

# ***Yeshiva University Self-Study Design Template***

## **I. Institutional Overview**

This section provides contextual information about the institution, including a brief relevant history, the institution's mission statement and institutional goals, and descriptions of the student populations served by the institution.

Yeshiva University has grown from a small yeshiva offering some secular education to Jews on the Lower East Side of Manhattan in 1886 to a prestigious, multifaceted institution that integrates the knowledge of Western civilization and the rich treasures of Jewish culture.

The University is a private, not-for-profit, coeducational comprehensive research university with four New York City campuses. It offers undergraduate programs through its Yeshiva College (for men), Stern College for Women, and the Sy Syms School of Business. Its seven graduate schools include the Azrieli Graduate School of Jewish Education and Administration, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, Bernard Revel Graduate School of Jewish Studies, Ferkauf Graduate School of Psychology, Katz School of Science and Technology, Sy Syms School of Business, and Wurzweiler School of Social Work.

Yeshiva University's enrolls about 5,750 students, with the proportion of graduate students slightly exceeding undergraduates.

The University traces its roots to establishment of Yeshiva Eitz Chaim, an elementary school of Talmudic studies on the Lower East Side of Manhattan, in 1886, merging in 1915 with the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (REITS). Liberal arts education started with the opening of Yeshiva College in 1928, and the institution moved to the Washington Heights section of Manhattan in 1929. Graduate study began with the opening of the Bernard Revel Graduate School of Jewish Studies in 1935, and university status began in 1945. The Albert Einstein College of Medicine (AECOM) opened in 1959. In 1970 REITS separated from the University and reincorporated as an affiliate with its own board, and in 2015 the University transferred ownership of AECOM to the Montefiore Health System while retaining an affiliation with its former College of Medicine.

Five core Torah values comprise the University's moral compass and guide it toward a better future:

### 1. Truth (Emet)

The pursuit of truth has always been the driving force behind advances in human understanding, from Socrates' wanderings through the streets of Athens to the innovations of the Industrial Revolution. People of faith, who believe in a divine author of Creation, believe that the act of discovery is

sacred, whether in the realm of philosophy, physics, economics or the study of the human mind.

The Jewish people in particular affirm that beginning with the Revelation of the Torah at Mount Sinai, God entrusted eternal teachings and values to us that we must cherish and study diligently above all else, for they represent the terms of the special covenant that God made with us. All people, regardless of their faith background, should value the accumulation of knowledge because it is the way to truth and a prerequisite to human growth.

## 2. Life (Chaim)

Jewish thought asserts that truth is made available to human beings not simply so they can marvel at it but also so that they can use it. Students studying literature, computer science, law, psychology, or anything else are expected to take what they learn and implement it within their own lives as well as apply it to the real world around them.

When people see a problem that needs addressing, their responsibility is to draw upon the truths they uncovered during their studies in finding a solution. They must live truth in the real world, not simply study it in the classroom.

## 3. Infinite Human Worth (Adam)

Judaic tradition first introduced to the world the radical proposition that each individual is created in the divine image and accordingly possesses incalculable worth and value.

The unique talents and skills each individual possesses are a reflection of this divine image, and it is therefore a sacred task to hone and develop them. The vast expansive human diversity that results from this process is not a challenge but a blessing. Each of us has our own path to greatness.

## 4. Compassion (Chesed)

Even as we recognize the opportunities of human diversity, Jewish tradition emphasizes the importance of common obligations. In particular, every human being is given the same responsibility to use his or her unique gifts in the service of others; to care for their fellow human beings; to reach out to them in thoughtfulness, kindness and sensitivity; and to form a connected community.

## 5. Redemption (Zion)

In Jewish thought, the concept of redemption represents the conviction that while we live in an imperfect world, we have a responsibility to strive

toward its perfection. Regardless of a person's personal convictions about whether social perfection is attainable or even definable, it is the act of working toward it that gives our lives meaning and purpose. This common striving is an endeavor that brings all of humanity together.

The Jewish people's task to build up the land of Israel into an inspiring model society represents this effort in microcosm. But it is part of a larger project that includes all of humankind. If the arc of the moral universe bends toward justice, then redemption represents our responsibility to work together in the service of God to move history forward.

## Yeshiva University Colleges and Schools

### Undergraduate

Stern College for Women (Beren Campus, Manhattan)  
 Sy Syms School of Business (Beren and Wilf Campuses, Manhattan)  
 Yeshiva College (Wilf Campus, Manhattan)

### Graduate

Azrieli Graduate School of Jewish Education (Wilf Campus, Manhattan)  
 Benjamiin N. Cardozo School of Law (Brookdale Campus, Manhattan)  
 Bernard Revel Graduate School of Jewish Studies (Wilf Campus, Manhattan)  
 Ferkauf Graduate School of Psychology (Resnick Campus, Bronx)  
 Katz School of Science and Health (Beren and Wilf Campuses, Manhattan;  
 Resnick Campus, Bronx)  
 Sy Syms School of Business (Beren and Wilf Campuses, Manhattan)  
 Wurzweiler School of Social Work (Wilf Campus, Manhattan)

### Additional Location

S. Daniel Abraham Israel Program (Jerusalem Campus, Israel)

### Affiliates

Albert Einstein College of Medicine (Bronx)  
 Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (Manhattan)  
 Yeshiva University High School for Boys/Marsha Stern Talmudical Academy  
 (Manhattan)

## **II. Institutional Priorities to be Addressed in the Self-Study**

After providing the institutional overview, the institution provides a brief narrative about processes the institution employed to identify 3 to 5 specific institutional priorities. This section should include information about how:

- Institutional stakeholders were consulted in identifying the priorities
- Selected priorities align with the institution's mission and goals
- How Commission Standards align (or map to) the selected priorities.

