



FULL SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS OF IUP'S MIDDLE STATES SELF-STUDY

DECEMBER 2015

SUBMITTED BY: INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

IUP'S MIDDLE STATES SELF-STUDY

Full Subcommittee Reports

PREPARED FOR:

THE MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

DECEMBER 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subcommittee One: Full Report for Standards 1 and 6	5
Subcommittee Two: Full Report for Standards 2 and 3	31
Subcommittee Three: Full Report for Standards 4 and 5	59
Subcommittee Four: Full Report for Standards 8 and 9	83
Subcommittee Five: Full Report for Standards 10 and 11	112
Subcommittee Six: Full Report for Standards 12 and 13	139
Subcommittee Seven: Full Report for Standards 7 and 14	164

*The sources cited in this report may be found in the
IUP Middle States Library, which is accessible online via secure login.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ONE: FULL REPORT FOR STANDARDS 1 AND 6

Standard 1: Mission and Goals – The institution’s mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates whom the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are utilized to develop and shape its programs and practices to evaluate its effectiveness.

Standard 6: Integrity -- In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support to academic and intellectual freedom.

Members of Subcommittee One: William S. Balint (co-chair), Fredalene Bowers (co-chair), Holley Belch, Craig Bickley, Elaine A. Blair, Robert Bowser, Sharon Deckert, Sondra R. Dennison, Beatrice Fennimore, Robin Gorman, Regan P. Houser, John A. Lewis, Ute P. Lowery, Amanda L. Marshall, Michele Renee Papakie, Christian Hans Pedersen, Michele Lee Petrucci, Joyce Ann Shanty, Deanne Snavely, Richard P. White and Joette M. Wisnieski.

Description of the areas under review for Standard One: Mission and Goals

Context

This subcommittee’s task was to examine the institution’s mission and goals and to discover whether or not the university clearly states its responsibilities and ambitions; outlines how it intends to accomplish and continually assess them; and communicates to and involves the internal and external constituencies it strives to serve. Realizing that the journey is just as important as the destination, the subcommittee also sought to determine the level of collaboration that took place in its conception and whether or not the goals were designed to be flexible

enough to withstand constant assessment and renewal. The subcommittee believes that a well-communicated mission with specific, measurable goals should serve the university as a living document that drives budget decisions and fair resource management across the university.

Subcommittee One focused its investigation around the following research questions:

- How effectively do the university's mission, goals, and objectives support teaching, learning, service and scholarship? How are these components assessed? What is the process for revision and renewal?
- How does the development of the University Strategic Plan reflect collaboration, flexibility and the use of institutional assessment?
- How do the divisions – Academic Affairs, Enrollment Management, University Relations, Administration & Finance and Student Affairs – support the university's academic mission?
- How does the university communicate its missions and goals and progress toward the goals to faculty, students, staff, alumni and external constituencies?

Evidence

Members of Subcommittee One gathered evidence from the IUP Middle States Master Survey and from individual interviews. A diverse mix of faculty, staff and administrators met twice each month to conduct business. Much discussion and collaboration served to develop questions that would be included on the survey and provide quantitative data for analysis. Once the survey was conducted, the results were posted on the steering committee's page of the Confluence website for each subcommittee to access and analyze.

The IUP Middle States Master Survey with comments

Subcommittee One's questions were posed and answered as follows:

- Faculty/staff/students were asked: Are you aware of IUP's most recent Strategic Plan (2007 through 2012)? Sixty percent of the respondents reported they were not familiar at all with IUP's Strategic Plan, and 40 percent reported familiarity to some degree.
- Faculty/Staff/Students were asked: Are you aware of IUP's new Strategic Vision (2014-15)? Approximately half of the respondents reported they were not familiar at all with IUP's new Strategic Vision, and the other half reported familiarity to some degree.
- Administrators only were asked to rate the following statement: Collaboration occurs among the five divisions to support the Academic Plan of the institution. Seventy-eight percent agreed, 16 percent disagreed, and 6 percent reported they had no opinion.

The Middle States Steering Committee posted a 300-page document of comments that were gleaned from the survey in addition to the quantitative results. The members of Subcommittee One scoured these comments and aggregated them into themes that spoke to Standard One's initial research questions.

The subcommittee members discovered comments they felt pertained to its first research questions (How effectively do the University's mission, goals and objectives support teaching, learning, service and scholarship? How are these components assessed? What is the process for revision and renewal?). Overall, comments by the students, faculty, staff and administrators who responded to the survey were positive, except for comments related to tenure and promotion. Comments spoke of a conflicting mission that does not clearly articulate expectations for tenure and promotion. Administrators suggested promotion and tenure should be more focused on research. In sharp contrast, faculty reported the heavy teaching loads make research difficult and cause confusion over how the teacher/scholar model is evaluated.

When asked how the tenure and promotion process could be improved to reflect the teacher/scholar model, administrators who responded to the survey suggested the following: roll service and advising into teaching and promote faculty based on teaching and research; make research mandatory for promotion to associate professor; and weigh research heavier than teaching and service for both tenure and promotion. Again, faculty comments were contrary, citing the collective bargaining agreement's definition of scholarship and the need to more clearly define evaluation based on the CBA.

The survey question "What do you believe is IUP's greatest challenge?" revealed additional information that was considered to be noteworthy to the Standard One Subcommittee. Administrators answered this question and themes that emerged were: better academic advising; more faculty involvement regarding recruitment and retention; more service from faculty without pay; and greater trust from the staff and faculty.

Comments that appeared to pertain to the subcommittee's second research question (How does the development of the strategic plan reflect collaboration, flexibility and the utilization of institutional assessment?) demonstrated themes of strong leadership from the President and Provost, the university's commitment to its students, and robust community involvement. Faculty observations of collaboration were not as strong as those of students, staff and administrators.

The five divisions of the university are Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Enrollment Management and Communication, Advancement, and Finance and Administration. Regarding Subcommittee One's third research question (How do the divisions support the university's academic mission?), several themes emerged. Among those who responded to the survey, there were unfavorable comments regarding admissions, such as personnel are not open to suggestions, do not know the programs, fail to heed advice, and blame departments for low

enrollments. Unfavorable comments toward Developmental Studies included perceptions such as: the unit is disconnected from departments, their training is not assessed for effectiveness, grades are inflated in math courses, the personnel there are unfamiliar with various departments' requirements for freshmen, and DVST is not held accountable for retention rates. Finally, there were several comments about student workers screening calls in key offices and divisions, and this is believed to be a bad practice. The fact that callers are greeted by a voicemail message in the middle of the workday in some areas was reported to be unacceptable.

Comments also revealed that university and college enrollment goals and accountability hinder interdisciplinary collaboration among departments. It was said that the five divisions rely on faculty for service but do not accept input from faculty. Some respondents noted that strict policy adherence, or inflexibility when it comes to problem-solving, is more important than employing common sense.

Regarding how respondents commented on the question "What degree of collaboration occurs among the five divisions to support the academic purpose of the institution?" comments by students, faculty, staff and administrators were positive, except for comments pertaining to coordination/policy interpretations between the registrar's office and the financial aid/bursar's office. There also seems to be a perception of similar coordination problems between the bursar's office and the graduate school. The various policy interpretations impact service to students, which impacts academics (timely course enrollments), recruitment and retention.

Finally, staff members noted a lack of pleasantness, equality, and fairness among offices. They cited observations such as: certain staff members being rude, having poor attitudes, and not being customer-oriented. Several comments alluded to more specific issues such as staff's lack of responsiveness, effective communication, and adherence to policies. The university's

communication of the mission and goals and progress toward the goals to internal and external constituencies was not really addressed in the qualitative responses.

Interview questions and qualitative data

More of the same collaboration occurred within Subcommittee One to develop the open-ended questions that would be asked of a myriad of administrators to provide qualitative data for review and comparison. Committee members divided up the interviews, scheduled them through the Steering Committee and conducted them in a timely fashion. The notes were then transcribed and posted on Subcommittee One's work area on the Confluence website for members to discuss.

The interview questions were posed as follows:

- How effectively do the university's mission, goals and objectives support teaching, learning, service and scholarship? How are these components assessed? What is the process for revision and renewal?
- How does the development of the Strategic Plan reflect collaboration, flexibility and utilization of institutional assessment?
- What degree of collaboration occurs among the five divisions to support the academic purpose of the institution?
- How does the university communicate its mission and goals and progress toward the goals to internal and external constituencies?

The following people were interviewed to gather data for the four questions asked to research this standard: the university President, Provost, Vice President of Enrollment Management and Communications, Executive Staff Assistant to the Provost, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources, Provost's Associate, deans, IRPA Director, Vice President for Student Affairs,

Executive Director of Communications, members of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, Vice President of University Advancement, AACC, Assistant Vice President for International Education and Global Engagement, Vice President for Administration and Finance, and two Student Affairs administrative departmental directors.

Analysis of evidence as it pertains to Standard 1

During the years of the university's last strategic plan, 2007-12, IUP seemed to have all of the parts in place, but leadership lacked commitment to the plan, and consequently, a shared sense of purpose did not exist across campus. Comments across all constituencies reveal today that people believe many things have changed for the better at IUP since the new president. He spent his first year on campus listening and learning, and then things started to happen.

In 2013, the President enlisted the help of a journalism and public relations professor and a team of undergraduate students to conduct a university-wide strategic visioning process. The team worked for nine months, January to September, facilitating focus groups that were representative of all stakeholders at the university. Nearly 500 people participated in the process. Participants were asked the following questions: What makes IUP distinctive? What would you like to see IUP celebrate at its sesquicentennial in 2025? What are IUP's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats?

Individuals' comments were collected by meticulous, note-taking journalism students and then aggregated and coded through NVivo, a software program used to uncover themes.

The President then presented those themes at a Strategic Visioning Summit in October. More than 400 people attended the event at the KCAC and participated in breakout groups discussing each of the vision's components as well as value statements. People reported coming away from this process energized and hopeful about IUP's future. Throughout November,

comments from the summit were synthesized and shared in forums such as Cabinet, Senate and the Student Government Association, and by December, the Council of Trustees ratified the university's new vision and values.

In 2014, the Provost and a resurrected, more focused University Planning Council, comprised of members across the university community, followed a similar route to develop the University Strategic Plan. A subcommittee was assembled to examine the vision statement closely and categorize its messages into common themes that revealed four measurable, action-oriented goal statements. From there, 20 strategies and 66 tactics were developed to accomplish these goals. Again, the process was extremely transparent and participatory. The draft plan was posted on the university's website in fall 2014, and stakeholders were invited, repeatedly, to provide electronic comments that went straight to the Provost to be shared in both the subcommittee and the University Planning Council at large. The Provost also hosted several forums at different times and different days of the week to solicit feedback on the plan draft.

Before the final draft of the University Strategic Plan was even ratified, assessment, revision, and renewal became evident through endeavors such as the recent Summer Curriculum Action Team, which studied and proposed an overhaul for a streamlined curriculum process. The new process was approved by the end of the year, and the university is now poised to be more nimble in rejuvenating and creating new courses of study. This has also created an emerging collaborative environment where departments and colleges can more easily work together to create new academic programs.

Another program, one that had been disbanded under the previous administration and is in the process of being rejuvenated, is IUP's Academic Success Center, which is a cross-divisional effort spearheaded by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and involves many other

areas on campus. This comprehensive program is in its pilot stage, identifying stumbling blocks in departments that may be working against student success.

Although the strategic plan reflects much collaboration, its success will ultimately rely on assessment, particularly student learning outcomes. Historically, assessment of student outcomes on a consistent, universitywide level has been dicey at IUP. However, since 2008, the University Assessment Committee has been consistently moving forward, and its efforts fit well into the framework of the new strategic plan. Most recently, for example, the committee authorized pilot studies of two new assessment tools associated with the Liberal Studies program. And, units are using technology such as TracDat for assessment, and each university program participates in the State System five-year review process or holds accreditation with various accreditors, providing progress updates and reviews according to the accreditors' established review timetables.

The fact that IUP recognizes the need to improve institutional assessment, and that it is specifically addressed in the plan, is encouraging. Administrators consistently assert the new plan will dictate budget and resource priorities; funding will be tied to the plan's stated priorities. The hope is that this continual process of plan assessment and renewal will ensure ongoing environmental scans, which will reveal the university's need to responsively adapt to the speed of change in the global economy. It is already apparent that the current leadership uses quantitative and qualitative data in its decision making.

The plan has been built so its components can be assessed through evaluation at the program level. Leadership can monitor this evaluation, universitywide, so resources are allocated or reallocated based on the results at all levels. There has definitely been a need to refine institutional-level assessment and the universitywide communication of it. Constructive dialogue is occurring about assessment and results.

One of the emerging goals for IUP is to become more flexible. Historically, this has not been a characteristic of the institution. What's even more important than flexibility is the ability to be nimble; to respond quickly and efficiently to opportunities and threats that are presented to the university. Leadership's task is to collaboratively establish targets and encourage stakeholders to take initiative and calculated risks to achieve greatness. This requires everyone to be involved and to exhibit flexibility along the way. Sometimes this gets complicated when leadership and the union collide, especially in the latest discussions over "what it means to be a doctoral research university."

More intentional collaboration has become a practice across the university, beginning with the leadership of the five divisions. The siloes, in which the university community previously worked, are beginning to come down, reflecting a sense of shared responsibility and purpose. The insistence of more transparency and less territoriality has helped this to evolve.

The President's Cabinet has a retreat once every six months. Each division has worked to develop and sustain strong collaborative relationships with the academic side of the house that have served both divisions and students well. For example, the Concern and Response Team, or CART initiative, formally created relationships with faculty who then consult with divisions on other issues as well. There are multiple benefits of that initiative.

A sense of trust seems to be emerging that all are interested in the greater good. Students are the focus, and the divisions seem to be supporting the academic mission and purpose of the institution. When problems arise, people pull together and come to a resolution in the best interest of the students.

There are several other obvious examples of successful collaborations across campus. One involves communication among the five divisions and the Council of Deans. This

collaboration is essential to advancement and fundraising activities. The Advancement team is responsible for asking donors to invest in academic programs, so having an understanding of what programs are being developed is a key ingredient in effectively raising private gifts.

The University Budget Advisory Committee, which is comprised of representation from across the university, and President's Cabinet are well in tune with campus needs and the resources necessary to meet the academic purpose. Open discussions on these topics, and strategies to achieve the shared vision, take place regularly.

The Student Affairs division is responsible for extracurricular activities as well as living-learning programming. The University Advancement division works to create scholarship opportunities for students and raise funds for program enhancements. The Vice President for Enrollment Management and Communications and selected staff members began regularly meeting with the deans to ensure new programs are properly marketed and enrollment goals are fulfilled. The Enrollment Management division oversees the Financial Aid Office and Career Development Center. The Administration and Finance division cares for facilities in consultation with the academic community.

When colleagues collaborate to attempt to meet performance funding requirements, sometimes great things happen, and sometimes the requirements are in too much conflict with each other to produce successful results. Now that unit goals are being mapped to the university's Strategic Plan, everyone will continue to move in the same direction, regardless.

IUP is at the beginning of its new plan, and so not everything has been codified. In the last two years, however, the university's level of focus on its mission has risen to its highest level in several decades. The President, reflecting the desire of the trustees, is committed to an atmosphere of flexibility, collaboration and informed, data-driven decision making, which

ultimately ties back to assessment. This new plan must be communicated effectively to each and every stakeholder.

While administrators report they are communicating the university's mission and goals and progress toward the goals to internal and external constituencies quite well, the survey responses show otherwise. Only half of the survey respondents reported they knew about the new vision.

It's true that the President never misses an opportunity to communicate to all audiences—internal and external—the direction in which the university is headed. And, he uses all available forms of communication to do so—traditional media, e-mail, website, Twitter, monthly open forums on campus, meetings with advisory boards, and remarks at receptions and public events.

He has even reached far into the Indiana community, speaking at Indiana Borough Council meetings, Indiana County Chamber of Commerce events, Rotary International gatherings, etc. The President personally participates in the university's annual Hawk Walk, where teams of students, faculty, staff, administrators, police officers and community members travel in gaggles knocking on doors in the community to visit residents and foster positive town-gown relationships. He engages local legislators in regular dialogue as well, and he travels far and wide to spread news about IUP to alumni and potential donors. Progress is communicated upward at a quarterly Board of Governors meeting at the State System and laterally through monthly state union meetings from faculty to faculty among the 14 universities.

The departments, colleges, library and regional campuses produce a variety of annual reports, newsletters, social media content and information for the "IUP Daily," an electronic newsletter sent to faculty, staff and administrators each day. There is also a daily electronic publication that goes to students – "The Beak." However, it's never safe to assume that just

because it has been sent, it has been read. IUP uses social media well, engaging its followers on Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube primarily.

The documents explaining vision, values, mission and strategic plan are available online. Email has also been useful in pointing people to the information and soliciting feedback. News releases help the external constituencies understand where to find information.

Historically, clear, consistent, and frequent communication on strategic plan-like topics does not appear to have been an institutional practice. This is heard throughout campus frequently: “Here we go again. All of this work, and the strategic plan will sit on a shelf and gather dust.”

Some believe this time will be different, while others still doubt. Only time will tell.

Recommendations

1. Make the vision, values, mission, and strategic plan highly visible throughout campus, not just electronically. Utilize the power of language in catch phrases that express direction/values/vision/mission/strategic plan and display them prominently in all buildings on campus (academic and non-academic) capitalizing on the advantage of a consistent presence in the environment (NCATE is good at this).
2. Put the university's vision and values on our ID cards. Use it as a watermark wherever possible.
3. Incorporate the messaging in everything IUP communicates internally and externally, not just electronically.
4. Publish a quarterly newsletter for donors and legislators demonstrating how each goal is being lived; how IUP is walking the talk.

5. Help all constituencies to understand and buy into the “big picture” of the university by creating an hour-long “lesson plan” on IUP’s strategic plan that professors could tailor to their disciplines and incorporate into their student learning outcomes.
6. Develop and roll out consistent customer service training, which incorporates the university’s vision and values, for all staff and student workers.
7. Continue the outstanding collaboration that occurred during the development of the university’s vision and strategic plan. This collaboration needs to continue throughout the execution of the plan, and even more importantly, throughout the regular assessment and renewal of the plan.
8. Explore the reasons that might explain the following: When administrators were asked to rate the statement “Collaboration occurs among the five divisions to support the Academic Plan of the institution,” results were as follows: 78% agreed; 16% disagreed and 6% had no opinion.
9. Extend more opportunities for collaboration among the registrar, financial aid/bursar and graduate school offices. Policy misinterpretations hurt both recruiting and retention.
10. Continue discussions between faculty and administration regarding the tenure and promotion processes. IUP has streamlined the curriculum process; the tenure and promotion processes need to be overhauled as well.
11. Continue discussions between faculty and administration regarding advising, recruiting and retention. Faculty feel heavy burdens are being placed on them in these areas, yet they are being evaluated by completely different criteria.
12. Open discussion and engagement among Developmental Studies and related constituencies to discuss perceptions and activities.

13. Continue dialogue with faculty and administrators regarding the question, “What does it mean to be a doctoral research university?” This would exemplify living the vision and values regarding collaboration and transparency.
14. Dispel the idea – through actions and words – that this new strategic plan will “sit on a shelf and collect dust,” as plans have in the past.

Description of area under review for Standard 6: Integrity

Context

The Standard Six work group developed research questions that focus on the policies that IUP has developed to protect and encourage fair and equal treatment of all members of the university community, academic integrity, a respect for diversity, and academic freedom. Specifically, the work group tried to summarize: 1) what policies and procedures are in place with regard to these areas and 2) how well are these policies and procedures implemented and communicated to the university community. Every effort was made to consider how these policies are applied and communicated to all of the various stakeholders involved the mission of the university—administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

Focus

The group developed the following research questions to guide our assessment of the university's policies and practices related to integrity.

- 1) How do university policies address Standard 6 (Integrity)? Are they clearly stated and readily available? Are they effectively implemented with university community input before and after implementation? Are they adequately supported by institutional resources? Are they periodically reviewed, assessed, and revised as necessary? Are they implemented to ensure consistency and fairness?

2) What measures are taken to determine whether policies are followed? What processes for investigating complaints and for appeal are in place? What measures are taken to ensure the best stewardship of all resources?

3) How does IUP communicate its policies, practices and products?

4) How does the university promote a climate of civility, integrity, and appreciation for diversity?

5) How does the university support principles of academic freedom, academic integrity, and responsible conduct of research?

6) How does the institution ensure the integrity of performance and conduct of all employees?

To obtain concrete data with which to answer the research questions, the group crafted more specific questions that could be answered in an online survey. Not all of the research questions lend themselves to being answered in whole or in part through an online survey, so the survey questions are meant to be at best partial answers to the research questions. In particular, the subcommittee focused on survey questions that could elicit concrete, usable data pertaining to Research Question Four and Research Question Five. The following survey questions aim at providing data to answer Question Four:

- Do you feel your view/opinions are respected by your peers?
- Do you feel the university promotes an appreciation for diversity?
- Do you feel you are treated in a fair manner?

This set of survey questions provide data for answering Research Question Five:

- Do you feel you are able to freely express ideas and pursue research without judgment?
- How satisfied are you with the Academic Integrity Policy?
- Do you feel the university adheres to responsible conducts of research?

- Do you feel you are able to freely express your own ideas/opinions without judgment?

Evidence

Three main sources of evidence were used in writing this report: interviews with relevant administrators, faculty, and staff; quantitative data from the IUP Middle States Survey (online) of administrators, faculty, staff, and students; qualitative data (i.e., written responses to open-ended questions) from the same online survey. There will be little fine-grained analysis of any of these sources of evidence, since space in this report is limited. Instead, the focus will be on picking out general trends found in any of these sources that are relevant to this section.

Those interviewed were asked to give responses to all of the above research questions. The following people were interviewed: President, Provost, Vice President of Enrollment Management and Communications, Executive Staff Assistant to the Provost, Associate Vice President for Human Resources, Provost's Associate, Deans, IRPA Director, Vice President of Student Affairs, Executive Director of Communications, President's Commission on the Status of Women, Vice President of University Advancement, Director of African American Culture Center, Assistant Vice President of International Education and Global Engagement, Vice President of Administration and Finance, and two Student Affairs Administrative Departmental Directors. Members of the subcommittee conducted the interviews and recorded the responses.

The survey questions listed in the above section were included in the large online survey distributed to the broader IUP community, and much of our quantitative evidence comes from the responses to those questions. However, some questions put into the survey by other subcommittees also yielded responses that were deemed useful for answering our group's research questions. Therefore, the quantitative evidence considered in this report draws from the responses to our survey questions and responses to any other questions that were relevant.

Similarly, when analyzing the qualitative data, the group looked for general themes in the responses to the survey questions posed by the group and any other relevant responses. The large document containing the totality of the qualitative responses was searched using pertinent key words, such as “integrity,” “civility,” “fairness,” or “diversity.” Any responses containing these key words were then added to those to be considered.

Analysis of the evidence as it pertains to Standard 6

The first part of this section is descriptive, aiming to summarize what policies and practices are in place and how these policies are communicated. The second part of this section is evaluative, using the evidence gathered through the interviews conducted and the online survey to say something about how the university community feels IUP is doing in its implementation of its policies and principles.

Description of the policies and practices pertaining to integrity

All major policies and changes to policies should be endorsed by the University Senate. This ensures that all groups in the university community have input into the policy formation and revision process, as the University Senate includes representatives from the student body, the administration, the faculty, and the staff.

Policies governing student academic integrity and general conduct are found in the undergraduate or graduate catalogs and in *The Source*, a handbook for students. Students are also informed of important policies at orientation.

Many policies detailing the expectations for faculty and staff performance can be found in the collective bargaining agreements for each group. These agreements have been negotiated by the unions representing each respective group, so in principle, there is a mechanism by which faculty and staff members can have input in the process of developing these policies.

Administrators, staff, managers, and non-tenured faculty are evaluated annually to ensure that their conduct is consistent with all relevant policies. Of course, the conduct of faculty is thoroughly evaluated when they apply for tenure, and faculty must undergo post-tenure evaluations every five years.

Accounting and procurement practices at IUP are governed by the relevant professional and legal standards, such as the U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (U.S. GAAP), the American Institutes of CPAs (AICPA) Code of Professional Conduct, and state and PASSHE directives covering proper procurement practices.

In recent years IUP has worked to ensure that faculty and staff are aware of their responsibilities pertaining to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Training sessions have been held to clearly outline what sort of student information can be given out, to whom, in what circumstances, etc. The Office of the Registrar also has a one-page summary of FERPA guidelines on its website for quick reference.

IUP and its affiliated IUP Research Institute adhere to policies governing research proposed by the School of Graduate Studies and Research and endorsed by the Senate. In addition this school has other ways of ensuring integrity in research practices, such as the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. The Research Institute ensures that research with external funding complies with the policies set by the source providing that funding.

Though its implementation is still too new and under-developed to comment on with a great degree of certainty, it should be mentioned that IUP is currently in the process of formulating policies and practices that will ensure the university's compliance with recently passed PA Act 153, which aims to protect minors on university campuses. The university has

started a series of training sessions to make faculty and staff aware of the new law and its requirements and is finalizing the details of a background check program, which will require all employees to undergo background checks every three years.

IUP has been very committed to establishing a campus community in which diversity is respected and encouraged. There have been several new initiatives aimed at promoting the interests of students, staff, and faculty from groups that are traditionally underrepresented at IUP. There are, of course, other well-established policies in this area.

The university has hired an Assistant to the President for Social Equity and created an associated Office of Social Equity. Generally, this office seeks to promote diversity across the IUP community, including instituting hiring practices aimed at encouraging diversity, and works to ensure that IUP remains compliant with any and all regulatory standards pertaining to social equity. IUP has recently hired a Title IX compliance officer in the Office of Social Equity, and there has been an increased focus on training faculty and staff on policies related to Title IX and actions required by those policies.

The Office of Social Equity also ensures that the university is compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). There has also been a task force set up to recommend and implement policies related to the accessibility of electronic information technology.

There are different groups dedicated to promoting diversity on campus: Women's Commission, African American Cultural Center, Frederick Douglass Institute, LGBTQIA Commission, Native American Awareness Council, and the Hispanic Heritage Council.

In spring 2014, IUP opened the Military Resource Center, which aims to help veterans transition from their service in the military to their studies at IUP.

Evaluation of the policies and practices pertaining to integrity

General evaluation of integrity standards at IUP. The IUP Middle States Survey included several questions asking respondents to rate the extent to which they feel integrity standards are applied consistently and fairly at IUP. The results of those survey questions are given below. Overall, there seems to be a consensus that generally, integrity standards at IUP are applied fairly and consistently. With regard to these general questions concerning integrity at IUP, 71.1% of those who responded agree or strongly agree that IUP's integrity standards are applied consistently, 16.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 13.5% of respondents reported that they had no opinion on this question. In almost identical fashion, 71.6% agree or strongly agree that IUP's integrity standards are applied fairly, 14.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 13.7% of respondents reported that they had no opinion on this question.

Fair and consistent application of policies in evaluation of faculty and staff. While there were no questions directly relating to this issue in the online survey, there were a significant number of comments both in the responses to the interviews and in the open-ended responses to the online survey that this was deemed to be an issue worth addressing here. These comments regarding faculty and staff evaluation do not, of course, deal specifically with integrity policies in place at IUP, but they do address a key concern that many seem to have about the fair and consistent application of policies related to faculty and staff evaluation. There was dissatisfaction expressed in the interview responses with the effect of the collective bargaining agreements on faculty and staff evaluations. The strict rules in the respective contracts governing wage increases and decreases were thought to detract from the efficacy of annual evaluations in changing less than ideal conduct to be more in line with IUP's standards of conduct. The open-ended responses to the survey questions indicate that there is a feeling that the

standards governing faculty and tenure and promotion are less than clear and not always consistently applied. There were complaints that the leadership of the university has been unclear in articulating their expectations with regard to the relative weight of research, teaching, and service when considering tenure applications. There were also complaints that the expectations for promotion applications, which are determined by the faculty union, were similarly unclear. Additionally, there were worries that the standards for promotion are applied inconsistently, depending on the exact make-up of the promotion committee.

Evaluation of IUP's academic integrity standards. Clearly, having effective academic integrity policies is central to the operation of any university. Based on the responses to the online survey, there is broad satisfaction with the academic integrity standards at IUP and their implementation. The results of the survey indicate that 81.8% of those who responded agree or strongly agree that the leadership at IUP reflects their values on academic integrity, while only 6.8% disagree or strongly disagree, and 11.3% have no opinion on this issue. Similarly, 82.3% of respondents agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with academic integrity policies at IUP, while only 6.2% disagree or strongly disagree, and 11.5% have no opinion on this issue. There was no significant level of dissatisfaction with academic integrity expressed in either the responses to the interviews or in the open-ended responses to the survey.

Evaluation of the responsible conduct of research. As with academic integrity, the responses to the online survey do not give any indication that irresponsible conduct of research is a serious problem at IUP. A strong majority of those who responded, 72.4%, agree or strongly agree that research at IUP is conducted responsibly, while only 2.4% disagree or strongly disagree, and 25.1% of respondents reported that they had no opinion on this question. There was

no significant expression of concern about irresponsible research practices in either the responses to the interviews or in the open-ended responses to the survey.

Evaluation of climate of civility and respect for academic freedom. The online survey included several questions aimed at gauging the extent to which respondents feel that they are treated civilly and have the freedom to pursue their academic interests. When asked if peers solicited their opinions, 72.3% of those who responded agreed or strongly agreed, 14% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 13.7% reported that they had no opinion on this question. An even stronger majority of respondents, 81.1%, agreed or strongly agreed that peers respect their opinions, while only 9% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 9.9% of respondents reported that they had no opinion on this question. Similarly, a large majority of respondents, 86%, agree or strongly agree that they are treated in a fair manner by their peers, and 80.9% agree or strongly agree that they are treated in a fair manner by their superiors. An area of potential concern is that while 75.6% of respondents agree or strongly agree that they can express their ideas and opinions without judgment, 15.6% disagree or strongly disagree. Finally, 62.5% of respondents agree or strongly agree that they can pursue their research interests without judgment with 28.8% of respondents reported that they had no opinion on this question. Overall, it seems that most members of the IUP community feel that the university does a reasonably good job creating an environment that fosters civility and academic freedom. As mentioned above, it is a potential worry that 15.6% of respondents indicated that they felt they could not express their opinions without judgment, but when considered in the context of the other largely positive responses, it might be fair to treat the negative response to this question as an anomaly and not a serious indication of something amiss in the climate at IUP.

Evaluation of the respect for diversity. There were two questions in the survey that most directly address the general respect for diversity at IUP. When asked if IUP leadership reflects their values on diversity, 76.1% of respondents agree or strongly agree that, while 10.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed, 13.2% of respondents reported that they had no opinion on this question. Somewhat worryingly, while 76.8% agree or strongly agree that the climate at IUP reflects equal respect for diverse people, 15.6% disagree or strongly disagree with this statement. Furthermore, while the open-ended responses to the survey questions demonstrate an appreciation for the increase in diversity at IUP and the extent to which IUP has made Indiana much more diverse than a small, rural town normally, there is also a serious undercurrent of dissatisfaction with the level of diversity at the university and the extent to which members of various minority groups feel respected by and included in the university community. When considering all of this evidence, IUP has made strides in promoting diversity and making members of minority groups feel respected and included, but there is still work to be done.

