricular and degree program goals and objectives related to core knowledge and skills (general education)?

Standard 13: (Related Educational Activities)

- How does the institution attempt to meet the educational needs of non-traditional students?
- What kinds of educational offerings are available for students not fully prepared for college level work?

Conclusions/Recommendations

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Working Group 7 – Academic Support Services

Working Group 7 Objectives

The working group will examine the degree to which the college is fulfilling its commitment to providing academic support services to Delhi student. Attention will focus on the Resnick Library, the Resnick Learning Center and Records & Registration. Specifically, the group will assess reference and instructional services, academic advisement, career-transfer-veterans services, non-matriculated students, students with disabilities, educational opportunity program, English as a second language, international students, and tutoring, as well as the math center and writing center. In addition, the Committee will assess the effectiveness of these services, including accessibility and availability of programs that are designed to meet diverse student learning needs.

Relevant Standards

The following standards are drawn from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education document. The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation.”

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

- 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;
- accurate and comprehensive information regarding academic programs including any required placement or diagnostic testing; and
- evidence that support programs and services for low-achieving students are effective in helping students to persist and to achieve learning goals and higher education outcomes.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

- A program of student support services appropriate to student strengths and needs, reflective of institutional mission, consistent with student learning expectations, and available regardless of place or method of delivery;
- qualified professionals to supervise and provide student support services and programs;
- procedures to address the varied spectrum of student academic and other needs, in a matter that is equitable, supportive, and sensitive through direct service or referral;
- appropriate student advisement procedures and processes;
- policies and procedures, developed and implemented, for safe and secure maintenance of student records; and
- analysis of support services available to students, including any distinctions among physical sites or modes of delivery and the particular support services those sites/modes require (instructional technology support, library/learning resources support, etc.); and
- ongoing assessment of student support services and the utilization of assessment results for improvement.
Standard 11: Educational Offerings

- Learning resources, facilities, instructional equipment, library services, and professional library staff adequate to support the institution's educational programs;
- collaboration among professional library staff, faculty, and administrators in fostering information literacy and technological competency skills across the curriculum;
- programs that promote student use of a variety of information and learning resources; and;
- evidence of completed analytical program reviews that address topics such as:
  - evidence of accessible reference tools to ascertain where relevant materials exist and are located;
  - assessment of information literacy outcomes, including assessment of related learner abilities.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

- Analysis of the adequacy and appropriateness of library/information and other learning resources;
- available, accessible, and adequate learning resources (such as a library or other information resources) appropriate to the offerings at a distance; and
- analysis of the adequacy of the institution's technological infrastructure to support the resource needs of distance learning activities, and consideration of how learning outcomes determine the technology being used.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

- Assessment results that provide sufficient, convincing evidence that students are achieving key institutional and program learning outcomes.

Historic Issues and Areas of Focus

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

The 2007 Periodic Review Report noted that SUNY Delhi made significant progress during improving its academic support services and improving its system for delivering the effective advising of students. Other issues and areas of focus are:

- academic jeopardy system and early warning system for at-risk students;
- institutional commitment and support to train faculty advisors;
- support services and access for the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP);
- academic tracking, and additional advisor training;
- developmental and ESL courses;
- assessment of academic support services;
- information literacy; and
- development of partnerships between faculty and staff to better serve students.
**Research Questions**

The following research questions were developed as areas of interest to the college:

- Are academic support services available and accessible to all students? How are these services assessed?
- Does the institution effectively communicate the availability of academic support services to the campus community?
- How has the impact of technology affected the services provided?
- How does the institution meet the academic support service needs of the off-campus and online student population?
- How are all students, including distance learning students, being provided with comprehensive and accurate advisement, and how is the quality of advisement assessed?
- Do the learning resources, including the Library and Resnick Learning Center, support the diverse needs of our students?
- Do faculty and staff effectively promote information literacy?
- How do academic support services contribute to retention?

**Conclusions/Recommendations**

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Working Group 8 – Non-Academic (Co-Curricular) Support Services

Working Group 8 Objectives

This working group plans to examine co-curricular or non-academic support services, to ensure alignment between those areas and the college's mission of providing academic opportunities and campus programs that yield clear thinkers and productive citizens who are prepared for service, leadership, and successful careers. These services have continually evolved with our ever changing student body. The college has added more academic programs, online degrees and new facilities over the past ten years and it is important to make sure all are still focused on the goals of the institution.