Yeshiva's previous strategic plan ("Pathways to Our Future") provided guidance for the period 2016-2020. Beginning with the University's new administration, the president worked closely with members of the Board of Trustees, key lay leaders, and the President's Initiative Council to formulate renewed strategic directions—character (values and leadership), mindset (entrepreneurship and innovation), skillset (emphasizing science, technology, data, and data analytics), and outcomes (good jobs and impactful careers).

Four strategy groups amplified thinking and planning in the areas of focus and emphasis that constituted those strategic directions. Throughout the schools, deans convened working groups of students, faculty, and staff to engage them in discussions about school-based strategic directions and goals. This substantial and diverse group of constituencies informed and enriched an ongoing planning process focused on areas such as new academic programs, curricular innovation and the Innovation Lab, science and technology, and entrepreneurship. Potential opportunities identified through that process also included pathway programs linking baccalaureate and master's studies, joint baccalaureate and master's programs, international partnerships (including with Israel), and improvements in online delivery options, the Graduate Program in Advanced Talmudic Studies for Women (GPATS), and the Career Center.

Early in 2021, the president, provost, and deans began to shape the ideas arising from the preceding conversations into the initial elements of a strategic plan—clarifying the University's vision, identifying areas of distinction, formulating draft goals that would bring that vision to life, and linking key elements of the emerging plan to philanthropic opportunities. The aspirations and commitments inherent in the "5/4/3/2/1" framework (as explicated herein: five Torot, four strategic priorities, three funding platforms, and two key qualities of the University experience) provided guidance and illumination to support diligence, creativity, and innovation in the planning process.

Analytical work and initial goal setting by the deans of the undergraduate and graduate schools occupied early summer 2021; in parallel, ten topical working groups chaired by undergraduate deans and their colleagues and comprised of faculty, staff, and students addressed areas of common and high priority interest reflecting the four areas of strategic priority identified earlier, such as STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) education, the health sciences, and expanded, facilitated pathways from undergraduate to graduate programs. Each of the graduate and professional deans prepared presentations highlighting the most important, pivotal, and inspiring strategic priorities for their schools, with projected major capital requirements, during late spring and summer

2021; at the same time, the ten working groups developed presentations identifying strategic priorities in those core areas.

Later in summer 2021, the provost, working with a strategic planning consultant, convened a series of extended and in-depth leadership discussions among the deans, working group chairs, and their colleagues to connect and intercalate their aspirations and ideas with the president's vision, share their concerns and goals with one another, and formulate a pathway forward for the University in the light of its overarching commitments and values. The president convened groups of undergraduate, graduate, and professional deans, the provost, and the consultant to discuss the University's identity, vision, and values and to explore how the application of those universal values can guide Yeshiva's strategy—and later, to review draft versions of the emerging strategic plan. The president shared and discussed successive drafts of the plan with members of the Board of Trustees and brought their perspectives into the revision.

Six institutional goals emerged from the new strategic plan:

1. Academic Quality and Reputation  
Advance the quality, reputation, and visibility of the University and all of its schools and academic programs.
2. Student Experience and Success  
Promote and support the success of both undergraduate and graduate students during and after their engagement with the University's academic and co-curricular programs.
3. One YU  
Through joint programs, research projects, and faculty appointments, promote interdisciplinary and inter-professional collaboration to better integrate academic programs and strengthen Yeshiva as one University.
4. Administrative, Financial, and Operational Excellence  
Promote administrative, financial, and operational excellence across the University.
5. The Jewish People Project  
Focus the attention and resources of Yeshiva's schools on the most important social, cultural, and human needs of the Jewish people, marshaling the unique capacities of all the schools in the service of the health, well-being, and flourishing of Jewish communities.
6. Israel  
Elevate Yeshiva's commitments to and relationships with Israel and embed Israel in the University's academic and co-curricular programs.

The strategic plan identified four strategic priorities:

1. **Skillset—Science, Technology, Health Sciences, and Data Analytics**  
Support new or expanded programs in STEM, health sciences, and data analytics across undergraduate and graduate schools so that every Yeshiva student acquires the basic skillset needed for success today.
2. **Mindset—Entrepreneurship and Innovation**  
Encourage, support, and promote distinguished, innovative, and entrepreneurial research, scholarship, and creative work among all members of Yeshiva's student body and among faculty and staff throughout the undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools.
3. **Outcomes—Great Jobs and Impactful Careers**  
Through both academic and co-curricular programs, ensure that graduates of Yeshiva's undergraduate and graduate schools are well prepared for meaningful and successful careers.
4. **Character—Values and Leadership**  
Foster and sustain an institutional culture rooted in and framed by Yeshiva's values, oriented toward leadership development, and sustained and elevated in the University's undergraduate schools and programs.

|   | Priority 1:<br>Skillset—<br>Science,<br>Technology,<br>Health<br>Sciences,<br>and Data<br>Analytics | Priority 2:<br>Mindset—<br>Entrepreneurship<br>and Innovation | Priority 3:<br>Outcomes—<br>Great Jobs<br>and<br>Impactful<br>Careers | Priority 4:<br>Character—<br>Values and<br>Leadership |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Standards for Accreditation                                 |   |   |   |   |
| I. Mission and Goals  |   | YES   |   | YES   |
| II. Ethics and Integrity                                    |   | YES   |   | YES   |
| III. Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience | YES   | YES   | YES   |   |
| IV. Support of the Student Experience                       |   |   | YES   | YES   |
| V. Educational Effectiveness Assessment                     | YES   | YES   | YES   |   |
| VI. Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement      | YES   | YES   |   |   |
| VII. Governance, Leadership, and Administration             |   |   |   | YES   |

### III. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

The institution provides a list of outcomes the institution intends to achieve as the result of engaging in the self-study process, considering ways the self-study process can help the institution's meet its mission, can assist it in meeting key institutional goals, and can enhance its overall effectiveness.

