Chapter 4. Leadership, Governance, & Administration
(Standards 4 and 5)

Overview of Charge

The College-Institute's four-campus structure informs both governance and administration in both functional and conceptual ways, with multiple layers and interwoven realms of responsibility. As such, the working group charged with Standards 4 and 5 organized its tasks on the basis of the evidence, including, for example, Board manuals, meeting minutes, the 2009 and 2012 Board Surveys, and a student survey.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

Discussion of Research Question and Compliance

Research Question 4.1

> *To what extent are the distinct roles and responsibilities of each constituent group within arenas of shared governance understood and accepted by those involved? To what extent are existing structures utilized for decision-making, and to what extent are structures circumvented?*

Though not undertaken as a strategic plan, the New Way Forward Plan has emerged from the crisis of 2008-09 as the governing plan for financial sustainability, complete with benchmarks in periodic NWF Updates (see also Chapter 3). This plan inevitably has shaped many aspects of shared governance. Appropriately, the president and the chair of the Board of Governors have been the primary parties in shepherding the NWF on its five-year course. The regular president's reports recorded in the Board of Governors Minutes stress works in progress and ones completed that speak to the mission of the College-Institute, always in both directions: to the governors and to the community stakeholders as a whole. This communication has succeeded in representing the evolving, near-term situation with clarity, reliability, and context. The success of the plan as a financial guide is well represented in the NWF Pro Forma projections.

At the national level, the deans, VPs, and president collaborate with the governors, directly or indirectly, to keep on track with institutional goals. The president, VPs, and deans meet as a President's Cabinet weekly to confer about all of the College-Institute concerns, with NWF and related matters always present, though not always in the forefront. Deans and program directors report mission-driven activities, including growth in programs, newly funded programs, and student scholarships. In these meetings, the president always reports on ongoing discussions with the Board of Governors, and the sessions therefore serve as the primary vehicle for aligning the administration and the Board of Governors. Because sensitive personnel issues are often discussed at these meetings, minutes are not kept. However, see the President's Cabinet Call Agendas (09/2011-06/2012) for the major topics.

At the local level, directors of various programs on each campus regularly report to their deans. To various degrees, school directors avail themselves of formal and informal opportunities to keep members of both the Board of Governors and the local Boards of Overseers informed about their respective program needs and accomplishments. The mission of the Boards of Overseers, as articulated in the Board of Overseers Manuals from CN, LA, and NY is to

promote and provide support (financial and otherwise) for programs, promote student services and activities, promote faculty welfare, endorse HUC-JIR's mission, and serve as its ambassadors in the local and regional communities.

More challenging is the need to connect the Boards of Overseers and Board of Governors to the students (S4_03). The Board of Governors minutes document student reports from 2009 and 2011 that indicate a desire for more transparency on the part of the Board. As a result, the Governance Task Force (GTF) implemented specific and well-received initiatives to increase the direct engagement between governors and overseers on the one hand and students on the other (see Governance Committee Materials). In addition to student reports at Board of Governors meetings (a well-established agenda item), the GTF initiated a Board luncheon with students to familiarize Board members with students, their needs, and their interests, as well as to engage in substantive conversation with students, in small groups, around questions of their expectations as both students and future professionals. These initiatives address the students' expressed interest in expanding their opportunities "for student input regarding decisions that affect them" as identified in the fundamental elements of Leadership and Governance. The Board also has a long-standing Student Welfare Committee, which has met with students on each campus at the time of the Board meeting and addressed their concerns. The Committee has brought matters to the Board that needed attention. Even with selected students now reporting directly to the Board, the Student Welfare meetings on each campus remain important. Additional evidence for the College-Institute's extensive compliance with element S4_03 can be found in Chapters 2, 5, 7, and 8.

The 2009 Board Survey showed that many members of the Board of Governors from all constituencies were unclear about their roles and responsibilities, that they did not feel well oriented to their work on the Board or well educated prior to being asked to make decisions, that communication with Board members needed improvement, that Board members did not feel included in the strategic planning process and that once the strategic plan was completed (in 2006) it had been filed away and was not implemented consistently.