SUNY Delhi is a student centered campus that provides a safe environment that is conducive to student learning. In the examination of different areas, the following standards of excellence will be considered.

Relevant Standards

The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation” Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

- 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.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

- A program of student support services appropriate to student strengths and needs, reflective of institutional mission, consistent with student learning expectations, and available regardless of place or method of delivery;
- qualified professionals to supervise and provide student support services and programs;
- procedures to address the varied spectrum of student academic and other needs, in a manner that is equitable, supportive, and sensitive, through direct service or referral;
- if offered, athletic programs that are regulated by the same academic, fiscal, and administrative principles, norms, and procedures that govern other institutional programs;
- reasonable procedures, widely disseminated, for equitably addressing student complaints or grievances;
- policies and procedures, developed and implemented, for safe and secure maintenance of student records;
- published and implemented policies for the release of student information; and
- ongoing assessment of student support services and the utilization of assessment results for improvement.
Historic Issues and Areas of Focus

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

- support for online and off-campus education;
- efficient use of student life web pages;
- assess the effectiveness of service learning;
- need for adequate student communication;
- retention through programming;
- provide diverse student activities and programs;
- pledging policies and procedures for Greek life;
- community service;
- athletics; and
- extracurricular and recreational needs.

Research Questions

The following research questions were developed as areas of interest to the college:

- How do co-curricular services support the mission and goals of the institution, including: creating a student-centered campus and providing opportunities outside of the classroom for students to realize their potential in personal, professional, and intellectual life?
- Does the institution provide an environment conducive to student learning?
- Does the institution provide effective services to diverse populations, including: on-campus, commuter students, online and off-campus education?
- How does the institution assess the effectiveness of co-curricular program and how these programs affect retention?
- Are co-curricular programs adequate to attract and support baccalaureate students?
- How is the institution responding to rising parental involvement and expectations?
- How is the institution responding to the increased complexity of student issues and needs, and increased enrollment during a time of shrinking resources?
- Examine physical facilities and how they affect students' ability to achieve and participate.

Conclusions/Recommendations

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Working Group 9 – Admissions and Retention

Working Group 9 Objectives

The recruiting and retaining of quality students, clear thinkers, and productive citizens is central to the mission of SUNY Delhi and central to the institution’s guiding approach to student admissions and retention.

This working group will focus on examining SUNY Delhi’s admissions and retention approach of attracting and retaining quality students. This group will focus its study on the examination of information that is made available to prospective students including admissions criteria, program expectations and financial aid availability, and the institution’s ability to identify obstacles which may hinder a student from meeting educational goals and graduating in a timely manner. The use of data for programmatic development, and the use of admission and retention data for academic and student success will also be investigated.

Relevant Standards

The following standards are drawn from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education document. The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation.”

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

- Admissions policies, developed and implemented, that support and reflect the mission of the institution;
- admissions policies and criteria available to assist the prospective student in making informed decisions;
- 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;
- accurate and comprehensive information regarding academic programs, including any required placement or diagnostic testing;
- statements of expected student learning outcomes and information on institution-wide assessment results, as appropriate to the program offered, available to prospective students;
- accurate and comprehensive information, and advice where appropriate, regarding financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, and refunds;
- published and implemented policies and procedures regarding transfer credit and credit for extra-institutional college level learning; and
- ongoing assessment of student success 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.
Standard 9: Student Support Services

- A program of student support services appropriate to student strengths and needs, reflective of institutional mission, consistent with student learning expectations, and available regardless of place or method of delivery;
- procedures to address the varied spectrum of student academic and other needs, in a manner that is equitable, supportive, and sensitive, through direct service or referral;
- appropriate student advisement procedures and processes; and
- reasonable procedures, widely disseminated, for equitably addressing student complaints or grievances;

Historic Issues and Areas of Focus

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

- communication with students;
- remedial and other academic support services to students in all programs, but especially in programs with under prepared students;
- training of academic advisors;
- student scholarship support;
- student enrollment selectivity and performance;
- student retention;
- educational outcomes; and
- baccalaureate recruitment.

