



July 17, 2017

Paul Hogle, President
Cleveland Institute of Music
11021 East Blvd.
Cleveland, OH 44106

Dear President Hogle:

This letter is formal notification of action taken by the Higher Learning Commission (“HLC” or “the Commission”) Board of Trustees (“the Board”) concerning Cleveland Institute of Music (“the Institute” or “the institution”). During its meeting on June 29, 2017, the Board removed the sanction of Notice from the Institute. This action is effective as of the date the action was taken. The Board determined that the removal of the sanction was warranted based on evidence provided by the Institute, including the Notice Report; the report of the visiting team; the staff analysis of the sanction; and the Institute’s responses to these reports.

The Board maintained the Institute on the Standard Pathway with its next comprehensive evaluation (Year 4) to take place in 2018-19.

The Board required that the Institute submit an Embedded Monitoring Report no later than October 15, 2018, or at least four weeks prior to the comprehensive evaluation visit, on the following topics:

- Core Component 3.B:
 - The purpose and philosophy of the general education program;
 - Student learning outcomes for general education;
 - General education requirements; and
 - The general education curriculum.
- Core Component 4.A:
 - A program review template that follows best practices;
 - Program reviews of all divisions; and
 - The use of data to make curricular and instructional decisions.
- Core Component 4.B:
 - Alignment of course learning outcomes with program learning outcomes; and
 - The identification of assessment measures, collection of data, analysis and use of results to inform curricular and instructional decisions for outcomes in each program, including general education.
- Core Component 5.C
 - An explanation of the Institute’s strategic planning process; and
 - A strategic plan with measurable initiatives, outcomes, budgets, timelines, and responsibilities.

- Core Component 5.D
 - Use of data to develop and update the strategic plan; and
 - Evidence of the monitoring of the effectiveness of operations.

The Board based its action on the following findings made with regard to the Institute:

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Three, Core Component 3.B, “the institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs,” but with concerns because:

- The Institute successfully demonstrated evidence through course syllabi and student scholarly work that students are developing a broad base of theoretical, aural, rhythmic and historical skills;
- The Institute’s faculty has developed program-level goals and outcomes, as well as performance levels for its degree, diploma and certificate programs; and
- The team found that the Institute still needs to clarify its purpose for general education, develop outcomes for that program and determine whether changes are needed to its general education requirements.

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Four, Core Component 4.A, “the institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs,” but with concerns because, while it has formalized an Academic Program Review process and a schedule for such review, a more systematic and extensive collection of data is required as well as further training of faculty on best practices in program review in order to optimize the exercise.

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Four, Core Component 4.B, “the institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning,” but with concerns because:

- The Institute's Division Heads have worked with faculty to write program learning outcomes from each major and the Institute has purchased software to map these programs outcomes to courses and align them with the CIM Commitments;
- The Institute has demonstrated a commitment to shifting the culture of the organization toward a more systematic and structured assessment process; and
- However, the Institute still needs to demonstrate evidence of aligned outcomes, identifiable measures, data collection and data-based decision-making.

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Five, Core Component 5.C, “the institution engages in systematic and integrated planning,” but with concerns because:

- The Institute has established annual Institutional Operational Goals with key performance indicators as an interim step toward a more comprehensive strategic planning process with completion expected by 2018-2019;
- An inclusive twelve-month strategic planning process is expected to be adopted by the Institute’s Board in September 2017; and
- The timeline does not sufficiently allow for FY2018 budgetary guidance.

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Five, Core Component 5.D, “the institution works systematically to improve its performance,” but with concerns because, while the Institute recently achieved positive results in enrollment, fundraising and budgeting, these advancements require further Commission follow-up to assure that the Institute continues to apply data to improve its overall institutional effectiveness and operations.

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Two, Core Component 2.A, “the institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff,” because:

- The Institute consistently evaluates its faculty on an annual basis through a combination of student surveys, self-reflection and individual meetings with Division heads;
- The Institute’s Board of Trustees evaluates itself as a body in addition to members completing individual self-assessments; and
- The Institute has otherwise demonstrated a track record of consistently applying policies established for staff.