The University will use this Self-Study to:

1. Demonstrate how it meets the Commission's Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation
2. Focus and reinforce its commitment to continuous improvement in fulfilling its mission and institutional priorities
3. Bring together the University's community to engage in an inclusive and transparent self-appraisal process, involving constituents from all areas of the University community
4. Integrate the priorities advanced within the University's new strategic plan with this self-study process, examining both obstacles to their fulfillment and opportunities for aligning their implementation with the Commissions Standards
5. Increase awareness of the University's strategic priorities and engage constituents in ongoing efforts to advance the University's planning and to foster a culture of data-based decision making

#### **IV. Self-Study Approach**

Identify one of the following self-study approaches to be used to organize the Self-Study Report (check one box):

- Standards-Based Approach  
 Priorities-Based Approach

Provide a brief rationale for using either of the two approaches.

While the University hoped to use a priorities-based approach to this Self-Study, the finalization of the new strategic plan did not advance in time. The Standards-based approach is more prudent and useful, ensuring that the implementation process for that plan will be thoroughly integrated into University's fulfillment of its commitments under MSCHE accreditation.

#### **V. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups**

This section of the Design provides information about the membership of the Steering Committee and Working Groups.

Information in this section should include the following about the Steering Committee:

- Names and titles of chairpersons of the Steering Committee and its members, with their positions of responsibility at the institution;
- Information about strategies the Steering Committee will use to encourage Working Groups to interact with one another in the interest of engaging in common areas of inquiry and reducing undue duplication of effort; and,
- A description of how the Steering Committee will provide oversight to ensure that Working Groups will receive appropriate support for evaluation and

assessment of Commission Standards and the priorities selected for analysis in the self-study document.

- An initial description for how the Steering Committee will ensure that institutional mission, the 3 to 5 selected priorities, and the Commission's Standards will be analyzed in the Self-Study Report utilizing the institution's existing evaluation and assessment information.

#### Members of the Steering Committee

Dr. Timothy Stevens, Deputy Provost and MSCHE ALO, co-chair

Dr. Leslie Halpern, Dean of the Ferkauf Graduate School of Psychology, co-chair

Dr. Karen Bacon, Dean of the Stern College for Women and Yeshiva College

Alternate: Dr. Daniel Reynold, Dean of the Revel School of Jewish Studies

Dr. S. Abraham (Avri) Ravid, Professor of Finance, Sy Syms School of Business, Co-Chair of the Faculty Council

Alternate: Dr. Gabriel Cwilich, Professor of Physics, Yeshiva College, Co-Chair of the Faculty Council

Esther K. Sasson, JD, Associate General Counsel

Alternate: Sam A. Yospe, JD, Assistant General Counsel

Dr. Chaim Nissel, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Students

Alternate: Dr. Sara Asher, Dean of Undergraduate Students

Patrick Gallagher, Vice President of Administration and Chief Administrative Services Officer

Alternate: Julie Auster, JD, Chief Human Resources Officer

Joseph Dandic, Controller

Alternate: Jacob Kramer, Director of Budget and Planning

Susan Meyers, Chief Advancement Officer

Alternate: Ellen Finklestein, Chief Strategy Officer, Institutional Advancement

Deena S. Rabinovich, Chair, Judaic Studies Department; Director, Legacy Heritage Fund Jewish Educators Project

Alternate: Rabbi Jon Green, Director, James Striar School of Jewish Studies

For each Working Group, this section should include the following:

- Names and title of chairperson(s) and members of the Working Group with their positions of responsibility at the institution;
- A description of which institutional priorities will be addressed (if it is a standards-based design); or, a description of which Standards will be addressed by each Working Group (if it is a priorities-based design);
- Descriptions of the charge and specific lines of inquiry;

- A brief discussion about how relevant assessment information that will be gathered, reviewed, summarized, and used by the Working Group to accomplish its work; and,
- If not discussed above, initial strategies for how the Working Groups will interact with one another in the interest of engaging in common areas of inquiry and reducing undue duplication of effort.

## **VI. Guidelines for Reporting**

To guide the efforts of the Working Groups, this section of the Design includes a description of the processes the Steering Committee will use to ensure that they stay on task, such as scheduled discussions and updates within the Working Groups, with the Steering Committee, and among the Working Groups; the form and frequency of such interactions, and the format of interim and final reports. At a minimum, information in this section of the Design should include the following:

- A list or description of all products to be completed by the Working Groups and Steering Committee, such as initial outlines, Working Group reports, preliminary drafts, and final reports.
- Deadlines for the submission of various draft documents and reports
- A template for the preparation of Working Group Reports.

The Self-Study process at Yeshiva University will be managed through a dedicated MS Teams site, with sections dedicated to the Steering Committee, each Working Group, and various constituencies (students, faculty, staff, and alumni/community representatives) consulted for feedback. Access to the workspaces assigned for the Steering Committee and Working Groups will be limited to their membership in order to ensure the integrity of the groups' deliberations. This MS Teams site will hold resources relevant to each group, including project calendars, templates for Working Group reports to the Steering Committee (bi-weekly progress reports and draft reports by the Working Group), discussions within the Working Group, and the working drafts leading to the final reports to the Steering Committee.