Research Questions

The following research questions were developed by the working groups as areas of interest to the college:

- How do the college's plans for recruitment, retention, marketing and advertising reflect its mission?
- Does the college’s enrollment plan assist in attracting and admitting quality students?
- How does faculty involvement help retention and recruitment efforts? How does faculty involvement inhibit retention and recruitment efforts?
- How are admissions criteria, including program requirements, the technical standards needed and degree requirements for each of our different programs/degrees made available to students so that the process from admission to graduation is clear, transparent and congruent?
- What is the ethnic, socioeconomic and academic profile of admitted students; how does it compare to those who graduate and how are we helping those with barriers succeed?
- How has the college’s decision to remove academic pre-programs affected retention and student success? How does the campus support students who do not meet or marginally meet the admission requirements for their requested program of study?
- How is retention data distributed to the campus and then utilized to inform admissions policies, admissions criteria, as well as in program development and improvement?
• What efforts are made to provide clear communication regarding what student support services are available and what these services provide for a student? In what ways do these services improve retention and graduation rates?

• With regard to online and off-site students: how are retention rates and student service needs assessed, analyzed, and utilized for programmatic improvement?

• In assessing recent retention rates, what are the trends, and what efforts has the institutional taken to improve student retention? How do these efforts to improve retention reflect the college’s mission and institutional goals?

• What efforts are being made to make use of social media (i.e. social networking, marketing/advertising, websites, etc.) to reach students and further assist in their academic success?

• How does student involvement, satisfaction with student support services, and co-curricular activities affect retention?

• What are the characteristics of students who withdraw prior to attaining their educational objectives?

• Do students believe the college is attentive to their needs outside the classroom?

• What impact have efforts in the following areas had on: academic support services, early warning system, academic probation, orientation, career planning, disability services, ESL services, academic advisement, EOP, counseling services, readmit procedures, living learning environment, and freshman seminar had on improving retention and assisting students in reaching their educational goals?

Conclusions/Recommendations

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Working Group 10 – Online and Off-Campus Learning

Working Group 10 Objectives

To conduct an extensive institutional self-study process of online and off-campus programs, and to determine if programs are comparable to programs offered in traditional and other institutional formats.

Relevant Standards

The following standards are drawn from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education document. The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation.”

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

“The institution's mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are used to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness” Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

“The human, financial, technical, physical facilities and other resources necessary to achieve an institution's mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution's mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution's resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment” Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

“The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students' educational goals” Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

“The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students” Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.

Standard 10: Faculty

“The institution's instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals” Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.
Standard 11: Educational Offerings

“The institution's educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings” Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

“The institution's programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards” Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education. In particular, the following areas will be addressed in detail:

- branch campuses, additional locations, and other instructional sites;
- distance or distributed learning; and
- contractual relationships and affiliated providers.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

“Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals” Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.

Historic Issues and Areas of Focus

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

- institutional resources and technologies for online educational programming;
- institutional resources and support for off-campus programs;
- development of off-campus programs and curricula consistent with its mission;
- development of online programs and curriculum consistent with its mission;
- development of partnership and articulation agreements with other institutions to support online and off-campus baccalaureate programs;
- accreditation of online programs;
- partnerships with other institutions, local health care providers, governmental agencies, and non-profit institutions to improve Delhi’s visibility and marketability;
- recruitment of online and off-campus faculty and staff;
- expansion of online curriculum and programs in nursing at the baccalaureate and masters level; and
- expansion of off-campus programs at Schenectady County Community College, Tompkins Cortland Community College, and Onondaga Community College.
Research Questions

The following research questions were developed by the working groups as areas of interest to the college:

- In its content, purposes, organization, and enrollment history, are the philosophies of online and off-campus programs congruent with the institution's role and mission?
- Is there evidence of a rationale for online and off-campus program development?
- Is SUNY Delhi's technological infrastructure adequate to support the needs of distance learning and off-campus programs?
- What are the admissions and retention strategies for online and off-campus programs, and how is the effectiveness of these strategies measured?
- Is there a well organized, accessible, adequate program of support services (admissions, financial aid, registration, advisement) and learning resources (library, tutoring) for online and off-campus students?
- What strategies and practices are implemented by the institution to involve distant students as part of an academic community?
- Is there an orientation, training, ongoing development and support program in distance education modalities that includes instructional methods and evaluation for faculty?
- How do online and off-campus faculty participate in institutional governance?
- Is orientation to technology and technological support available to online and off-campus students?
- Are the information technology requirements and policies specific to distance education clear, accurate, consistent, and accessible?
- What are the institution’s policies concerning articulation and transfer to online and off-campus programs?
- How do online and off-campus programs meet standards for quality of instruction, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness comparable to other institutional offerings?
- How are assessment activities related to distance learning integrated into the institution's broader program of assessment?
- Are students able to complete online and off-campus degree programs within a reasonable timeframe?