Evaluation of the communication of policies. The survey data shows that a strong majority of those who responded (greater than 60%) find IMAIL (91%), the MyIUP web portal (70.4%), and the IUP website (68.8%) to be effective or very effective in communicating changes in university policy and procedures. None of the other methods of communicating changes in policies had significantly more than 50% of respondents rate them as effective or very effective. A common theme in the responses was that while policies were available online and in print, it would be beneficial to have some well-publicized, central location where all of the university's policies could be found. Currently, policies are available on the websites of different university divisions, colleges, and departments, a situation which potentially requires anyone looking for information to check multiple sources before finding the relevant policy or not

knowing exactly where to look and never stumbling upon the policy of interest. Though the majority of respondents feel that the IUP website is effective in communicating university policies, the comments from those interviewed are strong enough that it might be the case that the lack of a centralized, online repository of all university standards and policies is a problem.

Recommendations

1. There needs to be a serious review of the process for tenure and promotion of faculty to clarify expectations and ensure fairness. This becomes an integrity issue when numerous faculty members feel that the official policies that are supposed to detail the expectations for them to achieve tenure or promotion are unclear or applied unfairly or inconsistently. While difficult, it would be helpful to open a serious conversation involving all relevant parties aimed at providing clearer, more objective expectations in this area. To deal with the feeling that standards for promotion and tenure are applied unfairly and inconsistently, this group suggests that some form of external review be incorporated into the process. It would be difficult to find consensus on the exact manner in which this would work, but beginning the conversation is great progress.
2. When considering whether the university does well in fostering a climate of civility, the group discovered that IUP does have an official statement on civility, but this civility statement only exists in hard copy form in various offices around campus. While posting a civility statement on the university website will surely not dramatically change the atmosphere on campus, the group thought it important to make it clear that it is official policy to protect and encourage civil discourse on campus.
3. Despite the new initiatives aimed at fostering diversity at IUP, the responses to the open-ended questions on the survey make it clear that members of many traditionally

underrepresented groups still do not feel as if they are fully embraced and integrated into the larger university and local community. This is a difficult problem whose solution will undoubtedly require persistent, sustained effort. One potential specific recommendation is to institute a university diversity day at which groups representing all of the diverse members of the IUP community put on exhibitions open to all and advertised broadly, including in the broader Indiana community.

4. Finally, the responses to the interview questions make it clear that it would be helpful to have a central online repository for all university policies. The group understands that senior members of IUP leadership are aware and are evaluating suggested improvements.

SUBCOMMITTEE TWO: FULL REPORT FOR STANDARDS 2 AND 3

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal – An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources – The human, financial, technical, facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution’s mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution’s mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution’s resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

Members of Subcommittee Two: John Kilmarx (co-chair), Shari Robertson (co-chair), Jessica Baum, John Benhart, Thomas Borellis, Dolores Brzycki, Stephanie Caulder, Ola Kaniasty, George Long, Victor Lopez, Karen Mathe, Valerie Mercado, Sarah Neusius, Muhammad Numan, Autumn Shannon, Susie Sink, Gealy Wallwork, Ray Wygonik, David Yerger, and Ed Zimmerman.

Description of area under review

Context

A well-educated workforce is an important asset for Pennsylvania and earning a post-secondary degree remains a respected and valued credential for students and employers.

Strategic planning and resource management are critical components to the university’s success in providing the quality educational experiences that lead to these outcomes.

The last decade has proven to be a particularly challenging period for IUP, as it has for many universities. Numerous stressors, such the downturn in the economy, demographics, and instability in university leadership, have impacted the university’s environment. However,

despite these stressors, strategic planning that includes a strong focus on core mission and values has remained a high priority. As a result, IUP is in a relatively strong and stable position.

Focus

This section of the self study centers around five areas of investigation: 1) the factors that have contributed to the university's planning environment since the last self study; 2) the strategic planning initiatives that have taken place over the past 10 years; 3) the resources available to the university; 4) continued challenges related to planning, assessment, and institutional renewal; and 5) opportunities for innovation and institutional renewal..

What evidence was gathered and by what means? The committee met multiple times to familiarize themselves with the standards, develop the research questions, and identify potential sources to answer the questions. Following this, the committee members provided input on each of the research questions gleaned from these and other sources. These responses were then compiled and distributed to the full committee for review. During subsequent meetings, the committee discussed emerging themes and identified areas that required additional investigation. Specific committee members were then charged with taking responsibility for refining specific areas of focus. Following this, a synthesized draft of the self study report was sent to committee members. All committee members were then invited to participate in an extended working session to identify recommendations and further refine the document. Based on the input provided by committee members at this meeting, a draft report was created by the subcommittee co-chairs. This report was submitted to the entire subcommittee for final comments and a second working session was held in which final edits were made resulting in the finished version of the document.

Analysis of strengths and challenges

The planning environment

There are a number of factors that have contributed to the planning environment since the last Middle States Comprehensive Self Study.

University leadership. Since the last self study, IUP has had two presidents, one interim president, one acting president, and five provosts. With the hiring of President Michael Driscoll in 2012, and the subsequent selection of Dr. Timothy Moerland as Provost, there is a growing sense among the university community that the leadership has stabilized. Dr. Driscoll is perceived as a committed and pro-active president. His open communication style regarding the resources and long range university goals (e.g., University Planning Council and monthly Open Forums) is vital to building a strong campus community and effective strategic planning.

Economy. Declines in the U.S. and state economy in the past decade have resulted in reduced funding for public education from the state legislature. Consequently, tuition costs have increased as universities, including IUP, struggle to make up for this financial shortfall. Simultaneously, the ability of families to pay for a college education or advanced degree has decreased. This has resulted in broad negative effects at IUP and across the State System, such as escalating student loan debt, reductions in discretionary funding for faculty complement and support staff, and postponement of upgrades and replacement of some physical facilities. Under our new leadership team, IUP has begun to address these economic challenges strategically to facilitate academic excellence and institutional renewal.

Changing demographics. Demographic trends in the western Pennsylvania region, such as a documented decline in traditional age populations and the resulting lower number of high school seniors, have had a substantial effect on university enrollment and resources. The evaluation of key performance metrics and leading indicators, particularly through the most recent strategic planning efforts, identified as a high priority the recruitment and retention of students from the university's traditional pool as well as identification of new market niches. Recent efforts that support this commitment include a major re-organization of the university's marketing and admissions functions to increase efficiency and effectiveness (<http://www.iup.edu/newsItem.aspx?id=187857&blogid=6291>). A new international recruiter in the Office of International Education will help further increase the breadth and scope of student enrollments. In addition, IUP has signed reverse transfer agreements that will allow students to earn their associate degree from community colleges after transferring to IUP (e.g., Westmoreland County Community College, <http://www.iup.edu/newsItem.aspx?id=190939&blogid=17493>).

Competition. Competition among Pennsylvania's colleges and universities for the already-reduced pool of potential students is strong. Some of this competition is derived from for-profit, corporate institutions engaging in distance learning alternate delivery models. These entities are often less constrained by traditional procedures, policies, and regulations than those faced by public universities and, as a result, can respond more quickly to changing market trends. Consumer expectations for on-line instruction are very high, which will require attention to professional development and entrepreneurial approaches in order to be competitive there, as well as in new markets such as non-degree and noncredit programming. To address these

challenges, IUP has recently established the Office of Extended Studies under the direction of an experienced leader (<http://www.iup.edu/academicaffairs/default>).

Regulatory requirements. Compliance and regulatory issues (e.g., Title IX, protection of minors, state authorization for distance education) have increased, due, at least in part, to real abuses that have occurred in the state. The laws and regulations are complex and in a constant state of flux, which raises the cost of compliance both in terms of time and money. For instance, IUP has begun the challenging new process of obtaining FBI fingerprinting and Pennsylvania background checks for all university employees, contractors, and volunteers (<http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=158408>).

Technology. Technology creates challenges for university planning across several fronts. First, purchasing, maintaining, and upgrading technology is expensive both in terms of labor and costs. Increases in the university's Technology Fee have helped defray many of these costs, even as the IT industry continues to advance. Demands to support personal equipment, specifically mobile products, have additionally taxed IT and its associated resources as expectations expand for access to and integration within the existing infrastructure and technology offerings. As for technology accessibility for individuals with disabilities, changes occur so rapidly that the fixes sometimes are often beyond the ability of the user and require IT assistance. Finally, the increasing reliance on technology makes any down-time a serious problem, whether caused by a virus or a power outage or a distributed denial of service attack. With the growth of the use of laptops and personal mobile devices, it has become easier than ever for viruses and malware to affect individuals and campus systems, resulting in loss of productivity and increases in costs. These are recognized as serious issues for the university's operations and reputation. Three years ago, the senior leadership of IUP and IT Services prioritized efforts and within the last year

established a new directorate of personnel and other resources dedicated to proactively address information technology security.

Globalization. Increased levels of globalization offer both threats and opportunities to university planning. These include more international students and scholars, competition from offshore universities, the need to teach and learn cultural competencies, increased regulatory compliance, and a potential decline in responsiveness of large multinational companies to adapt their products and services to individual partners such as IUP. The Office of International Education has already been mentioned; it was re-established as a key unit in Academic Affairs in 2006 and provides outstanding support for international students and their families.

With these factors providing the context, IUP has engaged both in short-term and long-term planning activities and set specific goals to fulfill its mission. The university's planning activities have involved a cross-section of the university community and included such entities as President's Cabinet, the University Planning Council and its subcommittees, Council of Deans, Council of Chairs, Student Affairs Leadership Team, University Senate and its subcommittees, Student Operations Group, and other ad hoc and standing committees and task groups.

The university's strategic planning initiatives

2007-2012 strategic plan. The development of this university-wide strategic plan began in April 2007 and was completed by the end of that year (<http://www.iup.edu/strategicplan>). Efforts were made to make the plan consistent with *Leading the Way*, the strategic plan developed to guide the State System. The resulting IUP vision, mission, and plan addressed many goal areas that are still considered important today, including student success, economic and community development and partnerships, and commitment to teaching, scholarship and

service. At the university level, progress on achieving the 2007-2012 goals was reported annually. The credibility of the plan would have been substantially strengthened had it been more focused and action-oriented at the start, linked to resources, and revisited periodically for assessment and adjustment to the changing environment. However, there were few local implementation or monitoring committees that tracked progress from the various constituent units. Overall, although the 2007-2012 strategic plan had merit, it did not appear to be useful in confronting or solving the real problems of the national economic crisis facing the university during this period.

Current strategic plan. President Driscoll began the current strategic planning project with development of a strategic vision in 2013. The process is well-described at <http://www.iup.edu/president/svp>. Among the key steps were group interviews that drew participants from across the university in spring and summer 2013. The visioning process was regarded as highly inclusive; the focus groups and summit meetings drew more than 400 participants. In December 2013, the Council of Trustees endorsed the Strategic Vision Statement and associated values (<http://www.iup.edu/upper.aspx?id=2065>).

The University Planning Council (UPC) was then charged with creating a new IUP strategic plan based on the Strategic Vision. Subsequently, and also through a very open and participatory process, Provost Moerland led the development and refinement of a new University Strategic Plan, which was adopted in Spring of 2015 (<http://www.iup.edu/strategic-planning>).

A report to the University Senate in November 2014 indicated that the university intended to link the goals of the strategic plan with performance-based budget allocations. This signaled a substantially different approach from the 2007-12 IUP strategic plan and the Academic Affairs strategic plan, which were not clearly linked to resource allocation. The new

strategic plan was developed with this knowledge and will be better able to provide focus and a framework for aligning appropriate resources to achieve university goals. For example, as part of the short-term planning process in 2013, and in order to make some immediate progress, funds were allocated for strategic initiatives identified by various working task groups. One of these was the new Academic Success Center (ASC@IUP Final Report).

Another example showing the university's ability to respond to change is reflected in the implementation of a multi-year (three year) budget planning model. This approach improves our ability to see long-term trends with greater clarity, instead of reacting to one-year uncertainty and volatility caused by our dependence on student tuition revenues and by the increased costs of employee health care benefits (both of which have been difficult to predict), as well as untimely information on state appropriations.

Capital/facilities planning. In 2010, the university completed a new Long Range Facility Master Plan (<http://www.iup.edu/adminfinance/masterplan>). The effort involved all divisions of the university as well as shareholders from outside of the university community. Although the State System requires five-year updates for the Long Range Facility Master plan, IUP has updated this plan on a more frequent basis. This is evidence that the planning effort related to facilities is taken seriously.

The university also completed a Housing Master Plan in 2004 that led to the Residential Revival initiative. When completed in 2010, more than \$238 million had been spent replacing on-campus student housing (<http://www.iup.edu/newsItem.aspx?id=101081&blogid=6121>). These housing projects were financed through our public-private relationship with the Foundation for IUP (FIUP). The FIUP assumed all of the debt to the Residential Revival project and was instrumental in helping the university achieve a dramatic transformation of campus

housing. This was followed up in 2013 with a new housing market study and a study on the viability and future of the four remaining traditional housing units on campus. In 2011, the university produced a Dining Master Plan to coordinate the revitalization of all campus dining services. In addition, an Athletics Master Plan and a Campus Signage Master Plan have been implemented or are in progress.

Enrollment planning. IUP enrollment increased steadily over the last several years, peaking at 15,379 students in the Fall of 2012. Deans and graduate program coordinators met periodically with members of Enrollment Management and the School of Graduate Studies and Research in order to set admission targets, but the demographics were on the uptick, and close coordination between Undergraduate Admissions and college leadership was not essential to making our overall numbers. Within the Division of Academic Affairs, the Graduate School and the colleges worked on improving the use of resources in order to have a bigger impact on enrollment at the graduate level. For example, a new formula was developed for allocating assistantships, and departments were permitted to control their overall allocations so that they could become more competitive by offering fewer but better paid assistantships. With the new alignment of both undergraduate and graduate marketing, recruitment, and admissions being handled centrally by Enrollment Management (March 2015), we look for better visibility, more efficiencies, and overall more streamlined and responsive processing across the board.

Academic planning. In 2010, following a series of large, interactive planning meetings (charrettes) in which faculty, staff, and administrators jointly identified goals and priorities of the academic mission, and diligent oversight by a blue-ribbon steering committee, Academic Affairs adopted an academic plan (<http://www.iup.edu/academicplan>). Initiatives and achievements were recorded for each unit in Academic Affairs in a database (TracDat). A monitoring committee

was responsible for entering data, reviewing the results, sharing the information division-wide, and recommending annual priorities to the Academic Affairs Council. The transparency and many of the efforts, initiatives, and achievements were real, but enthusiasm for direction and focus seemed to be lacking in those post-President Atwater years.

Academic program review and faculty workforce plan. In 2011, driven by the budget crisis and State System directives, an Academic Affairs Program Review and Faculty Workforce Plan was implemented under the direction of Provost Gerald Intemann. Under pressure from the State System, the review asserted that IUP could no longer “be everything to everyone” and sought to achieve “strategic balance in academic offerings and preserve the highest quality and most-valued programs” (Plan Intro, June 9, 2011). College deans were charged with evaluating all of their academic degree programs using the criteria of program quality, centrality to mission and alignment with the academic strategic plan, student demand and program vitality, and current cost structure. Specific attention was given to degree programs that awarded fewer than five undergraduate degrees per year or two graduate degrees per year. As a result, 62 programs, tracks, or concentrations that were low-enrolled, not of obvious strategic value to the university, or redundant were identified to be placed in moratorium or discontinued. Although only 21 programs were actually eliminated or overhauled, very few students were affected, and no employees were retrenched or laid off as a result of the workforce plan, this “show cause” exercise caused a great deal of anxiety. At the same time, it forced the university to focus on core strengths and services, and to honestly examine our academic offerings in light of the new market imperatives. Such projects are, in the long run, healthy for institutions to undertake.

There can be challenges in terms of aligning actions with goals. Reasons why departments and colleges may not have always systematically linked local actions to university

planning may include the genuinely comfortable understandings of existing roles and behaviors; the power of historical stability and continuity (base allocations); the relative difficulty of adjusting goals and resources through reallocation; and the possibility that administrative leadership did not insist on accountability. With new leadership in place that is committed to moving forward and aligning all parts of the university to a common mission and goals, and the real necessity of adapting to budgetary priorities (cf. other public universities in the region), IUP can expect to sustain the excitement and relevance of the visioning process and of the Middle States self study throughout the next strategic plan.

University resources

Fundamental to the planning process is identification and application of appropriate resources to support viability and growth. The university manages five major kinds of resources to achieve its mission and goals (financial, human, technology, facilities, and partnerships). In general, resource allocations are predicated on historical funding practices, higher education industry standards, best practices, and directed actions based on opportunity or need.

Financial resources. Financial resources are received from a variety of sources. State Educational and General (E&G) funds are derived from appropriations (approximately 25% of the total E&G budget), State System performance funding (another 2%), and of course tuition and fees (73%), much of which is in the form of student loans and grants. Revenues include \$53 million in general state appropriation, which includes \$4.3 million in performance funding, \$113 million in tuition and fees, \$23 million in government grants and contracts, and \$16 million in other funds such as interest income and service income.

Base tuition rates are set by the Board of Governors for the State System; annual increases have been at or below the rate of inflation for many years. IUP has been approved to assess alternative (discounted) rates for residents of certain bordering states and alternative (increased) rates for high-cost, high-demand programs. IUP has proposed a plan that would assess, on a per-credit basis rather than a “flat rate” for full-time study, all IUP undergraduates who domicile in Pennsylvania. Tuition discounts and scholarships would be in place to help buffer any impact on students and to reward good academic progress. Implementation of the plan has been delayed from its intended fall semester 2015 implementation due to state budget uncertainty. Once implemented this plan is intended to support our longer goal of rationalizing tuition costs, increasing net revenue for the university, and helping more students graduate.

In the most general of terms, financial resource allocation is proportional and fairly stable. Although the Division of Administration and Finance is “responsible for the development, stewardship, enhancement, integrity, and stability of the university’s fiscal, human, and physical resources” (<http://www.iup.edu/adminfinance/about>), the budget is more or less determined by the leadership in each division. The vice presidents allocate fixed and variable resources and work with their component units to make adjustments to budgets or spending plans. For example, in the Division of Academic Affairs, base allocations, funded initiatives, and/or required trimming (cuts) are first modeled and discussed with deans, who in turn, as appropriate, communicate and pass these resources or adjustments through to department chairs/programs.

Human resources. IUP employs a large cadre of hardworking people who anticipate needs, seek to improve institutional quality, and promote institutional excellence just by doing a great job on a daily basis. While there are contractual requirements as minima for faculty and other employees represented by collective bargaining such as the number of required office

hours per week, most faculty exceed these minima in some way, either with research or service activities or through extensive interaction with students outside of the classroom. The university employs approximately 1,800 faculty, staff, and managers, plus another 500 student workers on a part-time basis. Salaries, wages, and benefits account for nearly 75% of the Educational & General budget (E&G). Not including auxiliary enterprises, 56% of all E&G expenditures are instructional (IPEDS; see <http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=19345>).

In 2009, the university's personnel budgeting process became somewhat more centralized in anticipation of financial shortfalls. This resulted in the pooling of frictional savings (differences between position budgets and actual expenditures), which allowed the university as a whole to manage one-time carryover reserves more effectively, and take positive action that would not have been possible otherwise. For example, such reserves were used to pay off the entire remaining debt of about \$32 million for the new Kovalchick Convention and Athletic Complex (KCAC) at the end of FY 2013/14.

Typically, about two-thirds of all vacant faculty lines are authorized for searches. Searches in some disciplines are competitive, but in others there have been few qualified applicants. For the past three years, the Provost, working with the Office of Social Equity, has augmented college funds for recruiting qualified underrepresented minorities. The remaining vacancies, along with base allocations to colleges for temporary faculty and for overloads, are used to pay for temporary appointments or for overloads. Total faculty FTE has not increased as quickly as total credit-hours. The university is still well within the 25% cap for temporary faculty, stipulated by the faculty collective bargaining agreement (APSCUF CBA Article 11.F).

Vacancies in academic support staff have routinely been filled. Some reductions have taken place in other staff areas, e.g., custodial and trades, but these have always been done in accord with collective bargaining agreements.

Student labor may be considered one of the university's greatest assets. For example, the operation of IUP Libraries could not occur without student support. This is true for a large number of offices across the university where undergraduates as well as graduate students find opportunities to develop lifelong skills while contributing to the success of the institution.

Technology resources. Information Technology Services (ITS) at IUP has grown into a mature organization with outstanding commitment to mission and outstanding attitudes toward currency, access, and service. The university's technological infrastructure is extensive, encompassing a combination of centralized and decentralized on-campus systems, and off-campus systems. A centralized IT Support Center was created when amenity space became available in the new Delaney Residence Hall. It consolidated various separate offices that had existed for faculty and students at opposite ends of the campus and made better service possible in one central location.

Many advancements in the technology available on campus have come to fruition over the reporting period. Although not a comprehensive list, a few examples include:

- Both Moodle and D2L Learning Management Systems (LMS) have been successfully implemented and are widely in use across campus.
- A variety of supporting technologies have been implemented or replaced, e.g., blogging systems and synchronous communication software for learning management systems.

- Implementation of SAP (the State System's enterprise product for financials and human resources).
- The entire IUP web site was redesigned and migrated to Ektron, a content management system, and is undergoing another comprehensive revision at this time.
- A data warehouse has been created with advanced Oracle analysis and presentation tools. More recently, a data dashboard for administrators and chairs has been made available.
- The Degree Works tool for students and advisors was implemented (Banner/Ellucian).
- Rich, detailed analytics about student progress is now available to faculty advisors through the university's membership in the Education Advisory Board's Student Success Collaborative.
- Student photos are now available for instructors.
- IUP was selected as a state hub for the new PennREN broadband research and educational network, which increased bandwidth at IUP by 40% with reduced costs.
- Internet access at regional campuses is robust and reliable.
- Wireless access has increased exponentially.
- The MyIUP portal was implemented (Banner/Ellucian).
- An IUP mobile app was developed in-house.

Facilities. Physical resources such as the campus buildings and grounds are managed in a tactical, operational sense, as well as with a very long-term planning horizon as described in the previous section. Capital funds are mainly allocated from the State System through a specially-legislated program administered by the Office of the Chancellor but outside of annual system allocations. Capital funds support new construction, major and minor renovations, and

infrastructure related needs. Since the last Middle States review, there have been a number of significant additions to the physical resources at IUP:

- “Residential Revival” replaced almost all of the older dormitories on campus with modern, suite-style buildings with a four-phase, \$238 million construction project. The debt is held by the Foundation for IUP (FIUP) and is paid off each year through student residential room fees. The new residence halls are extremely popular; so far that real estate venture has never failed to break even from current year revenues. This undertaking -- so transforming for the campus -- would not have been possible without the Foundation.
- The new Kovalchick Convention and Athletic Complex (KCAC) was built at the southeast corner of campus. The KCAC, which is professionally managed, offers a variety of athletic, university, and entertainment events and conference services that attract community and university members. It has turned out to be a very visible example of success in physical facilities.
- The renovation of the Fisher Auditorium building was completed, including a new addition of 20,000 square feet for use by the College of Fine Arts and other units.
- Stapleton Library was renovated to accommodate more reading/study space as well as an overall facilities upgrade.
- Cogswell Hall underwent a full life-cycle building renovation with emphasis on the acoustical needs of the university's nationally-recognized music program. The renovation included a 22,000 square foot addition that provided needed classrooms, rehearsal studio, and private practice rooms.
- A new academic building to replace Keith Hall and Leonard Hall is currently under construction and will be the future home for eight departments in the College of Humanities

and Social Sciences. The College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics is also currently planning for a major new building that will replace Weyandt and Walsh Halls.

In 2007 Pennsylvania's State System engaged Sightlines, a facilities advisers company, to perform an inventory and itemize the condition of all campuses and buildings in the system. Since that time, in addition to periodic updates of the initial campus conditions report, IUP (2009) has independently engaged Sightlines to perform an Integrated Facilities Plan for the campus and in 2010 they also performed a facilities staffing and performance review. That review was updated in 2013. The use of a nationally-accredited third party to perform evaluations of facilities conditions, facilities planning, and organizational effectiveness demonstrates a successful, ongoing effort of critical assessment.

Partners and affiliate organizations as resources. Another important resource for IUP is her effective partnerships with legally-affiliated organizations. A university as large and diverse as IUP benefits immensely from such organizations as the Research Institute, Foundation for IUP, Alumni Association, and the Student Cooperative Association (Co-op). The agreements between IUP and the affiliates stipulate that their activities support the university. The university and the affiliates rely on each other and have generally worked very well to collaborate as true partners to further the long-term interests of IUP. Overall, such collaborative arrangements have increased the university's image, visibility, and resource base.

- The Research Institute (<http://www.iup.edu/researchinstitute>) engages in, fosters, and supports research related to fields of study at the university and provides development and administrative services for such research. The Research Institute also disseminates information related to research to the academic community and public and offers programs and services related to the procurement of funding for conducting research and development

projects. As a 501(c)3 organization, the institute can often facilitate the hiring of specialized grant-funded personnel and administration of procurement for sponsored activities with less red tape than can an instrumentality of the state.

- The Foundation for IUP (<http://www.iup.edu/foundation>) currently owns almost all of the student residential housing on campus and manages the debt load with housing fee revenue collected through the normal university assessment systems. Further, the Foundation also acts as a repository for gifts given for the benefit of the university. The Foundation administers approximately \$75 million in scholarships, restricted, endowed, and other gift funds. Resources held by the Foundation are used solely to supplement the capital, public services, financial aid, and educational programs of the university and to administratively operate the Foundation.
- The Student Cooperative Association (<http://www.coop.iup.edu>) administers all student activity fees and operates the university bookstore and a variety of recreational venues, including the College Lodge.
- The Alumni Association (<http://www.iup.edu/alumni>) is an independent, self-supporting nonprofit association. It provides essential services to the university community through relationship-building activities, newsletters, and a wide variety of alumni networking events, as well as some tangible fund-raising activities.
- Other major non-profit profit centers that fall under the university's Centers and Institutes, such as the Academy for Culinary Arts (<http://www.iup.edu/culinary>) and the American Language Institute (<http://www.iup.edu/ali>) also function more or less independently to increase the perceived value of IUP, but as they are wholly-owned within an existing

university organization, they are not considered affiliates or partnerships in the legal sense used here.

- Finally, there are other extremely beneficial consortial arrangements (e.g., access to electronic information databases through the Keystone Library Network); coordinated state-wide and system-wide procurement programs (e.g., pre-approved state contracts for office supplies and computing equipment); and long-standing professional relationships with state and federal agencies that provide external funding for contracted services (e.g., PA-OSHA or PENNDOT). These programs assist the university by providing speediness, ease of certain procurements, and the like. As with the other assets listed in this section, they can also serve to raise the profile of IUP.

Continued challenges

Despite the many positive advances related to planning and resource management that have occurred since the last self study, challenges remain. Opportunities for growth and improvement exist in several areas.

State funding for public higher education is constrained. The new governor's statements are very encouraging, but projected obligations for employee post-retirement costs (pensions and benefits) in Pennsylvania are exceptional. The State System is required to disclose its post-retirement liabilities. For IUP, these liabilities are estimated at \$134.5 million for post-retirement benefits and \$15.7 million for compensated absences (2013/14 Financial Statements). Note that the university funds only the current portion of these expenses annually. However, new accounting standards will require IUP to disclose the annuitant earnings liability beginning in fiscal year 2015. It is estimated that this annuitant earnings liability may be \$150 million. No matter how this is resolved, it will likely restrict the State System's ability to invest in general

appropriation increases or issue bonds for future projects. In turn, this will place additional financial burdens on the university to control other expenses and to increase funds from external sources, e.g., philanthropic donations.

The IUP Research Institute has not come into its full realization relative to its original intent. Therefore, the university has not achieved its goals to increase its research profile or capacity. This phenomenon has negatively impacted the university's ability to acquire significant external grants and contracts or to expand graduate education. In addition, there has been a reduction in the general availability of grant dollars from state and federal government sources, which further limits research productivity and faculty scholarship. Recently, a concerted effort to improve the interface between the RI and the university has been undertaken (<http://www.iup.edu/newsItem.aspx?id=187857&blogid=6291>).

Previous engagements and actions of the Alumni Association have been more or less internal in nature. That is, activities of the Alumni Association have been limited mostly to serving its members. More could probably be done to integrate the Alumni Association with current students in the areas of career development, recruitment, fundraising, and related initiatives. If the Alumni Association were more involved in these areas, the resources of the university would potentially increase and current resources could be repurposed.

The actions of the Student Cooperative Association have been focused on student programming, the bookstore, and facility acquisitions. The Co-Op can be an even more important partner in assisting the university to achieve its full potential.

IUP is currently grappling with the need to secure State authorization from other states for students enrolled in online programs and for field experiences taking place out-of-state (see

<http://www.iup.edu/registrar/students>). This is an exceedingly complex, and potentially expensive, undertaking that will also require monitoring and enforcement. Fortunately, the state government is taking up State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (SARA) legislation, which should make compliance easier for students and universities.

IUP is in a relatively strong condition, particularly in comparison to many of the other State System schools. That being said, there are recurring issues related to university and department budgets. The resources that IUP does have available are not always effectively and efficiently used. As an example, static allocation models for distributing funds for operating and student wages are in need of updating.

Communication regarding planning and resource management continues to be a challenge. Although there have been great efforts to inform the campus community about the mission/vision and strategic and budget planning, many faculty, staff, and students remain relatively unaware of these important topics. We need to continue to seek out ways to connect with all members of the IUP community. This is a problem that persists as stated in the 2005 Comprehensive Self Study document, "...employees do not always understand the relevance of planning efforts to their individual units..." (p. 51). Money comes in real handy here, and it is important for more members of the university community to know how it is generated, how much there is, and how to use it effectively.

As with any large institution, complex processes and procedures can sometimes get in the way of progress. Innovation, change, and renewal can be hampered by red tape and elaborate institutionalized procedures, the reasons for which are often not understood by faculty or staff or students. There is occasionally frustration over all the requirements that must be met for different levels of authority and the numerous bodies that must be consulted. Many business processes are

becoming standardized and/or automated (e.g., processes for completing change-of-major forms, online applicant processing for employment, and so on), but there is much work yet to be done in the way of basic, systematic questioning and assessment of why we do things in certain ways (or at all; see <http://www.people.iup.edu/jkilly/pogo.gif>). Even the simple mathematical calculation of how to distribute Finance and Administration “indirect” incentive funds to researchers with sponsored awards cannot be known until months after the end of the fiscal year.

Institutional renewal

Controlling our own fate and mastering our own destiny. Despite these challenges, IUP has a history of pro-actively moving forward with innovation, initiatives, and optimism for the future of the entire campus community. As such, there a number of areas in which IUP demonstrates its commitment to building its reputation to both its internal and external customers as a vibrant, go-to community of learners and a destination of choice for students and employees.