### General Charge for All Working Groups

While each of the Working Groups has a charge applicable to its Standard, all Groups share the following responsibilities as they prepare their reports:

1. Hold regular meetings (at least bi-weekly), beginning in January 2022, to identify, collect, and analyze evidence, and to draft reports for the Steering Committee in accordance with the established timetable.
2. Keep minutes of all meetings, to be stored on the Working Group's MS Teams site.
3. Support their analysis of how the University fulfills the Requirements of Affiliation and the Standards for Accreditation, including the Criteria applicable to each Standard, through reliance on specific evidence included in the evidence inventory.
4. Address the assigned lines of inquiry.
5. Provide a well-documented analysis of the University's success and challenges in implementing the University's Mission and Goals under the MSCHE Standards.
6. Demonstrate a record of assessment under each Standard and the resulting revision of policies and practices in response while evaluating evidence of data-based decision making.
7. Suggest ways in which to apply priorities identified in the new strategic plan in order to further the successes and address the challenges identified in the Working Groups analysis of the University's fulfillment of its obligations under the Standards.
8. Be aware of ways in which the Standards may overlap and reach out to chairs of other Working Groups to facilitate collaboration and avoid redundancy.

### Working Group Charges

## Standard I: Mission and Goals

Chair: TBD

### Members:

David Schatz, PhD, Ronald P. Stanton University Professor of Philosophy, Ethics, and Religious Thought

Joshua Bacon, PhD, Associate Professor of Psychology, Stern College

Steven Fine, PhD, Dr. Pinkhos Churgin Professor of Jewish History and Director of the Yeshiva University Center for Israel Studies

Fredy Zypman, PhD, Professor of Physics, Chair of the Department of Physics at Yeshiva College and the Katz School of Science and Health

Edward Stein, JD, Professor of Law, Director of the Gertrud Mainzer Program in Family Law, Policy and Bioethics, Cardozo School of Law

### Lines of Inquiry

1. How and to what extent are the University's mission and goals appropriate to higher education and relevant to the University's commitment to a culture of continuous improvement?
2. What evidence is there to show that the University's mission and goals are clear, widely known, and collaboratively developed?
3. How do the University's mission and goals address the concerns of internal and external constituencies, guide decision making at all levels of the University—including planning, resource allocation, program development, and outcomes—and support scholarship and research appropriate to higher education?
4. What processes are in place to determine if the University is achieving its mission and goals, and reassessing them periodically?
5. How does the University comply with:
  - Requirement of Affiliation 7: Mission and Goals
  - Requirement of Affiliation 10: Institutional Planning
6. What are the obstacles to fulfillment and opportunities for alignment of the following University priorities with Standard I:
  - Priority 2: Mindset—Entrepreneurship and Innovation
  - Priority 4: Character—Values and Leadership

### Examples of Evidence

- University Strategic Plan

- Documentation of Board of Trustees Approval of University Mission and Resolution for Approval of the University's Strategic Plan
- Board of Trustees Bylaws
- University Educational Goals
- Faculty Handbook
- Statement for Job Postings
- Office of Institutional Research Website
- Annual Reports from Enrollment, Library, Information Technology, Advancement, Human Resources, Facilities, Communications and Marketing, and Finance
- College and Schools Strategic Plans
- Curriculum Committees—Charge and Annual Reports
- Course Catalog

#### Standard II: Ethics and Integrity

Chair: Paul Glassman, MBA, MS, and MArch, Director of University Libraries

#### Members:

Renée Coker, MPA, Senior Director, Talent Management & Equity Compliance and Deputy Title IX Officer

Jessica Roth, JD, Professor of Law, Co-Director of the Jacob Burns Center for Ethics in the Practice of Law

#### Lines of inquiry

1. How do University policies, procedures, programs, and systems foster a climate of respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration with a diverse range of backgrounds, views, and perspectives?
2. What evidence is there that appropriate, fair, and impartial policies and procedures are in place to address complaints and/or grievances articulated by students, faculty, and staff?
3. How does the University promote affordability and accessibility while also providing support services that enable students and their families to understand funding sources and options, value received for cost, and methods to help them make informed decisions about incurring debt?
4. How does the University fulfill its commitment to communicating fairly and honestly with internal and external constituents and to complying with all applicable Federal, state, and MSCHE reporting policies, regulations, and requirements?

5. What are the obstacles to fulfillment and opportunities for alignment of the following University priorities with Standard II:

Priority 2: Mindset—Entrepreneurship and Innovation

Priority 4: Character—Values and Leadership

#### Examples of Evidence

- Financial Aid Information
- Conflict of Interest Policy
- Grievance Procedures
- Hiring procedures
- Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures
- Student Surveys
- Verification of Compliance Report
- Consumer Information Webpage
- Copyright and Trademark Policies
- Course Catalog
- Examples of Communications to Students, Faculty, and Staff
- Title IX Compliance Documentation
- Academic Policies
- Staff Handbook
- Faculty Handbook
- Code of Student Conduct
- Human Resources Policies—Equal Employment, Americans with Disabilities Act, Bias, Non-Discrimination, etc.
- Performance Evaluation Policy
- University Fact Book
- Cost of Attendance Calculator
- Internal Audits
- Student Surveys

### Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

Chair: William Stenhouse, PhD, Associate Dean of Yeshiva College and Professor of History, The Robert M. Beren Department of History