Conclusions/Recommendations

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Working Group 11 – Resource Allocation, Funding & Budget

Working Group 11 Objectives

Resource allocation, funding and budgeting are a critical process to ensure campus efficiency and effectiveness. Ultimately, it affects all that the institution does. Significant improvements have been made in virtually every area of budget and planning. This working group will examine the role that resource allocation, funding, and budgeting play in the day to day operation of the institution. Furthermore, this working group will investigate the ways that resource allocation, funding, and budgeting are reflected in the mission of the institution.

Relevant Standards

The following standards are drawn from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education document. The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation.”

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

- Goals and objectives or strategies, both institution-wide and for individual units that are clearly stated;
- goals and objectives or strategies, both institution-wide and for individual units that reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results, are linked to mission and goal achievement, and are used for planning and resource allocation at the institutional and unit levels;
- planning and improvement processes that are clearly communicated, provide for constituent participation, and incorporate the use of assessment results; and
- well defined decision-making processes and authority that facilitates planning and renewal.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

- Rational and consistent policies and procedures in place to determine allocation of assets;
- strategies to measure and assess the level of, and efficient utilization of, institutional resources required to support the institution’s mission and goals;
- allocation which allows for adequate faculty, staff and administration to support mission;
- financial planning and budgeting process aligned with the institution’s mission and goals. Provides both annual budget and multi-year budget projections, both institution wide and among departments utilizes planning and assessment documents; and addresses resource acquisition and allocation for the institution and any subsidiary, affiliated, or contracted educational organizations;
- comprehensive facilities master plan appropriate to mission recognition in the comprehensive plan that facilities, such as learning resources fundamental to all educational and research programs and the library, are adequately supported and staffed to accomplish the institution’s objectives for student learning, both on campuses and at a distance;
- educational and other equipment acquisition and replacement process;
- adequate institutional controls to deal with financial, administrative and auxiliary operations, and rational and consistent policies and procedures in place to determine allocation of assets;
- an annual independent audit confirming financial responsibility, with evidence of follow-up on any concerns cited in the audit’s accompanying management letter; and
- assessment of the effective and efficient use of institutional resources.

**Standard 4: Leadership and Government**

- A governing body that assists in generating resources needed to sustain and improve the institution; and
- a governing body capable of reflecting constituent and public interest and of an appropriate size to fulfill all its responsibilities, and which includes members with sufficient expertise to assure that the body’s fiduciary responsibilities can be fulfilled.

**Standard 7: Institutional Assessment**

- Written institutional (strategic) plan(s) that reflect(s) consideration of assessment results.

**Historic Issues and Areas of Focus**

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

- inter-relatedness among planning, resource allocation, budget and accounting;
- processes and contingencies for unplanned events, including mid-year cuts and unfunded mandates;
- inclusion of long-term needs in the short term allocation process;
- relationship of each area to the college's mission, goals and objectives;
- impact of SUNY and New York State on planning, resource allocation, budgeting and accounting;
- impact of SUNY budget on institutional planning, resource allocation, budget and accounting;
- effectiveness of current policies and procedures;
- review of State Operations, Dormitory Income Fund and Income Fund Reimbursable accounts;
- strategic planning as it affects planning, resource allocation, budget and accounting;
- communication and campus awareness; and
- involvement at a SUNY and State level to effect change and promote improvements.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were developed by this working group as an area of interest to the college:

- How does SUNY Delhi’s budget and planning process work?
- What sources and activities provide feedback for assessment?
- How does this feedback impact future budgets and the budgeting process?
- What gaps, if any, exist in the institutional resource allocation process?
- How does the budgetary process relate to the institution’s mission?
- How are changes in funding addressed?
- What policies and governance structures support financial planning?
- Is there transparency in the resource allocation and budgeting of all functional areas?
Is Delhi’s planning process in line with the SUNY-wide mission and planning process?
How successful has the college been in identifying donors, matching revenues, grants, and partnerships?
What controls are in place for budget oversight i.e. internal controls/audits?
In what ways can current levels of the State support impede the college's mission, goals and objectives?