Financial management and innovation. The university is continuing to take thoughtful and strategic action to increase financial resources:

- The university’s three-pronged budget plan features: adjusting expense allocations to more closely match actual expenditures; setting college-level expectations for tuition and fee revenue while providing seed funding for new program development and additional funding for those colleges that meet or exceed expectations; and using modest increases in the Student Service Fee to fill any remaining budget shortfalls (<http://www.iup.edu/newsItem.aspx?id=173987&blogid=6291>) This multi-year plan is beginning to drive performance measures in Academic Affairs that matter to students (e.g., credit hour production, retention, degrees awarded, etc.). While incremental budgeting is the

norm, with certain funds the university does use formula-based allocations or even resource-centered management principles, and the university continues to explore new ways to set aside streams or pools of funding for new ventures.

- Multi-year budget planning incorporates a series of direct approaches to generate revenue and reduce expenses. Budgeting will be reasonably based on actual expenditures, tuition revenue incentive models are being developed to enable colleges to address enrollment and retention concerns, and a pilot for flexible tuition pricing was proposed for Fall 2015 (<http://www.iup.edu/newsItem.aspx?id=186767&blogid=1447>). All of these efforts will be closely monitored as the university seeks to more effectively address resource needs.
- The debt for the Kovalchik Convention and Athletic Complex has been paid in advance, using \$32 million of unrestricted net assets, to reduce the debt load and meet the State System's expectations for lower reserve funding.

Examples of other successful initiatives include:

- Establishing differential tuition for high-cost, high-demand graduate programs (<http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=17303>)
- Implementing need-based and performance-based student aid; moving carefully towards a "high-cost, high-aid" institutional profile (like most independent institutions), without abandoning our commitment to public education (<http://www.iup.edu/financialaid>).
- Management of locally-approved fees (housing, health & wellness, student services)
- More and better financial and data reporting to budget managers and other decision-makers and stakeholders.

Philanthropy. Emphasis on all types of fund-raising has increased. Deans are expected to build relationships with donors and bring in more funds from private sources. University

Advancement is increasing the number of development officers and college liaisons, and its staff is raising attention through such programs as the University Family Campaign (<http://www.iup.edu/supportiup/universityfamily>). For the last three years, faculty and staff have volunteered to help reach out to other employees for the University Family campaign.

Curriculum innovation. At both the undergraduate and graduate levels, modern and attractive academic programs are essential to providing students with an education that leads to useful and productive careers. Increased student enrollment is, in turn, promoted by university leadership as a viable alternative to cutting programs and/or positions. One of the most frequent complaints voiced by faculty members over the years involved the cumbersome nature of the curricular process. Concerns included the length of time required to move curriculum revisions through the multiple steps and committees, the sometimes inconsistent and conflicting feedback to proposers from committees, and the amount of information required when a new course or program was proposed. These perceptions often resulted in trepidation as faculty weighed the considerable investment of effort involved in the curricular process against competing demands on their time. Moreover, faculty were often discouraged by colleagues from bringing innovative ideas forward given the time and effort involved. To address these problems, steps have been taken:

- In the summer of 2014, Provost Moerland convened a workgroup to examine the existing policies and procedures and to recommend how to make the process more streamlined and efficient. As a result, in December, 2014, the University Senate approved a new curricular process that retained an emphasis on quality curriculum while reducing the time and effort required by proposers (<http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=177700>). The implementation of

the new process began in the spring 2015 semester. Faculty have responded enthusiastically, as demonstrated by a boatload of curricular proposals recently submitted.

- Also in 2014, deans were asked to identify new degree programs within their colleges that had significant potential to attract new undergraduate and graduate students. Now that the new, streamlined curriculum process is in place, development of these major projects can be undertaken more quickly. The draft strategic plan calls for three new degree programs that respond to student interest, reflect disciplinary advances, and serve the needs of society, with emphasis on interdisciplinary programs that leverage existing faculty expertise. These “heavy lifts” include environmental engineering, public health, and digital science and security.
- The University-wide Graduate Committee recently developed two new policies designed to recruit and retain high quality graduate students. High-achieving undergraduate students can now seek early admission to an IUP graduate program during their senior year (<http://www.iup.edu/admissions/graduate/howto/early-admission>). This reduces the time for the graduate degree and encourages retention of students who might otherwise choose to attend another university for graduate level studies. The second policy allows graduate students to be enrolled in two graduate programs simultaneously, which will help part-time students seeking more than one (part-time) credential (<http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=187441>).

Online learning opportunities. Another area of potential growth related to development and delivery of new curriculum lies with distance education. Students are typically quick to adapt to change and are increasingly connected to their world via technology. Online programming is an expectation for many students who may view traditional academic calendar and face-to-face scheduling as less desirable. Currently, IUP has two fully online programs and a

rapidly expanding cadre of hybrid and blended programs. In some situations, students from multiple satellite instructional centers participate in a class via distance education technology at the same time a faculty member delivers traditional face to face instruction with on-campus students.

In Fall 2014, as part of the constellation of support activities that are part of academic success (ASC@IUP), we implemented for students in developmental math a new online assessment and learning system (ALEKS) that features adaptive questioning and an intentional blend of online, tutorial, and classroom activities. Preliminary results are impressive and will be followed carefully.

Commitment to teaching and learning. IUP has a long history of planning for and celebrating student success, and students are recognized as the lifeblood of the university. This is critical to helping IUP be the premier institute of learning in the region. The Center for Teaching Excellence (<http://www.iup.edu/teachingexcellence>) is a well-supported and well-used resource for faculty to improve their pedagogical skills. The center provides opportunities for faculty to learn about, embrace, and implement new models for learning to better meet the needs of today's student. Student evaluations of course quality are taken seriously and used to make decisions regarding promotion and tenure. An updated evaluation instrument will be implemented in summer 2015.

Quality of the campus experience. Campus life – for students, staff, and faculty – is a point of pride for IUP. The physical campus is impressive, even stunning, and the resilience and goodwill of our employees, while less tangible, is also visible and very substantial, and is not treated as a trivial matter by university leadership.

Conclusions and recommendations

The following trends and recommendation related to planning, assessment and institutional renewal have emerged as a result of this self study. After a long period of administrative turnover, IUP is poised to address the university's challenges with a solid administrative team that is formulating and implementing powerful strategic plans. The entire campus community is cognizant of past and current challenges, but it is moving forward with optimism and strategic thinking and a commitment to wise management of all of the resources at its disposal.

1. Administration and leadership at all levels must insure that resource decisions are simple, understandable, predictable, and above all, tied to the strategic plan. A system to assess and monitor progress toward the goals of the plan, and adjust the plan if needed, is imperative.
2. IUP can not rely on the State System as the primary means of financial support for the university. We must manage and promote IUP's value proposition on our own.
3. IUP must seek out additional means of revenue through enhanced alumni support and other philanthropic avenues. Education of the public as to what universities do and how they are funded must be a component of this effort.

IUP must distinguish itself from other institutions in the region and become *the destination public university* in western Pennsylvania. To achieve this, IUP must:

4. Develop high-quality academic programming that is responsive to the personal and professional goals of current and future undergraduate and graduate students as well as to the needs of their potential employers.
5. Enhance and expand high-quality extended and distance learning opportunities.

6. Continue efforts to remain current and ahead of the curve in areas related to technology both in and out of the classroom.
7. Expand affiliate programs, centers, and professional development resources that are perceived as high-value assets by current and future students.

SUBCOMMITTEE THREE: FULL REPORT FOR STANDARDS 4 AND 5

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance: The institution's system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

Standard 5: Administration: The institution's administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution's organization and governance

Members of Subcommittee Three: Yaw Asamoah (co-chair), Edel Reilly (co-chair), Taylor Billman (fall 2013), Lynanne Black, Paul Bliss, Susan Boser, Matthew Brown (fall 2014-date), Portia Diaz, Gretchen Heine (2013-2014), Chris Jeffords, David LaPorte, Mike Lemasters, Malinda Levis (2013-2014), John Lowery, Jonathan Mack, Lindsey McNickle, Scott Moore, Meg Reardon, Bob Simon, Cynthia Spielman, Mark Staszkiwicz, Ruffina Winters, Bill Zimmerman.

Description of area under review

Context

Brief history of governance, leadership, and administration. In 1875, Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) was founded as Indiana Normal School, an independent and privately-owned school. There were 225 students and one building, John Sutton Hall, a building still standing today. In 1920, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania took over ownership and, by 1926, it was awarded the right to grant degrees and it became known as State Teachers College at Indiana, Pennsylvania. Twice more the name was changed, first in 1959, when it became Indiana State College, and again in 1965, when it became Indiana University of Pennsylvania and initiated its first doctoral program. From 1965 to 1982, IUP was the only state-owned college designated by law as a university and was the only one of the 14 institutions authorized

to offer any doctoral degrees. In 1982, Act 188 enabled legislation for the State System of Higher Education of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to be created consisting of the fourteen institutions previously under the administrative control of the Pennsylvania Department of Education. Act 188 renamed the other 13 institutions to become universities but maintained the role of IUP as the only doctoral-granting institution in the State System. The Act clearly describes the roles and relationships among the Board of Governors, the Chancellor, councils of trustees, and university presidents.

The Board of Governors is comprised of 20 members including the Governor, the Secretary of Education, two Senators, two Representatives, and 14 members appointed by the Governor and approved by the state Senate (Act 188, 1982). The board appoints the chancellor, who serves as the chief executive officer of the State System and whose charge is to advise the board on the formulation of policies, administer the State System, recommend overall budget allocations, and assist the board in its appointment of presidents of the constituent institutions (Act 188, 1982). Until recently, IUP ranked as the largest of the State System's fourteen member institutions and is still the only one authorized to grant Ph.D. degrees, although the other 13 institutions are now authorized to also offer professional doctoral degrees. IUP remains a keystone of higher education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The relationship between IUP and the State System since the last self study. IUP continues to have a strong position in the State System. According to Chancellor Brogan, "IUP has a rich history in the State System especially when one looks at the quality and brand or reputation it brings." He added that even through tough budgetary times for the universities in the State System, IUP has continued to maintain its high quality, partly because it has been successful in growing sources of revenues. That, coupled with wise internal budgeting and

spending, has allowed it to survive a period of serious budget constriction. Since the last self study IUP has:

- Developed new tuition models for graduate education that build upon a per-credit model, with adjustments for high-cost programs. This change has not negatively impacted graduate enrollment;
- Assisted the State System in developing a new funding allocation formula. That formula resulted in a minor decrease in funding to IUP, which was largely offset by a phased-in implementation model, but also secured long-term funding recognition for the university's doctoral research university mission;
- Paid off the bond for the Kovalchick Conference and Athletic Center (KCAC), which resulted in a long term saving of over \$19.5 million with an annual savings of approximately \$2,500,000 to the E&G budget;
- Developed a three-pronged internal budgeting approach that more closely ties budgeting with actual expenditures; created incentives for colleges to grow revenues; and proposed a pilot per-credit charge for undergraduate tuition.

IUP has been able to avoid the retrenchments and painful personnel reductions faced by several other State System universities. This is largely due to its leadership and the cooperation that leadership receives from members of the university community.

Overview of the university's administrative structure. The University President is the chief executive officer of the university. The university's administrative structure consists of five divisions, each headed by a vice president: the Academic Division, headed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; and the Divisions of Administration and Finance; Student Affairs; University Advancement; and Enrollment Management and

Communications. The Academic Division includes IUP Libraries, School of Graduate Studies and Research, the regional campuses at Punxsutawney and Northpointe, the Monroeville Center, and the six colleges: the Eberly College of Business and Information Technology; and the Colleges of Education and Educational Technology; Fine Arts; Health and Human Services; Humanities and Social Sciences; and Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

Each college is comprised of departments headed by a department chairperson, a faculty member elected from and by the members of the department to serve a three-year term as specified by Article 6 of the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the State System and the Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties (APSCUF). In addition to departmental governance, the chair participates in college chair meetings and monthly Council of Chairs meetings. Representatives of the Council of Chairs participate in various organizations (e.g., University Planning Council, University Budget Advisory Committee, Academic Affairs Council), and meet monthly with both the Provost and the President.

As a result of the Public Employee Relations Act (Act 195) of 1970, faculty members of the State System are represented in collective bargaining by Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties. The APSCUF president is based in the state capital, Harrisburg, with local chapter presidents at each university. The policy making body of statewide APSCUF is the Legislative Assembly, which consists of the chapter presidents and representatives from each university. Statewide, APSCUF interacts directly with the Chancellor and with members of the Pennsylvania legislature. The policy making body of local APSCUF at each university is the Representative Council, consisting of representatives of each academic department at the university and the Executive Committee.

At both the state and local levels, periodic meetings (Meet-and-Discuss) between APSCUF and the Administration are mandated by the collective bargaining agreement (CBA), which guarantees shared governance in such areas as the appointment and performance reviews of faculty, including renewals and non-renewals, tenure, and promotion. The CBA also delegates to the faculty the establishment of curriculum committees at each university. At IUP, APSCUF has assigned this role to the University-wide Undergraduate Curriculum and the University-wide Graduate Committees of the University Senate and the full Senate. The curriculum committees are co-chaired by APSCUF and Senate members.

Employees in supervisory, clerical, maintenance and custodial roles are represented by the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME). The collective bargaining agreement stipulates that AFSCME representation be included on some University committees. All AFSCME union representation is appointed by the union's leadership.

Certain full-time and regular part-time professional employees are also represented in collective bargaining by the State College and University Professional Association (SCUPA). At both the state and local levels, periodic meetings (Meet-and-Discuss) between SCUPA and IUP administration are mandated by the CBA, which also guarantees shared governance in certain areas. SCUPA members have expressed their concern that they are not guaranteed seats in the University Senate or on its committees.

The University Senate serves as a representative governing body for IUP, and provides a forum where issues related to the welfare of the university as a whole are discussed and debated with all stakeholders participating. Senators are primarily elected and come from all areas of the campus community: faculty, administrators, students, staff, and alumni.

The University Planning Council (UPC) was created to advise and assist the president in the strategic and tactical planning of the university in response to State System requirements and to changes in the university's budget environment. During this review period, President Driscoll has directed that the UPC be co-chaired by the Provost and the chair of the Council of Chairs. While membership on UPC comes from a broad spectrum of university constituents, twelve UPC subcommittees have been formed that include both members of the UPC and additional IUP personnel.

The university's administrative procedures and decision-making. Representatives from different offices come together as groups or committees to share information and discuss solutions. Once each month, the President's quarterly cabinet meeting has the college deans and key administrative unit leaders joining with cabinet to share information on important university business. Each vice-president provides an update on key developments from their division as a regular agenda item. The Academic Affairs Council, made up of the Provost and his staff, the Deans, representatives from the Council of Chairs and the A-Deans' Council (made up of assistant and associate deans of the colleges), and directors of non-departmental academic units (e.g., the Liberal Studies Program, the Honors College, and the Registrar), meet once a month to share information, discuss solutions, and facilitate decision-making in a setting that assures wide representation of the entire division. An extended A-Deans' meeting is also held twice a semester with representatives from Information Technology Services, the Bursar's, the Registrar's, and Financial Aid offices joining the A-Deans. The Student Operations Group of the Instructional Technology Services unit meets bi-weekly throughout the year with members from key administrative offices across the divisions. Other administrative bodies such as the University Senate, Council of Chairs, graduate coordinators, Centers and Institutes directors, and

the Student Government Association also meet on a regular basis and submit yearly goals and annual reports. Frequently individual members of each of these bodies wear more than one hat (e.g., a graduate coordinator who is also a member of the Senate). Thus, informal communication of information among these bodies frequently occurs.

Administrative structure changes since the last self study. IUP has experienced significant changes to its administrative structure since the last self study. Critical changes include:

- The creation of a new division, Enrollment Management and Communications, with leadership at the level of the President's Cabinet
- The creation of the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC)

Data from interviews suggest that these changes are already having a positive impact. In an interview, President Driscoll stated that the structural changes have better enforced divisional work. In particular, he noted two pods of communication, namely enrollment management and communications, and university advancement, where the changes have already improved communication and efficiency. Representatives from the Council of Trustees also voiced their sense that adding a Vice President for Enrollment Management has strengthened the university overall.

The University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) was established as an advisory body to the president by then-President Atwater and Finance and Administration Vice President Wooten at the onset of a budget crisis in the spring of 2009. It was set up with a more forward-thinking objective to support the integration of planning and budgeting so that strategic goals could be linked to broadly defined resource allocations. The committee is charged with advising the President regarding the development and implementation of short and long-term priorities

and factors impacting the University's overall fiscal health and viability. Integration of planning and budgeting includes strategic planning, annual review of enrollment targets and strategies, and budget allocation recommendations. The committee was specifically charged with promoting "an environment whereby the university budgeting process is participatory, transparent, and informative in nature." After its establishment it was continued by Presidents Werner and Driscoll, who have highlighted the importance of the committee through their active engagement in committee discussions.

The Council of Trustees also noted an important structural change that they feel has enhanced their functioning. At the time of the last self study, the Council itself operated through a committee system, with a separate committee overseeing and having expertise in each of the four major divisions. However, they have since eliminated this structure, and at present the full body of the Council of Trustees oversees all five divisions. Further, the vice presidents of each division are present for the quarterly presentations from all divisions to the Council of Trustees. The trustees feel these structural changes have improved communication and understanding, strengthening the university overall.

In their interview with members of this subcommittee, the President and Provost offered several examples of shared governance, specifically citing the University Planning Council, University Senate, Student Government Association, various union/management Meet and Discuss sessions, Cabinet, Council of Deans, University Budget Advisory Council, and expanded Cabinet as examples of opportunities for university constituents to be part of decision making. From all appearances the current administrative leadership values consultation, gathering feedback, and giving individuals opportunities to comment on major decisions. The

leadership has also indicated that there is no drive to pursue increased centralization in current decision making.

The University's administration has demonstrated its strong belief in shared governance and is constantly looking for ways to involve concerned parties in decision making. Examples of these efforts are the university visioning process and the strategic planning process. The subcommittee also observes that the University's organizational structure and decision making processes reveal an effort to seek a balance of centralization and decentralization, and that members of the IUP community believe that their opinions are valued and considered when decisions are being made.

Transitions in leadership

Since the last Middle States Self Study, IUP has been under the leadership of three presidents. Dr. Tony Atwater served as president from February 2005 until his resignation in June 2010. This period was marked by considerable construction at the University, including the residential revival and the construction of the Kovalchick Convention and Athletic Complex (KCAC). Unfortunately, during this period, state appropriations began to decline and serious concerns were expressed about the questionable expenditures that were being made (such as the costs associated with the construction of the KCAC), at a time of severe fiscal stress. There was a growing feeling of little communication taking place, and an absence of shared governance between President Atwater and the University community. This tension culminated in a faculty vote of no-confidence in the President in the spring of 2010.

Dr. David Werner served as interim president of IUP from August 2010 to June 2012. A former college president who had previously served as Interim Provost at IUP, Dr. Werner served as an able steward of the University during his two years in office. He made considerable

strides in rebuilding the University community's trust in its leadership despite the financial pressures caused by continued reductions in state funding. He began his term by hosting monthly President's Open Forums, which provided the University community an opportunity to meet with him to ask questions on various issues. This practice was crucial in building a foundation of shared governance. Monthly open forums have continued under Dr. Michael Driscoll, who took office in July 2012. Since his arrival, Dr. Driscoll has built upon the progress that was begun under Dr. Werner to build trust with the University community and pursue an approach to University leadership, governance, and administration that emphasizes transparency. This approach will be particularly important as state funding for higher education remains significantly lower than a decade ago.

The university's Council of Trustees. The Commonwealth's Act 188 provides for a Council of Trustees for each of the universities in the State system consisting of 11 members appointed by the governor with the approval of the Pennsylvania Senate. Trustees are political appointees, and begin with nomination by Senator Don White. These nominations are thoroughly vetted before selection and once chosen, are forwarded to the Pennsylvania Senate and the Governor's Office for approval, confirmation, and official appointment to the council. The university's current trustees are reflective of various constituencies, diverse backgrounds, skills, and affiliations. One member of the council must be a full-time undergraduate student in good academic standing. Reflecting the community and the region, members bring a diverse mix of talents and experience to the council, including an attorney, a former CEO of S&T Bank, a Ph.D. in Education with expertise in educational workforce management, and a state legislator. One trustee is also a member of the Board of Governors. In this way, the council does reflect the university's various constituencies.

Despite the fact that these individuals are themselves politically appointed, the trustees interviewed confirm that the Council itself is apolitical, with the focus being on the best interests of IUP. They described themselves as an “advisory body” rather than a “governance body” and as “experienced, diverse, with acumen and passionate investment in IUP,” which they bring to bear in active and engaged counsel to the university leadership.

To support effective operations, the Council enjoys a high level of communication with President Driscoll. They described him as “transparent,” stating that he heavily utilizes them for their counsel and keeps them in the loop on all relevant issues. The Council has a full-day, quarterly meeting, but the Chair of the Council has an additional monthly meeting with the President, who they perceive as extremely accessible as well, providing immediate response to e-mail or phone calls. The Council of Trustees also has formal structural relations with the university's affiliated institutions, including three advisory members from the Foundation for IUP, two from the Research Institute, and one from the Student Co-operative Association. The Council schedules meetings as needed to address mutual interests and support, such as a recent meeting with the Foundation regarding scholarships.

While the trustees have not engaged in an external evaluation in recent years, they do utilize constant self-evaluation and assessment. In addition, they hold an annual retreat, which they have found instructive in facilitating self-reflection through the turbulence and leadership transitions that have taken place in the past 10 years. Self-reflection has proven useful; for example, through such reflection they became aware that a “fuzziness” exists regarding the lines of responsibility among the President, Council of Trustees, Board of Governors, and the Chancellor. They indicated that this has not presented a problem per se at IUP, but in the absence of clarity they do continually self-assess whether a particular action is their role, or to

what extent they serve as a governance board versus advisory board, and in what ways they can best support IUP and the public without overstepping their boundaries. They also self-assess their own performance, ensuring that appointed members actually have the time to dedicate to service. The Council of Trustees conducts an evaluation of the President and forwards the results of that evaluation with a recommendation to the Chancellor in addition to a triennial self-evaluation the President also submits to the State System. They indicate that they are responsive to community interests and are enjoying a period of stability, cohesiveness, and solid communication with their constituencies.

Focus of the subcommittee's investigation

The focus of this section of the self study centers on three key factors that relate to leadership, governance, and administration. The Commission on Higher Education expects a climate of shared governance in which all constituencies are involved in carrying out the institution's mission and goals. One area of focus is therefore the practice of leadership through shared governance and what it means to IUP constituents. From shared governance, the subcommittee looked at all levels of communication between, within, and among the governing bodies. Finally, the investigation also focused on employee leadership development and succession planning.

What evidence was gathered and by what means?

Standards 4 and 5 were examined by a subcommittee which broadly represents the university community and its governance structures, including a trustee, a dean, the president of the (undergraduate) Student Government Association, the chairperson of the University Senate, three department chairpersons, the president of IUP-APSCUF (the faculty union), the president of AFSCME (the largest staff union), a member of SCUPA (also a staff union), four

other administrators, and a representative of the Graduate Student Assembly. The committee was co-chaired by a dean and a faculty member who is her department's assistant chairperson. We began our inquiry by familiarizing ourselves with the context for the standards, reviewing the subcommittee report on these standards prepared as part of the 2005 IUP Middle States Self Study report, identifying the significant issues, and compiling and reviewing documents such as Act 188. Questions were submitted for the combined IUP Middle States Survey of students, faculty and staff conducted in November 2014. Because of the importance of triangulating our findings with multiple perspectives, the committee also conducted interviews with leaders at IUP as well as the State System. Interviews were conducted with Chancellor Brogan and Vice-Chancellor Garland, President Driscoll, Provost Moerland, Vice President Wooten, seven deans, and three trustees, all occurring during winter 2014. Each interview was conducted by a team of two or three members of the subcommittee.

Prior to analysis, subcommittee members received a copy of all interview transcripts or notes for their review as well as survey responses of students, faculty and staff. The first level of data analysis was based on the questions in the charge to the committee. In teams of three or four, subcommittee members drafted responses to each question using data from documents, the interviews, and the survey responses. These drafts were combined into one draft document and shared with the entire subcommittee for review and feedback. The subcommittee then met to discuss emerging themes in the combined report and developed a set of recommendations. The final report was reviewed by all members before submission to the Steering Committee.

Analysis of the strengths and challenges

The practice of leadership through shared governance

One of the strengths of leadership, governance, and administration at IUP is the commitment to shared governance. Since the last self study, this commitment had not always been the case. From 2005 to 2010, under President Atwater's administration, most IUP constituents did not feel they had a role in shared governance; in fact a chief reason for the vote of no confidence, by a substantial majority of the faculty, was their concern that he did not believe in, or practice shared governance. President Atwater resigned in 2010. That same year President Werner arrived and worked hard to develop a new climate of shared governance, a practice President Driscoll has since continued. Data collected in the interviews show that most members of the IUP community had an opportunity to discuss what shared governance means to them, and the response is very positive. President Driscoll indicated that he saw his role for making decisions as based upon the legal authority and responsibility that come from the state legislature; however he is aware that the practice of that governance is in a public context that includes multiple constituencies. Thus although decisions are ultimately his to make, he must provide an opportunity for others to express other perspectives and opinions on key issues.

Others in leadership roles in the university concur with this perspective. For example, in a focus group, the Council of Deans noted that "everyone, faculty, staff and students have a voice," and another added, "but that does not mean equal decision making authority." Multiple formal structures, such as the Senate, the University Planning Council, the Student Government Association, the unions, and the Council of Dean, are ready for formal consultation on issues. A member of the Council of Trustees commented on this as well, describing the President as almost "painfully inclusive" in that he goes out of his way to involve all constituencies. But in addition

to the formal structures, the President stated that he also seeks counsel in informal ways as well. He observed that the University is full of smart, engaged people intent on serving the mission of the University, and that there is no idea that cannot be made better. Another trustee corroborated this point, observing that “the President has surrounded himself with bright individuals who share his values. He uses them as a decision-making team, delegating responsibility and empowering them to act.” Vice President Wooten also reflected that faculty, staff, and students should all share and participate in decision making on issues that are of concern to them, and that shared governance involves accountability, responsibility, and communication.

According to our survey findings, a strong majority of those who responded -- of staff (72%), of faculty (74%) and administrators and managers (86%) -- indicated that the leadership strives for community agreement when making decisions, a sentiment that was also supported by a majority (62%) of the undergraduate respondents. This support, however, was not as strong among graduate students, with less than half (46%) of those responding indicating their agreement with that sentiment, and nearly half (49%) of them having “No Opinion.” Overall, though, the survey findings suggest that in general, the majority of the main constituent groups at IUP feel positive about the current administration’s performance as it relates to shared governance.

The President stated that hard decisions have multiple right answers, and that he and his team return to strategic planning and the use of quantitative analysis for guidance on the best answers. But ultimately the authority to decide resides with him and, once a decision has been made, shared governance also means that he must be transparent and explain why the decision was made. The deans agreed on the need for transparency. The trustees interviewed also

observed that even when differences are irreconcilable, the President's active listening facilitates acceptance by all parties, in that they feel heard and respected.

Transparency and shared governance also entails shared responsibility, as was pointed out by Provost Moerland and Vice President Wooten. The deans spoke to this as well, with one stating, "shared governance sets the climate for collective responsibility," and offered an example in which the Provost initiated a process last summer to redesign the curriculum approval procedures at IUP. That process involved a high level of collective engagement from relevant constituents, and the results were very well received.

The findings from the survey of IUP's five constituent groups indicate that this practice of the university leadership effectively reflects shared governance. Overall, of those who responded to the survey, 92% of administrators and managers, 80% of faculty, and 73% of staff reported that the President and his Cabinet value shared governance. Among undergraduates who responded to the survey, the majority (54%) of also agreed, although 39% of them expressed "No Opinion," while slightly less than half (46%) of graduate students shared this view, with 50% indicating that they had no opinion.

Communication between, within, and among the governing bodies

One key requirement of shared governance is communication within and among the various governing bodies at IUP. This occurs through a number of mechanisms, many of which are overlapping in terms of how information is conveyed. At the university level, the President's monthly forum, at which those in attendance pose questions to, and listen to responses from the President, offers a good opportunity for him to interact with other members of the university community. The University Senate provides a more formal mechanism for communicating information from the administration to a representative body. That information is then shared

with each constituent group (i.e., faculty, students, staff, and administration) via mechanisms such as faculty meetings, e-mail communications, and verbal reports to assemblies (e.g., the Student Government Association). Additionally, the minutes of Senate meetings are posted on the Senate website where all members of the university community can access them. However, questions have arisen as to how many non-Senators actually read the minutes. The responsibility for conveying information provided at Senate meetings lies with representatives of the Senate, who are expected to report back to their respective departments the proceedings of the meetings. The degree of effective representation and communication across departments is uneven.

There is also a “trickle-down” mechanism where information starts at the top level of administration and is then communicated to bodies at the next level, for example the President’s Cabinet and Council of Deans. Additionally, the top administrative leaders also meet with the Council of Deans and the Council of Chairs. Information is then passed on from the deans to chairs in a college-level Council of Chairs. Deans and department chairs in turn communicate directly with the faculty. The administration also meets regularly with members of the faculty union’s Executive Council. That information is shared with departmental representatives who, in turn, inform their colleagues in department faculty meetings. These mechanisms allow for feedback at any number of levels. However, this “trickle-down” effect also opens up the risk that some of the information may be lost. Even where the information is not lost, there is substantial opportunity for misinterpretation.

Employee leadership development and succession planning

The university's academic instruction model is built around the traditional model of a division of Academic Affairs, divided into six colleges, which are further divided into 49 academic departments. These departments are directed by chairpersons, who are elected for 3-

year terms as called for in the collective bargaining agreement. Chair nominations and appointments are submitted by the department and approved by the University president before being voted upon by tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department. Virtually all academic issues are handled by department chairs, including such vital concerns as course schedule planning, curriculum development, faculty evaluation, hiring, and the provision of academic support to students. Each college has a Council of Chairs that meets on a regular basis with the college dean to address college-level academic issues. In addition, a campus-wide Council of Chairs meets on a monthly basis to provide information to all chairs across campus. The co-chairs of the Council of Chairs serve on the Academic Affairs Council and meet each month with the provost and president to allow for consultation on issues and concerns. This use of the Council of Chairs has greatly enhanced the flow of information throughout the university.

Although department chairs are critically important to the daily functioning of IUP, there is no formal mechanism for leadership development among them. IUP also lacks succession planning for chairs. Only 16 departments have assistant chairs. All assistant chair nominations and appointments must be approved by the Provost. However, departments which have had an assistant chair for many years are still required to justify reauthorization of the position when it becomes vacant and, after the election of chairs, all new assistant chair positions must be reauthorized. According to the deans, the assistant chair position, where it exists, offers an optimal venue for succession planning for departments. However, since not all departments have an assistant chair, this provides a limited opportunity for chair succession.