#### Members:

Terry DiLorenzo, PhD, Associate Professor of Psychology, Stern College

Wendy Kosakoff, MM and MLIS, Public Services and Outreach Librarian

Greta Doctoroff, PhD, Associate Professor of Psychology, Ferkauf Graduate School of Psychology

#### Lines of Inquiry

1. How effectively and in what ways do the University's academic programs document their commitment to learning experiences that demonstrate rigor and academic excellence?
2. To what degree are student learning experiences designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty and/or other appropriate professionals who demonstrate effectiveness of professional responsibilities, hold appropriate qualifications, are sufficient in number, engage in professional growth, and are evaluated regularly?
3. Are the University's programs of study clearly and accurately described in official publications of the University—such as catalogs, websites, and other institutional publications—in ways that students can understand, use to follow degree and program requirements, and consider in terms of expected time to completion?
4. How does the University periodically assess the effectiveness of programs that provide student learning opportunities?
5. How does the University comply with:
  - a. Requirement of Affiliation 8: Systematic Evaluation of All Programs
  - b. Requirement of Affiliation 9: Student Learning Programs
  - c. Requirement of Affiliation 10: Institutional Planning
  - d. Requirement of Affiliation 15: Faculty
6. What are the obstacles to fulfillment and opportunities for alignment of the following University priorities with Standard III:
 

Priority 1: Skillset—Science, Technology, Health Sciences, and Data Analytics

Priority 2: Mindset—Entrepreneurship and Innovation

Priority 3: Outcomes—Great Jobs and Impactful Careers

#### Examples of Evidence

- College and Schools Educational Goals
- Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Degrees Conferred
- Course Catalog
- Faculty Handbook
- Common Data Set—Faculty Info
- Global and Off-Campus Education
- Undergraduate Research and Creative Projects
- Undergraduate Core Curriculum Assignment
- Program Reviews
- Everspring Program Reviews

#### Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience

Chair: Dr. Chaim Nissel, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Students

Co-Chair: Dr. Sara Asher, Dean of Undergraduate Students

#### Members:

Rabbi Saul Berman, JD, Associate Professor of Jewish Studies, Stern College

Traci Tullius, MFA, Associate Professor of Art and Chair of Studio Art, Stern College

Justin Thomas, MLIS, Public Services and User Experience Librarian

Vance Zemon, PhD, Professor of Psychology, Ferkauf Graduate School of Psychology

Joe Bednarsh, MBA, Associate Dean of Students

Jonathan Schwab, PhD, Director of the Office of Student Life

Jenn Kim, JD, Dean of Student Services & Advising, Diversity, & Inclusion, Deputy Title IX Coordinator, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law

Geri Mansdorf, MEd, Assistant Vice President of Enrollment

Debra Pine, MBA, Assistant Administrative Dean, Sy Syms School of Business

Shaina Trapedo, PhD, Lecturer, Stern College, and Resident Scholar and Recruitment Office, The Zahava and Moshael Straus Center for Torah and Western Thought

Chad Austein, MA, Director of Enrollment Management Systems

Susan Bauer, Assistant Vice President and Executive Director

Shevet Glaubach Center

## for Career Strategy and Professional Development

### Lines of Inquiry

1. How does the University support student success, retention, graduation, and transfer through applicable services, policies, and practices?
2. How well does the University support all students across programs of study, levels, modalities, and schedules?
3. What academic, fiscal, and administrative policies and procedures govern athletics, student life, and other extracurricular activities?
4. How do we measure the effectiveness of the University's efforts to support the student experience?
5. How does the University comply with:
  - a. Requirement of Affiliation 8: Systematic Evaluation of All Programs
  - b. Requirement of affiliation 10: Institutional Planning
6. What are the obstacles to fulfillment and opportunities for alignment of the following University priorities with Standard IV:
 

Priority 3: Outcomes—Great Jobs and Impactful Careers

Priority 4: Character—Values and Leadership

### Examples of Evidence

- Orientation and First-Year Programs and Assessments
- Retention and Graduation Rates
- Consumer Information Webpage
- Policies: Registration, Grade Dispute, Grading, Graduation, Academic Standing, Refund of Tuition and Fees
- Course Catalog
- Admissions Materials
- Accessibility Resources
- Student Orientation
- Student Advising Documentation
- Credit Transfer Policies
- Data Request and Reporting Policy
- Privacy Statement
- Student Disciplinary Records Retention Policy
- Student Educational Records

- The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- Research Involving Human Subjects/Institutional Review Board
- Responsible Use of Computing Technology
- Transcript Policy
- Athletics Teams
- Student Handbook
- Social Media Policy

#### Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Chair: Rachel Ebner, PhD, Director of Student Learning Assessment

Co-Chair: Amiya Waldman-Levi, Clinical Associate Professor, Director of Scholarship and Research of Occupational Therapy, Katz School of Science and Health,

Members:

Ariel Malka, PhD, Professor of Psychology

Rina Krautwirth, MLIS, Research and Instruction Librarian

Kenneth Critchfield, PhD, Associate Professor and Program Director of the Clinical Psychology Program, Ferkauf Graduate School of Psychology

#### Lines of Inquiry

1. What is the assessment culture at the University and the strategies employed to engage the University community in meaningful assessment? Provide evidence demonstrating how effectively these assessment strategies contribute to academic, student support, and administrative decisions.
2. What are the University policies, procedures, and systems that guide routine decision making, periodic assessment, strategic planning, and response to emerging challenges?
3. How effective is the University's use of assessment at the institution, program, department, course, and classroom levels when applied to improving teaching and student learning?
4. How does the University comply with:
  - a. Requirement of Affiliation 8: Systematic Evaluation of All Programs
  - b. Requirement of Affiliation 9: Student Learning Programs
  - c. Requirement of Affiliation 10: Institutional Planning
5. What are the obstacles to fulfillment and opportunities for alignment of the following University priorities with Standard V:

Priority 1: Skillset—Science, Technology, Health Sciences, and Data Analytics

Priority 2: Mindset—Entrepreneurship and Innovation

Priority 3: Outcomes—Great Jobs and Impactful Careers

#### Examples of Evidence

- Annual Assessment Plans
- Curriculum Mapping
- Relevant Academic Policies
- Faculty Handbook
- Assessment Resources
- Professional Accreditation Goals: ABA, APA, etc.
- Policies on Curriculum Governance—Course Approval, Program Approval, Program Changes
- Assessment Webpage
- Academic Affairs Webpages
- Office of Institutional Research Website
- Career Services Website

#### Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Chair: Marian Gidea, PhD, Associate Dean for STEM Education and Research, Director of the Graduate Program in Mathematical Sciences

#### Members:

Matthew Incantalupo, PhD, Assistant Professor of Political Science

Rabbi Lawrence Teitelman, MS, Clinical Assistant Professor of Computer Science

Alan Kluger, JD, Director of Tax and Compliance

Matthew Levine, MBA, Senior Associate Dean for Finance and Administration, Cardozo School of Law

Maureen Cahill, BA, Senior Director of Project Management

#### Lines of inquiry

1. How and to what extent does the University engage in organized and systematic strategic and operational planning processes, and how are these processes linked to the University's mission, goals, strategic plan, and resource allocation?

2. Are planning and improvement processes clearly documented and communicated to University constituencies?
3. Do the University's financial, human, physical, and technological resources adequately support its operations?
4. How does the institution periodically assess the effectiveness of planning, resource allocation, institutional renewal processes and availability of resources?
5. How does the University comply with:
  - a. Requirement of Affiliation 8: Systematic Evaluation of All Programs
  - b. Requirement 10: Institutional Planning
  - c. Requirement 11: Financial Resources
6. What are the obstacles to fulfillment and opportunities for alignment of the following University priorities with Standard VI:
 

Priority 1: Skillset—Science, Technology, Health Sciences, and Data Analytics

Priority 2: Mindset—Entrepreneurship and Innovation

#### Examples of Evidence

- Strategic Plan
- Annual Reports—Enrollment, Library, Information Technology, Advancement, Human Resources, Facilities, Communications and Marketing, Finance, DEI
- Centers and Institutes Annual Reports
- Program Reviews Examples
- Description of Budget Process
- Equal Employment Opportunity Policy
- Background and Credential Check Policy
- Use of Computer Technology Policy
- Facilities Report
- Campus Master Plan
- University Organizational Chart
- Board of Trustees Meetings Minutes and Summaries
- Audited Financial Statements
- University Fact Book

## Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

Chair: TBD

Members:

Matt Miller, PhD, Associate Professor of English and Chair

Esther Sasson, JD, Associate General Counsel

Michael Herz, JD, Arthur Kaplan Professor of Law, Cardozo School of Law

1. What are the responsibilities and authority of University governing bodies?
2. How are students, faculty, staff, and administration involved in the University's shared governance structure?
3. What procedures are in place for evaluating leadership, governance, and administrative units and documenting their use of assessment data to improve institutional operations and support the strategic vision of the University?
4. How does governance and organizational communication ensure the successful implementation of goals, the fulfillment of key initiatives, and allocation of resources?
5. How does the University comply with:
  - a. Requirement of Affiliation 12: Governance Structure
  - b. Requirement of Affiliation 13: Governing Board Conflicts of Interest
6. What are the obstacles to fulfillment and opportunities for alignment of the following University priorities with Standard VII:

**Priority 4:** Character—Values and Leadership

Examples of Evidence

- Board of Trustees Minutes and Biographies
- Organizational Chart

- Institution Bylaws
- Administrative Credentials
- Conflict of Interest Statement
- Board Surveys
- Board Self-Assessment
- Faculty Council Bylaws
- Board of Trustees Bylaws
- Faculty Handbook
- Student Government Bylaws
- Board of Trustees Committees — Roles and Responsibilities
- University Organizational Chart
- Provost's Organizational Chart
- Faculty Committees and Charges
- Board of Trustees Conflict of Interest Disclosure
- Annual Staff Performance Evaluations
- Financial and Governing Policies
- Top Manager Evaluation

#### Compliance Working Group

Chair: Timothy Stevens, PhD, Deputy Provost, MSCHE ALO, NYSED CEO-Designee, and NC-SARA Primary Contact

#### Members:

Robert Friedman, University Director of Student Finance

Larry Simmons, MS, Deputy Chief Information Officer

Yuxiang Liu, EdD, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment

Jennifer Spiegel, MA, University Registrar

Randy Apfelbaum, MS, Chief Facilities and Administrative Officer

#### Charge:

1. Review institutional policies and procedures that demonstrate compliance requirements.
2. Document the University's compliance with all Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations.
3. Consult with Working Groups to document the University's compliance with:
  - a. Requirement of Affiliation 1: Authorization to Operate
  - b. Requirement of Affiliation 2: Institution is Operational