**Conclusions/Recommendations**

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Working Group 12 – Assessment of Student Learning

Working Group 12 Objectives

The assessment of student learning is an integral part of how the mission of SUNY Delhi is accomplished. An examination of the "Assessment of Student Learning" should produce information that shows how expected student learning outcomes are clearly stated at all levels and are tied to the mission of the program and of the college; that the assessment process provides evidence of student learning; that assessment results are shared with the appropriate constituents and used to improve teaching and learning; and that assessment results are used for institutional improvement.

Relevant Standards

The following standards are drawn from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education document. The standards below “affirm that the individual mission and goals of each institution remain the context within which these accreditation standards are applied during self-study and evaluation.”

Standard 12: General Education

- Assessment of general education outcomes within the institution's overall plan for assessing student learning, and evidence that such assessment results are utilized for curricular improvement.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

- Clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes at all levels (institution, degree/program, course) for all programs that aim to foster student learning and development, that are: appropriately integrated with one another, consonant with the institution's mission, and consonant with the standards of higher education and of the relevant disciplines;
- A documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning that meets the following criteria:
  - Systemic, 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;
    - Are of sufficient quality that results can be used with confidence to inform decisions; and
    - Include direct evidence of student learning;
  - Support and collaboration of faculty and administration;
  - Clear, realistic guidelines and timetable, supported by appropriate investment of institutional resources;
  - Sufficient simplicity, practicality, detail, and ownership to be sustainable;
  - Periodic evaluation of the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the institution's student learning assessment processes;
- Assessment results that provide sufficient, convincing evidence that students are achieving key institutional and program learning outcomes;
evidence that student learning assessment information is shared and discussed with appropriate constituents and is used to improve teaching and learning; and
documented use of student learning assessment information as part of institutional assessment.

**Historic Issues and Areas of Focus**

The themes that resulted from the 2001 Institutional Self-Study, the 2001 Middle States Recommendations, the Memorandum of Understanding, the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, and the Student Opinion Survey that pertain to this working group are as follows, and should be addressed in the 2011/2012 Institutional Self-Study:

- responsibility for assessment. The Provost is in charge of retention and general education assessment, while appropriate deans are in charge of assessment of the major;
- assessment of student learning outcomes;
- review of unit assessments by the President's Cabinet;
- availability of course syllabi, learning expectations, expected student learning outcomes, and assessment techniques;
- student learning outcomes are published in the college catalog and via online course syllabi;
- measurable course objectives and course content detail; and
- impact of the use of technology in the academic program review.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were developed by as areas of interest to the college:

- What is the relationship between course objectives, program objectives, and institutional goals and mission?
- What is the evidence that SUNY Delhi’s curriculum and academic programs are meeting stated goals and objectives?
- How are assessment results used to improve courses and programs, develop goals and plans (at both the program level and institution level), and make resource allocations?
- What is the evidence that SUNY Delhi’s general education courses are meeting stated goals and objectives (i.e., oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning)? How are those results utilized for general education, program, and institutional improvement?
- How effective is the current method of distributing assessment results to faculty, staff, and administrative personnel who are responsible for improving teaching and learning?
- What are the goals of SUNY Delhi's developmental courses in mathematics and English? How is the effectiveness of these courses assessed?
- How may SUNY Delhi's methods for general education assessment change in light of SUNY’s amended general education program?
- How successful are SUNY Delhi students upon transfer to another institution?

**Conclusions/Recommendations**

Each working group is expected to produce analytical and objective reports pertaining to its area of study. Based on these reports and conclusions, recommendations on how the college can better accomplish its mission and objectives in relation to the area of study should be explored.
Process, Reports, and Evaluation

Document Submission and Organization

During the research and data-collection process, working groups will be required to submit all organized data to the data analyzers for inventorying and repository purposes. The data will be housed electronically on Confluence, as well as printed and cataloged for the documents room in the library. This data will be kept in a master spreadsheet for ease of access by standard, either electronically or in print.