After almost two years of work, the GTF created a plan for Board orientation, education, development, structure, communication, and ongoing self-evaluation that includes the review of roles and responsibilities of constituent groups (see Governance Task Force Report of the Board Orientation and Education Subcommittee and Chapter 2). In February 2012 a standing Governance Committee of the Board was established and charged with continuing and implementing the work of the GTF. The Resolution on Governance, passed in June, 2012, included the assignment of a professional staff liaison to serve on the standing Governance Committee. Recently, the 2012 Board Survey found the governors to be much more knowledgeable. However, there were still areas needing improvement, especially their knowledge of MSCHE accreditation requirements and the use of assessment results in decision-making.

The Board of Governors Manual clearly spells out the mission statement and purpose for the legally invested governance of the Board of Governors, the "ultimate responsibility for the operations and activities of HUC-JIR." Its Regulations establish the basic structure and powers of the Board, its members, and its committees. The committees are structured to cover every aspect of life and activity at the College-Institute. To the extent that the Board of Governors members read and understand this manual, they are well informed about their roles and responsibilities. The Board of Governors Manual also delineates the role of the four Boards of Overseers. The NY Board of Overseers Manual includes the Mission Statement and Regulations of the Board of Governors, so that local overseers are aware of their role vis-à-vis the entire system of governance. The NY Board of Overseers has its own clearly framed

Mission Statement, to promote and strengthen the educational, religious, and organizational aspects of the College-Institute, as well as the well-being of, and advocacy for, the New York School.

In contrast to the central role of the Board of Governors, the role of the Boards of Overseers has been less clear. For example, the LA Board of Overseers Manual delineates the differences between the national Board of Governors and the Los Angeles Board of Overseers in the following way:

> The Board of Overseers shall concern itself with the aid and support of the College-Institute and the management of the Los Angeles School, subject, in all cases to the control of the Board of Governors, and shall have such power and authority as shall from time to time be delegated to it by the Chair of the Board of Governors, the Board of Governors, or the President of the College-Institute in conformance with his/her authority as set forth in section 3(a) of Article V of the Regulations of the College-Institute.

While this makes the division of labor between the two groups clear, the type of "aid and support" that overseers are expected to give is not spelled out explicitly.

The overseers meet at least two to four times a year. The NY Board of Overseers Manual specifies the number of overseers and their terms of office. There are 25 overseers (9 of whom are also governors) with each having a 3-year term so that approximately one-third of the terms end per year. However, it does not say if members can be re-elected after their terms are over. It does offer the option of emeritus appointments:

> Overseers whose term has ended but who have offered exceptional service are eligible for emeritus status, which they enjoy as long as they continue to contribute.

Again, it does not spell out what "contributing" entails, which perhaps best encapsulates the sometimes equivocal role of the Boards of Overseers in contrast to that of the Board of Governors. Nevertheless, insofar as the Boards of Overseers do not exercise any fiduciary responsibilities, this indeterminacy need not pose a problem. All of the campuses rely on their respective overseers for essential contributions, be they in dollars, time, or wisdom.

Additional Findings Related to Compliance with Standard 4

At first glance, the governance and administration of HUC-JIR function in similarly federal structures, with a national body and local bodies for each. National offices, spread out among the various campuses, interact with the campus administrations along clear organizational lines. However, governance does not trickle down from national to local in the same fashion. The HUC-JIR Regulations define the College-Institute's collegial system of governance (fulfilling S4_01). Thus, they prescribe:

> The Board of Governors has final authority in all matters affecting the College-Institute. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Faculty, working in concert, has [sic] primary responsibility for policy in all academic areas, including academic standards, curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.

The Regulations also clearly delineate governance structure, assign authority and provide for Board member selection, and preclude the Board from being chaired by the chief executive officer (fulfilling S4_02 and S4_05), whose duties to the institution are carefully spelled out (S4_11). As they indicate, the fiduciary responsibilities of governance lie solely with the Board of Governors, whereas the local Boards of Overseers have no such responsibility, despite their

crucial role as advisors and supporters on their respective campuses. Therefore governance, strictly speaking, does not function federally. Nevertheless, governors frequently participate in their local Board of Overseers (the chairs of which are also governors), and overseers have opportunities to interact with governors during Board of Governors meetings. Thus, the local-national dynamic is at the heart of the administrative and governance life of the College-Institute, even if it plays out somewhat differently in the two contexts. These local-national relationships loom in the background, even if they do not emerge specifically, and they give shape to both the culture and the workings of HUC-JIR. In this context, documents such as the articles of incorporation of HUC in OH, JIR in NY and the merger information have not ceased to have cultural impact on current structures, authority, and Board member selection. Further efforts could be made to make the role of the Boards more transparent to students and other community constituents. This could be easily accomplished by making the Regulations accessible on the HUC-JIR website with links to it in the faculty, personnel, and student handbooks.