Another problem with succession planning at IUP is that all department chairs are on the same three-year election schedule, which creates the possibility that in one year every chair could be a brand new, untrained, first-time chair. Fortunately, such a complete turnover has

never happened in practice, but the possibility is a concern. Although chair terms and elections are defined by the collective bargain agreement, staggering the terms of chair would make practical sense. If one-third of the chairs were elected each year, we would always have in office incumbents with some experience.

Finally, IUP has no formal training programs for chairs, although the School of Graduate Studies provides training for new coordinators. Twice each year, the State System conducts an Academic Chairpersons' Conference that focuses on training for chairs. IUP should support sending chairs and assistant chairs to this conference on a rotating basis. Some colleges occasionally provide limited chair training, but this is infrequent and has not included assistant chairs. Furthermore, the IUP Council of Chairs has not been tapped to provide formal training for chairs. Outside the State System, chair training opportunities are available. Many disciplines offer specialized chair-training seminars and there is an annual nation-wide Academic Chairpersons Conference where chair training is provided and other leadership issues are discussed. Currently, no travel support is provided for chairs or assistant chairs to attend such national training opportunities beyond the department's own limited travel funds.

Besides re-elected chairs and assistant chairs, some newly-elected chairs come with experience as former program coordinators. There is no other formalized program for identifying and developing employee leadership in the Academic Affairs division. Incentives for chairpersons include very limited supplemental pay and a reduced teaching load. Not all program coordinators receive reduced teaching loads, and none receives supplemental pay. Because these incentives are limited compared to the hours most chairs and program leaders spend in the discharge of their responsibilities, it is often difficult to find faculty members who are willing to take on the role of chair or program leader. According to the survey results, although 59.7% of

faculty who responded to the IUP Middle States Survey viewed themselves as having a leadership role at IUP, and 61% reported that formal mentoring is effective for developing future leaders, 66.1% of them observed that there is no formal mentoring program in place in either their department, college or the university. Faculty must therefore rely on previous chairs and program leaders for passage of information, mentorship from the dean or other chairs, and informal college practices and/or non-university leadership academies.

A distinction between formal and informal academic leadership opportunities needs to be noted here. At IUP there are many persons who perform leadership functions outside the academic department structure. These include, for example, those who serve on Senate, APSCUF, other University-wide committees, and college-wide committees. However, membership on these committees is based on elections, and being elected is often the result of name-recognition, making it hard for people to get involved. What is needed therefore is an opportunity to cultivate leadership skills, regardless of position. The open-ended responses to the survey revealed several references to the lack of formal mentoring in leadership skills, and a strong reliance on informal mentoring from colleagues in service opportunities that develop into leadership roles.

Across the university, staff members are a key part of the leadership team in all departments and administrative units. Staff members are vital in the day-to-day functioning of the university. They provide much needed advice and assistance when leadership decisions are made, and they ensure that leadership decisions are carried out correctly. Because they hold a wealth of vital institutional knowledge and are so critical to effective leadership, it is essential to ensure effective staff member development and transition planning.

With regards to employee leadership development among staff, only 31.7% of the staff respondents who took the IUP Middle States Survey view themselves as playing a leadership role at IUP, and 46.4% of staff report that they want a greater leadership role. Over half of the staff respondents noted that a formal mentoring program for staff does not exist, nor, in their view, does their department or unit provide any support to develop future leaders. One dean pointed out in the interview that the staff discuss succession planning because they are aware of the problems that are created when a staff member leaves and takes with them their accumulated institutional knowledge. A particular problem, however, is that when staff members leave or retire from IUP, they are not replaced until weeks or months after their departure. This means there is never an opportunity to directly pass on knowledge from a departing staff member to their replacement. Allowing a two- to four-week overlap to provide transition training would greatly improve retention of knowledge and information in staff positions.

Recommendations

Shared governance

As mentioned earlier, in spite of its relative newness to IUP, the current administration has already nurtured a strong climate of shared governance. With respect to the opportunity for input on university issues before decisions are made, results of the IUP Middle States Survey show a majority (78%, n=?) of administrators and managers, of faculty (66%), and more than half (54%) of the staff responding (54%) either “Strongly Agreed” or “Agreed” that they have adequate opportunity for input into issues facing the university. However, a much smaller proportion of the student respondents (45% of undergraduates and 38% of graduate students) felt that they had such opportunity. Interestingly, 44% of undergraduate students, and 53% of graduate students also had no opinion on this matter, and this may be particularly relevant given

that a larger percentage of all five groups expressed their satisfaction with their current level of input. While those students who have no opinion may not really understand what is meant by shared governance, a recommendation here is to more fully explore what shared governance means for students and how their input can be valued.

While the above-reported data from the survey indicate that views of shared governance are driven by the key stakeholders' ability to work together, this is in turn inspired by the top leadership. It is certainly true that with the current President and his administration, there is a great sense of shared governance – but that is something that did not exist for the first few years after the last Middle States review. This suggests that shared governance is a model that is not necessarily institutionalized, but rather, is derived from the current style of the institution's leadership. What IUP needs is to continue to build on the current culture so that it can survive leadership changes.

1. Continue the current practice of shared governance through open communication and transparency.
2. Examine what shared governance means to the student population, in particular the graduate students
3. Involve students in a capacity where they feel their input is valued.

Communication

Shared governance requires effective communication, and the current leadership is taking steps to improve its communication. President Driscoll and Provost Moerland both reported that sometimes this involves sitting down with a variety of groups and saying the same things over and over again. This is in addition to providing documents online and using Dr. Driscoll's own e-mail to convey certain information. Dr. Wooten reports that he emphasizes the three-Cs:

communication, cooperation, and collaboration in his division. In his communication with students, President Driscoll talks about tweeting and linking to get the word out, so that students can have immediate access to information that concerns them.

Although it is an excellent opportunity to communicate with the president, the President's Open Forum, in its current format, is under-utilized. Attendance is sparse, and during the sessions, questions posed to the President are even scantier. The President has tried to address this problem by encouraging the use of pre-submitted, written questions (to supplement ones posed on the spot by those in attendance). Furthermore, there is no formal mechanism to communicate his answers to members of the university community who are not in the audience. New measures that would extend the impact of the Forum could include:

4. the use of summaries or recorded proceedings, which are then disseminated in other campus-wide media
5. the practice of focusing a given forum on a specific topic, where the president would open by saying a few words on the topic, and then soliciting questions from the audience regarding that topic in addition to the current wide-ranging topics
6. inviting students or convening a similar forum for the student population.

Employee leadership development and succession planning

Across all groups surveyed and interviewed, there is a clarion call for employee leadership development and succession planning. Recommendations from the subcommittee include:

7. Develop and schedule a new chairperson orientation program. In addition, schedule chairperson workshops at the beginning of the year to cover more advanced topics that the chairs themselves identify as ones for discussion. Consider the election of chairs on a

staggered basis to assure mentoring opportunities between chairs already serving a term and incoming new chairs.

8. Use the assistant chair role as a succession planning opportunity. Find ways to support assistant chairs and create additional mechanisms to develop the skills they need to succeed. Chairs understand their role, but aspects of those roles or responsibilities are not clearly understood by other faculty members.
9. Define additional leadership roles beyond the chairperson's. Other leadership opportunities such as departmental program directors, graduate coordinators, advisors to student groups, and committee leaderships exist in the Academic Affairs division
10. Expand the current leadership development opportunities on campus and identify additional means to better advertise existing leadership development programs.
11. Develop an employee (staff) rewards program that recognizes employees who take everyday leadership initiatives.
12. Arrange for succession planning to occur by allowing brief overlaps in terms.
13. Allow for more frequent reclassification and promotion among staff to allow them to remain in their current division or unit but be recognized for their hard work.

SUBCOMMITTEE FOUR: FULL REPORT FOR STANDARDS 8 AND 9

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention - The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students' educational goals.

Standard 9: Student Support Services – The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.

Members of Subcommittee Four: Ms. Kathleen Linder (co-chair), Dr. Jack Makara (co-chair), Ms. Shavonne Arthurs, Dr. Matthew Baumer, Mr. Kevin Berezansky, Ms. Jeannie Broskey, Dr. Daniel Burkett, Mr. Zachary Clark, Ms. Tory Dellafiore, Dr. Catherine Dugan, Ms. Jessica Halchak, Mr. Derek Hanely, Mr. Michael Husenits, Dr. Melvin Jenkins, Dr. Shirley Johnson, Dr. Nicholas Karatjas, Dr. Robert Kostelnik, Dr. DeAnna Laverick, Dr. Shijuan “Laurel” Liu, Dr. Patricia McCarthy, Dr. Theresa McDevitt, Mr. Steve Roach, Mr. Mitchell Steffie, Ms. Paula Stossel, and Mr. Theo Turner.

Description of area under review

Context

Successfully admitting and retaining students is the life blood of a university. Now more than ever, higher education institutions compete to enroll and retain quality students as a matter of economic survival. The demographic trends in western Pennsylvania and the surrounding region indicate a steady decline in the number of high school graduates. Over a decade of steadily decreasing state financial support for IUP has shifted the predominate cost of higher education from taxpayers to students and their families. Under these challenging conditions, recruitment and retention are impacted by a variety of factors, including the diversity and quality of support services available to students.

Today's traditional age college students will enter into a job market where 9.1% of graduates will be unemployed, the average student will carry over \$30,000 in educational debt for a baccalaureate degree, and they will have a 25% chance of living with their parents post-graduation (Levine & Dean, 2012). Despite these challenges, this generation of college students persists in having higher personal and material aspirations than previous generations. Students expect universities to deliver the caliber of services and academic and co-curricular experiences that will position them to achieve career, personal, and financial success after graduation. Student needs are complex, diverse, and challenging and the provision of high quality services to address these needs is critical to allow students to focus on academic and career success.

Focus of subcommittee investigation

The three areas of focus for this subcommittee were to: (a) investigate the undergraduate and graduate recruitment and admissions processes at IUP, (b) examine retention strategies, and (c) determine the extent to which IUP meets the needs of current students in its delivery of support services. The subcommittee also examined the extent to which IUP is positioned to excel in admissions, retention, and provision of future student support services.

Tasked with examining the university's effectiveness in meeting the fundamental elements of Middle States Standards 8 and 9, this subcommittee initially identified 14 questions which examined key elements of student admissions, retention, and support services. Upon addressing these questions, the following preeminent areas for consideration emerged: (a) admissions goals, standards, and initiatives, (b) demographic trends and other external influences affecting enrollment and retention, (c) alignment of academic majors and career opportunities with prospective students' needs and interests, (d) impact of cost and financial aid on admissions and retention, (e) definition and availability of student support services, (f)

quality, satisfaction, and use of student support services, (g) student engagement and involvement opportunities impacting student success, (h) recruitment, access, and support of students in underrepresented populations, and (i) effectiveness of academic advising. The examination of these areas illustrated the relationship between the quality of student support services and the recruitment, enrollment, and retention of students.

Evidence

This study was conducted by gathering information from the following sources: annual reports, survey results, archived data, current proposals and new initiatives, departmental reviews, university publications, web-based information, and personal interviews. The IUP Middle States Master Survey (2014) generated new information concerning student support services for the purpose of this study.

Analysis of evidence and conclusions

Enrollment, undergraduate and graduate

Since fall 2011, IUP has instituted two major reorganizations to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of undergraduate and graduate admissions. In September 2011, the Division of Enrollment Management and Communications (EMC), comprised of Undergraduate Admissions, Financial Aid, Communications, Culinary Admissions, Continuing Education, and Career and Professional Development Center, was established. In March 2015, undergraduate and graduate admissions were merged and placed within EMC to “benefit from a synergy created through shared services and expertise” (Office of the President website, Finding Our Success, February 2015).

Since fall 2006, the university’s enrollment has fluctuated significantly (GI Common Data Set). From fall 2006 to fall 2007 total enrollment declined. From fall 2008 through fall

2012 total enrollment increased steadily, yielding a record enrollment of 15,379 students in 2012. Enrollment declines occurred in fall 2013 and fall 2014. Undergraduate enrollment has followed a similar trend, decreasing between fall 2006 and fall 2007 and increasing incrementally from 11,724 students in fall 2007 to 13,058 students in fall 2012. In contrast, graduate enrollment has held relatively steady since 2006, with a net decline of 33 students between fall 2006 and fall 2014. This ranged from a high of 2,382 students in 2008 to a low of 2,189 students in 2011.

Table 1.

Fall IUP student enrollment by year

Category	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Undergraduate	11,976	11,724	11,928	12,291	12,827	12,943	13,058	12,471	12,130
Graduate	2,272	2,294	2,382	2,347	2,299	2,189	2,321	2,257	2,239
Total Enrollment	14,248	14,018	14,310	14,638	15,126	15,132	15,379	14,728	14,369

Source: G-1 Common Data Set, 2006-2007 through 2014-2015

Undergraduate admissions

According to the Division of Enrollment Management and Communications Vice President Jim Begany (phone conversation, February 17, 2015), IUP met its target admissions goals for new first-time and total new students every year since 2010, with the exception of fall 2013. However, IUP did not meet its admissions goals for new transfer students for fall 2013 and fall 2014. As evidenced below, each category of admitted students other than transfers fluctuated between fall 2010 and fall 2014. Since fall 2011, the number of transfer admissions has sharply declined.

Table 2.**IUP new undergraduate first-time, new readmitted, and new transfer students**

Student Type	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
New First-Time	3,135	3,050	3,103	2,823	2,905
New Re-Admitted	366	303	333	335	294
New Transfers	680	730	717	641	570
Total New Students	4,181	4,083	4,153	3,799	3,769

Source: IUP Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment

Reflecting the demographic trend in the university's primary market area between fall 2011 and fall 2014, undergraduate applications decreased by approximately 10%. Out-of-state applications decreased by 25%, and out-of-state enrollment decreased by 30%. However, in 2013-2014 IUP compensated for this loss with increases from in-state applications and enrollment (S4 Admissions Annual Report, 2014). Despite a similar trend in admits, deposits, and registrations from fall 2011 to fall 2014, IUP met its new student enrollment target for 2014-2015 at the Indiana and Punxsutawney campuses; IUP at NorthPointe did not.

The admissions process for transfer students is supported at IUP through the Pennsylvania Transfer and Admissions Center, where students can identify courses and degrees that are accepted at participating institutions ([PA TRAC Website, http://patrac.org/](http://patrac.org/)). IUP has a credit evaluation website that analyzes how credits from other institutions will transfer to IUP ([Transfer Credit website, http://www.iup.edu/creditevaluation](http://www.iup.edu/creditevaluation)). Despite these resources, but consistent with State System trends, the number of new transfer students enrolled at IUP decreased by 71 students in 2014-2015.

Due to the changing demographics of primary and secondary markets for IUP, there was a shift in the ethnic makeup of new IUP students from fall 2011 to fall 2014 (S4 PA Public High School Graduates, 2010-2028; S4 PA Public High School Graduates by County, 2007-2027).

IUP increased new registrations of Hispanic/Latino students from 124 to 175, African-American students from 388 to 435, Multi-Racial students from 97 to 144, and Non-Resident Alien students from 69 to 98, but experienced a decline in enrollment of Caucasian students from 2,903 to 2,405 (S4 Admissions Annual Report, 2014). Because the Hispanic/Latino population is a rapidly growing demographic in the university's primary and secondary markets, one assistant director position focusing on the recruitment of this population was added to the Undergraduate Admissions staff, contributing to a 23% increase in new Hispanic/Latino students from fall 2013 to fall 2014 (S4 Admissions Annual Report, 2014). For fall 2014, the total minority student population at IUP was 17% (Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment website, IUP Fact Sheet, 2014).

Several new recruitment programs that target under-represented groups, such as Promising Scholars, Caring for Latino Student Achievement (CALSA), Latino Exploration Day (LED), the College Conference for Minority Students, and provision of transportation from place of residence to IUP, contributed to this increase (S4 Admissions Annual Report). Limited funding poses a significant challenge to continuing and expanding these recruitment initiatives (Shawn Jones, assistant director of multicultural recruitment and Irvin Rivera, assistant director of Latino recruitment, September 29, 2014).

Consistent with national trends prior to 2014-2015, IUP experienced a decline in international student applications and admits from fall 2011 to fall 2013; however, in 2014-2015 new international student applications, admits, deposits, and enrollment increased (S4 Admissions Annual Report). The Office of International Education (OIE) employs the following strategies to recruit and retain international students: (a) utilization of the American Language Institute (ALI) to attract international students that desire to improve their English language

proficiency before enrolling in a degree program, (b) implementation of an off-shore MBA program that offers an opportunity for students to start their MBA or Bachelor's in Business Management in India and complete it at IUP, (c) use of articulation agreements, and (d) facilitation of specially designed programs (e.g., orientation program addressing transition issues, Friendship Program, Global Awareness living-learning community, university-wide International Lunch Hour, and Global Café) (S4 Personal Communication, Michele Petrucci, November 10, 2014; S4 Office of International Education Report, 2014).

In fall 2012, in an effort to increase access to IUP without sacrificing the quality of applicants, the Undergraduate Admissions Office conducted a pilot at IUP Punxsutawney and admitted a select group of students who had low SAT/ACT scores but high grade point averages (3.0 on a 4.0 scale). Students in the pilot group had a 71.43% persistence rate from first to second year, which is higher than the average Punxsutawney persistence rate of 68.97% (S4 Venture Student Performance, 2013-2014). Subsequent data analysis of the IUP undergraduate population revealed that, consistent with the national data, incoming high school grade point average was a better predictor of academic retention and success than SAT/ACT scores. IUP continues to explore this practice when reviewing applicants for admission to the university.

In compliance with federal requirements and to support the recruitment, enrollment, and retention of veterans and military-affiliated students, the following initiatives were implemented at IUP: (a) The Military Resource Center (MRC) was established in 2014, (b) an Office of Financial Aid staff person was assigned to assist veterans with obtaining their tuition benefits from the military, (c) IUP obtained names of recently discharged veterans from the Pennsylvania Veteran's Administration, the College Board (SAT), and Phi Theta Kappa, (d) an extensive

communications plan was developed and implemented, and (e) on and off-campus recruitment programs were conducted to meet prospective students and their families throughout the year.

According to the annual survey conducted by the Undergraduate Admissions Office, cost and financial aid were the top reasons that prospective students selected IUP (S4 Admitted Student Questionnaire, 2014). In response, \$317,250 in IUP Grant funds were awarded to prospective students from lower income levels to encourage their enrollment (financial aid records in Banner). Additionally, two scholarship programs were developed and continue to aid in the recruitment of high caliber students. The Promising Scholars program targets talented minority students from the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh regions of the state, while the Sutton Scholars program interviews prospective students on campus for \$2,000 renewable and non-renewable scholarships to IUP. Since 2012, IUP has added over \$7 million in annual financial aid to students (Office of the President website, Finding Our Success, February 2015).

In addition to the steady decline of prospective undergraduate students in the university's traditional recruitment areas, the following challenges exist with regard to undergraduate recruitment and admissions: (a) continued "summer melt" (a loss from deposits to enrollment) at approximately 14% across all three campuses (S4 Admissions Annual Report, 2014), (b) due to declining high school staffing in target markets, students may not receive adequate advisement around the college preparation and selection processes, (c) Regional campuses at North Pointe and Punxsutawney are small and geographically isolated, (d) IUP at North Pointe is a commuter-only campus in an area where the population is in steep decline (S4 PA Public High School Graduates, 2010-2028), (e) Punxsutawney's bed capacity on campus is limited, forcing some incoming students to seek off-campus housing and/or reconsider their decision to attend IUP (Shawn Jones, assistant director of multicultural recruitment and Irvin Rivera, assistant director

of Latino recruitment, September 29, 2014), (f) underrepresented students who choose not to attend IUP, or leave shortly after enrolling, cite the lack of racial-ethnic diversity in Indiana, Pennsylvania, and/or the lack of a multicultural center at IUP as determining factors (Shawn Jones, assistant director of multicultural recruitment and Irvin Rivera, assistant director of Latino recruitment, September 29, 2014; S4 Admitted Student Questionnaire, 2014), (g) barriers exist to successful transfer articulation agreements between two-year institutions and IUP, and (h) declining enrollment at Pennsylvania community colleges exacerbates the trend in decreased transfers. IUP should continue to develop and implement innovative strategies to address each of the above challenges utilizing all available data sources, including results from the Spring 2015 IUP Campus Climate Survey.

Graduate admissions

Dynamic change and graduate program innovation have contributed to a relatively stable graduate enrollment at IUP (School of Graduate Studies and Research website - SGSR Annual Report, 2013-2014). These innovations include: (a) program offerings at new locations (e.g., new master's program at IUP at Northpointe, (b) two new doctoral and one new master's program at the Dixon Center in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, (c) one new day-time offering at the IUP Monroeville Graduate and Professional Center, and (d) one doctoral and two new Professional Science Master's programs at the Indiana campus (SGSR Annual Report, 2013-2014). Also contributing to enrollment stability are two new policies: Early Admission to Graduate Programs and Dual Enrollment (School of Graduate Studies and Research website). The first permits eligible undergraduates to pursue graduate course work, enabling IUP's "best and brightest" to remain for additional semesters and earn a master's degree. The second enables those interested in two masters' programs to earn both degrees simultaneously.

Graduate marketing is targeted by program, and each doctoral and master's program has a distinct marketing plan tailored to its unique demographics. Over the past several years, IUP has shifted from using traditional advertising methods (print, radio, TV) to using primarily digital methods, including International Google, Google Retargeting, YouTube, gradschools.com, and Facebook (SGSR Annual Report, 2013-2014). As a result of using the automated e-communication plan, conversion rates from inquiries to applicants increased from 27% to 40% (SGSR Annual Report, 2013-2014). A spring 2013 strategic initiative funded web page revisions within EMC and the School of Graduate Studies and Research (SGSR). For the first nine programs completed (mix of graduate and undergraduate programs) the first 90 days showed an increase in page view and time on page (S4 SWAP Analysis Spreadsheet, 2014; Mike Powers, director of electronic communications, September 29, 2014).

Challenges exist with regard to graduate recruitment and admissions, including: (a) lack of adequately funded graduate assistantships, teaching associate positions, fellowships and scholarships (Middle States Master Survey, 2014), (b) no increase in graduate stipends over a ten-year period, and (c) fewer graduates from four-year colleges from which to recruit.

To address the funding challenges, the SGSR began distribution of mini-assistantships in 2012-2013. These one-semester, eight-hour awards are designed to attract new students and to fund those who would otherwise have left the university due to financial difficulty (SGSR Annual Report, 2013-2014). In 2013-2014, the SGSR received additional funding to enable the award of \$1,000 scholarships, which were distributed to 15 students (SGSR Annual Report 2013-2014). Finally, block funding was created, allowing select programs to offer larger stipends and design custom graduate assistantships (SGSR Annual Report, 2013-2014).

To remain viable and strive toward an increase in graduate enrollment, IUP must offer graduate programs in disciplines, locations, and through modes of delivery that prospective students are seeking, remain current with market research, and continue implementing dynamic change through graduate program innovation. It is recommended that IUP use innovative models as determined by market research for specific undergraduate and graduate academic programs.

Career trends

A major factor in aligning the university's mission with the needs of its students is the degree to which IUP offers the majors that students most desire and which will most likely lead to employment after graduation. IUP currently offers academic programs in each of the "25 Careers Trending Most Industry Growth," as identified by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (S4 Career Information and Career Services). While IUP does not offer an engineering major, dual-degree programs at the University of Pittsburgh or other institutions are an excellent avenue for students who wish to enter those fields. The Career and Professional Development Center at IUP collects post-graduate employment statistics by surveying recent graduates and by using a data collection company. For the class of 2013 (response rate of 34.8% of total graduates), 93.6% were employed, continuing their education, or not seeking employment, and 73% were employed in the field of their choice (S4 Career Information and Career Services, Postgraduate Survey Report). The sampled group earned an average salary of \$43,260, just slightly below the national average of \$45,327 for 2013 graduates.

Financial aid

An effective, accessible financial aid process is essential to promote the admission and retention of students at IUP. Information relating to financial aid, scholarships, grants, and loans is current, comprehensive, and clearly presented on the website for the Office of Financial Aid.

Facebook and Twitter are used by the Office of Financial Aid to distribute information to students, and financial aid information is contained and updated annually in the IUP Undergraduate Catalog (GI Undergraduate Catalog) and The Source: The Student Policy Handbook (S1 Student Handbook). Also, graduate websites link to the Financial Aid website. The Office of Financial Aid developed a “Cost Estimator,” an interactive form on its webpage for undergraduate students that assists families in determining the out-of-pocket expenses associated with IUP attendance (Financial Aid website). Additionally, three videos are available on the website to explain the financial aid process. The Office of Financial Aid is regularly audited and examined through program reviews. A Federal Title IV Program Review was conducted in October, 2014, which found that financial aid policies were administered appropriately, and all consumer information, including a Net Price Calculator to calculate the estimated cost of attendance at IUP, was complete and accurate (Office of Financial Aid website).

The positive relationship among the Office of Financial Aid, University Advancement, and the Foundation for IUP (FIUP) ensures that the IUP scholarship website is accurate and comprehensive in detailing the growing number of scholarships since 2010-2011. The Office of Financial Aid supports Undergraduate Admissions events, where staff discuss financial aid and cost information with families to support their informed decisions. Financial customer service is available in person, by telephone, and by email, and is heavily utilized. Open-ended responses to the Middle States Master Survey (2014) suggest that students place a high priority on receiving quality customer service from the Office of Financial Aid. Consequently, ongoing training for employees in this area remains influential in promoting student satisfaction.

Retention of students

Student persistence rates impact institutional budgets and enrollment, and they serve as a marker of student success. Increasingly, families, government officials, and the media gauge an institution's success by the rates at which students persist. Since 2006, the university's combined campus persistence rates for first-time, full-time, degree seeking cohorts ranged from 73.4% to 77.1% for first to second year, 61.8% to 66.2% for second to third year, and 58.0% to 62.2% for third to fourth year (S4 State System Persistence Rates). Also, between 2006 and 2013 cohort persistence rates were lower than State System cohort averages for second to third year and third to fourth year. With regard to first to second year persistence, the university's average was lower than the State System average for every year except 2009 and 2011. Since 2006, students who began at the IUP Punxsutawney campus have had lower overall persistence rates than students at the Indiana campus (S4 Student Persistence, IUP campuses).

Table 3.

IUP student persistence rates by cohort: First-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking

Cohort Progress By Year	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
To 2 nd Year %	73.5%	73.8%	74.7%	77.1%	74.4%	75.3%	73.4%	74.5%**
To 3 rd Year %	62.4%	61.8%	64.8%	66.2%	63.3%	64.0%	64.3%*	-
To 4 th Year %	58.0%	58.8%	60.4%	62.2%	60.0%	61.2%*	-	-

Sources: S4 State System Persistence Rates. Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education Persistence Rates of First-Time, Full-Time, Bachelor's Degree Seeking Student; *Preliminary Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment generated data; **Chris Kitas, associate director, Office of Planning, and Assessment, March 31, 2015.

The above data supports the need to adopt a data-driven, systemic approach to understanding and addressing the academic, social, and financial challenges which impact student persistence. Coordinated retention initiatives will allow information and insights to be shared across the university and enable effective collaboration.

Retention strategies

The university employs multiple strategies to promote retention and graduation, including:

- (a) all academic chairs and administrators are able to identify students with a QPA below 2.00, allowing appropriate intervention,
- (b) each college, regional campus, and the Department of Developmental Studies (DVST) designates an academic standards officer responsible for academic review, enforcement of standards, and the development of a comprehensive plan to promote students' academic good standing,
- (c) DVST offers academic and skill-building courses, collaborates with various academic departments to provide walk-in tutoring, and facilitates college success workshops (Developmental Studies website; Melvin Jenkins, director/chairperson, Department of Developmental Studies, December 2, 2014),
- (d) the Academic Recovery Assistant (ARA) program supports the implementation of academic recovery plans, (S4 Academic Recovery Assistant; Mary Williams, dean's associate, College of Health and Human Services, October 27, 2014),
- (e) institutional retention and graduation data for all campuses is tracked and distributed internally, and compared to external benchmarks by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (Chris Kitas, associate director, Office of Planning and Assessment, November 17, 2014; GI Common Data Set; Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment website, Crimson Snapshot),
- (f) the Advising and Testing Center requests and examines the reasons for student withdrawal (S4 Personal Communication, Catherine Dugan, November 18, 2014),

- (g) the Academic Success Center (ASC@IUP), established in fall 2014, identifies and addresses needs by connecting students with available resources, (S4 Academic Success Center),
- (h) a subcommittee of the University Planning Council studies the barriers to IUP Punxsutawney student persistence when transferring to the Indiana campus and implements strategies to address these barriers (Mary Williams, dean's associate, College of Health and Human Services, October 27, 2014),
- (i) colleges and departments implement customized retention plans.

Student support services

Student support services are broadly defined as any service, office, department, program, activity, event, organization, or facility that supports students' academic and co-curricular success. Specific support services extend across all university divisions. Although there are multiple offices and personnel responsible for administering these services, redundancy is minimal. Students' overall satisfaction with their educational experience is influenced by the quality and availability of student services. Student satisfaction, in turn, impacts admissions and persistence.

Multiple services support specific student populations, such as international students, students with disabilities, racial-ethnic minority students, students of lower socio-economic status, military-affiliated students and veterans, women, LGBTQIA students, graduate and transfer students, and students involved in organizations. Offices providing these services include, but are not limited to International Education, Advising and Testing, Social Equity, African American Cultural Center, Department of Developmental Studies, Military Resource Center, and Mid-Atlantic Addiction Research Center.

As stated previously, the Office of International Education employs multiple strategies to recruit and retain international students. The Office of Social Equity oversees the following diversity commissions and programs: GLBT Commission, Hispanic Heritage Council, Native American Awareness Council, Women's Commission, and Diversity Peer Educators (Office of Social Equity website). The African American Cultural Center delivers programs such as Diversity Counts and focuses on African American history, culture, achievements, and contributions (African American Cultural Center website). The Department of Developmental Studies provides supplemental instruction, walk-in peer tutoring, and college success workshops (Department of Developmental Studies website). The Military Resource Center provides one-stop information and referral to help military-affiliated and veteran students "transition to college life and achieve their academic goals" (Military Resource Center website). Finally, the Mid-Atlantic Addiction Research and Training Institute initiatives include "alcohol and drug research, veterans' reintegration, family and mental health issues, training conferences for health professionals and educators, and community outreach" (Mid-Atlantic Addiction Training Institute website). IUP does not currently have a multicultural center or a commuter student center.

The following university commissions also support student retention and success: The President's Commission on the Status of Women, The President's Commission on Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues, and The President's Commission on Reducing Student Substance Abuse (Office of the President website, Offices, Commissions, and Divisions). Notably, in spring 2014, IUP also created a quarter-time appointment for LGBTQIA advocacy in the Center for Student Life.