- c. Requirement of Affiliation 3: Graduating One Class before Accreditation
- d. Requirement of Affiliation 4: Communicating with the Commission in English
- e. Requirement of Affiliation 5: Compliance with Government Policies, Regulations, and Requirements
- f. Requirement of Affiliation 6: Complying with Commission Policies
- g. Requirement of Affiliation 7: Mission and Goals
- h. Requirement of Affiliation 8: Systematic Evaluation of All Programs
- i. Requirement of Affiliation 9: Quality Student Learning Programs
- j. Requirement of Affiliation 10: Institutional Planning
- k. Requirement of Affiliation 11: Financial Resources & Fiscal Management
- l. Requirement of Affiliation 12: Governing Body Fulfillment of Its Responsibilities
- m. Requirement of Affiliation 13: Governing Body Free of Conflicts of Interest
- n. Requirement of Affiliation 14 : Accurate, Fair, and Complete Information Provided by Institution and Governing Body
- o. Requirement of Affiliation 15: Core Faculty with Responsibility for Curriculum

### *Editorial Style and Format*

Each Working Group will produce a report limited to no more than 15 single-spaced pages for submission to the Steering Committee. Each report will follow the following formatting and stylistic guidelines:

#### Format

1. One-inch margins on all sides
2. 12-point Times New Roman font
3. No indentation of paragraphs
4. Set paragraph spacing to 0 and use one space between paragraphs.
5. Left justification
6. Single line spacing
7. One space between sentences
- 8.** Follow APA 7th edition citation style for in-text citations and references.
- 9.** Major headings left justified in bold, upper and lower case, 14-point font

10. Sub-headings left justified in italics, upper and lower case, 12-point font
11. Tables to be numbered, titled, and listed in a table of contents
12. In the header, include the Middle States Standard number, justified left and italicized, and the page number, justified right
13. Double number all tables and figures, using the Middle States Standard number first. For example: Table 2.2 would refer to the second table in Standard II.

### Style

1. Write in active voice.
2. Use the Oxford comma (a comma before the 'and' following a series separated by commas between the elements).
3. Use the default MS Word format or bulleted or numbered lists.
4. When referring to a person employed by Yeshiva University, use the person's name and full title, with commas before and after the title.
5. Use APA format for all citations.
6. Refer to Yeshiva University as the University.
7. Refer to Colleges and Schools by their full names.
8. Spell out all institutional acronyms.
9. Avoid institutional jargon.

## **VII. Organization of the Final Self-Study Report**

This section includes an outline of the organization, format and structure of the final Self-Study Report, including information that will be found in the document's introduction and conclusion, and initial indications of the focus of each chapter. In cases where the institution employs the priorities-based approach, this section contains a description of which Commission Standards will be addressed in a separate chapter of the Self-Study Report.

The Yeshiva University Self-Study Report (limited to no more than 100 pages, excluding appendices, and no more than 20 pages, exploring the University's response to the pandemic, excluding appendices) will be organized in this fashion:

#### *Executive Summary*

1. Summary of Self-Study organization and process
2. Summary of findings
3. Summary of future directions

#### *Introduction*

1. Profile and overview of Yeshiva University
2. Compliance Certification
3. Summary of the Self-Study organization and process

#### *Analysis of the University's Fulfillment of the Seven MSCHE Standards for Accreditation (approximately 10 pages each)*

1. Documented evidence of compliance and periodic assessment
2. Analysis
3. Suggestions for improvement or future directions

### **VIII. Verification of Compliance Strategy**

Each institution is required to complete a Verification of Compliance process. The Design includes a description of what strategy(ies) the institution will employ to successfully complete this process, including:

- What groups, offices or individuals will be responsible for the process. In cases where a separate Working Group has been organized to lead the institution through this process, the Design should contain a listing of these.
- How those responsible for the Verification of Compliance process will communicate with the Working Groups and Steering Committee.

There will be a Compliance Working Group responsible for documenting the University's compliance, reporting back to the Steering Committee and relevant Working Groups for support in locating the evidence. Its report will be made available to all Working Groups on the Self-Study MS Teams site during their research and analysis efforts.

### **IX. Self-Study Timetable**

Institutions include in the Design a timeline for each major step in the process, beginning with early preparation to completion of the process. In this section,

institutions indicate whether they prefer a Fall or Spring visit by the Evaluation Team, list major milestones in the self-study process and when they will be achieved.

**September—December 2022**

- Assemble Steering Committee and Working Groups
- Submit Self-Study Design

**November 8, 2022**

- MSCHE VP Liaison Self-Study Prep Visit to YU

**November—December 2022**

- Revisions and acceptance of Self-Study Design

**February—May 2023**

- Self-Study Evaluation Team Chair chosen
- Visit dates chosen
- Accepted Self-Study Design sent to Team Chair
- Self-Study drafted and shared with YU community

**May—September 2023**

- Self-Study revisions and campus review

**September—November 2023**

- Self-Study Report draft sent to Team Chair (two weeks before visit)
- Team Chair's Preliminary visit to YU

**December 2023—January 2024**

- Self-Study Report finalized based on Team Chair Feedback and shared with campus

**February—March 2024**

- Final Self-Study Report/Verification of Compliance/Evidence Inventory uploaded to MSCHE portal (six weeks before Team visit)

**March—May 2024**

- Self-Study Evaluation Team visit to YU
- Team Report
- Institutional Response

**June/November 2024**

- Middle States Commission meets to determine action
- Team visits after April 15 are acted on at the Commission's November meeting

**X. Communication Plan**

An initial Communication Plan with a listing of intended audiences, communication methods, and timing. This plan is used to guide the Steering

Committee and its Working Groups in gathering feedback from institutional stakeholders and updating them about major developments related to the self-study process. This may be integrated with the Self-Study Timetable (Section IX) if desired.