A major accomplishment that led to this report was the application for single accreditation by MSCHE that was submitted by the president on behalf of the Board of Governors on August 2, 2010 (see the fuller account in Chapter 1). The acceptance of this letter along with the Complex Substantive Change Proposal has enormously facilitated College-Institute's compliance with S4_06. Before, four campuses submitted three self-studies to three different regional accrediting agencies. HUC-JIR followed up its acceptance by MSCHE with letters of resignation from the other two regional agencies. The simplified structure was in part enabled by the creation in 2009 of the national Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. When the assistance of this office is combined with the simplified structure, keeping the College-Institute up-to-date with all of its reports to MSCHE and other governmental agencies requires substantially less resources.

The Board of Governors Manual clearly specifies on page 15 the responsibilities of governors in generating resources needed to sustain and improve the institution (S4_08). The Board recently updated its conflict of interest policy, which clearly complies with S4_07 in all of its details. The results of the 2009 Governance Survey and Responses made clear that, although the governance structure itself posed no major problems, the standing committees needed some reconfiguration to meet the current needs of the College-Institute. These needs precipitated the Governance Task Force. The GTF has initiated, to date, two crucial processes. First, they recommended, in February 2011, that the Board of Governors institute a standing committee on governance, which the Board duly resolved to do. Second, in June, 2012, the Board of Governors amended its Regulations; it clarified the distribution of responsibilities by breaking down the committee structure along different lines. Under Article VI (Committees), the former Nominating and Governance Committee will now be broken out into two committees. These new, more narrowly defined committees obviously attend to the precise concerns of this element, but critically, they also represent a consciousness on the part of the Board of Governors that the committees need to represent both the state of affairs and the desired direction of the Board of Governors, both of which shift with time. These latest amendments, therefore, also include two new committees to reflect those shifts in attention: Communications and Israel.

Perhaps most saliently, the College-Institute has taken aggressive steps to comply with the requirement to establish "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…." In this regard, the primary work in filling the gap came by way of compliance with the financial, assessment, and governance issues that led to the 2009 Focused Visit mandated by the NCAHLC, when each campus was accredited by its local accrediting body. At that time the College-Institute established an Office of Institutional Research and Assessment at

the forefront of all of the assessment and accreditation processes (see Chapter 8). It has served not only to consolidate the College-Institute's efforts and its idiom of assessment and accreditation but also to initiate new, standard processes for academic program assessment, at the very heart of the institution's mission.

As part of the larger discussion surrounding the GTF, the College-Institute addressed the ongoing need to orient incoming governors (S4_09, see Board of Governors Orientation Plan and Governance Task Force Report of the Board Orientation and Education Subcommittee). An orientation for new governors, under the new plan, was held at the October, 2012 Board meeting. While there is ample documentation established in the Board of Governors Manual, the pending questions concern in-person orientation and updating of the manual. There are significant information updates relevant to decision-making on an annual basis. These include, but are not limited to, (1) turnover in offices due to promotions, hires, and departures, (2) additions or terminations of programs, (3) changes in enrollments, (4) changes in endowment and financial status, (5) changes in policies and Regulations, and (6) changes in Board membership and committee rosters. Instead of requiring Board members to shuffle pages on an annual basis, the manual might use website links to the relevant information and supplement the paper versions of the manuals with pdf's that include those links. Consequently, the College-Institute complies with this fundamental element and is also taking steps to improve its implementation.

In the meantime, major strides have been taken in relation to expanding Board engagement and information. Since the adoption of the GTF recommendations, regular email communication to the members conveys the minutes of Executive Committee meetings, shared with the overseers as well. Moreover, the Board of Governors meetings now include formal, routinized opportunities for overseers to interact with governors, both as a means to community- and leadership-building and as an opportunity to expand the governance discussion, even if more informal and not binding.