Student engagement / Leadership opportunities

In addition to offering a variety of support services, IUP affords students a number of engagement and leadership opportunities such as peer mentoring, campus employment, community service, service learning, as well as within recognized student organizations. According to the Center for Student Life, in 2014-2015 IUP recognized nearly 300 student organizations across eighteen broad categories (Kimberly Wick, clerk typist, February 16, 2015). The 2014 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results indicated that first-year students spent an average of 5.25 hours per week in co-curricular activities. Senior students spent an average of 5.95 hours per week, which was significantly higher statistically when compared to State System, Carnegie Class, and public institutions that administered the 2014 NSSE (S7 National Survey of Student Engagement, 2014). IUP students are also active in leadership roles within recognized organizations. According to 2014 NSSE, 11.8% of first-year respondents held a formal leadership role in a student organization or group. For senior respondents, 42.4% held leadership roles, which is significantly higher statistically than Carnegie class and public institutions that participated in the 2014 NSSE.

There are 30 Greek organizations at IUP, governed by three councils, which afford students opportunities for philanthropy, leadership, and social connection (Office of Student Leadership and Greek Life website). The Entertainment Network (TEN) and Black Emphasis Committee (BEC), the university's major student programming boards, are housed within the Student Cooperative Association, Inc. Both organizations are student-led, student-centered and provide cultural, recreational, social, and educational programming. Finally, the Student Government Association (SGA), which represents the undergraduate student voice, has over 40

representatives, including an executive board of six student leaders. For graduate students, there is the Graduate Student Assembly.

The student activity fee supports multicultural services, initiatives, and recognized student organizations. From 2013-2015, the Student Cooperative Association funded 30 different multicultural initiatives, including the Black Emphasis Committee, PRIDE Alliance, and the Latino Student Organization. These initiatives, in total, received \$172,328 in 2013-2014 and \$149,392 in 2014-2015 (S4 Student Cooperative Association Budget Allocations 2013-2014, S4 Student Cooperative Association 2014-2015 Student Fund Budget Allocations Prelim.). Additionally, in 2014-2015, African American student initiatives received \$65,723 (1.4% of total discretionary allocations), Latino/Hispanic student initiatives received \$8,349 (0.2%), and International Student initiatives received \$10,283 (0.2%) (S4 Student Cooperative Association Budget Analysis, 2013-2014 and 2014-2015).

Information dissemination, Student services

The Office of Communications and Marketing provides infrastructure for information dissemination that can be used by staff and faculty. Diverse methods used to inform the IUP community about student services include: (a) summer orientation, (b) Welcome Weekend, (c) The Source: The Student Policy Handbook, (d) undergraduate and graduate catalogs, (e) university, divisional, departmental, and office publications (e.g., newsletters, brochures), and (f) electronic communication (e.g., IUP Daily, The Beak, Crimson Connect, university email, social media, etc.).

Effectiveness and satisfaction, Student services

IUP offices, departments, organizations, services, programs, and facilities assess the effectiveness of student support services and user satisfaction in a decentralized manner. Data is

obtained through: (a) service usage such as office visits, program attendance, and webpage hits, (b) nationally-normed instruments such as NSSE and ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Assessment, (c) institution-specific survey instruments, (d) program reviews, (e) review of printed and web-based information, (f) needs-based assessments, and (g) periodic reports.

The IUP Middle States Master Survey (2014) asked respondents to rate their level of satisfaction with 30 student support services, as “very satisfied,” “satisfied,” “dissatisfied,” “very dissatisfied,” “no opinion,” and “not applicable.” When examining responses for each service from those who completed the survey, in all instances students were substantially more “satisfied-very satisfied” than they were “dissatisfied-very dissatisfied.” Students who responded either “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied” were asked to further elaborate through open-ended statements. Constructive themes which emerged from open-ended responses included:

- (a) a university multicultural center is needed,
- (b) student satisfaction with services is directly impacted by customer service delivery, particularly in areas related to student finances,
- (c) students desire affordability, convenience (e.g., extended hours, proximity, ease of access, wait time), and food variety (e.g., healthy options, accommodations for dietary needs) in dining,
- (d) negative perceptions of Greek life prevail,
- (e) concerns exist regarding University Police vigilance in enforcement (e.g., parking, substance use),
- (f) some respondents believe that students should have a greater role in managing the student activity fee, and
- (g) the process of credit transfer should be reviewed.

Only individuals who expressed dissatisfaction were provided the opportunity to share open-ended responses with regard to student support services. Therefore, these trends should be viewed with caution, and are not generalizable without additional supportive data.

Institutional initiatives that support student academic and career success

To ensure timely academic progress and support student academic success, there is an extensive academic advisement system in place. Contractually, primary academic advising responsibilities are assigned to the faculty through the collective bargaining agreement. Incoming students are typically advised for the first time during their orientation process. The Office of Advising and Testing oversees freshman orientation for the Indiana and Punxsutawney campuses and annually trains faculty representatives and peer mentors to discuss general degree requirements, their intended majors, and first semester courses, and to assist in transfer orientation. International students and graduate students are initially advised by their departments. Once students have matriculated, they are assigned a primary faculty advisor. The assignment of an advisor and continued advising varies depending on many factors. Students at the regional campuses are advised on site. Students assigned to the Department of Developmental Studies are advised by those faculty until they complete 24 credits and obtain a 2.0 QPA, at which point they are transitioned to departmental advisors. Undecided students are admitted to a specific college and advised by designated faculty. Also, each department decides how it advises its own students. At least one department has an advising center with one faculty member overseeing the advising for all students. Most departments assign advisees to individual faculty by track, year, or specialty. Each semester, students must meet with their advisor at least once to obtain a PIN to enter the registration system.

In addition to having a primary faculty advisor, there are a number of academic advising resources available to students. The undergraduate and graduate catalogs contain all academic policies and requirements for graduation. The MyIUP web portal provides access to a large amount of student data, including transcripts, course listings, liberal studies requirements, and advisor-advisee information (MyIUP Website). IUP uses the Degree Works software, which allows students and advisors to monitor progress toward the degree online through MyIUP, and to explore the requirements for other majors or minors (Degree Works website). IUP recently introduced two major initiatives. As referenced earlier, the Academic Success Center was created. Also, IUP has begun implementation of the Student Success Collaborative (administered through EAB, which allows advisors to access online "dashboards" that provide an early warning system for students in academic difficulty and identify alternate career choices for students whose major may not align with their abilities (S4 Student Success Collaborative Initiative). IUP will pilot the system with advising in four majors during spring 2015. The Honors College provides advising for its specialized Honors Core. International students receive assistance from the Office of International Education. Students who fall below a 2.0 cumulative QPA are placed on academic probation and are required to meet with an Academic Recovery Assistant, a graduate student trained to help students regain success.

Subcommittee Four derived evidence of the effectiveness of academic advising from: (a) new student orientation surveys, (b) NSSE data, and (c) Middle States Master Survey data. Orientation surveys show high satisfaction with the initial advising experience (S4 Advising and Testing Orientation Surveys, 2013, 2014). However, when asked to indicate the quality of interactions with academic advisors, IUP students cited less positive interactions than students at comparison institutions (NSSE 2013, 2014). Finally, 62% of student respondents to the Middle

States Master Survey (2014) reported overall satisfaction with advising. However, open-ended student responses regarding advising were predominantly negative. The most common student concerns regarding advisors cited the need for better availability and responsiveness, better organization, better overall knowledge of curriculum, and greater help with career planning.

Students can receive career advice from academic advisors. IUP also provides a one-credit career exploration course for freshman undecided majors, and multiple services through the Career and Professional Development Center (e.g., Majors Fair, IUP Career Connect, resume referral, on campus employer recruiting, mock interviews, job fair announcements, career coaching). The Center also tracks job trends, industry growth, and post-graduation job placement.

Residential revival and Campus Dining

Student career and academic success are supported by the university's Residential Revival, a \$243.5 million housing replacement project, implemented from 2006 to 2010. The project replaced the majority of traditional residence halls with eight suite-style buildings having an occupancy of 3,528. In addition to providing attractive, modern facilities, the project enhanced the living-learning focus in residential buildings. Living-learning communities extend student learning beyond the classroom and allow residents to participate in activities and experiences themed to their academic college, major, or area of interest (S4 Living-Learning Annual Report, 2013-2014). Informal interactions and collaboration with faculty, staff, and other students who share a similar academic program or interest are encouraged.

Activities sponsored by living-learning communities are open to all students, regardless of their place of residence. The Advisory Board for Living-Learning Excellence (ABLLE) includes representation from each academic college, IUP Libraries, Center for Teaching

Excellence, and the Division of Student Affairs. Members support the university's academic mission by sharing ideas, updates, best practices, and challenges pertaining to living-learning.

The nationally-normed ACUHO-I/EBI (Association of College and University Housing Officers International and Educational Benchmarking, Inc.) Resident Assessment indicates that residents view living learning/Residential Revival initiatives as successful (S4 OHRLD Longitudinal Results). Specifically, overall student learning, satisfaction, and program effectiveness has increased steadily since 2006. Data on the percentage of students retained at IUP shows that students living on campus tend to be more likely to persist (S4 OHRLD Student Persistence). QPA by academic college survey data shows that first and second-year on campus students in all academic departments have higher QPA's than off-campus students (S4 QPA by Academic College and Overall, 2014).

Food service facilities are currently being built or renovated. A new food service facility opened in fall 2014, an existing dining facility is currently undergoing extension renovations, and an additional new dining facility is being planned. Food settings vary from cafeteria style, to café, to fast food, and convenience stores. Campus dining informs students of locations, food options, menus and nutritional content of food, and collects feedback through email surveys and social media (Dining Services website). Quantitative responses to the IUP Middle States Master Survey (2014) show general satisfaction with campus dining; however, as previously referenced, open-ended responses overwhelmingly indicate dissatisfaction with dining costs, convenience, and food variety. Notably, IUP dining costs compare favorably within the State System (S4 State System Meal Plan Rates).

Summary

The collection and analysis of data substantiates that IUP has met the fundamental elements of the Standards for Admissions and Retention and Student Support Services. The effective functioning of each of these interrelated standards is essential to accomplishing the university's mission, sustainability, and growth as an educational institution.

IUP recognizes the challenges posed in continuing to meet Standards 8 and 9. Among the most significant challenges is the continued projected decline in the number of high school graduates in traditional recruiting regions. The Division of Enrollment Management and the School of Graduate Studies Research have been anticipatory and strategic by developing and implementing ambitious recruitment plans. However, challenges to recruit undergraduate and graduate students will persist. The March 2015 merger of undergraduate and graduate admissions, and their placement in the Division of Enrollment Management and Communications, creates a significant opportunity for IUP to maximize resources and expertise and achieve greater effectiveness in identifying and enrolling high-quality students.

Multiple initiatives focus on analyzing and increasing institutional retention rates. A shared dialogue exists across departments, academic colleges, and divisions regarding how each facet of the institution impacts, or can potentially contribute to, student success. Beyond increasing student persistence rates simply to maintain enrollment, IUP is committed to providing the conditions and resources necessary for students to succeed.

Student support services are delivered in many capacities across the institution, and are intentionally designed to provide a supportive learning environment where students can thrive and succeed. IUP regularly uses nationally-normed and IUP-specific instruments, utilization data, departmental program reviews, and program evaluations to measure student satisfaction

and improve support services. IUP responded to identified gaps in support services with the spring 2014 creation of the Military Resource Center, and the fall 2014 creation of the Academic Success Center.

Given the critical role of academic advising in promoting student academic success, strategies have or will be implemented to improve overall student satisfaction with academic advising. Although IUP has invested resources in recruiting minority students, there remains a need to establish a university multicultural center to aid in the recruitment of racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse students, and to provide institutional support once they are enrolled.

To successfully recruit new students, IUP must effectively market its inherent strengths, yet remain sufficiently agile to identify and adapt to changing student needs and demographic trends. Once enrolled, students must receive access to support services that successfully address their needs and promote their success. As IUP implements a new University Strategic Plan, the institution is positioned to recognize and address these challenges and realize its vision relative to admissions, retention, and student support services.

Recommendations

Subcommittee Four's analysis of the university's effectiveness in meeting the fundamental elements of student admissions, retention and support services resulted in the following recommendations:

1. Collaborate across IUP to develop and implement a comprehensive university retention plan.
2. Expand student financial assistance and monitor the pilot Tuition Flexibility Program, once implemented, to assess the impact on recruitment and retention.
3. Design and implement innovative strategies to increase transfer student enrollment.

4. Improve institutional mechanisms to ensure that students receive ongoing, effective academic advising. Strategies to consider include providing faculty training, effectively using technology-related resources such as the Student Success Collaborative, and cultivating greater student awareness of available resources and their responsibilities related to advising.
5. Further align degree offerings and modes of educational delivery (e.g., online, off-campus, video streaming, etc.) with the changing educational needs and interests of undergraduate and graduate students, and to reflect both workforce and societal needs.
6. Create a university multicultural center to advance greater inclusivity, provide resources and support, and enhance the recruitment and retention of students from underrepresented populations.
7. Develop employee expectations and provide university-wide training to achieve the highest quality of customer service in all areas for all university constituents.
8. Monitor the impact of the Academic Success Center (ASC@iup) and the Military Resource Center in supporting and retaining students.
9. Regularly assess dining and catering services (affordability, convenience, food variety) utilizing feedback from all IUP constituents to ensure that concerns are addressed.

References

For Subcommittee Four Full Report

GI Common Data Set. <http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=21479> Common Data Set (2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014). [Retrieved February 15, 2015].

- GI Middle States Master Survey Results, 2014. Quantitative Survey Results, Middle States Survey Open-Ended Responses. [Retrieved on February 16, 2015].
- GI Undergraduate Catalogue. <http://www.iup.edu/registrar/catalog/> Undergraduate Catalogue 2014-15. [Retrieved on February 16, 2015].
- Levine, A. & Dean, D. R. (2012). Generation on a tightrope: A portrait of today's college student. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- S1 Student Handbook-The Source. <http://www.iup.edu/studentconduct/thesource/default.aspx>
The Source: A Student Policy Guide. [Retrieved on February 16, 2015].
- S4 Academic Recovery Assistant (ARA). Details of Assignment, IUP College of Health and Human Services.
- S4 Academic Success Center (ASC). IUP Academic Success Center Description. (ASC@IUP).
- S4 Admissions Annual Report, 2014. IUP Office of Undergraduate Admissions Annual Report, 2013-2014.
- S4 Admitted Student Questionnaire. IUP Office of Undergraduate Admissions Annual Student Survey, 2014-2015 Results.
- S4 Advising and Testing Orientation Surveys (2013, and 2014). IUP Advising and Testing Center.
- S4 Career Information and Career Services. Folder containing multiple documents for career information and career services. [Retrieved on February 16, 2015].
- S4 Living-Learning Annual Report, 2013-2014. IUP Office of Housing, Residential Living, and Dining.
- S4 Office of International Education Report, 2014. IUP Office of International Education Self Study and Program Review, Abridged.

- S4 OHRLD Longitudinal Results: Residential: Overall Satisfaction, Overall Learning, and Overall Program Effectiveness. IUP Office of Housing, Residential Living, and Dining.
- S4 OHRLD Student Persistence. Percentage of Students Retained at IUP, On-Campus versus Off-Campus
- S4 PA Public High School Graduates by County, 2007-2027. Pennsylvania Public High School Graduates by County, Actual and Projected, Selected Years 2007-2027.
- S4 PA Public High School Graduates, 2010-2028. Pennsylvania Public High School Graduates, Actual and Projected Years 2010-2028.
- S4 Personal Communication, Catherine Dugan. (November 18, 2014). Email from director, Office of Advising and Testing.
- S4 Personal Communication, Michele Petrucci. (November 10, 2014). Email from assistant vice president for international education and global engagement.
- S4 QPA by Academic College and Overall. IUP Full-Time, Freshmen and Sophomores, On-Campus Compared to Off-Campus, Fall 2009 through Fall 2014.
- S4 State System Meal Plan Rates. PASSHE 2014-2015 Meal Plan Information. Weekly Meal Plan Rates Charged to the Student.
- S4 State System Persistence Rates. Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education Persistence Rates of First-Time, Full-Time, Bachelor's Degree Seeking Students. [Retrieved February 16, 2015].
- S4 Student Cooperative Association Budget Allocations, 2013-2014. Student Cooperative Association.
- S4 Student Cooperative Association 2014-2015 Student Fund Budget Allocations, Prelim. Student Cooperative Association.

S4 Student Cooperative Association Budget Analysis, 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. Discretionary and Non-discretionary Budget Allocations. Student Cooperative Association.

S4 Student Persistence, IUP Campuses. Fall 2005 Cohort through Fall 2013 Cohort, Second-Year, Third-Year, and Fourth-Year Student Persistence Rates for Armstrong, Indiana, and Punxsutawney Campuses, and Overall.

S4 Student Success Collaborative Initiative. EAB.

S4 SWAP Analysis Spreadsheet. Sites Performance, First 90 Days and Summary: Performance of All SWAP Sites in Their First 90 Days. (2014).

S4 Venture Student Performance. IUP Punxsutawney Venture Student Performance, Academic Year 2013-14.

S7 National Survey of Student Engagement. <http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=46741> 2013, 2014 NSSE Results. Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons. [Retrieved on February 16, 2015].

SUBCOMMITTEE FIVE: FULL REPORT FOR STANDARDS 10 AND 11

Standard 10: Faculty – The institution's instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings – The institution's educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

Members of Subcommittee Five: Steve Hovan (co-chair), Ramesh Soni (co-chair), Mohammed Alarjani, Luis Almeida, Emma Archer, Hanna Beightley, Parimal Bhagat, Lynn Botelho, Ben Ford, Andrew Gillham, Tammy Hamilton, Terrance Hudson, Chris Janicak, Joann Janosko, Tim Mack, Janelle Newman, Lloyd Onyett, Gian Pagnucci, Lisa Price, Stephan Schaffrath, Brian Sharp, Tracy VanHorn-Juart, Kimberly Wick, and Robert Wilson.

Context under review

Educational excellence is built upon having high quality faculty and current curricula. Indiana University of Pennsylvania's primary mission is teaching. IUP began as a teacher training school dedicated to developing high quality teachers, and it has maintained excellence in teaching for over 140 years. Faculty at the university teach a full range of undergraduate students and a wide disciplinary range of graduate students. IUP offers 132 undergraduate programs, 52 masters programs, and 12 doctoral programs. These programs are designed to help students develop both breadth and depth of knowledge as well as the ability to integrate knowledge across disciplines and to synthesize ideas. IUP doctoral programs focus on the creation of new knowledge. IUP undergraduate and masters students are also encouraged to contribute to their professions by taking part in both local and national academic conferences and to pursue research under the direction of qualified faculty mentors.

The university is dedicated to active student learning and offers small classes to ensure direct instruction to all students. The university also offers enhanced learning opportunities for students through internships, study abroad opportunities, undergraduate research, and service learning projects. IUP offers a robust Liberal Studies Program that aims to cultivate global understanding and interdisciplinary knowledge in all students. The university's degree programs target disciplinary learning for students and the development of workplace skills. The university employs a broad range of technologies to keep both face-to-face and online learning current and appropriate. The university's curriculum seeks to prepare informed citizens who can be productive and valuable members in today's economy and who are committed to lifelong learning.

IUP is consistently chosen by the *Princeton Review* and a number of other prestigious publications for inclusion in various lists of U.S. Best Colleges. The Robert E. Cook Honors College is featured in Donald Asher's *Cool Colleges for the Hyper-Intelligent*. IUP has also received numerous awards and accolades for its programs, students, and faculty. IUP seeks to hire a diverse, high quality faculty through rigorous search processes. The university then works actively to develop and maintain that superior quality faculty through mentorship, peer observations, student evaluations, and teacher-learning opportunities. These faculty development opportunities are coordinated by academic departments, the Center for Teaching Excellence, and the Office of the Provost.

Along with outstanding teaching, the university's faculty also excel in scholarship and service, with many faculty having established national and international reputations through their publications and presentations at prestigious venues. The university's faculty members are involved in scholarly activities that are both rich and diverse. The university encourages and

evaluates scholarship by recognizing that knowledge is acquired in a wide range of ways, through research, intellectual synthesis, and practice, as well as through teaching. For this reason, it is very difficult to showcase scholarly activities by simple summation of publications, presentations, art exhibitions, musical recitals, and grant writing. Still, while imperfect, we do provide here some data that reflect the traditional forms of faculty scholarship in order to examine historical trends in these types of activities at the university.

From 2007-2014 a total of 1,331 proposals for external grants and contract awards in the amount of \$165.4 million was requested. During that time period, 983 projects were funded and \$82.7 million was awarded to IUP. Faculty members from every college in the university were active in grant writing. Faculty have been similarly recognized by international and national honors, winning more than 60 Fulbright Fellows. Students have won 12 Fulbright awards, 6 Barry M. Goldwater Scholarships, 11 Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarships, and 12 Freeman-Asia study abroad awards. One of the university's students was named the Number One ROTC Cadet in the nation. Faculty honors have included the Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Educator of the Year, two Rome Prize winners, and four professors named in Princeton Review's "Best 300 Professors."

Faculty have published books with leading publishing houses and articles in premier international journals and regularly present at the most prestigious national and international disciplinary conferences. They have highly rated creative performances and exhibits on stages and in galleries globally. But to quantify the totals for these forms of scholarship is difficult because IUP does not systematically collect annual data about these accomplishments. From 2005-2013 EBSCO Host Academic Search showed that IUP faculty had 793 publications, or an average of 88.1 publications per year. A self-reported listing of faculty publications showed that

from 2007-2013, faculty published 612 journal articles (87.4/year), 191 books or book chapters, and 81 creative performances (S5 Appendices: Table - Summary of Faculty Achievements).

The university's faculty actively lead the academic mission of the university. From departmental-level curriculum committee work to university-wide elected offices, faculty in all colleges at IUP contribute substantially to the ongoing work necessary for the smooth running of the university. Many faculty members also serve on national organization boards of directors, editorial boards, journal review boards, funding agency review boards, scientific panels, business boards of directors, and advisory committees. The faculty also serve local communities by engaging in outreach activities, business consulting, community education, and volunteer work. It is particularly noteworthy that faculty from all teaching ranks participate in these service activities.

By combining a first rate faculty with rigorous, high quality curricula, IUP is able to offer students a premier education.

Focus of subcommittee's investigation

The university's reputation as a high quality educational institution is built on quality teaching. To ensure high quality teaching, an institution needs to hire the best faculty it can, to develop those faculty effectively so that they earn tenure and promotion, and to recognize faculty to motivate them to maintain high quality performance. These considerations led Subcommittee Five to investigate the effectiveness of faculty hiring procedures, tenure and promotion processes, and faculty recognition efforts. However, even with the best teachers, students cannot get a high quality education unless curricula are current and delivered effectively. In addition, students need effective advising if they are to proceed through a curriculum in a timely fashion that prepares them for their future careers, educational aspirations, and lifelong learning goals.

Therefore the subcommittee also investigated the effectiveness of the curriculum review process, instructional delivery modes, and advising procedures.

Evidence gathered

Evidence for this subcommittee report was gathered from both quantitative and qualitative sources. A survey of all IUP stakeholders was conducted. Interviews were conducted with the President, Provost, and Council of Deans. The subcommittee also collected data from the Office of the Provost, Office of Human Resources, Office of Institutional Research, and the Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculty (APSCUF, the faculty union). Additional information was collected from department chairs.

Hiring qualified and diverse faculty

Demographic trends: *Snapshot of IUP faculty (2005-2013)*. Faculty data were available for the 2005-2006 through 2013-2014 academic years, although the total number of minority faculty was not available for 2005-2006 year and the number of nonresident alien (international) faculty was not recorded until the 2009-2010 year (S5 Appendices: Table - Demographic Data for Faculty).

The total number of faculty has remained largely constant, averaging 709 during this period. Relative stability in total numbers is maintained despite substantial variability in the number of new faculty hired each year. The number of new faculty hired ranges from 32 in 2010-2011 to 114 in 2007-2008, with a yearly average of 74. The difference between total faculty and new faculty hired indicates the university has been able to maintain a stable faculty pool despite retirements and resignations. Since 2010-2011, the number of new faculty hired has increased steadily (S5 Appendices: Figure - New Faculty Hiring). The stability in number of

faculty has allowed the student-to-faculty ratio to remain fairly constant, ranging between 16:1 and 19:1.

The percentages of male and female faculty members have also remained generally steady. In 2005-2006, male faculty outnumbered female faculty by 9.2%; however, in recent years this gap has narrowed to less than 2%. This trend is in part due to the historic demographics of the faculty and the vagaries of retirements and resignations. Since 2006-2007, with the exception of 2010-2011, the number of women hired each year has outpaced the number of men hired by between 3 and 22 individuals (S5 Appendices: Figure - New Faculty by Gender). Nearly two times as many women are hired as temporary; the faculty ratio is 1.7:1.

The percentage of ethnic minority faculty has hovered around 12.7 since 2006-2007. The number of new minority faculty hired each year has remained low. While 64 White (non-Hispanic) faculty members were added, on average, each year between 2005-2006 and 2013-2014, only 4.4 individuals identifying as Asian or Pacific Islander, 1.6 identifying as Black, 1.3 as Hispanic, 0.4 as multi-racial, and 0.3 as American Indian or Native Alaskan were hired, on average, per year during the same period (S5 Appendices: Figure - New Faculty by Ethnicity). The number of faculty members who are nonresident aliens (international) has also increased only slightly, from 1.3% to 2%, since the statistic began to be recorded in 2009-2010.

The number of part-time faculty since 2009-2010 has increased consistently and is marked by the number of female hires (S5 Appendices: Figure - Part-time Faculty by Gender; Part-time vs. Full-time Faculty). Between 2009-2010 and 2013-2014, the percentage of part-time faculty increased from 10.1% to 13.6% with a one-year high of 14.5% in 2011-2012.

The teacher-scholar model at IUP

The “teacher-scholar model” (Boyer, 1990) is often used when describing IUP’s mission, goals, and faculty. The term is accepted across campus as an appropriate model for student-centered teaching and learning and for assessment/evaluation of faculty. In October, 1992, the IUP Faculty Professional Development Committee (FPDC) produced a report on the teacher-scholar model for IUP. The goal of the FPDC was to provide a unified model of teaching and scholarship in order to clarify expectations for faculty development and to help develop a framework of incentives and rewards to encourage the enactment of a teacher-scholar model at IUP. The concept of the teacher-scholar was based upon a specific definition of good teaching and a comprehensive definition of scholarship. The committee offered the following definition of teacher-scholar: “The Teacher-Scholar is someone who understands the subject matter deeply enough to structure, select, and organize it in order to effectively communicate to students and whose scholarship and service to the university and community demonstrate a commitment to creating new knowledge, to applying knowledge to solve problems, to synthesizing various strands of knowledge, and to understanding how students learn” (IUP FPDC, The Teacher-Scholar Model, 1992). The FPDC definition was not formally adopted at the time nor in the 25 years since. However, the general framework of Boyer’s teacher-scholar concept still prevails in the university’s strategic vision statements and tenure and promotion policies.

A recent strategic planning effort makes a clear and concise argument for formal adoption of a definition of the teacher-scholar model at IUP (Academic Affairs Strategic Plan 2010-2014). The plan argues that IUP needs a consensus view of the teacher-scholar model in order to provide for establishment and implementation of discipline-specific definitions of teacher-scholar. Because this consensus view has not been reached yet, there is considerable

confusion and frustration about faculty teaching and scholarly responsibilities, evaluation, and the reward structure for tenure and promotion. While it is true that one can teach traditional knowledge well without doing research and that making significant discoveries does not guarantee excellent teaching, it should be the goal of every IUP faculty member to achieve excellence in both teaching and scholarship.

Tenure and promotion

Data from 2012 show faculty are evenly distributed across the professorial ranks. At IUP 27% (208) of faculty are fully promoted to the rank of Professor, 26% (200) of faculty are at the rank of associate professor, 27% (210) of faculty are at the rank of assistant professor, and 20% (152) of faculty are at the rank of instructor (S5 Appendices: Table - 2012 Faculty Distribution). Tenure and promotion at IUP follows a prescribed process outlined in the collective bargaining agreement negotiated between the faculty union (APSCUF) and Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education. This agreement requires evaluation of teaching, scholarly activity, and service using a variety of measures. IUP faculty apply for tenure and promotion separately, and tenure and promotion decisions are made separately. Faculty generally apply for tenure and promotion at the same time, but faculty may be granted tenure without being promoted. Probationary faculty are eligible for tenure and promotion after a period of five academic years; however, in exceptional cases, the Provost may approve applications for promotion prior to tenure. Tenure and promotion decisions are made by the university President from a ranked list provided by the Universitywide Promotion Committee, which is composed of elected faculty. Universitywide Promotion Committee recommendations are based on evidence submitted by the applicant and the comprehensive annual evaluations and recommendations of the applicant's departmental promotion committee, department chairperson, college dean, and the Provost. Promotion data

tabulated from academic years 2005 through 2013 and are provided in tables on file in the IUP Middle States Library (S5 Appendices: Table - Faculty Demographics; Faculty Promotion 2005-2013).

Tenure data shows nearly universal success by faculty applicants from 2005-2013. We believe this results from the university's effective mentoring and evaluation of probationary faculty. Each year, probationary faculty are provided feedback on teaching through classroom observations (four from colleagues within the department plus one by the department chair). In addition to classroom observation reports, annual reports providing formative feedback regarding a faculty member's overall teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service activities are prepared by each department evaluation committee, the department chairperson, the college dean, and the Provost. If a faculty member is not performing well in any category, recommendations for improvement are made and support mechanisms are identified to assist with the faculty member's professional development and to take corrective measures.

Formal and informal mentoring are also used to help with faculty members' career development. Formal mentoring occurs in a few programs on campus, most notably through the Center for Teacher Excellence and New Faculty Orientation, but only 22% of faculty polled by the 2014 Middle States Master Survey identified that they had taken part in a "formal mentoring" program on campus. Most mentoring (80%) appears to occur "informally" within departments or peer groups. But most faculty note satisfaction with both the formal and informal mentoring they received on campus (32% very satisfied, 51% satisfied, 12% dissatisfied, 2% very dissatisfied, 3% no opinion; Middle States Master Survey Results, 2014). This survey information was not broken down by gender or ethnicity and thus we are unable to determine what segment of the faculty are unhappy with their mentoring experience. In any case, the combination of regular

formative feedback to faculty coupled with strong mentoring appears to be effectively guiding new faculty through the tenure process as indicated by the very high success rates for faculty with these processes.

Promotion data from the period 2005-2013 also demonstrates faculty success with nearly 80% of those who applied (269 of 337 applications) receiving promotion (S5 Appendices: Table - Promotion Data 2005-13; Figure - Faculty Promotion). On average more women applied for promotion (142 women, 127 men) and a higher percentage were successful (81.6% women, 77.9% men) relative to their male counterparts at each rank. In terms of ethnicity, the relatively small numbers of non-white faculty make it difficult to conduct any meaningful statistical analysis, but the data do not reveal any systematic trends.