Working Groups will also be expected to update a research gaps page on Confluence where any gaps in data can be documented and brought to the appropriate departments to address. As the gap is addressed, its status will be updated on the gaps page.

Editing Style and Format of Reports

Reports to the campus and Middle States should follow SUNY Delhi’s established Graphics Standards. The following guidelines have been established, and every attempt to adhere to the graphics standards was made. A template with the established guidelines was created in Word, and attached to Confluence for all members of the self-study to access.

- Fonts
  - Paragraph / Body Font: Garamond 12 point font
  - Title: Garamond 24 point font
  - Sub-Title: Garamond, All caps, 12 point font
  - Heading I [Chapter Headings]: Impact, 28 point font
  - Heading II [Chapter Sub-Title and In-Chapter Heading]: Garamond, Bold, 14 point font
  - Heading III [In-Chapter Sub-Heading]: Impact, 12 point font
  - Heading IV [In-Chapter Smaller Sub-Heading]: Garamond, Bold 12 point font
  - Bullets: Square filled, smaller no-fill square, and smaller filled square
  - Header: Garamond, 8 point font; all caps, left justified.

- Paragraph & Pagination
  - Single-Spaced
  - No indent
  - Page Numbering: Footer, Center, Garamond 12 point font
  - Left Justified
  - No hyphenation at the end of lines
  - References in MLA style

- Page Setup
  - Portrait, 8.5 x 11" Paper
  - Gutter Margins (for binding)
  - Top & Bottom: 1"
  - Left: 1.5"
## Working Group Standard Responsibility

Due to the complexity of the working group structures and concerns regarding overlap, the following “crosswalk” has been created to map out the *Standards of Excellence* that each working group is responsible for. Below represents a list of the working groups responsible for the full coverage of each of the *Standards of Excellence*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Working Group(s) Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Standard 1: Mission and Goals | Working Group 1: Our Mission and Planning for the Future (mission and goals)  
Working Group 2: Institutional Assessment (assessment of mission) |
Working Group 2: Institutional Assessment (assessment, accountability, and documentation of planning and goals)  
Working Group 11: Resource Allocation, Funding & Budget (planning and institutional improvement) |
| Standard 3: Institutional Resources | Working Group 3: Physical Plant (infrastructure, facilities master plan, equipment)  
Working Group 11: Resource Allocation, Funding & Budget (budgeting, operations, financial planning, and resource allocation) |
| Standard 4: Leadership and Governance | Working Group 5: Integrity, Leadership, and Governance |
| Standard 5: Administration | Working Group 4: Human Resources |
| Standard 6: Integrity | Working Group 5: Integrity, Leadership, and Governance |
| Standard 7: Institutional Assessment | Working Group 2: Institutional Assessment (institutional effectiveness, and strategies for implementation of assessment results) |
| Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention | Working Group 7: Academic Support Services (related to retention)  
Working Group 9: Admissions and Retention (policies and dissemination of information) |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Standard 9: Student Support Services       | Working Group 7: Academic Support Services (support related to academic learning: library, learning center, tutoring)  
Working Group 8: Non-Academic (Co-Curricular) Support Services (support related to non-academic services: counseling, athletics, student activities, and residence life)  
Working Group 9: Admissions and Retention (services that cater to student strengths and needs, and procedure for student complaints and grievances) |
| Standard 10: Faculty                       | Working Group 4: Human Resources |
| Standard 11: Educational Offerings         | Working Group 6: Education at Delhi (educational programming, and offerings congruent with mission, academic content and rigor)  
Working Group 7: Academic Support Services (research and information literacy) |
| Standard 12: General Education             | Working Group 6: Education at Delhi (development and measurement of general education skills, and educational offerings consistent with mission)  
Working Group 12: Assessment of Student Learning (assessment of general education outcomes, and use of assessment results for curricular improvement) |
| Standard 13: Related Educational Activities| Working Group 6: Education at Delhi (certificate programs, basic skills, experiential learning, and non-credit offerings)  
Working Group 10: Online and Off-Campus Learning (branch campuses, additional locations, and other instructional sites) |
| Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning| Working Group 12: Assessment of Student Learning |
Writing and Editing of the Working Group Reports

Working groups should begin the process of writing and editing their final reports during the Fall 2010 semester. Final working group reports must be submitted to the Steering Committee no later than Monday, November 1, 2010. Final Reports should cover all aspects of each working group’s charge, including the relevant Standards of Excellence, the historic issues and areas of focus, the research questions, and the conclusions and recommendations of the group.