Finally, the College-Institute is taking active steps to establish periodic assessment of institutional leadership. A comprehensive self-assessment survey of the Board was conducted in 2009, and analyzed and documented for the 2009 Focused Visit Report to the NCAHLC. Subsequently, the work of the GTF, the initial acceptance of its recommendations, and the institution of a standing Committee on Governance have created the vehicle for this assessment. A comparative and embellished Board of Governors Survey 2012 was distributed in August 2012 with the results summarized in time for the October, 2012 meeting. These steps provide strong support for S4_10 and the governance portion of S4_12 (support for the leadership portion of S4_12 is noted below in the discussion of Standard 5).

Standard 5: Administration

Discussion of Research Questions and Compliance

Research Question 5.1

> *In what ways and for what reasons have staffing patterns and reporting lines been changed within the past five years? How appropriate were those changes?*

This question addresses the issues related to S5_04 and shows that the College-Institute has fulfilled this element. The discussion provides details for further improvements to be made in the near term.

The NWF plan for financial sustainability was adopted in the wake of the economic crisis of 2008-09. Through it, the College-Institute has taken steps to strike a balance between fiscal responsibility and functionality in four departments: operations, finance, recruitment and admissions, and institutional advancement. In the first instance, the College-Institute chose not to replace the outgoing chief operating officer in 2011, choosing instead to redistribute his former duties among the remaining Offices of Finance and Administration, Academic Affairs, and Institutional Advancement (with the promotion of the VPFA, all three offices are now led by vice presidents). This cost-cutting measure has proven feasible, but a stretch on human resources. The College-Institute did materially alleviate this stress by recruiting a National Director for Human Resources, who reports to the VPFA. Even more aggressively, the hire of a new VPIA provided an opportunity to increase the College-Institute's development staff to include a researcher, a regional director in Cincinnati, and a replacement for a regional director in Los Angeles who became assistant VP for Major Gifts. These investments have proven prescient in assuring the success of the current comprehensive campaign, which is proceeding apace, as documented in the Board of Governors Minutes for 2012. In a separate category is recruitment and admissions, under the auspices of the VPAA. The NWF stipulated rather drastic cuts in this department, leaving only a national director, who happened to reside in Los Angeles, and a regional director in Jerusalem. A very slow recruitment year in 2011 prompted reconsideration of the cuts and ultimately caused the College-Institute to re-invest in regional directors. All of these investments have demanded heavy budgetary commitments at a time when the College-Institute continued to experience the pressures of a weak economy. However, a $5.2-million dollar grant from the Jewish Foundation of Cincinnati is helping to defray costs for a new National Director of Recruitment and Admissions to be located in Cincinnati. Thus, the administration and governors have collaborated successfully to isolate these problems and solve them within the context of rigorous standards for financial sustainability.

At the level of the VPs, the above-mentioned changes since the NWF implementation have had the broadest effects in the system. As a result of them, for example, the VPAA currently bears the weight of a notably large brief, beyond the strict scope of academic affairs, including the OIRA, recruitment and admissions, and information technology. Despite the fact that this consolidation may have been necessary and despite the VPAA's widely hailed success in managing it, this organization bears consideration as a long-range priority for investment in an additional VP or in reconsidering the distribution of responsibilities and resources allotted, pending budgetary opportunity. In many ways, this particular staffing concern reflects the very heart of the federalism of the College-Institute. In truth, the breadth of both the mission and geographical dispersion is out of proportion to the College-Institute's size, which is a structural challenge that stretches resources. The staffing of the VPs, a major investment, is symptomatic of that structural challenge. Through the NWF the College-Institute unflinchingly confronted this breadth of mission and geography, and affirmed the simple fact that the mission requires the College-Institute to retain the four-campus structure. So, this self-study seeks to acknowledge and work through this structural challenge, while affirming the validity of the demands behind it.