To get a sense of the age distribution of faculty, we examined a 2012 ‘snapshot’ view of faculty distributed by age, rank, and gender (S5 Appendices: Table - 2012 Faculty Distribution Snapshot). In these data, we found the total number of faculty at IUP to be gender-balanced (389 men, 391 women). At the Assistant and Associate rank, roughly equal proportions of gender are found (50.9% and 51.5% women faculty respectively); however, a significant disparity occurs at the Professor rank where nearly two-thirds of faculty are male (130 men, 78 women). A similar gender imbalance existed among non-tenure track faculty, where 117 faculty are women and 79 are men. There is some evidence that a smaller pool of eligible women than men apply for promotion to Professor (25% women, 30% men) (S5 Appendices: Table - Associate Promotion Data).

A common theme in comments submitted by those who completed the 2014 IUP Middle States Master Survey is confusion about the standards used to define excellence among faculty in terms of teaching, scholarship, and service, especially as it pertains to tenure and promotion

decisions. When asked, “How can the tenure and promotion process better reflect the teacher-scholar model at IUP?” the survey generated a lively and widely varying set of responses by faculty (IUP Middle States Master Survey Open Ended Responses, pp. 107-120). Many comments identified the cumbersome nature of the application process, with words like “ridiculous,” “daunting,” and “tedious” repeatedly used. Currently all applicants are requested to document their teaching effectiveness, fulfillment of professional responsibilities, continuing scholarly growth, and service activities included in their “box” of application materials. The term “box” needs to be understood literally. Promotion applicants turn in a large box of materials, typically the size of a large packing crate with enough material to fill a filing cabinet drawer. In fact, sometimes applicants submit two boxes. These materials are used by all reviewers to determine qualifications and recommendations for promotion. Reviewers write recommendation letters that are then included with the application materials sent to the Universitywide Promotion Committee who carefully review all documents submitted in the box. The Universitywide Promotion Committee reviews these recommendations and supporting documentation and then provides to the university President three lists of candidates (highly recommended in ranked order; recommended in ranked order; and not recommended). The President (or his designee) ultimately decides who is promoted within the guidelines established by the collective bargaining agreement. The tenure process follows the same pattern as the promotion process with the exception that applicants are not required to submit a box of supporting materials.

Among faculty who responded to the 2014 Middle States Master Survey, there seems to be a general sense that “there is too much emphasis put on stuff in the box” and that too much weight is given to one particular category over another. Faculty comments also indicate that a culture of “excessive demands for documentation” has developed at IUP and faculty feel

compelled to submit large amounts of paperwork to demonstrate and verify their promotion application materials. This may be due, at least in part, to the perception that the universitywide committees are not as familiar with the applicants' disciplinary activities of teaching and scholarship. Those perceptions are reflected in survey statements like "get elected universitywide committees out of the process (as) they cannot possibly have the expertise or objectivity to make reasonable decisions," and, we "rely on a unilateral definition of a scholar (as) being published in academic journals." Such survey comments were typical and repeated. The universitywide committees are established through an election process and representation is limited to no more than one member from any individual department and no more than four members from any individual college. Thus a majority of the committee members are from disciplines outside of the applicants' disciplines and there exists a sense among the faculty that overly extensive documentation is required in order to educate the committee on the significance of their materials. Indeed, many respondents to the survey suggested that the process could be improved by making these decisions by committees more centered at the college level where reviewers would have better expertise and understanding of each applicant's materials and by including external reviewers from within each applicant's disciplinary fields.

Moreover, standards for promotion are perceived as murky and inconsistently applied from year to year. One respondent summarized this perception best by stating, "The promotion process is at the whim of the committee. I went up one year and was ranked; not everyone was promoted. I went up the next year with the same material except a little more and was deemed not ready. What happened in one year? The committee changed. Promotion is a moving target in a black box" (IUP Middle States Master Survey, open-ended responses, pg.118). Perceptions of fairness and equity are an essential component to any promotion process. If decisions are

perceived to be based not on performance but on stereotyping or prejudice, then this has a negative impact on our institution, on faculty morale, and on our ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty.

While the procedures to apply for promotion are clearly outlined in the Statement of Promotion Policies and Procedures document (SP3, 2009), there still remains considerable confusion on the part of the faculty about the standards that define promotability within these procedures. When asked “whether the promotion process reflects the teacher scholar model at IUP,” roughly equal numbers of respondents strongly agreed and strongly disagreed with this statement (16% strongly agreed, 41% agreed, 18% disagreed, 12% strongly disagreed, 13% no opinion). Respondents also indicated a wide variety of ways that the promotion process could be improved, many of which were directly conflicting. Some felt that there is too much emphasis on teaching while others felt the process has moved too far away from a “university where teaching should be valued first and foremost.” Many indicated an over-reliance on research and scholarship, while others suggested that promotion decisions are currently weighted too heavily on teaching. When our subcommittee interviewed the university’s Provost and President, we found a similar lack of clarity in how to define faculty using the teacher-scholar model. They suggested that much of the confusion in the universitywide promotion decisions leads to a “detrimental ambiguity of who we are and where we are going.”

This ambiguity has serious implications beyond hiring and retaining good faculty. If we cannot articulate what we strive to be as faculty and scholars, how can we attract quality students to our programs? How do we determine where to allocate resources or how to decide on new programming? How do we decide if we have achieved excellence? IUP is classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a Doctoral/Research institution and strives to provide academic

programs of high quality and value. But how can we determine what “high quality” means? Is it by the number of scholarly publications or grantmanship? Or is it by teacher-led student opportunities and achievement? We believe that now is the time to open a serious dialogue at IUP about our identity as an institution and what we value. Only then can we begin to build a clear and consistent system of faculty evaluation and assessment.

Faculty recognition mechanisms

IUP has made progress in the last decade in formal methods of recognizing faculty for accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service. In the 2005 Middle States Self Study, the subcommittee that examined the standard on faculty made four recommendations, two of which related to increasing the number of awards available for faculty: 1) “ask the provosts, vice-presidents, and deans to create more inclusive and substantive ways to recognize and reward faculty for governance and service work to the university” (p. 83) and 2) “commit to defining and creating additional ways to support, recognize, and reward the vast variety of scholarly endeavors in which the faculty engage” (p. 83). Our current study reveals increased opportunities for faculty to be recognized for service and scholarly endeavors, while faculty recognition for teaching accomplishments has been sustained.

Teaching awards have long been available at IUP and are evidence of the high value placed on quality teaching at the institution. Currently, teaching awards are given annually across all levels of the university. These awards include a President’s Office award (Distinguished University Professor which recognizes excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service), one Senate award (Distinguished Faculty Award for Teaching), nine different awards from the Center for Teaching Excellence (with five to six awards typically given each year), one award for curriculum and instruction from the School of Graduate Studies and Research, several

college-level awards for teaching (College of Education and Educational Technology, College of Health and Human Services, and the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics), and several department-level awards, such as the English Department's awards in the categories of Outstanding Professor and Outstanding Advisor. The awards offered by the President, Senate and Center for Teaching Excellence have clear guidelines that are published on the IUP website, a formal application process, and committees that evaluate the applications and select the awardees. Application processes for school/college-level and department-level awards are not published on the web. Some of these honors are awarded by deans and chairs while others are selected by students.

The recognition of scholarship has made clear progress since the last Middle States review. Awards for scholarship now exist at all levels across the university. At the university-wide level, there are two Senate Distinguished Faculty awards (in Research and Creative Arts) to reward scholarship from across all disciplines. In the last three years, the University Senate Fellowship Award program has awarded funding for faculty scholarship ranging from \$6,700 (2012-2013) to \$19,160 (2014-2015). The University Senate Research Committee (USRC) offers small grants to support scholarship. The USRC received an average of 154 proposals over the last three academic years, funding an average of 114 grants each year. In 2013-2014, this scholarship support included \$113,000 awarded to faculty for travel to present at international or domestic conferences and \$26,000 in small research grants. Smaller amounts, totaling \$14,000, were awarded for cooperative programs with industry or the community, innovative teaching projects, student/faculty research, and new investigator awards. All of these mechanisms for awards were well publicized through the IUP website with detailed directions for applying.

Beyond the university awards already noted, each college grants an annual Outstanding Researcher Award. Some departments, such as Mathematics, also formally recognize their outstanding scholars. This abundance of awards shows a concerted effort at all levels of the university to recognize faculty scholarship.

Formal recognition of faculty service has also increased since the last Middle States comprehensive review. At the universitywide level, awards include a Senate Distinguished Faculty Award for Service, a Meritorious Service Award from the faculty union, and two awards from the Graduate School for service activities (Outstanding Achievement in Centers and Institutes and Outstanding Achievement in Public Service). Relatively few colleges currently offer recognition for service; however there does exist the College of Education and Educational Technology Faculty Leadership Award and the Natural Sciences and Mathematics Distinguished Service Award. While there are few department specific awards for service, the departments of History, Sociology, Mathematics, and Professional Studies in Education do formally recognize faculty service.

Curriculum approval process

IUP is committed to delivering quality curriculum that is relevant and cutting-edge. Curricular innovation has also become critical in today's fast-changing and increasingly competitive environment. This is why IUP faculty work so actively on curriculum development. Nevertheless, guidance and encouragement from academic leaders, such as an academic deans and department chairpersons, is sometimes needed to help direct faculty efforts on the most needed curricular projects. The IUP Middle States Master Survey respondents (Dean/Associate or Assistant Deans; n=21) were asked to identify the extent to which various incentives or strategies are used to encourage new curriculum development. Ninety-five percent of the

respondents indicated they “often” or “always” motivate faculty through the use of collegewide meetings, 57% encourage department chairpersons to encourage their faculty members, approximately 5% (n=1) often offer release time for the development of curriculum, and approximately 28% “always” or “often” offer other types of incentives, though these incentive were not identified. One dean indicated that once “a new course is developed, we offer release from a large class in order to teach the new course. No release time is given for curriculum development.”

Some respondents (Deans/Associate or Assistant Dean) to our survey indicated that curriculum development was often an offshoot of college strategic planning committees that may have engaged in a benchmarking study (other universities) or from the recommendation of their business/alumni advisory boards. Some academic deans challenge their “chairs to develop new curriculum (some of it interdisciplinary and across colleges) and have provided funds to bring in consultants when appropriate and/or desired.” Other colleges may engage in “periodic day-long meetings (retreats) of faculty colleagues, the results of which are typically new curricular initiatives.” Approximately 46% of the respondents indicated faculty required “a lot of motivation” to develop curriculum. This is not surprising given that the curriculum approval process in place at the time of the survey was very time consuming and labor intensive. Nonetheless, 79% percent of the faculty responding to the survey (n=340) have been engaged in the university’s curriculum process. If we review the data from 2006, an enormous amount of curriculum development has taken place.

The university’s curriculum development is particularly impressive given the complexity and length of the curriculum approval process. Based on faculty responses (n=256) in the IUP Middle States Master Survey, approximately 79% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the

curriculum process is too complex. Approximately 44% of respondents “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the statement that the curriculum process at IUP runs much smoother than the process at other institutions. This matched anecdotal reports that the curriculum approval process at IUP was overly cumbersome.

Because faculty felt the curriculum approval process at IUP needed an overhaul, “in summer 2014, IUP’s provost, Dr. Timothy Moerland, convened a workgroup to examine the existing curricular process policies and procedures with an aim toward providing recommendations to make the process more streamlined and efficient” (<http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=177704>). The workgroup successfully developed a new curriculum approval process that was approved by the local Meet and Discuss of APCUF and Management in December, 2014. Further, that new curriculum approval process was approved at the statewide Meet and Discuss level by the State System and APSCUF. This new curriculum approval process has since been fully implemented at IUP. Most faculty members are excited about this new curriculum approval process. This should make the university more agile in terms of curriculum innovation.

Class size

The subcommittee analyzed data for class size from 2005 to 2013 (2014 data was not available). The average class size for all the colleges, with the exception of the College of Education and Educational Technology, has steadily inched up. The two colleges with the maximum class size average are the Eberly College of Business and Information Technology and the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. These two colleges have also seen their average class sizes jump from the mid-20s to low-30s over a nine-year period. The class sizes for the College of Fine Arts and the College of Education and Educational Technology have

remained in the low teens, barring 2013 when the average class size for the College of Fine Arts jumped to 19. The data supports the university's claim to be a school that offers small classes (S5 Appendices: Graph - Average Class Size by Colleges).

Class sizes differed by faculty status (temporary vs. permanent) (S5 Appendices: Graph - Average Class Size by Faculty Status). Temporary faculty tend to teach lower-level classes and hence it is not surprising that they teach larger classes than permanent faculty. Encouragingly, this gap in class size is slowly shrinking. This would support the assertion that IUP treats its temporary faculty fairly.

As with face-to-face classes, the size of online classes has also increased since 2005. However, online class sizes have increased at a markedly faster and sharper pace (S5 Appendices: Graph - Average Class Size by Mode of Instruction). This is specifically true for the Colleges of Health and Human Services and Natural Sciences and Mathematics. This increase in online class size has increased the burden on faculty teaching these courses since online classes never “sleep.”

Men and women teach classes of roughly the same size, with men teaching slightly larger groups on average. However, that difference is systematically less than five students per class (S5 Appendices: Graph - Average Class Size by Gender). Thus there appears to be no gender bias in terms of the class sizes that faculty teach. Furthermore, there is no perceived difference in the average class sizes based on instructor ethnicity (S5 Appendices: Graph - Average Class Size by Instructor Ethnicity).

Distance education

IUP started offering distance education courses in 1999. By 2015, distance education offerings have grown to include several online/hybrid undergraduate, graduate and certificate

programs. Looking at the data from 2007 to 2012, it is clear that the total number of online sections as well as the number of students registered in online sections have grown steadily across all colleges but Fine Arts (S5 Appendices: Figure - Students Enrolled in Online Classes by College; Figure - Number of Online Sections by College). Online courses have both advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, there is an increasing need to offer online classes to accommodate the growing but small number of fulltime online students at IUP. On the other hand, sometimes courses are offered only in an online format, which necessitates that students take an online course even though they are a traditional face-to-face student and do not want an online course. About 40% of student respondents to the IUP Middle States Master Survey indicated that they took online classes because that was the only section available. Additionally, a majority of the student survey respondents (56%) felt that online classes were not as effective as face-to-face classes. On the positive side, 48% of student respondents perceived that they learned as much in online classes as in face-to-face classes and 60% of respondents said they were satisfied with the quality of interaction they had with their online instructor.

The IUP Council of Deans expressed concern that many faculty members are mainly relying on publisher-provided and often text-heavy content for online classes with very limited personalization of the content by the faculty. They also worried about limited engagement by faculty with the online students. In some online courses, students have to read text-heavy content and then take quizzes and exams that are computer graded. Some faculty members have also expressed concern about student cheating in online courses. However, only 28% of students who responded to the IUP Middle States Survey indicated that they had been tempted to engage in academic dishonesty in an online class.

It is worth noting that results from this same survey indicate that 93% of the faculty who teach online classes agree/strongly agree that they use content that they have personally developed. This data runs contrary to the concerns expressed by the Council of Deans. About 14% of the faculty survey respondents agree/strongly agree that they rely mainly on course content provided by publishers. About 54% of faculty respondents said that their online and face-to-face students come out equally prepared.

Advising procedures

Advising and curriculum are intricately intertwined. Student success depends on how well students can successfully navigate through curriculum requirements. Effective advising is a critical component for students to succeed at that navigation. To understand how satisfied the stakeholders are with the current advising process and to seek ideas for improving the advising process at IUP, a set of specific advising-related questions was included in the IUP Middle States Master Survey. These questions included: “How satisfied are you (students) with the advising process?” and “How can the IUP advising process be improved?”

Students who completed the IUP Middle States Survey expressed an extremely positive view of academic advising at IUP, with approximately 74 percent indicating that they were either “very satisfied” or “satisfied.” The importance that advising holds at the university is demonstrated by the degree of qualitative comment it generated: sixty pages (page no. 44 to 103) or about 1/5th of the 307-page written comments were on advising issues. The good news is that there were at least 50 comments that indicated satisfaction with the current advising process and did not think that it should be changed. Students wrote: “I feel it is great right now;” “I don't think it needs improvement;” and “I have no issues with advising so I do not think it needs to be improved.”

Not unexpectedly, given its importance, there were many suggestions for improving the advising process. Students specifically asked for a little bit more “handholding” and wanting advisors to “Actually sit down with you and create your schedule.” They also asked for “More [of a] one-on-one relationship” with faculty. In the same vein, students wanted to “Make it a more personal experience and not seem so rushed.” Approximately 79 percent of student respondents were either “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with advising pertaining to scheduling classes and approximately 69 percent “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with advising pertaining to pursuing career objectives.

Faculty do not, however, uniformly share IUP students’ views on advising. While 74% of the students who responded to the survey indicated they were either “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with academic advising at IUP, only 49 percent of faculty who responded shared this view. Some advisors spent 8 hours or more each semester on their advisees (perhaps graduate students), but on average faculty spent about 40 minutes on each advisee, with a median of 30 minutes per semester (S5 Appendices: Table - Faculty Estimates on Advising Time).

Not all faculty are asked to do advising. Other data (S5 Appendices: Table - Percentage of Faculty Respondents by Range of Advisees) shows that the number of advisees ranged from 0 to more than 50. This undoubtedly increases the workload of those who do advising. In response to these uneven and often high advising loads, many faculty expressed the need for a centralized advising center based on the model for advising used in the Criminology Department. There were numerous comments regarding the uneven distribution of advising load, not only across colleges or departments, but also within departments. Many faculty members expressed a need for formal advising training, including a need for “better promulgation of changes in LS

curriculum” and for developing “departmental guidelines and resources for advisors” and providing “training or workshops.”

There are, however, formal advising training programs that exist already. For example, the Advising and Testing Center offers a training program prior to summer orientation, but this program remains somewhat limited in focus and reaches out to only those faculty engaged in summer freshmen advising. Some assistant deans provide brief advisor training once or twice year. Some departments dedicate time to advising issues while others have their own advising handbooks. Some training/information is provided for new faculty during the New Faculty Orientation program. Unfortunately these programs often have so much information to deliver in a short period of time that new faculty end up being overwhelmed. In the end, most faculty learn the trade of advising from their more seasoned department colleagues. Clearly, there is a need for developing better advisor training.

The university’s new advising tool, DegreeWorks, has been well received by faculty, students, staff, and administrators. However, DegreeWorks is not without its share of idiosyncrasies. Fortunately, the tool has been regularly tweaked over the last four years to work more effectively with the university’s curriculum. To its credit, the university has also hired a full-time manager dedicated to DegreeWorks. In spite of bugs and difficulties, DegreeWorks has been a successful advising tool. Unfortunately, early problems with the system seem to have biased some faculty against the system. One insightful survey comment sums up this problem as well as a possible solution: “Perhaps some basic information about DegreeWorks should be disseminated to faculty. Too many faculty seem to think Degreeworks is no good. Actually, Degreeworks is very good. I think many faculty have just not used it and are more suspicious of it than they should be.”

Recommendations

Hiring qualified and diverse faculty

1. IUP should strategically plan for the use of temporary and part-time faculty in order to ensure the growth and success of programs. The university should make opportunities to integrate non-tenure track faculty into programs through longer-term contracts, awards, etc.
2. IUP should maintain its strong gender-balanced hiring practices but should further expand efforts to hire a more diverse faculty.

Teacher-scholar model

3. IUP faculty should work closely with APSCUF to establish a consensus view of the teacher-scholar model at IUP that allows for discipline-specific (college or departmental-level) operational definitions.
4. IUP should establish a process and guidelines for discipline-specific definitions of the teacher-scholar model. These definitions should recognize that faculty can and do contribute differently to the multiple missions of the department, college, and university at different points in their careers.
5. IUP should design and implement hiring practices, incentives, and a reward structure that reflects the values embodied in these definitions of the teacher-scholar model. Accurate data regarding appropriate measures of this model should be collected annually and made available publically.

Tenure and promotion processes

6. Tenure and promotion standards should be aligned with discipline-specific definitions of the teacher-scholar model. Standards should be explicitly defined at the departmental and college

levels and reflect the reality that our mission is multi-faceted and that excellence is achieved by the skills of faculty collectively.

7. The application and review processes for tenure and promotion should be streamlined. Applicant materials should be limited to a concise set of documents to evaluate tenure and promotion standards as defined by colleagues within their discipline and evaluated by colleagues within their discipline. The role of the universitywide committees should be to assist departments and colleges in establishing appropriate review procedures and guidelines and to ensure that these procedures are applied consistently and fairly.
8. External reviews should be solicited for all applicants for tenure and promotion.
9. Student evaluation instrument data and other performance indicators should be reported relative to normative measures by department, college, and university as well as by gender, class type, size, etc. These reports should be available to all faculty and to those reviewing tenure and promotion materials.

Faculty recognition

10. There should be a coordinated effort to publish on the university's website a listing of all faculty awards and their purposes, their application or nomination processes, and a full listing of previous award recipients.
11. Application processes for awards should also be streamlined as much as possible. For instance, there is an over-reliance on signatures from chairs, deans, and others at IUP. Eliminating signatures would save time and effort by applicants and nominators and would thereby likely help to increase the number of applications submitted for any given award.
12. In addition to formal recognition, IUP faculty accomplishments should be recognized in less formal ways, in order to boost morale and promote faculty productivity. For instance, an

effort should be made to recognize all faculty who publish annually, rather than a select group as is currently the practice.

Curriculum approval process

13. IUP should monitor the new curriculum process and make further improvements as needed.

Class size

14. IUP should monitor progress on class size continuously and devote resources to sustain our excellence in this area.

Distance education

15. IUP must balance online and face-to-face offerings in such a way that our students who do not enjoy or flourish in online courses are not forced to take online classes.

16. Academic integrity should be given the highest priority. Benchmarks with other universities to improve academic integrity in online courses should be used. Specifically, major exams for online courses should be given in a proctored environment.

17. A process should be developed for more peer review and technology support to help faculty increase course content personalization and student engagement in online courses.

18. Student evaluation numbers for online courses are consistently lower than for face-to-face courses. This discrepancy needs to be addressed so that faculty teaching online courses are not disadvantaged.

Advising procedures

19. IUP should dedicate resources to develop an advising handbook and develop advising training programs for all faculty, especially newer faculty.

20. IUP should continue to improve DegreeWorks and develop other online advising tools.

21. The university should explore creating centralized advising centers for colleges and/or large departments or other approaches to ensure that the best advising resources are made available to all students.
22. Advising loads should be more evenly distributed among all faculty within departments.

References

For Subcommittee Five Full Report

Academic Affairs Strategic Plan, 2010-2014.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, N.J: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

IUP FPDC, *The Teacher-Scholar Model*, 1992.

Middle States Review, 2005.

Middle States Survey Open Ended Responses, 2014.

Middle States Survey Results, 2014.

S5 Appendices: Tables, Figures, Graphs. IUP Middle States Library.

SP3, 2009.

Subcommittee Six: Full Report for Standards 12 and 13

Standard 12: General Education -- The institution's curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities – The institution's programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.

Members of Subcommittee Six: Terry Appolonia, (co-chair), B.Gail Wilson (co-chair), Jan Baker, Lisa Marie Baker, Tedd Cogar, Chauna Craig, Lisa Dupnock, Nancy Evans, Luis Gonzalez, Dot Gracey, Dakota London, David Martynuik, Melanie Muscatello, David Pistole, Shawn Rooney, Theresa Rufrano-Ruffner, Gail Sechrist, Ramy Shaaban, Yaya Sissoko, Dawn Smith Sherwood, and Mary Williams.

Description of area under review for Standard 12: General Education

The committee charged with investigating General Education, or Liberal Studies, used a series of research questions designed to provide an understanding of how the university community perceives the program and understands its mission and goals and well as investigating academic support for students and institutional support for the program. Answering these questions necessitated data collection from a variety of sources such as existing university literature, including: the university's mission and values statements; Liberal Studies goal statements and program information, and: from data collected via the campus-wide IUP Middle States survey.

In 2003, the Provost charged a team with developing a revised Liberal Studies program and implementation plan. The Liberal Studies Revision Committee conducted meetings with representatives from each academic department and additional university constituencies including the Division of Student Affairs, International Education, and the regional campuses to

discuss their proposed involvement in and concerns about the revision (S6 Liberal Studies Main Page).

Several iterations of a revised curriculum were developed; however, resistance to a large-scale revision due to budgetary and economic concerns resulted in a compromise revision implemented in fall 2012. The revision included a reduction in total required Liberal Studies credits from 48 to 43. The credit reduction came in three areas: deletion of the LBST 499 Liberal Studies Synthesis requirement, reduction of Natural Science credits from a range of eight-ten to a range of seven-eight, and reduction of the ENGL 101: College Writing credits from four to three. Academic departments submitted a program revision demonstrating how they would incorporate these revisions. Departments primarily added credits to major requirements or added free elective credits (S6 Liberal Studies Course Requirements Information).

The revision to Liberal Studies also included revised titles to Liberal Studies categories. Health and Wellness became Dimensions of Wellness with additional offerings including courses addressing financial wellness and women's wellness. Non-western Cultures became Global and Multicultural Awareness (S6 Liberal Studies Course Requirements Information).

The range of credits for Liberal Studies Electives (LSE) was changed from zero-to-nine to three-to-nine. Six competencies were added in this category: oral communication; information literacy; scientific literacy; quantitative reasoning; technological literacy; and global citizenship. With the revision, all existing and newly proposed Liberal Studies elective courses must meet the criteria for at least one of these competencies. Academic departments revised existing and new courses intended to meet the Writing-Across-the-Curriculum requirement to designate those courses as "writing intensive" and to meet the new Liberal Studies criteria for this category. The

revision was a three year process that included 256 programs and 270 courses. (S6 Liberal Studies Course Requirements)

Perhaps the most significant accomplishment of the Liberal Studies revision process was the adoption of the Expected Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (EUSLOs). Three EUSLO categories--the Informed Learner, the Empowered Learner, and the Responsible Learner--guide the educational process at IUP. The University Senate approved this framework, integral to the Liberal Studies (LS) program, in 2006 (S6 Liberal Studies Statement of Goals). The establishment of these outcomes provides an appropriate mechanism for university assessment.

The Expected Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (EUSLOs) also represent an opportunity to conjoin the efforts of the Liberal Studies program to the requirements of a contemporary job market. Based on a study reported by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU), employers' top priorities for graduating college students include knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world, intellectual and practical skills, including critical thinking and analytic reasoning, and personal and social responsibility, among others (S6 Liberal Studies Main Page). A review of this report illustrates that the Liberal Studies goals and the EUSLOs address these priorities.

Data collection and analysis of evidence

Assessment of Liberal Studies and student outcomes

For the first time in the university's history, the Liberal Studies program's revision provided a common set of student outcomes and a university-wide obligation for individual departments and Liberal Studies courses to facilitate the accomplishment of these outcomes by students. The University Assessment Committee (UAC) developed a multi-faceted plan that

included two new assessment tools directly related to Liberal Studies and assessment of the Responsible and Empowered Learner EUSLOs (S7 Student Learning Outcomes). The Responsible Learner Assessment (RLA) provides comparative analysis of freshman and senior level student writing samples. The UAC administers the RLA to approximately 100 freshmen and 100 seniors. The samples are compared to measure the progress in becoming a Responsible Learner. The RLA data from two academic years (2012-2013 and 2013-2014) representing approximately 100 freshmen and 100 seniors showed no notable trends with a total of 91 subjects. The RLA data for the first two years were part of a feasibility study. Based on these data, the UAC will broaden participation and implement the RLA as part of the annual assessment of the Liberal Studies program (S7 Student Learning Outcomes).

The Student Learning Outcome (SLO) assessment is administered to 200 senior level students who write an essay based on the same prompt used to place them into their first English course. The samples are compared to their incoming freshmen English placement exams to measure progress as an Empowered Learner (S7 Student Learning Outcomes).

In addition to these two assessments, the university continues to administer the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) to 100 freshman and 100 seniors. This instrument measures critical thinking, analytical reasoning, problem solving, and communication skills. The expected CLA+ score and the observed CLA+ score for IUP students were almost identical at 1,125 for the performance task and selected response questions in spring 2014. The corresponding mastery level for this score is “proficient.” IUP’s CLA+ score was mid-range as compared to the CLA+ score of all 4-year colleges and universities. Moreover, IUP has a senior total CLA+ score of 1,134 and percentile rank of 49. The corresponding mastery level for this score is proficient (S7 Student Learning Outcomes).

The Responsible Learner Assessment and Student Learning Outcomes assessment plans are in the preliminary stages, piloted in 2012 and expanded in 2014 with the expectation of a more comprehensive assessment in 2015-16. The pilot results will be used to inform the more comprehensive assessment plan. As these assessment processes remain in the pilot stage, no trended data is available to gauge the impact.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) addresses student learning and retention, and surveys students about their participation in high-impact practices (HIPs). These HIPs are special undergraduate opportunities seen to have positive effects on student learning and retention (S7 National Survey of Student Engagement). HIPs also demand time and effort, facilitate learning outside of the classroom, require meaningful interactions between faculty and students, encourage collaboration with diverse others, and provide frequent and substantive feedback. The six HIPs are Learning Community, Service-Learning, Research with Faculty, Internship or Field Experience, Study Abroad, and Culminating Senior Experience, and are used to measure student engagement. Six-hundred and fifty freshmen were asked about their involvement in the first three HIPs while 563 seniors were asked to respond to all six HIPs. The resulting information indicated that 11% of the freshmen students were involved in a learning community, 49% in service learning, and 5% were engaged in research with faculty. Not surprisingly, more seniors were engaged in these HIPs than other classes. The survey results indicated that 25% of the seniors were part of a learning community, 62% participated in service learning, and 20% engaged in research with faculty. Additionally, seniors were involved in HIPs for which freshman were not surveyed. These results showed 54% of seniors in an internship or field experience, 12% were doing study abroad and 41% were involved in a culminating experience (S7 National Survey of Student Engagement).

In addition to these university-wide assessment practices, academic departments teaching Liberal Studies courses assess those courses as part of their departmental program reviews or specialized accreditations. Program reviews must incorporate a plan for student learning outcomes (EUSLOs) assessment (S2 Program Review).

The UAC has a long-term plan to further engage departments in assessment to gather data on the Informed Learner outcomes. With that plan in place, all three areas--Informed, Empowered, and Responsible Learners--will be included in the assessment process. Additional discussion of the university assessment process is included in the analysis of Standards 7 and 14.

University programs for student academic assistance

The Academic Success Center (ASC@IUP) provides a centralized approach to academic services by providing outreach to at-risk and transitioning students (S4 Academic Success Center). The ASC@IUP works in conjunction with a number of other IUP activities to facilitate academic support for these students but also to assist all students in their ability to accomplish the EUSLOs. In the categories of Informed and Empowered Learners, the Academic Recovery Assistance program provides academic support to students on or at-risk for academic probation through regular meetings with an Academic Recovery Assistant. A dean's staff member in each academic college manages this program.

The African American Cultural Center (AACC) provides a variety of services – orientation, leadership, and personal skills development – to African-American and other students-of-color in support of the Informed and Empowered Learners outcomes. Additionally, the AACC provides programming and co-curricular activities to all students to promote their development as Responsible Learners. The AACC provides meeting, study, and lounge facilities for students to use (S4 African American Cultural Center).