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Three, Core Component 3.A, “the institution’s degree programs are appropriate to higher education,” because:

- The Institute has established learning goals for all its academic programs and measures each student’s performance using rubrics established by the relevant division;
- An Academic Program Review process has been implemented that assures the quality of all programs within an initial three-year period, with regular program review occurring every six years thereafter; and
- The Institute has begun tracking student attrition and has established an Enrollment Management Committee to improve completion and time-to-degree rates.

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Three, Core Component 3.C, “the institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services,” because:

- The Institute has developed new policies to select and retain faculty members, establishing annual faculty activity reports and reviews; and
- It has allocated significant financial resources for faculty and staff development.

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Three, Core Component 3.D, “the institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching,” because:

- The Institute serves its students, not only by leveraging Case Western Reserve University’s considerable resources, but also through its own Office of the Associate Dean for Student Academic Affairs, its Library Director, the inclusion of office hours in the CIM Music Theory Faculty workload and its Registrar’s office; and

- The Institute's students also receive support through a close network of committees, including Dean's Council, Academic Outcomes Committee, and Student Affairs all designed to enhance faculty support of students.

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Four, Core Component 4.C, "the institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs," because:

- The Institute's Enrollment Management Committee is spearheading efforts to collect and analyze data as part of a comprehensive retention plan; and
- The Institute has acquired and implemented new software during 2016-2017 to maintain the data being collected.

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Five, Core Component 5.A, "the institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future," because:

- The Institute has taken concrete steps to slow the growth in gross tuition while increasing net tuition;
- The Institute's Board of Trustees increased its giving by 32% from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, with the Annual Fund in the latter year netting a record of \$1.5 million, the highest proportion of which was donated by sources other than the Board of Trustees; and
- The Institute is actively mining data from several sources in an effort to benchmark its position and engage in appropriate environment scanning.

The Institute has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Five, Core Component 5.B, "the institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission," because the Institute has adopted new by-laws for the Faculty Senate that facilitate faculty participation in assessment and strategic planning efforts, and which, in combination with the newly established close network of committee structures, approximates shared governance mechanisms at other institutions.

At this time, the Commission will reassign the Institute from its liaison Dr. Anthea Sweeney to Dr. Eric Martin. Please be assured that Dr. Sweeney will work with Dr. Martin to ensure a smooth transition.

The Board action resulted in changes to the affiliation of the Institute. These changes are reflected on the Institutional Status and Requirements Report. Some of the information on that document, such as the dates of the last and next comprehensive evaluation visits, will be posted to the HLC website.

Information is provided to members of the public and to other constituents in several ways. Commission policy INST.G.10.010, Management of Commission Information, anticipates that HLC will release action letters to members of the public. The Commission will do so by posting

this action letter to its website. Also, the enclosed Public Disclosure Notice will be posted to HLC's website not more than 24 hours after this letter is sent to you.

In addition, Commission policy COMM.A.10.010, Commission Public Notices and Statements, requires that HLC prepare a summary of actions to be sent to appropriate state and federal agencies and accrediting associations and published on its website. The summary will include HLC Board action regarding the Institute.

On behalf of the Board of Trustees, I thank you and your associates for your cooperation. If you have questions about any of the information in this letter, please contact Dr. Martin.

Sincerely,



Barbara Gellman-Danley
President

Enclosure: Public Disclosure Notice

cc: Chair of the Board of Trustees, Cleveland Institute of Music
Brian Sweigart, Senior Associate Dean, Cleveland Institute of Music
Evaluation team chair
Stephanie McCann, Associate Vice Chancellor, Program Development and Approval,
Ohio Department of Education
Eric Martin, Vice President and Chief of Staff, Higher Learning Commission
Anthea Sweeney, Vice President for Accreditation Relations, Higher Learning
Commission
Karen Peterson Solinski, Executive Vice President for Legal and Governmental Affairs,
Higher Learning Commission