Another significant staffing change occurred in May, 2012, with the appointment of the Director of the Rhea Hirsch School of Education to become the senior National Director of the Schools of Education. This appointment was the culmination of at least five years of deliberations, first initiated by the former VPAA. The purpose of these deliberations was to align the education programs going forward now on each of the three state-side campuses, so that students in each program were offered comparable courses and required to submit comparable capstone projects. The process of decision-making accelerated as a result of the College-Institute's receipt of a multi-year multi-million-dollar grant from the Jim Joseph Foundation. Tenure-track education faculty members at all locations and the directors of the programs in New York and

Los Angeles met face-to-face twice over this period and by video-conference three or four additional times.

As a result of these meetings, and the preparatory work done between them, faculty members reviewed the courses of study leading to the masters' degree in education in Los Angeles, in New York, and in Cincinnati (the latter, which began this year, is joined to and credentialed by the MARE program in NY). Where differences were found between the programs, decisions were made as to which option (or combination of options) led to more rigorous and high-level learning. The new position of National Director of the Schools of Education ensures that all of the decisions will be implemented (many have already taken effect), and that the three degrees will remain fully aligned.

The new national education director's position represents a successful approach to managing and leveraging the strengths of the federal nature of the administration. When programs span campuses, as almost every one of them does (be it between the States and Jerusalem or among stateside campuses), each one requires its own solution to curricular and programmatic administration. This obligation does and will continue to apply to the College-Institute's expanding number of executive and certificate programs (Cantorial, Education, and Jewish Nonprofit Management), which have, thus far, also successfully remained under the purview of the directorship of the local schools out of which they grew (NY for Cantorial, LA for Jewish Nonprofit Management, and both LA and NY for Education).

Research Question 5.2

> *In what ways do administrative structures facilitate learning and how do students and faculty perceive the effectiveness of that facilitation?*

This question directly addresses the single aspect of element S5_05 that is of the highest concern to the fulfillment of the College-Institute's mission, student learning. Other aspects of this element are addressed in the discussion below and in the compliance section that follows.

At the national level, the College-Institute administration has pursued a number of important policies that impinge directly on student learning. One key element from the perspective of the NWF is the commitment to fund scholarships. Depending on a number of variables, scholarships may or may not relieve budgetary pressures. When they do not do so, they do, of course, relieve financial pressures on the students in question, furthering the College-Institute's educational mission. The pursuit of new student scholarships will facilitate student life and, in as many cases as possible, will also strengthen program initiatives, such as the Executive MA in Jewish Education, Cantorial Certificate, and the Certificate in Jewish Education for Adolescent and Emerging Adults.

Also centered nationally and characteristic of the federal structure of the College-Institute is the VPAA's study of faculty distribution among the various campuses and investigation into how the faculty can better be deployed and, prospectively, hired to serve students and curricula on the different campuses. The result has been a plan, worked out in close consultation with the deans, to strike a sustainable balance of full-time faculty on all campuses, taking into consideration curricular demands and the possibility for distance learning (a signature goal of the NWF). The newly reconstituted Faculty Council, together with the VPAA, assesses academic needs, all of which are at the heart of this calculation of faculty distribution and hires.

The stateside campuses all have administrative mechanisms to address concerns of student learning. The names of the committees differ, as do their purviews, but they all ensure that the administration of the College-Institute is successfully deployed for the educational mission.

The convening body in Los Angeles is called the Executive Committee on Academic and Student Affairs (ECASA), constituted by: school directors (RHSOE, Louchheim School of Judaic Studies, Rabbinical School, Magnin School of Graduate Studies, and SJNM), faculty chair, dean, and chaired by the associate dean. ECASA sets the campus agenda, convenes the campus administration, sets local policy, and generally concerns itself with matters bridging schools or beyond the purview of faculty and student governance. The LA Executive Committee on Academic and Student Affairs Minutes document that ECASA has ample opportunity to promote student learning, be it indirectly or directly. In Nov. 2010, the group discussed the teaching loads of faculty members and their schools in relation to curricular needs and, crucially, the particular attention given to advising. In the same meeting, the group discussed the policy of program assessment, including extra-curricular programs, as part of the larger goal of student learning. In March, 2011, the group discussed the attendance policy and explicitly queried that of the faculty, as well as that of the students, in terms of course continuity and professional modeling. ECASA deals, in sum, with the full range of issues that connect policy-makers to the ultimate goal of the College-Institute, namely, to teach.