Working groups should be aware that the language and format of the report may be modified for the final institutional self-study report. Please note that since Middle States requires the final self-study report to be no longer than 100 pages (without appendices), it is recommended that each working group report be around 15 pages. Working Group reports can be in either narrative or in bullet form, but coverage, analysis, recommendations, and the bibliography of resources used for the section should be separated by the relevant Standard of Excellence. It is the responsibility of the working group to ensure that all referred data and supporting documents are included in the bibliography of each section, and attached as appendices where needed.

Writing and Editing of the Institutional Self-Study Report

Following the submission of working group drafts to the Steering Committee, a team of five to eight selected writers, editors, and data analyzers will begin the process of creating a draft of the institutional self-study report in Winter/Spring 2011. The institutional self-study report will be mostly narrative, but heavily analytical and objective.

Data analyzers will examine the information used in the working group reports, and cross reference all information for accuracy and validity. Data analyzers will also be responsible for ensuring that all information used in the report is inventoried electronically and in the documents repository for ease of access.

A team of writers will be responsible for compiling the twelve working group reports into the six chapters listed below. The themes present in each chapter reflect the structure of two or three working group charges, except for the chapter on the online and off-campus special emphasis topic, which will have its own chapter, with supplemental information from the other working groups with relevant information.

A first draft of the institutional self-study is expected to be given to the campus for review and discussion before the end of the Spring 2011 semester. After meetings and town halls during the summer faculty/staff workshop sessions, the writers and editors will begin the process of creating a second draft to submit to the campus for review by the middle of the Fall 2011 semester. After further meetings and town halls, the writers and editors will then create the final draft of the institutional self-study report to be submitted to Middle States over the Winter 2011/2012 break.

Organization of the Self-Study Report

Introduction

- Executive Summary and Eligibility Certification Statement
- Institutional Overview
- Self-study Process
Inventory of Characteristics per Chapter

Chapter 1 – Mission, Planning, and Creating a Vision for the Future
- Reports from working groups 1 and 2
- Standards 1, 2, 7
- Introduction of topic, relevant standards, areas of focus, and related issues
- Analysis and assessment
- Recommendations for improvement
- Conclusion: recap of strengths and challenges with recommendations

Chapter 2 – Education at Delhi: Creating Clear Thinkers and Productive Citizens
- Reports from working groups 6 and 12
- Standards 11, 12, 13, 14
- Introduction of topic, relevant standards, areas of focus, and related issues
- Analysis and assessment
- Recommendations for improvement
- Conclusion: recap of strengths and challenges with recommendations

Chapter 3 – The Seeking and Keeping of Well-Rounded Students: Support Services, Admissions, and Retention
- Reports from working groups 7, 8, and 9
- Standards 8, 9, 13
- Introduction of topic, relevant standards, areas of focus, and related issues
- Analysis and assessment
- Recommendations for improvement
- Conclusion: recap of strengths and challenges with recommendations

Chapter 4 – The People that Build a Responsible Campus Community
- Reports from working groups 4 and 5
- Standards 4, 5, 6, 10
- Introduction of topic, relevant standards, areas of focus, and related issues
- Analysis and assessment
- Recommendations for improvement
- Conclusion: recap of strengths and challenges with recommendations

Chapter 5 – Institutional Resources: The Facilities and Budget that Keep the Campus Running
- Reports from working groups 3 and 11
- Standards 2, 3, 9
- Introduction of topic, relevant standards, areas of focus, and related issues
- Analysis and assessment
- Recommendations for improvement
- Conclusion: recap of strengths and challenges with recommendations
Chapter 6 – Strategic Growth: Online and Off Campus Education

- Report from working group 10 with some data from relevant groups
- Special Topic with emphasis on Standards 9 and 13
- Introduction of topic, relevant standards, areas of focus, and related issues
- Analysis and assessment
- Recommendations for improvement
- Conclusion: recap of strengths and challenges with recommendations

Conclusion – Changes for the Next 5-10 Years

- Summary of SUNY Delhi strengths, challenges, and recommendations
- Emerging themes and patterns
- Guidance for strategic planning