IUP Libraries provide programs, services, and resources that aid students in their development as Informed and Empowered Learners. Assistance offered by the libraries supports student development of “information literacy skills, including the ability to access, evaluate, interpret, and use information from a variety of sources” (S4 IUP Libraries).

The Military Resource Center, an information and referral site helping veteran and military-affiliated students transition to and from the Indiana campus, provides services and programs in support of the Informed and Empowered Learners outcomes. The MRC offers facilities for veteran and military-affiliated students to use (S4 Military Resource Center).

Tutoring, which primarily promotes student development as Informed and Empowered Learners, is provided in many ways across campus. In addition to the services offered by the Writing Center (see below), Developmental Studies (S2 College of Education and Educational Technology) offers supplemental instruction and walk-in peer tutoring in collaboration with the Advising and Testing Center. Many academic units offer discipline-specific peer tutoring opportunities.

Several other institution programs support student success in accomplishing the Responsible Learner Outcome. The Advising and Testing Center offers services (including orientation, advising, disability support, and major and career exploration) designed to promote and strengthen the interaction of faculty and students. Their stated goal, to provide student assistance “that both answers questions and encourages the development of personal resources for decision making,” supports the development of Responsible Learners (S4 Advising and Testing Center).

In addition to providing traditional career and graduate school preparation services, the Career and Professional Development Center (CPDC) offers critical assistance in the areas of

internships and service learning. In these ways, the CPDC supports the Informed, Empowered, and Responsible outcomes, as students translate classroom knowledge to practice in a variety of real world settings (S4 Career Information and Career Services).

The Office of Housing, Residential Living, and Dining (OHRLD) promotes student success, individual and community well-being, inclusion, and engagement. Through the efforts of residence-based staff (including Academic Success Mentors, Community Assistants, and Residence Directors), the OHRLD assists students in their development as Informed, Empowered, and Responsible Learners through services and programming. A key component of this assistance is the Living-Learning Communities (S4 Office of Housing Residential Life and Dining).

The Office of International Education (OIE) provides a wide array of support services to international students as well as support to domestic students seeking educational experiences abroad. Additionally, the OIE offers campus-wide programming that features diverse international perspectives. In all of these ways, the OIE promotes the Informed, Empowered, and Responsible Learners outcomes for all students (S4 Office of International Education).

The IUP Writing Center assists students in becoming better and more self-sufficient writers by offering one-on-one tutoring and group workshops. Through these efforts, the Writing Center supports the development of Empowered Learners who demonstrate effective written communication abilities and critical thinking skills. Additionally, through instruction in proper citation methods, the Writing Center promotes the development of Responsible Learners who demonstrate intellectual honesty (S4 The Writing Center).

Liberal Studies and the university mission

The goals of the Liberal Studies program remain consistent from its inception in 1989 to the current revised program. The program promotes the broad vision that persons must enjoy full, rich lives and play constructive roles in their communities. The goals include:

- The development of important modes of thinking and intellectual skills: critical thinking, literacy, understanding numerical data, historical consciousness, scientific inquiry, ethical perception, and aesthetic sensitivity
- The acquisition of a body of knowledge or understanding essential to an educated person
- An understanding of the physical as well as the intellectual nature of human beings (S6 Liberal Studies Statement of Goals)

Despite the longevity of the Liberal Studies goals, they remain consistent with the University Mission statement that the university “engages students as learners and leaders in an intellectually challenging, culturally enriched, and contemporarily diverse environment,” and “students become productive national and world citizens who exceed expectations personally and professionally” (S1 Strategic Plan 2007-2012). The Liberal Studies revision aimed to reaffirm a commitment to the university's mission and ensure that courses in the program were updated, intellectually challenging, and intentional about the development of identified intellectual and affective skills, with an emphasis on expanding the global and multicultural cultural awareness of students in a changing world environment. Successful IUP alumni suggest that IUP is indeed graduating productive national and world citizens and, as the core educational component, the Liberal Studies program is a factor in the development of successful students and alumni.

IUP embarked upon the Liberal Studies revision specifically to respond to the changing social and global environment and to ensure that courses were updated to develop students as

thinkers, leaders, scholars, and responsible citizens. While the language of the Liberal Studies goals did not change, the university addressed the strategies for ensuring relevance in a changing environment by redefining categories of course offerings and by revising courses relative to the development of specific student learning outcomes. The revision to the Liberal Studies elective category mentioned earlier is just one example.

Some of the university's values, while related tangentially to the implementation of the Liberal Studies program, are not specifically addressed in the Liberal Studies goals. For instance, the IUP value, “knowing students as individuals who work closely with faculty...” (S1 Vision and Values Statement) is demonstrated in Liberal Studies courses where student-to-faculty ratios allow students to be known as individuals. The university recognizes the value of student/faculty interaction and is able to preserve some smaller classroom environments when it is viewed as conducive to student learning (i.e., writing intensive courses, science labs, and selected humanities courses). While not financially feasible to teach all Liberal Studies courses in this manner, such courses, when feasible, allow for individual interaction and relationship building between student and professor.

Another IUP value, operationalized in Liberal Studies coursework but not specifically addressed as a Liberal Studies goal, is “using technology to reach place-committed students and enhancing learning for all” (S1 Vision and Values Statement). Eighty-nine LS courses are approved for distance education delivery, allowing students to learn from remote locations.

Another example of an IUP value experienced by students in specific Liberal Studies courses is “enjoying historic, inspirational, and functional campuses and facilities” (S1 Vision and Values Statement). Students in Liberal Studies courses have an array of campus activities housed in historic, inspirational, and innovative facilities that allow them to enjoy the heritage of

IUP and to engage in activities that are intellectual, inspirational, cultural, spiritual, and physical. Several examples of these are the Lively Arts Series and a vast menu of fine arts productions, the University Museum, the Six O'clock Series, Mindfulness Rooms, Meditation/Prayer areas, the Center for Health and Well-Being, the HUB Fitness Center, intellectual programming hosted by programs of study, and Constitution Day.

In 2014, the university embarked on a new strategic visioning project that involves every unit of the university community and was finalized in 2015 (S1 Vision and Values Statement). This project may result in a revision of the university mission statement and identified core strengths and values. The Liberal Studies program will continue to foster values and outcomes consistent with a new University Strategic Visioning statement.

Liberal Studies and the university community

As part of the data gathering process, questions related to Liberal Studies were included in the university-wide IUP Middle States survey. Faculty, students, staff, and administrators responded to questions about the Liberal Studies Program. Faculty participation in the survey totaled 442 responses, representing 57.4% of the university's faculty (G1 Middle States Survey). While the hopeful expectation is that faculty who seek employment at IUP are drawn to the institution because of its identity as a four-year liberal arts university, this appears to be only a partial factor in attracting faculty. Of those responding, 15.6% strongly agreed and 29.5% agreed that the university's status as a four-year liberal arts university factored into their decision to come here (G1 Middle States Survey).

The survey data indicate faculty have a clear understanding of Liberal Studies and the role the program plays in the intellectual development of students. Faculty agreed or strongly agreed that they understood the over-arching purpose of the Liberal Studies program at a high

level (82%), which reflects an acceptance of a liberal arts background as important to a student's education. Similarly, 80.5% of the faculty answered positively that Liberal Studies courses contribute to the development of skills students need for their major.

A majority of the faculty who responded to the survey felt confident in their ability to convey the purpose of the Liberal Studies program to their students with 73.9% agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement (G1 Middle States Survey). For the three Expected Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (EUSLOs), the faculty felt students are best demonstrating skills associated with being Informed Learners (68.2% agree or strongly agree), second best at demonstrating skills associated with being Empowered Learners (59.3% agree or strongly agree), and least able to demonstrate skills associated with being Responsible Learners (56% agree or strongly agree). The faculty responding to the survey felt students are not that aware of the EUSLOs, as only 38.8% agreed that the outcomes are clear to their students (G1 Middle States Survey).

Similarly, the survey queried IUP students related to their understanding of the Liberal Studies program. Their participation rate in the survey was 10.8%, or 1,557 students. The distribution of responses from students was fairly even with 12.5% freshmen, 11.7% sophomores, 12.1% juniors, and 14% seniors. About 75% of these students agreed that they understood why they take courses required for Liberal Studies, which correlates well with the faculty understanding of the purpose of Liberal Studies (G1 Middle States Survey).

Students responding to the survey had an even higher agreement (80.7% agree or strongly agree) with the statement that their IUP education is helping them to achieve knowledge and understanding of the world and is preparing them to become life-long learners. The responses

were similar (79.3% agree or strongly agree) to the statement about their education helping them to acquire an understanding of their physical and intellectual nature (G1 Middle States Survey).

With the three EUSLOs, the students' opinion about their preparation as Informed (85.4% agree or strongly agree), Empowered (83.1% agree or strongly agree), and Responsible Learners (83.3% agree or strongly agree) is substantially higher than faculty members' impressions of their demonstration of these same three outcomes (G1 Middle States Survey).

Slightly lower were the agreement reactions (78.5%) to the statement that the students understand the connection between the EUSLOs and their IUP education. There is, however, a large gap between the perceptions of the faculty about the students' understanding of the EUSLOs and the students' own opinions about this same connection (G1 Middle States Survey).

The subcommittee compiling this report attributes this overall strong level of understanding, at least among those who responded to the survey, to an increased university awareness of Liberal Studies during the recent revision process. The extended conversation, during this three-year revision, about the role and purpose of Liberal Studies as well as several additional communication mechanisms in place promoted this improved recognition of the Liberal Studies program and the EUSLOs. By way of example, the Liberal Studies website (S6 Liberal Studies Main Page) provides detailed information about Liberal Studies requirements for students and faculty, including sample syllabi for faculty wishing to propose a course for LS credit and, for students, a multimedia presentation on how to request a course substitution for requirements. MyIUP is an online resource for faculty, staff, and students to access information about classes, accounts, and university news. Faculty can access information directly through a link in the Advising Support Resources section of MyIUP that provides both Liberal Studies categories (e.g., Dimensions of Wellness, and a list of courses accepted in each category such as

HPED 143 Physical Wellness). This page is updated monthly, and a note reminds all users to check the current schedule on MyIUP to see which of the possible courses is offered each semester. From 2013 to 2014, the Liberal Studies website had 5,809 unique page views, up by nearly 1,000 viewers. The website's total page views and number of unique viewers both increased over the last year, indicating heavier use, though the reasons for that cannot be determined.

Incoming first-year and transfer students enrolled for the fall semester create their schedules during summer orientation. Liberal Studies requirements are explained in a presentation before students work with trained peer mentors and faculty advisors in their colleges to build a schedule around major and LS requirements. Staff from the Office of Admissions are available to assess how courses completed at other institutions may transfer to IUP as LS courses, and faculty advise students on requesting exceptions. Faculty advisors at orientation attend a mandatory half-day workshop in May to be trained, reminded, or updated about Liberal Studies requirements, and they are provided with a folder of relevant guides and references. In addition, the Director of Liberal Studies, until recently, participated in new faculty orientation (S5 Faculty Orientation) to help introduce the Liberal Studies program and prepare them in their role as academic advisors.

Liberal Studies and university support

Various university units support the administration of the Liberal Studies program and associated courses. One of the most significant sources of support is the faculty complement used to teach courses in the Liberal Studies program. From fall 2014 through summer 2015 that complement was 4,775 full-time equivalent hours, equal to 199 full-time faculty for one year.

Additionally, the Liberal Studies program has an annual operating budget. Since the latest available record of budget information (2007), the Liberal Studies budget has varied significantly, from a high of \$82,186 in AY 2008/09 to a low of \$30,000 for AY 2014/15. After the 2009-2010 academic year a new budget model was used for Liberal Studies. Previously, part of the Director's Alternative Work Equivalency (AWE) and ¼ of a graduate assistantship were part of the operating budget. In 2009-10, those were removed from the LS operating budget and the LS budget was reduced. In 2011-12, the responsibility for the cost of a full-time graduate student was returned to the LS operating budget. For the past four years, the LS budget continues to be funded at a significantly reduced level.

The standard FTE for the LS Director is nine credit hours or three-quarter time. During the time of the LS curriculum revision (2011-2014), the LS Director had a 12-credit (full-time) release. With the expansion of the LS Director's duties, the Director now serves on several major bodies including the University Senate, the University-Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Honors College Curriculum Committee, and University-Wide Assessment Committee. Another major workload addition of the LS Director since the last Middle States review is additional responsibility for aiding in the assessment of the LS program. This resulted in new assessment methods for the curriculum and the creation of annual reports discussing those results.

With the Liberal Studies requirement that all departments offer writing intensive courses specific to the major, the Liberal Studies Office has provided support for faculty to teach those courses. The Liberal Studies Office has funded writing workshops to assist faculty with development and instructions of writing intensive courses. External presenters, paid by the Liberal Studies Office, conducted these workshops. In response to budget cuts the workshops

once offered by paid outside providers over 2 ½ days are now offered using in-house content experts, and workshops have shortened to 1 ½ days. To improve coordination of workshop offerings with faculty availability and to encourage increased attendance, future workshops will be offered more frequently for shorter periods. To ensure proper design of writing intensive Liberal Studies courses, the university requires all faculty who teach professor-specific writing intensive courses to attend workshops. Other faculty are always encouraged to attend as well.

Faculty support for teaching is also provided through the Center for Teaching Excellence. The Center offers new faculty orientations and provides sessions on creative teaching strategies during teaching excellence workshops offered throughout the year. Examples of large Reflective Practice and smaller Teaching Circle topics that support Liberal Studies include: Working with International Students; Time Management for Faculty; Integrative Learning; Tech Teaching 101; Best Practices in Online Pedagogy; High Impact Practices; and Teaching Large Groups. Programming, such as Partnering to Create Conditions for Student Success, is conducted in collaboration with other institutional divisions, especially Student Affairs. The director of the Center for Teaching Excellence is heavily involved in university-wide committees and receives a six credit (half time) AWE in fall and spring and three credit AWE in summer.

Technology support is critical to any program to maintain information and communication at all levels. The primary upgrade in Liberal Studies technology is the development of a more content-driven, user-friendly web site. Examples include resources for students and advisors regarding the LS categories and LS course listings by term. Resources for the new LS curriculum provide faculty with sample course revisions, rationales for the various categories, and many other types of information. Other technology related projects include the creation of a digital University wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Syllabi of Record

and Program Proposal Archive in which documentation of all institution courses and programs is maintained. Additionally, IUP's Information Technology (IT) Support Center follows a governance methodology in addressing any/all requests for service. The goals of the methodology are to continually align appropriate IT resources to university goals to serve Liberal Studies and all aspects of the university in an efficient manner.

Since 2006, the Office of Liberal Studies is housed in a temporary library facility that has not sufficiently supported the needs of the program or its staff.

Related Educational Activities

Investigation scope and focus

The institution's related educational activities, whether led solely or in partnership with external agencies, demonstrate great breadth and depth. They include off-site credit-bearing programs; regional campuses; developmental education and academic recovery; distance education; IUP Libraries; certificate programs; intercollegiate athletics; and field and internship experiences. Data collection and analysis for each related educational activity was conducted independent of one another and through interview of the primary officer responsible for oversight of the activity. The nature of each investigation uniformly addressed the following questions:

- To what extent are the activity goals and outcomes congruent with the mission of the institution?
- Are there adequate processes in place to meet activity goals and outcomes?
- Is the activity adequately resourced to meet its stated goals and outcomes?

- Has the institution established and does it maintain adequate oversight to ensure that appropriate standards are met?

Data collection and analysis

Off-site credit-bearing programs

Off-site credit-bearing academic programs include the IUP Monroeville Graduate and Professional Center, articulation agreements with regional community colleges, the Education Abroad Program, and the National Student Exchange Program. New or existing academic programs seeking to move or expand to the Monroeville Center submit a variability of delivery proposal through the established institutional curriculum approval process, thereby ensuring quality and cost-effectiveness. Once established, Monroeville Center academic programs undergo regular review as required by accrediting bodies and the institution. Oversight of cost-effectiveness of the Center is the responsibility of the School of Graduate Studies and Research. Current community college articulation agreements fall under the auspices of the Pennsylvania Transfer and Articulation Center (PA TRAC). Full information regarding legislation, oversight, credit framework, transfer standards, and articulation agreements can be found at <http://www.patrac.org/Administrators/TAOCPolicies/tabid/716/Default.aspx>. The Office of Admissions serves as the institution's liaison to PA TRAC. All Education Abroad Programs are reviewed and approved by the institution through the Office of International Education (OIE). An active relationship is maintained through site visits, electronic communication, and conferencing. The National Student Exchange Program is hosted by the institution through the Career and Professional Development Center. Participating students continue their baccalaureate studies at partnering institutions while broadening their personal, educational, and cultural perspectives.

Regional campuses

The institution hosts certification and baccalaureate study at the IUP at Northpointe and the IUP Punxsutawney campuses. The Northpointe campus is located in Freeport, PA and serves as a commuting destination for Armstrong, Butler, Allegheny, and Westmoreland Counties. The Punxsutawney campus is located in southern Jefferson County and, while also serving as a commuter destination for 10% of its student body, relies heavily upon Office of Admissions designation of admitted students. Designated admission to the Northpointe and Punxsutawney campuses is based on the applicant's profile of high school grade point average and SAT/ACT score. Designated student applicants whose domicile is within a commuting distance to Northpointe are offered admission there. Designated student applicants requiring campus residency are offered admission to the Punxsutawney campus. As the Punxsutawney student profile is largely developmental in nature, its mission statement, instructional delivery, and support programs are carefully crafted to serve its students' developmental needs (S6 IUP PXY Mission-Strategic Goals). Both regional campuses support the first-year Liberal Studies curricular requirements of all IUP programs of study. The Northpointe campus offers the full curriculum for two masters programs, three baccalaureate programs, and one associates program. In addition to first-year baccalaureate study, the Punxsutawney campus hosts the Academy of Culinary Arts certification program. The quality and integrity of instruction and learning standards of the regional campuses are equivalent to that of the Indiana campus, as coursework at all three campuses is directed by the institution's six undergraduate colleges and assigned departmental faculty. Both regional campuses productively use their smaller, more intimate environments to focus upon first-year student needs and intrusively guide students through early college success. Nonetheless, both regional campuses continue to experience challenges in

acquiring coursework from selected academic departments. Despite high levels of student satisfaction with their experiences at the regional campuses (S6 IUP PXY Participation-Satisfaction Survey Report (2013-14)), the regional campus environments and their student cohorts frequently are perceived as “lesser than” the experiences and students at the “main campus” by Indiana campus personnel and students.

Developmental education and academic recovery

A number of institutional units collaborate in assessing pre-matriculation needs and delivering support for developmental education and post-matriculation academic recovery. Entering students participate in placement assessment for English, mathematics, reading, education readiness, Spanish, German, and French. The assessment results determine introductory course placement. The Department of Developmental Studies (DVST) provides developmental coursework, academic support services, and Act 101 services for deserving students at the institution’s three campuses. DVST also offers a one-week first-year seminar of college preparatory experiences for matriculating Indiana campus students (S6 DVST Program Review 2015). Following the completion of one semester of study, the academic standing of a student earning less than a 2.0 grade point average moves from good standing to probation. Intervention is initiated and directed by the student’s undergraduate college or the Department of Developmental Studies at the Indiana campus and by the chief academic officer at the regional campuses. The Academic Success Center (ASC@IUP), an accessible hub of academic resources, is in development at the Indiana campus and the Student Success Center exists at the Punxsutawney campus. The institution also is a member of the Education Advisory Board Student Success Collaborative and is piloting an early warning dashboard system to identify

Indiana campus students encountering difficulty in their declared career path (S4 Academic Success Center).

Distance education

Distance education programs and courses are aligned, with varying degrees of success, with Liberal Arts and academic program coursework. The distance education curriculum is overseen by the respective academic departments and colleges and is assessed to maintain academic rigor through the departmental program review process. Learning outcomes are required and are identical to those established for classroom learning experiences. Appropriate synchronous or asynchronous interaction is required for all distance education courses. The institution offers training opportunities for distance education faculty, including the two learning management systems and best practices pedagogy. IUP Libraries provides support through electronic access to the catalog and online databases, two online services, the Reference Desk, and website resources. Tenure-track faculty serve as academic advisors. Upon being accepted into online programs, an online orientation is offered to students new to distance learning. All services provided by institutional units are available online. The university has a portal entitled MyIUP that provides information tailored to various types of students, faculty, administrators, and staff. This portal has a specific view defined for students in distance education programs.

IUP Libraries

IUP Libraries fulfills its mission of developing life-long learners through a variety of ways. Credit-bearing courses addressing information literacy continue to increase, and information literacy is a two-credit course requirement within the Punxsutawney campus first-year Liberal Studies experience. Embedded librarians exist within four undergraduate colleges at the Indiana campus, and collaboration with academic departments regularly yields undergraduate

internship experiences. Tutoring satellites for Foreign Language and the Writing Center are hosted within Stapleton Library. IUP Libraries provides access to an integrated search discovery platform called I-Search, a time and effort-efficient search tool across multiple data bases. The IUP Libraries continually strive to offer the best print and electronic resources or via Interlibrary Loan in support of research and scholarly activity for students, faculty, and staff. IUP Libraries service and program awareness is accomplished through use of social media outlets and Web 2.0 content, monthly programming, and an annual Database Expo. The Indiana campus Stapleton and Stabley facilities recently were upgraded with contemporary furniture and a cyber café to create a more collaborative study space. A 24/5 weekday schedule now better accommodates student study trends. The Punxsutawney campus library continues a transformation from traditional stacks to an open concept tutorial and group study space. Punxsutawney campus dedication to information literacy and successful collaboration between course instructors and support staff recently was awarded a full-time librarian. Attention to technology upgrades includes the hiring of two assistant deans with technology and assessment responsibility; the installation of a book scan station and a self-checkout station; an increase in electronic book holdings to over 120,000 titles; the implementation of a demand driven acquisition program to streamline the acquisition of print and electronic books; and the implementation of an Online Information Literacy Design Center. Library improvements are favorably reinforced as the most recent Indiana campus gate count of 857,737 represents a 34% increase over the previous year.

Certificate programs

The institution currently hosts 22 active certificate programs, each under the auspices of an academic department or undergraduate college (S6 Active Certificate Programs). Program oversight, need, assessment, and marketing therefore is decentralized. Program offerings are

congruent with the institutional mission of advancing undergraduate and graduate education. Fifteen of the programs lead to an IUP credential upon completion. Curriculum completion within the remaining six programs leads to credentialing by an entity external to IUP.

Intercollegiate athletics

Oversight of the intercollegiate athletic program and its alignment with institutional mission is conducted by the Presidential Athletic Advisory Committee (PAAC). Program execution, including NCAA compliance is the responsibility of Intercollegiate Athletics as detailed at <http://www.iupathletics.com/staff.aspx?staff=132>. The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan 2013-2014 and Appendices located at <http://www.iup.edu/studentaffairs/about/default.aspx> documents use of the student learning outcomes and satisfaction survey to measure learning and satisfaction as a result of student participation in intercollegiate athletics. Intercollegiate athletics is required to present its Institutional Self Study Guide (ISSG) to the NCAA every five years. The data collection process yielded a degree of confusion regarding the specific leadership roles of the Presidential Athletic Advisory Committee (PAAC) and the Division of Student Affairs.

Field and internship experiences

Students participate in a diverse set of credit-bearing experiential learning activities (ELAs), including clinics, education field experiences, and internships to extend learning from the classroom to applied settings, including public schools; hospitals; nursing homes; restaurants; hotels; radio stations; day care programs; group homes; mental health facilities; local businesses; and community theaters. In the ELA setting, students practice, master, and extend skill development encountered in coursework. Both undergraduate and graduate students may select

or be required to complete an ELA as part of their programs of study. According to data from Institutional Research Planning and Assessment, students completed 3,569 internships during the 2013-14 academic year; 3,057 internships were at the undergraduate level and 512 were at the graduate level. ELAs are required for many academic programs, based on state licensure or certification policies, professional standards, student learning outcomes, or discipline-specific outcomes.

Recommendations

After thorough data collection and analysis, the following recommendations for General Education and Related Educational Activities are offered:

1. Strengthen planning and assessment for General Education.
 - a. The Liberal Studies program should be subject to a five-year review with the purpose of maintaining the currency of the program and its relevancy to educational needs of students and well as employer priorities.
 - b. The University Assessment Committee and the Office of Liberal Studies should continue their plans for assessment of the entire General Education program including the development of a plan for continuous Liberal Studies program and course improvement based on the assessment data collected.
 - c. The University Assessment Committee and the Office of Liberal Studies should develop a process to work more closely with academic departments to advance course assessment.
2. Increase the perception of relevance of the regional campus experience and the viability of their first year curricula.

- a. Internally market the regional campus experience as one that successfully contributes to critical institution enrollment and persistence goals by most suitably meeting the developmental and financial needs of its student cohort .
 - b. Strengthen academic department support for appropriate course and faculty assignment.
 - c. Reinforce or redefine the Office of Admissions program of study designated-admit parameters to the regional campuses.
3. Better coordinate or consolidate the developmental education and academic recovery efforts of the Department of Developmental Studies, the academic departments of English and Mathematics, the undergraduate college Assistant and Associate Deans, the Academic Success Center (ASC@IUP), and the regional campuses.

References

For Subcommittee Six Full Report

G1 Middle States Survey.
 S1 Strategic Plan 2007-2012.
 S1 Vision and Values Statement.
 S2 College of Education and Educational Technology.
 S2 Program Review.
 S4 Academic Success Center.
 S4 African American Cultural Center
 S4 IUP Libraries.
 S4 Military Resource Center.
 S4 Career Information and Career Services.
 S4 Office of Housing Residence Life and Dining.
 S4 The Writing Center.
 S5 Faculty Orientation.
 S6 Liberal Studies Main Page.
 S6 Liberal Studies Course Requirements.
 S6 Liberal Studies Statement of Goals.
 S6 IUP PXY Mission-Strategic Goals.
 S6 IUP PXY Participation-Satisfaction Survey Report (2013-14)
 S6 DVST Program Review 2015.
 S6 Active Certificate Programs.
 S7 Student Learning Outcomes.
 S7 National Survey of Student Engagement.

SUBCOMMITTEE SEVEN: FULL REPORT FOR STANDARDS 7 AND 14

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment – The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning – Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation or other appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.

Members of Subcommittee Seven: Barbara Moore (co-chair), Timothy Runge (co-chair), Mimi Benjamin, Karen Cercone, Melissa Daisley, Jeffrey Fratangeli, Christina Huhn, Katherine Jenkins, Kelli Jo Kerry-Moran, Chris Kitas, Becky Knickelbein, John Levey, Elizabeth Palmer, David Porter, Todd Potts, Joseph Rosenberg, Eric Rubenstein, Mark Sloniger, Brandon Weber, Kim Weiner, and William Oblitey.

Description of areas under review for Standard 7

The Standard 7 work group of Subcommittee Seven studied the assessment process to evaluate the overall effectiveness in achieving the university mission and goals along with compliance with accreditation standards.

Self study questions

1. What is the current state of institutional assessment at IUP? How are the assessment results used to support planning and continuous improvement and to inform resource allocation?
2. How does the university's organization, procedures, and culture encourage, support, and value assessment? How effective are assessment processes in helping to fulfill the university's mission and goals?
3. How are Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education's performance indicators incorporated in the institutional assessment process?

4. How are institutional assessment results communicated to stakeholders? What opportunities are there for dialogue throughout the process? What evidence is there that assessment results inform decision-making at the unit, college, department, and program level?

Culture of assessment

Assertion 1: IUP has taken a multi-faceted approach to assessment with more purposeful coordination and analysis

Assertion 2: IUP has made assessment an integral part of its institutional procedures.

Assertion 3: IUP provides support and training for institutional assessment.

Since 2006, the Division of Academic Affairs at IUP has made assessment of institutional effectiveness the core of divisional planning, program review, committee organization, and strategic timelines. To measure the institutional effectiveness of our academic programs, IUP chose to build on existing strengths in external accreditation and state-mandated five-year program reviews rather than implement a brand-new assessment system. External accreditations have substantially increased their requirements for assessment of effectiveness over the past ten years. Accredited IUP programs, particularly in the Eberly College of Business and Information Technology and the College of Education and Educational Technology, have kept pace with assessment. State-mandated program review guidelines, which originally date back to 1986, did not require the same level of rigor, and so IUP made the decision to go beyond the minimum state requirements in our program review process. The significance and meaningful outcomes of program review were improved in a series of gradual steps from 2009 to 2014, as shown below. Of particular note is the addition of reflection meetings at the end of the review process in order to create a meaningful strategic action plan. These high-level strategic conferences bring together

the program leaders with the provost and college dean in order to affirm the program's next five-year action plan and allocate or reallocate resources to achieve its implementation.

Modification or addition to the university's program review process

Year 2014 – The reflection meeting report was strengthened to include three measurable action steps. Reflection meeting participants were required to agree on a timeline for strategic change.

Year 2013 – IUP participates in a State System pilot study of proposed new program review template. Internal review committee approval required to schedule external reviewers' visits.

Year 2012 - Assessment of program review process by provost staff; new timeline and guidelines.

Annual progress reports required to be submitted to Provost as well as dean.

Year 2011 - College dean must approve self study before submission can be made to provost. Three potential external evaluators must be identified; provost and dean choose one.

Year 2010 - Reflection meetings followed up by a written report documenting findings. Annual progress reports required to be submitted to college dean.

Year 2009 - Added two pre-review workshops and a post-review reflection meetings. External evaluators required every five years instead of PASSHE's 10-year interval.

Recommendation #1: Post-review reflection meetings have been so successful at creating a consensus and allocating university resources to support each program's strategic action plans that they should be added for accredited programs as well as those that undergo five-year review.

In response to Middle States recommendations, IUP implemented a university-wide strategic plan (Advancing a Legacy of Excellence - 2007-2012) after our last accreditation. The Division of Academic Affairs then aligned its own action plan and priorities to the university's larger vision and adopted a process of internal monitoring from 2010-2014. During this period, a Monitoring Committee was created for oversight of the Academic Affairs' strategic plan's implementation and assessment of the division's institutional effectiveness.

An assessment team composed of representatives from all division units (colleges, campuses and internal offices) entered their strategic actions, expected outcomes and actual

results into a relational database (TracDat). The Monitoring Committee analyzed both the plans and the results and compiled an annual report for the Academic Affairs Council.

At the beginning of this assessment timeline, it was envisioned that the TracDat database would also help colleges, campuses, offices, and programs monitor their own priorities and plans in addition to reporting results for division assessment. However, the relational database software did not prove as user-friendly as we had hoped and few units so far have used it for anything other than the divisional monitoring process.

The Division of Academic Affairs has held between two and four planning workshops for programs engaged in that year's cycle of self study and external review. These workshops have included presentations by national assessment experts such as Dr. Doug Eder and Dr. Kathy Cummings as well as internal presentations of model self-studies and of sample assessment instruments, both for student learning outcomes and for strategic actions (S7 Appendices: A).