In New York, the Curriculum Committee more explicitly melds the faculty purview with that of administration, with the connection to students explicit in its title. The committee, however, does not merely set curriculum policy in relation to the requirements and nature of requirement-fulfillment. In more engaged fashion, it developed a survey to assess the value of the fifth-year rabbinic thesis, the capstone of the rabbinic program. This can be found in NY Curriculum Committee Documentation. It sent the survey not only to current fifth-year students but also to recent rabbinic alumni of the New York school. With questions such as "Did preparation of a thesis provide you with an opportunity to appreciate and apply skills and knowledge you gained over your years at HUC?" the committee tried to get at the summative and formative value of such a capstone. Though the survey has not been repeated annually, it represents the New York campus's ongoing efforts to assess and shape curriculum and to constantly improve student learning.

In Cincinnati, the dean and program directors of the Rabbinical School and the Graduate School collaborate with faculty through each program's faculty executive committee and ultimately with the faculty as a whole. For example, the CN Faculty Minutes from August, 2011 describe the beginning contacts of the dean with the Jewish Foundation of Cincinnati that ultimately led to the service-learning grant. The dean indicated the routine administrative procedure that "the faculty will be kept informed and will have a voice if curricular issues might be involved." Because innovations in curricular delivery are required for the grant, the faculty will focus on the changes as major topics in its monthly meetings and in two retreats during the current year. As another example, the Cincinnati faculty, in November, 2011, engaged in a recurring discussion about Hebrew language learning. The national administration most recently has facilitated further discussion on Hebrew curriculum across all four locations.

In Jerusalem, there is a "management team" that reviews students' needs constantly. Not only does every course have an evaluation, but all outings and extra-curricular programs get rated by students. These ratings are carefully read by the director of the YII, head of Student Services, and the dean. In addition, the YII director and the dean have individual meetings with students at the end of the year to hear their feedback (see, YII Year-end Notes for the last two years). Based on student feedback, improvements are made yearly. In addition, the VPAA meets with students throughout the year.

At the level of the national administration, the president convenes the aforementioned President's Cabinet and the VPAA convenes the Academic Advisory Council (see Academic Advisory Council Minutes). The President's Cabinet serves as a key (though not sole) venue for

both the president and the VPAA to work through the educational agenda in terms of the administration's allocation of resources. For example, the VPAA recently consulted the President's Cabinet on the aforementioned faculty plan.

The AAC is a large group comprising local directors as well as deans, faculty chairs, and some other representative administrators. It meets periodically when national academic policy issues arise. For example the AAC minutes for March and August of 2010 document crucial discussions of the single-accreditation issue that substantively informed the final decision to recommend to the Board of Governors that the College-Institute seek accreditation of all HUC-JIR campuses through MSCHE. In addition recent meetings were devoted to reviewing the registrar's drafts of the National Student Academic Handbook.

Another way that the national administration has supported learning is through the National Assessment Committee, which explicitly leveraged the accreditation process for the purpose of focusing the Rabbinical School's mission. This group worked with the faculty as a whole on each campus to adapt the language to local needs. Additional facilitation of student learning is accomplished through biweekly meetings of the Student Information System Management Team. As mentioned above, this group has resolved numerous difficulties involving the storage and retrieval of student learning information.

Overall, the federal system works so that the local committees leverage their proximity to both the faculty and the students on their respective campuses to efficiently assess student learning and deal with challenges that arise. The President's Cabinet, the Academic Advisory Committee, the National Assessment Committee, and the SIS Management Team offer the VPAA ramified venues for setting the learning agenda of the College-Institute and initiating implementation with appropriate consultation.

Additional Findings Related to Compliance with Standard 5

The Regulations describe the role of the president as chief executive officer (fulfilling S5_01). The current president's credentials and huc.edu president's listing reveal a strong academic background. His prior service for 23 years as a faculty member meant that he knew practically everyone when he assumed office, and those relationships were important building-blocks for cementing institutional stability even during a time of crisis. Other sources document the way that his character and leadership have inspired others. One example is the 2001 HUC-JIR Chronicle article that announced his appointment as president. His leadership in formulating and seeing through the success of the New Way Forward Plan provides strong evidence for the role of this office in achieving institutional goals and managing the administration of the College-Institute (S5_02). The current president is retiring in 2014 and a search is currently beginning for his successor.