Appendices and Supporting Documents

- Table of contents for documents and reports

Suggestions for the Composition of SUNY Delhi’s Evaluation Team

After requesting the input of the campus community, the Steering Committee recommends representation from the following perspectives on the 2011/2012 Middle States Evaluation Team:

- team members from small (0-5000 FTE) residential colleges that use economies of scale to maintain sustainable growth;
- team members with comparable flagship programs: nursing, veterinary science, culinary arts, hospitality, golf course management;
- team members from residential colleges that offer a full array of long-standing campus life services;
- team members familiar with publicly financed systems of higher education;
- team members from two and four year colleges that award different levels of degrees (e.g. certificates, associate, and baccalaureate); and
- team members with experience developing and implementing successful online and off-campus programs for two and four year programs.

Evaluation Team Preparation

In preparation for the evaluation team chair’s preliminary visit and the team visit, the Steering Committee will create a team to organize and publicize the events in early Spring 2011, after the evaluation team chair has been selected and visitation days have been finalized. This team will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation team and chair have all that they require to have a fruitful visit to the campus. The team will make hotel and campus reservations for events, provide catering when needed, and publicize campus events.
Inventory of Supporting Documents

Documents Preparation and Repository

In the past, documents on campus have not been stored in any single repository. However, in light of the large amount of documents that are being used for the institutional self-study, along with the different locations and formats in which they have been previously stored, the campus created an online repository for the Middle States self-study process. This repository will organize campus documents by the Standards of Excellence that it supports, and the functional area that they correspond to. This repository will also link to electronic copies of the documents which will be stored either on Delhi’s wiki, Confluence, or on the campus website. Print versions of each document will also be created and cataloged in the Library Archives room.

In order to organize the campus’s data, the President’s Cabinet has been charged with identifying and cataloging all the documents and reports they oversee. As working groups discover data, they will be added to the repository to be cataloged and linked. In the process of organizing the campus’s documents, it is anticipated that gaps will be discovered. A gaps action list has been created to handle all gaps in information. As working groups discover areas that are lacking information, they will be added to the list, and then passed on to the appropriate functional areas to be addressed.

Middle States Documents and SUNY Delhi Middle States Reports


—. "Evaluating Institutional Student Learning Assessment Processes." Middle States Commission on Higher Education.


**SUNY Delhi Institutional Publications and Reports**


—. *Annual Report*. Delhi, NY: State University of New York at Delhi, current 5 years.

—. "College Catalog." 1 February 2009. [State University of New York at Delhi.](http://www.delhi.edu/academics/catalog_09/). 20 January 2010


—. "Faculty & Staff Handbook." 2009. SUNY Delhi: Human Resources. 20 January 2010


—. "Internal Control Program." 2009. SUNY Delhi: Business and Finance. 20 January 2010
   <http://www.delhi.edu/administration/finance/internal_control/docs/Web Version 2009 Internal Control Program.doc>.


—. Student Data File. Submitted for SUNY. Delhi, NY: State University of New York at Delhi, ongoing by semester.


—. SUNY Delhi: College Mission Statement. 3 August 2008. 20 January 2010

—. SUNY Delhi: Organizational Chart. January 2010. 20 January 2010

—. SUNY Delhi: President's Program of Work. 16 June 2009. 20 January 2010
   <http://www.delhi.edu/administration/president/programofwork.php>.


—. "General Education Assessment Plan." 2002. SUNY Delhi: General Education. 20 January 2010


—. Provost Updates. Delhi, NY: State University of New York at Delhi, 2008- .
—. Provost's Annual Summary of Assessment Report, Delhi, NY: State University of New York at Delhi, current 5 years.


**SUNY Delhi Department Reports and Data**

State University of New York at Delhi: Athletics Department. Athletic Overview, Submitted for athlete GPA and retention. Delhi, NY: State University of New York at Delhi, n.d.


State University of New York at Delhi: College Foundation. CADI Audit Reports, Delhi, NY: State University of New York at Delhi, 2009.


State University of New York at Delhi: Resnick Learning Center. Academic Advisement Annual Survey Results. Delhi, NY: State University of New York at Delhi, 2000-.


New York State, SUNY, and Union Resources


External Research and Data