Academic Affairs has also provided annual workshops and individual training in the use of the TracDat for those individuals in colleges and campus offices tasked with submitting the key success indicators and strategic results for each assessment cycle.

Recommendation #2: Following development and implementation of the university's new strategic plan in 2015, a new process should be put in place to measure how effectively the university achieves the strategic priorities over the coming decade. The university should consider a new software system to report and track assessments.

A culture of assessment exists at IUP beginning at the level of the President's Cabinet. The Cabinet meets weekly to discuss operations and key items related to the university. A new format for weekly meetings has provided more opportunity to discuss strategic initiatives.

Retreats for Cabinet are held twice each year to reflect on strategic goals, initiatives, strategic planning and assessments.

The Division of Administration and Finance includes 15 diverse entities such as Finance, Facilities, Human Resources and Public Safety and University Police. Each area assesses operations within their department in various ways. Many entities are subject to reporting guidelines and assessments established by professional organizations, the state, State System, or legal requirements.

The Enrollment Management and Communications (EMC) division was established in 2011. Within this division are such offices as Admissions, Career and Professional Development, Communications and Marketing, and Financial Aid. Multiple measures are used to assess client satisfaction, performance, and procedural compliance in this division. Client satisfaction and performance satisfaction are the most widely used metrics. As part of this division's yearly strategic plan, each director is required to identify and implement one Key Performance Indicator (KPI) that measures a function(s) of that office and align with the university's vision and values as well as the IUP Strategic Plan. An annual review occurs for the office to assess the effectiveness of the KPI. Procedural compliance occurs in some of the offices because of legal and professional standards (e.g., Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency (PHEAA) program review, financial aid audit, veteran's affairs compliance surveys, and program accreditation reviews).

The Division of Student Affairs consists of ten offices, including the Center for Student Life, Athletics, and the newly-established Military Resource Center. Student Affairs has been conducting regular assessment since 1998. Assessment is tied to the division's strategic plan. Student Affairs makes use of both nationally normed (e.g., National Survey of Student

Engagement (NSSE); EBI Resident Assessment) and university-normed surveys. The Student Affairs Division Student Learning Outcomes Committee (SAD-SLOC), which has been in existence for 16 years and is comprised of representatives from across the division, serves as an informed body to consider what members of the division are learning from the various assessments being conducted and how to create a common discourse about what they are learning.

Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education developed funded performance measures related to student success, access, and stewardship. Although performance funding has existed since 2000, a new framework for these measures and their funding was instituted by the State System in 2012. The new framework currently remains in a transitional stage of implementation and has not been finalized.

Results

Assertion 4: IUP collects assessment data across many institutional levels.

Assertion 5: IUP has used assessment data to make critical institutional decisions.

IUP collects assessment data within and among its divisions at many institutional levels as identified in an inventory of assessments by division (S7 Appendices: B). The University Planning Council (UPC) was established by the President and is led by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and a chair representing the Council of Chairs of the academic departments. The function of this council is to advise the president and his cabinet in matters concerning the university's strategic plan and requirements of the State System and Commonwealth. Composition of the council is broadly representative of the university community. A number of smaller area specific subcommittees make up the whole and cover the following areas: academic excellence, branding, campus facilities master plan, Development

Office, enrollment management, performance funding, research/scholarly activity, resource management/University Budget Advisory Council, social equity/diversity, strategic planning, space allocation, and student success. (S7 Appendices: C)

The Division of Academic Affairs measures institutional effectiveness at multiple internal levels:

- Individual programs are assessed through national accreditation or five-year program review. Programs are also required to provide annual progress reports on their strategic action plans.
- Colleges create their own individual planning process, usually using a shared-governance model so that faculty and administrators can jointly identify common needs, opportunities, and areas where improvement is needed. Strategic data is coordinated by staff in the dean's Office.
- Academic Affairs sets strategic priorities each year and requires its colleges, campuses, and other units to create key success indicators for each unit. These represent the concrete strategic actions that will be taken to achieve the division's goals. At the end of each assessment cycle, strategic results are collected and compared to the expected outcomes for each unit to determine whether or not the action was successful in achieving the desired goal.

One of the major divisional goals of the past five years has been to improve student success and retain more of the students who choose IUP for their education. Data from surveys and student career counseling suggested that students were often unclear about how to meet the requirements of their chosen major, resulting in delayed graduation or departure from IUP. As a division, Academic Affairs made a major strategic investment in a more useful and user-friendly advising software, DegreeWorks. In conjunction with the roll-out of this software, facilitated by

IT Services and the Registrar's Office, many individual colleges created workshops for both faculty and students to help them get the most out of this new resource.

A second major problem identified from faculty surveys and program review reflection meetings was the cumbersome and multi-step process that had been required to make even minor changes in program curricula. Since curriculum reform is the main way that programs can 'close the loop' on student learning outcome gaps, the division had a strong incentive to make the process less burdensome so that student learning could be improved in a more nimble and responsive fashion. A committee of faculty and administrators met during the summer of 2014 to create a streamlined process for program and course revisions. The new process that resulted from this committee's efforts was recently enacted by the University Senate and should have a positive impact on metrics such as time required for curriculum approval and the number of revision proposals submitted.

Probably the most critical decision made at any university involves the distribution of faculty positions to colleges and departments across campus. IUP has used assessment data in two ways to address this on-going issue: at the Council of Deans level, assessment data on student enrollment, retention, and job opportunities was used to re-align faculty positions between colleges in 2013. Within individual colleges, assessment data from program review and accreditation reports as well as from solicited proposals for interdisciplinary faculty positions have been used to distribute faculty positions to the programs with the greatest needs and/or the greatest opportunities for growth. The impact of these strategic distributions of faculty lines can be continuously assessed through program review (including annual progress reports on program action plans) and also through college participation in the division's current and future monitoring process for institutional effectiveness.

Results of internally and externally mandated reporting in the Administration and Finance division are used to make changes in procedures and policies, many of which have an impact on resource allocation in terms of service delivery or systems. The Long Range Master Plan is an example of how assessments are used as part of this division's efforts to integrate with the university planning process.

Enrollment Management and Communications (EMC) utilizes assessment results to support planning and continuous improvement and to inform resource allocation. Assessment data from the undergraduate admissions annual report have been used to develop and implement new recruitment programs such as the Sutton Scholars and the IUP Grant program. Research tools for these programs include: focus groups; event surveys; application surveys; Enrollment Planning Service; and assessment of Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and ACT results.

Assessment efforts led to the Sutton Scholars Program, established in fall 2012, to recruit high-achieving students through substantial merit-based financial aid. The results of this program have been very encouraging. The IUP Grant program was established to assist non-commuter freshmen students from Pennsylvania who have graduated with a high school GPA of 3.0 or its equivalent, and who demonstrate a specific financial need. This scholarship is a yield effort to increase the size of the freshman class since IUP is experiencing demographic challenges in western Pennsylvania. The Lehigh Valley Campaign is yet another example of how assessment results are used both to support planning and inform resource allocation. The Lehigh Valley was identified as an area of significant growth, providing opportunities for successful student recruitment.

Student Affairs collects data across the division and uses that information to make critical decisions as well. Five units have undergone program review since 2011 and used the results to

inform practice. Following its 2014 review, the Center for Student Life created and implemented assessment plans for each office within the unit. Assessment data are also used for continuous improvement. The Living-Learning Activities Survey, developed locally and distributed annually since 2008, is used to assess resident interest in categories of activities such as major/career preparation. Results are distributed to Student Affairs and academic colleagues for planning and delivery of living-learning programs. For example, when the data suggested a desire for career-related programming, the division created a “Meet and Greet” program, bringing together faculty and students. Additionally, the Office of Housing, Residence Life and Dining is partnering with the Career and Professional Development Center to invite employers from specific fields into living-learning facilities for special programming, a direct result of assessment information.

Additional on-going assessments include the Haven Project, which is guided by many years of data to determine female students’ experiences with sexual assault, relationship violence, and stalking, and the barriers and experiences with seeking help. Guided by findings from a Student Veteran Campus Climate Survey, the Military Resource Center opened in the spring of 2014. Using assessment to fulfill the university’s mission and goals, Student Affairs benchmarked NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) variables aligned with Student Affairs work, using information to identify priority areas based on variable trends. One example of how this data was used is the creation of mini-grants to support diversity-related initiatives. Additionally, funds were invested to improve internet access in residence halls this year, following two years of declines in that question area on the EBI Resident Study.

Performance measures are incorporated into the university's assessment process in many ways. The University Planning Council sub-committee structure, as noted above, provides

opportunities for discussions and recommendations of these measures and as a committee at large. For example, the subcommittee for student success has incorporated measures for retention, persistence, and graduation rates in a pilot program for the transition of our Punxsutawney Students to main campus (Appendix D). The subcommittee for social equity/diversity provides recommendations for hiring practices to increase the diversity of the faculty. The subcommittee for development has used the performance metric as a means of goals within the Advancement Division. A new strategic plan, developed by the State System in 2014, incorporates these measures. The ongoing assessment of these measures is key to success and funding for the university.

Enrollment Management has used the performance measures related to success to help develop recruitment and retention strategies. A new Latino recruiter was hired to help increase the diversity and retention of our Latino students. New IUP scholarships were developed to target groups such as “promising scholars” in the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh areas, Pell-eligible students with low expected family contributions, and IUP Sutton scholars. Additional recruitment efforts at minority college fairs, Latino exploration days, and new markets have been incorporated in the enrollment management plan.

Academic Affairs and Student Affairs recently began a three-year Student Success Collaborative partnership with the Educational Advisory Board to provide access to best practices research, benchmarking, tools, and analytics for improved student success and retention, better outreach to veterans, and support systems for minorities and first-generation college students. These new resources should help faculty and staff address assessment needs in many different areas.

A new Academic Success Center (ASC@IUP) has been developed and is now in the implementation stage. The center will provide emphasis on the success of all students. The funding of graduate assistants as part of the Academic Recovery Program has also helped to guide the success measures. Math 101 has been re-focused to be self-paced and has shown positive results from the first semester.

The deans of the Colleges of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and Health and Human Services are providing additional recruitment and outreach to those students studying in the areas of science, technology engineering, and math (STEM). This is a measure of the number of degrees awarded within these specific majors. They are also looking at developing new programs to meet the needs of these students.

Data for planning throughout the year is available upon request through reports such as I-Reports, advancement services targets and goals, and Institutional Research.

Recommendation #3: Divisions and/or units should continue to collect assessment data across many levels, using a variety of instruments and processes to reflect individual needs.

Recommendation #4: Divisions and units should continue to monitor outcomes and metrics to ensure that the recently implemented strategic changes have achieved the desired results.

Communication

Assertion 6: Assessment processes and results are effectively communicated at IUP.

Based on the Middle States Master Survey, 75% of all who responded to the survey across campus agreed or strongly agreed that a culture exists that supports assessment at IUP, and 73% of the respondents also agreed or strongly agreed that their department, division, or office uses assessment results (S7 Appendices: E).

Academic Affairs has made a strong effort to communicate the results and process of its internal strategic assessment over the past four years. The Academic Affairs Council, made up of the provost, college deans, academic deans, and representatives from other divisional stakeholders such as IT Services, has received annual written reports on strategic assessment from the Monitoring Committee since 2011. Presentations about strategic and student learning assessment in Academic Affairs has also been provided to other divisions on campus, particularly to the Student Affairs Division through its annual assessment workshops. The division has also reported on its assessment process and results to the university's Council of Trustees on at least three occasions in the past five years. The leadership of our division, including leaders of colleges and departments, has been informed about the need for constant assessment and the process through which the division is currently trying to measure its own success in strategic actions.

Communication of assessment results appears to be reaching the broader community of faculty, staff, and students at IUP. According to the Middle States Master Survey, over 64% of all survey respondents agree or strongly agree that outcomes and assessment results are shared within their college, department, or division, while almost 62% of all survey respondents agree or strongly agree that opportunities exist to discuss the results of outcomes and assessments (S7 Appendices: E)

The Division of Administration and Finance's annual report is available to the university community as well as the general public. It details recent accomplishments that have resulted in cost savings, increased revenue, streamlined procedures, improved services, and enhanced efficiency across the division. Other reports such as the long-range master plan and the university space study are also available to university stakeholders.

The Division of Enrollment Management and Communication shares information monthly with the university community through an electronic publication, *EMC Update*. It features one or two data snapshots from areas within the division, as well as updates on the current progress of fall undergraduate admissions. Information is also shared with the Office of the President, President's Cabinet, Council of Trustees, academic deans, and division meetings.

The Student Affairs Strategic Planning and Assessment website (<http://www.iup.edu/studentaffairs/assessment/default.aspx>) is a primary vehicle for making available various reports and resources. Included on the website are the division's assessment annual reports, department projects/program reviews, and the David A. DeCoster Excellence in Assessment Award information. Information about the Student Affairs Division Student Learning Outcomes Committee (SAD-SLOC) is also available on the website. In addition to these mechanisms, the division's Assessment Annual Report is shared with the President and his Cabinet, the Council of Trustees, SAD-SLOC members, the Student Affairs Leadership Team, Student Affairs departments, and the University Assessment Committee.

Students, as stakeholders, may also receive information about assessment. For example, results from the Living-Learning Activities Survey were shared in a "Did You Know" format in *The Beak*, a news and information source for students. Results from the National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) were also included in *The Beak* and tweeted to all students.

The results of performance measures are made available on the IUP website to all university employees. IUP received \$4.3 million in 2014 as a result of these measures. The results are also discussed in detail at University Planning Council meetings and with the Council of Trustees. As the new framework moves from "transitional" to a final stage, the goal is to provide additional information on the performance measures on a regular basis and develop a

comprehensive communication plan for the university. This would include the targets and goals for each of the measures.

Recommendation #5: As the University Planning Council and its subcommittees, especially the University Budget Advisory and Performance Funding committees, play such vital roles in the planning and assessment of the university, it is important that the continuous efforts to demonstrate transparency and data driven decision making be increased toward the university community at large.

Recommendation #6: In addition to communicating the strategic assessment processes and results to administrators, university leaders and governing bodies, divisions and/or departments should make it a priority to share updates about assessment with the larger IUP community.

Description of areas under review for Standard 14 – Assessment of Student Learning

The Standard 14 work group of Subcommittee Seven reflected on the context, elements, and evidence as described in Middle States publication *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Requirements of Affiliation and Standards for Accreditation*. Specifically, the work group concluded that assessment of student learning is an integral component of the four-part cycle of teaching and learning: 1) establishing measurable learning outcomes, 2) developing course and instructional materials to achieve those learning outcomes, 3) assessing student achievement of learning outcomes, and 4) using assessment data to inform future teaching and learning. Consequently, Subcommittee Seven's self study questions sought to measure the university's collection and use of data to improve university, department, and program offerings.

Self study questions

1. What is the current state of assessment of student learning at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP)? How are assessment data utilized to inform the university's processes for continuous improvement at all levels?
2. Are IUP student learning outcome statements mission driven and of high quality relative to accepted standards within higher education? What evidence indicates that students achieve key learning outcomes?
3. To what extent is student learning assessment at IUP integrated into university culture? To what extent has assessment of student learning been a meaningful process? How are assessment results used to improve teaching and curricula?
4. What resources are available to support student learning assessment and are they adequate?
5. How does IUP know it has added value to student development?

Data sources

With these research questions identified, the work group systematically considered a wide range of data to appraise the extent to which student learning assessment is integrated into the university's cultural fabric. Notable sources of data included, but were not limited to, annual reports of the University Assessment Committee (UAC), Student Affairs Student Learning Outcomes Committee, Student Affairs assessments, national surveys such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education five-year program reviews, specialized professional accreditation (SPA) reviews, and various curricular processes. Next, the work group gathered and integrated these data to determine which mechanisms were utilized by faculty, departments, and colleges to assess student learning, how those data were communicated to all stakeholder groups, including students and administrators, and the extent to which data were connected to the four-part cycle of

teaching and learning that is designed to improve instruction, courses, and programs. While our findings and recommendations were informed by the self study questions, results are presented in thematic assertions to capture the extent to which assessment of student learning is regularly completed, communicated, and utilized at IUP.

Culture of assessment

Assertion 7: IUP has taken a multi-faceted approach to assessment with more purposeful coordination and analysis.

Assertion 8: IUP has made assessment an integral part of its institutional procedures.

IUP strives to maintain a balance between the autonomy of its academic units – programs, departments, and colleges – and its broader academic mission and strategic objectives. To this end, the university employs a multi-faceted approach to student outcome assessment based on the premise that one standard or methodology does not fit all. As of 2008, the University Assessment Committee (UAC) has designated a centralized process, if not instrument, for student outcome assessment in order to ensure that unit-level practices are sufficiently rigorous. The UAC oversees Liberal Studies assessment and reports to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Division of Academic Affairs mandates the assessment of student outcomes for all courses, but the particulars vary by program and designations. For example, Liberal Studies courses are subject to a new assessment tool that gauges student performance in terms of the Expected Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (EUSLOs) developed in 2006 (S7 Appendices: F). Moreover, many of the university's programs – nursing, education, and safety science, for instance – are reviewed by outside accreditors and undertake a range of assessment activities to meet the attendant standards, which are indicative of current best-practices in higher

education. For example, as a member of the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the Eberly College of Business and Information Technology undertakes specific assessment tasks that correlate with the vision of the AACSB (see <http://www.aacsb.edu/en/about/mission/>). Similarly, most programs in the College of Education and Educational Technology are accredited through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), now the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). As stipulated by the State System, programs without such special accreditation must describe “knowledge and skills outcomes and how they are assessed” (see PASSHE's Board of Governors' Policy 1986-04-A: Program Review; see also related form, S7 Appendices: G) through their required five-year self study.

The Division of Student Affairs manages assessment for outcomes relevant to co-curricular learning and student development. Student Affairs considers a dozen comprehensive student learning outcomes, revised in 2013 and organized according to four keystones: student success, individual and community well-being, inclusion and engagement, and accountability and sustainability. Importantly, Student Affairs learning outcomes are aligned with the EUSLOs, mentioned above, as detailed in S7 Appendices: H.

At an institutional level, student learning outcomes are in harmony with, if not driven by, missions of the University Assessment Committee, Division of Academic Affairs, Division of Student Affairs, and Liberal Studies. Locally, programs that undergo outside evaluation must respond to the missions of their accreditors. Finally, the State System specifies “mission centrality” as a required component of periodic academic program review (see PASSHE's Board of Governors' Policy 1986-04-A: Program Review and Appendix G). Sample mission statements are reproduced in S7 Appendices: I.

IUP currently assesses student learning outcomes in a wide variety of ways. Some efforts are broad and bring students together from many disciplines under a single umbrella of assessment, while others are uniquely tailored to a particular program or department, enabling faculty to respond in a nimble manner to changing curricular needs as well as changes in student population and programmatic demand. These assessment measures include the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Liberal Studies writing assessments, Responsible Learner Assessment (RLA), and various accreditations and program reviews (see S7 Appendices: B, for a detailed review of each).

The CLA (now called CLA+) is a nationally benchmarked assessment instrument, focusing on critical thinking, analytic reasoning, problem solving, and communication, that gathers direct student learning outcomes from freshman and seniors to measure value-added learning at the undergraduate level across the university. Another nationally-benchmarked assessment instrument, the NSSE, uses freshman and senior writing samples administered in conjunction with the university's peer institutions. The NSSE assesses progress in the areas of academic challenge, learning with peers, experiences with faculty, and campus environment.

From 2008-2013, the Liberal Studies program collected writing samples from capstone courses (LBST 499) and other senior-level courses in an effort to obtain additional direct measures of student learning. These samples were reviewed by a committee of faculty members using a rubric tied directly to the Expected Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (EUSLOs). Beginning in 2014, the University Assessment Committee (UAC) implemented a new Liberal Studies writing assessment because of imbalances in college representation in the writing samples and the discontinuation of LBST 499. The new model compares writing samples of freshmen (based on the English placement test) to those of seniors who write to the same

prompt. Results from this new system have been shared with the UAC and this method is set to be continued in 2014-2015 and going forward.

To better assess the Responsible Learner EUSLO, something IUP had struggled with in the past, the UAC developed the RLA in 2011-2012. The RLA collects writing samples from freshmen and seniors (130 were collected from 2012-2014) and a committee of raters identifies markers in the writing that are tied to the Responsible Learner EUSLOs and conducts the assessment. A pilot was completed in summer 2014 and the Provost recently approved the continuation of the RLA.

Assertion 9: IUP provides support and training for assessment of student learning.

There are considerable resources available to faculty, departments, and programs to ensure student learning outcomes are assessed in a meaningful and productive way. These are provided via a number of professional development and grant opportunities, thus demonstrating that assessment of student learning is integral to the culture of IUP.

The IUP Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) provides workshops and reflective practice activities in support of faculty work in the classroom, including some specific to student outcomes assessment. Newly-hired faculty receive professional development during their New / Temporary Faculty Orientation which focuses in part on effective teaching and assessment practices embedded in the cycle of teaching and learning. The CTE provides continuing education throughout the academic year, including workshops from national experts on topics related to creating and sustaining effective assessment practices within courses and programs and faculty-led symposia on innovative teaching and assessment practices.

The faculty and staff of the Information Technology (IT) Support Center provide a variety of technologies to improve the assessment of student learning. For example, faculty have

access to the Desire2Learn (D2L) online learning platform, which has multiple tools for the assessment of student learning. Through D2L, faculty can create quizzes, rubrics, and competency structures as part of a course offering. Competency structures can also be used to track student progress through courses and programs. Other D2L options, such as survey and self-assessment tools, can be used to assess comprehension and progress toward learning outcomes and satisfaction with delivery style. Additionally, student progress can be tracked through the user progress tool, enabling instructors to assess students' progress in a course by tracking their completion of progress indicators. Other technologies, such as Qualtrics, Skillsets, Blackboard Collaborate Web Conferencing, iblog and iclick, are available to faculty as well.

In addition to providing these technologies to the university, IT Services frequently offers workshops on the use and application of these technologies. Instruction on the use of D2L is available through online self-directed training courses, IT Services-sponsored workshops, and individual counseling upon request by IT Services support staff. Much of what the faculty and staff in IT Services do to support student learning assessment is represented by the instructional workshops that they offer on a regular basis. Workshops cover a variety of topics and include discussions related to pedagogical issues in addition to more practical "how to" information posted on the department's website. Additional learning opportunities are offered through special events hosted by IT Services and its fall and spring semester Technology Days, representing efforts to bring a series of lectures and activities together in a compact form to university faculty. In sum, the IT Support Center is a significant resource that university members can utilize in their efforts to conduct student learning assessment.

Aside from existing technologies and educational opportunities, University Senate Research Grants provide funding for innovative teaching practices which are clearly linked to

improving learning outcomes for students. Specifically, faculty-student research awards provide resources for faculty to mentor undergraduate and graduate students through all phases of research. Further, innovative pedagogy grants are awarded to conduct research examining teaching data or effectiveness.

Recommendation #7: While there are several ways in which faculty are supported in expanding their assessment skills, it is incumbent on individual faculty members and departments to engage in these activities. IUP would increase the value placed on support and training by having more consistent and coordinated financial and training opportunities related to assessment.

Results

Assertion 10: IUP collects assessment data across many levels of the institution.

Data collected at various levels are used for evaluating previous practices and informing future actions. At the university level, Collegiate Learning Assessment Plus (CLA+) and Responsible Learner Assessment (RLA) data indicate that students exhibit substantial value-added growth from admission to graduation. Specifically, CLA+ results indicate that IUP students score at or slightly above what would be expected from their beginning academic potential (S7 Appendices: J). As a means of objectively measuring social growth, results from the RLA pilot indicate that seniors hold a stronger sense of accountability and an awareness and understanding of critical self-reflection as a consequence of their attendance at IUP. While these data are only preliminary, the methodology to assess responsible learners was deemed strong enough to expand this assessment, allowing for value-added evaluations in the coming years.

National Survey of Student Engagement data, while not particularly favorable to IUP, suggest areas for improvement moving forward (S7 Appendices: K). These data suggest that IUP

students desire a more diverse, supportive university community and more engaging and effective teaching practices. This latter observation is one which the university might wish to emphasize for improvement in future years, especially given the technologies and professional development opportunities already available to faculty.

In addition to data demonstrating professional and intellectual growth, evidence of students' scholarly growth is encouraging. Faculty involve students in their research and scholarly activities, providing students opportunities to develop these skills for use in future career aspirations. To promote presentation of scholarly work, IUP organizes the Undergraduate and Graduate Scholars Forums in which undergraduate and graduate students present their original research, scholarly activities, or creative endeavors. Further, IUP students are frequently involved in national and regional presentations.

Data demonstrate that students mature socially as a consequence of their experiences at IUP. IUP's Office of Workforce Education and Economic Development utilizes the expertise of IUP faculty, staff, and students, who work in collaboration with area business executives, owners, managers, and entrepreneurs to help evaluate and achieve business objectives through sound planning and management. The group also provides ongoing workshops to new and existing businesses. Students who volunteer their hours receive invaluable coaching and mentoring in a variety of entrepreneurial skills that position them for future business ownership. Additionally, IUP students actively participate in multiple levels of university governance, including University Senate, Council of Trustees, preparation for the Middle States accreditation process, and some departmental advisory boards. These experiences prepare them for leadership in their respective disciplines.

In addition to university-level data providing a favorable assessment of the institution, other data are used for evaluation of academic programs within colleges. For example, the results of student learning assessment data contribute to the continued accreditation of specialized programs. Many programs at IUP undergo specialized accreditations, including all programs in the Eberly College of Business and Information Technology, all teacher preparation programs, all Nursing programs, all Safety Sciences programs, and many other individual programs (see <http://www.iup.edu/academicaffairs/accreditations/default.aspx> for a complete list). Evidence of educator preparation programs utilizing assessment practices and reflecting on student learning outcomes in their periodic reviews can be found, for example, on the NCATE Electronic Evidence Room website at <http://ncate.adm.iup.edu/>.

The continuous improvement model used by many of IUP's programs includes the use of outcomes, measures, and data systems to inform data-driven change to improve student learning and provide accountability. All of these specialized programs maintain their accreditation, demonstrating that discipline-specific indicators of student learning continue to be met.

IUP is making a concerted effort to utilize assessment results to promote improvement at all levels. Programs without external accrediting bodies are required to maintain and reflect on their plan for student learning assessment and to include this plan in the State System-mandated five-year program review. These program-level assessment plans vary in depth and breadth, but they are flexible and can be adjusted quickly to meet departmental and program needs. Student-centered learning goals for individual courses have been required of every new course proposal and syllabus of record for years. The five-year program review process has been revamped and now includes a reflection follow-up meeting in which the dean, provost, and academic vice presidents sit with faculty to review the assessment plan and discuss how assessment results can

be used to improve teaching. Summaries of these reviews and exemplars are maintained on the Academic Affairs website (<http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=66719>) for review by the university community.

Recommendation #8: Subcommittee Seven recommends that the University Assessment Committee continue its annual review of various data regarding student learning outcomes (e.g., NSSE, CLA+, program reviews) and that these data be used to evaluate current practices and inform future actions at the university, college, and program level.

Assertion 11: IUP has used assessment data to make critical institutional decisions.

Gathering data on students' learning has been a meaningful process at IUP. Data from various sources inform decisions from the classroom to institutional level. At the university-level, a model of continuous improvement is embraced via course revisions and program and unit changes that are suggested by data from student learning assessments. Recent changes approved by the University Senate and the faculty union began with a task force to examine the curriculum approval process at IUP. The work of the task force resulted in a streamlined curriculum revision process that allows for a time-sensitive response to requests for curriculum revisions. Notably, the approval process requires explication of student learning outcomes (see S7 Appendices: L through P). The University Senate minutes reflect these program or course changes as evidenced in the curriculum review process and reported at the Senate level.

Assessment results are used to improve teaching and curricula. It is therefore vital that we select and measure key outcomes, identify data sources, and assess using quality and reliable outcomes-focused assessments. IUP has adopted key assessments within units and programs and captured those data via the university assessment systems, Key Assessment Rating System (KARS) and LiveText, to make certain that data are gathered and used for program

improvement. Because programs vary widely in their requirements for assessment and review, it has become a challenge to map outcomes-focused assessment policies universitywide.

Results from the IUP Middle States Master Survey indicate that academic departments are making great strides in using student learning assessment data to achieve learning outcomes. Of 43 responding department chairs, 83.7% indicated that their departments formally discuss assessment results (S7 Appendices: Q). The most common frequency of these discussions is annually (30.6%), followed by once a semester (25%). Additionally, 51.6% of faculty respondents (n=336) indicated that they have used assessment data to revise a course requiring a formal curriculum review; and 79.5% report that they have informally revised a course based on assessment data (S7 Appendices: R). A substantial majority of faculty indicate that they use assessment results to change their teaching: 73.6% report that they use assessment data to change teaching in a future class meeting and 76.1% claim to use assessment results to change teaching in a future semester offering of a class (S7 Appendices: R).

Improvement of teaching also takes place at the individual level. Faculty have the opportunity to use both program evaluation data and end-of-course data from the Student Evaluation Instrument (SEI) to inform change. SEIs are teaching evaluations required of all temporary and tenure-track faculty in each course they teach. Tenured faculty are required to collect SEI data in the semester immediately preceding their five-year review but have the option to collect SEI data at any other time if they wish. These data are released to the department evaluation committee and become part of the faculty review process with a final copy of the evaluation stored in the personnel office as part of the faculty member's personnel file. Feedback obtained through SEIs allows the faculty member to make informed change. A 2014-2015

revision to the SEI will provide faculty, departments, and units with more informative and meaningful data to make decisions about the quality of teaching and courses offered at IUP.

Recommendation #9: Subcommittee Seven recommends that the University Assessment Committee continue with the new process of Liberal Studies assessment and expand the breadth of the RLA so that these data can be used to measure longitudinal growth of IUP students.

Communication

Assertion 12: Assessment processes and results are effectively communicated at IUP.

The University Assessment Committee generates an annual report that includes the most recent results from the Collegiate Learning Assessment Plus (CLA+), the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Responsible Learner Assessment (RLA), and the Liberal Studies writing analysis. Results from each of these assessment instruments are examined by the Liberal Studies Committee and the provost before making curricular decisions that affect the entire Academic Division. These results show that IUP has made much progress in using assessment results to “close the loop.” However, the university recognizes that it must continue to strive for improvement in this vital area. Like the UAC, the Division of Student Affairs produces an annual report that lists results according to various internal and external metrics. The report also issues recommendations. Assessment planning efforts and results are shared with the Office of Institutional Planning and Assessment (OIPA) and the Division of Student Affairs via the UAC.

Recommendation #10: The university is well served by assessment processes that reflect the needs of various academic units – programs, departments, and colleges – but Subcommittee Seven recommends that it seek ways to communicate more effectively the methods used by individual programs, perhaps via a centralized website and the activities of the UAC. In addition,

we recommend that IUP consider increased centralization of student learning assessment, both in process and substance. The existing system allows individual programs to measure the value added by their curricula, but it is difficult to determine how students in any one program fare with respect to other IUP constituencies.

Reference

S7 Appendices. IUP Middle States Library.

END of FULL REPORTS