Perusal of the administrative résumés reveals a high level of qualifications and experience related to all of the administrative functions of the College-Institute (fulfilling S5_03). The improvements and efficiencies resulting from the staffing changes described under *Research Question 5.1* attest to the efficacy of these qualifications for both new and old appointments.

The communication of information and processes for decision-making include the previously mentioned President's Cabinet and Academic Advisory Council, as well as the deans' and program directors' groups. In the last three years, three new groups have been added that have played instrumental roles in supporting the work of administrative leaders: the aforementioned Student Information System Management Team, the National Assessment Committee, and the IT Strategic Planning Group. The first is headed by the Director of Information Systems and includes the Admissions Coordinator, Director of Financial Aid, Director of the OIRA, registrar,

and the VPAA. The second is chaired by the Director of the OIRA and comprises faculty members from each of the four campuses and the VPAA. The third includes the VPAA and the Directors of eLearning and Information Systems. These structures fulfill the remaining aspects of S5_05 not covered above.

The administration faced particular challenges regarding the functions of the registrar (see *Staffing and Human Resources Decisions* in Chapter 3 above, and the fuller discussion at *Research Question 9.1* in Chapter 5, below). The relatively recent implementation of the current SIS reflects the consolidation of the registrar's functions in one national office, in Cincinnati. The previous state of affairs included not only individual registrars for each campus but also varying standards and cultures regarding their functions. The current registrar, with the help of the national SIS Committee, has begun to adapt the relatively new SIS to better fit institutional needs and cultures, on many levels. First, he has helped to bring more coherence among campus cultures and expectations in grading systems, calendars, policies, and channels of communication. Second, aided by vendor improvements and enriched IS support, he has adapted the SIS to College-Institute needs. The new National Student Academic Handbook (initiated in fall 2011, reviewed by the Academic Advisory Council in summer-fall 2012, and being implemented in spring 2013) and the Administrative Survey Results testify to the success of the efforts to achieve better coordination, which have involved working closely with the VPAA, deans, and Directors of Institutional Research and Assessment, Human Resources, and Information Technology (fulfilling S4_12).

The organizational chart for the College-Institute demonstrates the fulfillment of S5_06. The Administrative Survey addressed all administrative functions of the College-Institute and was filled out by over 120 respondents. The findings are detailed in Chapter 8 and reveal that systematic assessment of administrative functions occurs, fulfilling S5_07.

The College-Institute entirely lacked a uniform, institution-wide vehicle for assessment until the establishment of the OIRA. Concurrent with this self-study, the entire institution has embarked on its first full-scale administrative and academic-program assessment. The OIRA has instituted a system-wide survey, which all instructors and administrators fill out on a term-by-term basis. The survey frames the entire instructional and administrative universe of the College-Institute on the web-based platform, which solicits both quantitative and qualitative responses about student progress in relation to their advancement through their programs, for example.

Suggestions for Improvement for Standards 4 and 5

1. From the point of view of governance, the Board of Governors needs to continue its commitment to the evidence-based reflective process engendered by the GTF and carried on by its new Committee on Governance (see the materials generated by this committee at Governance Committee Materials and Minutes 06/2012 and 07/2012, as well as the Governor's surveys from 2009 and 2012).These already have served as important vehicles for improving governance, not only in terms of the internal resolutions cited above but also in the realm of governor-overseer relations, governor-student relations, and new governors' orientation. These last two pursuits have resulted in programs that bring the governors more directly in contact with the individual campuses (through the overseers) and the students. Such commitments produce salutary effects in other areas, such as communications, and generally improve morale and working conditions. An easy way to further this communication would be to make the Regulations readily accessible on the HUC-JIR website.

2. The College-Institute must consider next steps in relation to administrative hiring or organization. The reorganization of the VPAA's position may yet prove, like the attempted reorganization of the recruitment and admissions department, unsustainable. And though the VPAA has borne that weight remarkably well and to good effect, and though the budget does not truly allow the College-Institute to consider hiring a new VP, it might consider the possibility of a long-term strategy that prioritizes the strengthening of the VPAA's office or the addition of a new VP. Such a person's brief might be construed in any number of ways, as long as the goal is to relieve the VPAA of as much non-academic responsibility as possible.