| Initial Communication Plan   |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| Purpose  | Audiences  | Methods  | Timings   |
| To share data, documents and research results and communicate in a secure, transparent and convenient manner | Steering Committee Members and Working Group Members | Middle States Self-Study MS Teams Site   | Fall 2022- Spring 2024  |
| To update campus constituencies about the Self-Study process   | Students   | YU Middle States Self-Study Webpage; open forums; presentations to Student Government (SG) groups; monthly email updates                                       | Continuous updates to the webpage; reports to SGs each academic term; periodic forums   |
|  | Alumni and community members                         | YU Middle States Self-Study Webpage; alumni affairs representatives on Steering Committee; updates in alumni newsletter and emails, advisory committee reports | Continuous updates to webpage; Alumni newsletter; periodic updates  |
|  | Faculty  | YU Middle States Self-Study Webpage; open forums; faculty representatives on Steering Committee; updates at Faculty Council meetings; monthly email updates    | Continuous updates to webpage; reporting of faculty representatives to divisions; monthly updates at Faculty Council meetings |
|  | Board of Trustees                                    | YU Middle States Self-Study Webpage; presentations at BOT meeting  | Updates by the President and Provost; periodic updates at BOT meetings by Self-Study co-chairs                                |
|  | Administration and Staff                             | YU Middle States Self-Study Webpage; open forums; monthly email updates  | Continuous updates to webpage; periodic updates   |
| To gather feedback   | Students   | Feedback from SG representatives after sharing   | Spring 2023-Fall 2024   |

|   |                              |  |                       |
|---|------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| about Working Group reports and Self-Study drafts |                              | updates on Working Group reports; feedback from open forums; monthly email updates   |                       |
|   | Alumni and community members | Feedback by alumni and community representatives on steering committee; updates in alumni newsletter and emails; advisory committee reports  | Spring 2023-Fall 2024 |
|   | Faculty                      | Feedback by Faculty serving on Steering Committee after sharing relevant Working Group reports; feedback after sharing updates at Faculty Council meetings; feedback from open forums; monthly email updates | Spring 2023-Fall 2024 |
|   | Board of Trustees            | Feedback from board members after periodic reports   | Spring 2023-Fall 2024 |
|   | Administration and Staff     | Feedback about relevant Working Group reports by administrative and staff representatives on Steering Committee; feedback from open forums; monthly email updates  | Spring 2023-Fall 2024 |

## **XI. Evaluation Team Profile**

It is important that the Commission obtain sufficient information about the institution to organize an Evaluation Team that can evaluate the institution's compliance with Commission standards and give meaningful feedback to the institution relating to the institution's selected priorities. Along these lines, provide the following information:

- **Team Chair:** Indicate the specific expertise desired in the Team Chair, such as experience at similar institutions, experience with the identified institutional priorities, or expertise in a program or process. The Team Chairs are usually chief executive officers, presidents, or chief academic officers. A preference for any of these will be helpful in identifying the appropriate person.
- **Peer Evaluators:** The team usually includes evaluators that have expertise/experience with academic affairs, assessment, student affairs, faculty issues, and financial issues. As with the Team Chair, outlining specific expertise desired in the evaluators, such as expertise in a discipline or process, or a background working with a certain type of institution, will be helpful in identifying appropriate potential team members. If the institution has distance education programs, a team member will be identified with that expertise.
- Institutions that are considered comparable peers, preferably within the Middle States region;

- Institutions that are considered aspirational peers, preferable within the Middle States region; and,
- If necessary, institutions whose representatives might present conflicts of interest should they serve on the self-study evaluation team, as outlined in the Commission's policy [Conflict of Interest: Commission Representatives](#).
- A listing of the institution's top programs by enrollment would be helpful as well.

Although the institution's expressed preferences will be given careful consideration, the final decision about team membership remains with the Commission and its staff.

As a noted faith-based institution in an urban setting, with a unique division of student populations between undergraduate religious colleges and secular graduate schools, the Evaluation Team for this Self-Study might best be comprised of colleagues who have:

- Have experience with faith-based undergraduate institutions.
- Understand the challenges of maintaining a law school and other graduate professional schools.
- Have expertise in managing and providing services for disbursed urban campuses.

The Evaluation Team Chair should have experience as a president of an urban faith-based university that is research active and has robust professional graduate schools. Other members might include individuals with experience as a chief academic officer, a chief financial officer, a chief operating officer, a director of institutional or learning assessment, and/or a law school dean.

Currently, we consider the following institutions to be peers:

- Elon University (NC)
- Fordham University (NY)
- Gonzaga University (WA)
- Pepperdine University (CA)
- University of Denver (CO)
- University of San Diego (CA)
- University of San Francisco (CA)

Among Middle States member institutions, in addition to Fordham University, we would consider the following institutions as comparable or aspirational:

- Adelphi University (NY)
- Catholic University of America (NY)
- Duquesne University (PA)
- Gannon University (PA)
- Misericordia University (PA)

## **XII. Evidence Inventory**

This section contains a description of the institution's strategies for populating and managing the Evidence Inventory, from the beginning of the self-study process forward. Strategies might include designating a separate Working Group, assigning the refinement of the Evidence Inventory to members of the Steering Committee, among others.

The Evidence Inventory will be managed by Sandra Moore, Head Librarian of the Pollack Library, who will serve as liaison to the Steering Committee and the Working Groups as they seek to identify relevant evidence to support their analyses of the University's fulfillment of the MSCHE Standards and Requirements of Affiliation. She will work with the Steering Committee to identify evidence needed to support the work of the Steering Committee and Working Groups. As work progress on the Self-Study, she will help refine and finalize the Evidence Inventory for submission along with the final draft of the Self-Study Report.