APPENDIX D

Middle States Report

Report to the
Faculty, Administration, Trustees, and Students
of
INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
Indiana, Pennsylvania

by

An Evaluation Team representing the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Prepared after study of the institution's Self-Study Report
and a visit to the campus on March 19-22, 2006

The Team:

Dennis R. Black, Vice President for Student Affairs, State University of New York at Buffalo
Kathryn Doherty, Director, Office of Assessment, Towson University
Carolyn Haessig, Coordinator for Academic Outcomes, Planning and Accreditation Support, State University of New York College at Oneonta
Gary Horowitz, Former Vice President, University Advancement (Retired), Frostburg State University
Arthur T. Johnson, Provost, University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Donald N. Langenberg (CHAIR), Chancellor Emeritus and Professor of Physics and Electrical Engineering, University of Maryland, College Park
Edward J. Schoen, Dean of the College of Business, Rowan University
Barbara Simpson-Darden, Director of Library Services, Kean University
Gene A. Vincenti, Executive Vice Provost for Administration, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Working with the Team:
James Moran, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education
Paula Fleck, Acting Director, Bureau of Postsecondary Services, Pennsylvania Department of Education

This report represents the view of the evaluation team as interpreted by the Chair; it goes directly to the institution before being considered by the Commission. It is a confidential document prepared as an educational service for the benefit of the institution. All comments in the report are made in good faith, in an effort to assist Indiana University of Pennsylvania. This report is based solely on an educational evaluation of the institution and of the manner in which it appears to be carrying out its educational objectives.

[please see next page]

AT THE TIME OF THE VISIT

Indiana University of Pennsylvania President/CEO: Dr. Tony Atwater

Indiana University of Pennsylvania Chief Academic Officer: Dr. Cheryl Samuels

Indiana University of Pennsylvania Chair of the Council of Trustees: Ms. Susan Delaney

I. Context and Nature of the Visit

Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) is one of fourteen public universities that compose the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE). With just under 14,000 students, IUP is the largest PASSHE institution, and it is the only one authorized to grant doctoral degrees. Its Carnegie classification is "Doctoral/Research University." IUP offers Associate's, Baccalaureate, Certificate, Master's, and Doctoral programs. It has no branch campuses, but offers programs at the following additional locations:

> *IUP at Northpointe, Freeport, PA
> *Monroeville Graduate and Professional Center, Monroeville, PA
>   Dixon University Center, Harrisburg, PA
>   CCAC-Allegheny Campus, Pittsburgh, PA
> *CCAC-Boyce Campus, Monroeville, PA
>   IUP Academy of Culinary Arts, Punxsutawney, PA
>   IUP Police Academy, Indiana, PA
>   IUP Police Academy, Lock Haven, PA
>   Honeywell Aerospace Division, Lanham, MD
>
> (Stars indicate additional locations visited by members of the Visiting Team.)

IUP also offers a program at an overseas site (Bangalore, India) and M.S. degree in Safety Sciences by distance learning.

IUP was initially accredited in 1941 and its accreditation was last reaffirmed in 2001. Our Team's current visit was a part of the University's regular decennial reaccreditation process. The Self Study design/model was "Comprehensive."

It is important to note that since its accreditation was last reaffirmed, IUP has experienced significant institutional stresses caused by several years of severely constrained state funding and by unusual instabilities in presidential leadership. Nevertheless, the University managed to organize and conduct a very effective preparation for its decennial reaccreditation process, including an exemplary Self Study Report that will help the University create a strategic framework and action plans that can carry it forward throughout the next decade. Nearly two hundred members of the IUP community were directly engaged in the development of the Self Study, many as members of fourteen subcommittees, one for each of the MSCHE accreditation standards.

IUP President Tony Atwater assumed the presidency about half way through this process, and has just recently completed a set of senior administrative appointments that place an almost-all-new leadership team on the bridge of the University. The University is thus well positioned to build on the Self Study's articulation of the University community's views of its University and its vision of its possible future, to create a new mission statement, and a strategic plan to achieve that future.

II. Affirmation of Continued Compliance with Eligibility Requirements

Based on review of the Self Study, other institutional documents, and interviews, the Team affirms that the institution continues to meet eligibility requirements 1-7.

III. Compliance with Federal Requirements; Issues Relative to State Regulatory or Other Accrediting Agency Requirements

Based on review of the Self Study, other institutional documents, and interviews, the Team affirms that the institution's Title IV cohort default rate is within federal limits.

IV. Compliance with Accreditation Standards

As noted above, the University's Self Study Report is based on reports by fourteen subcommittees, each of which addressed one of the MSCHE accreditation standards. Each subcommittee made substantive recommendations that, in the view of the Team, merit careful consideration by the University. In the Self Study Report itself, the IUP Middle States Steering Committee chose to synthesize these numerous recommendations under five overarching themes (**Identity, Priorities, Niches, Leadership and Governance,** and **Agility and Responsiveness**), together with four "key" and numerous other substantive recommendations.

The Team applauds and concurs in this synthesis. We believe the five themes provide an excellent framework for characterizing the broad objectives of the University and for guiding its planning and actions during the decade ahead. (N.B. On pps. 36-44 the Self Study Report presents a matrix relating the fourteen MSCHE standards to its four key recommendations.)

For the purposes of this Team report, however, we have chosen to organize our observations in the conventional standard-by-standard format. That may indicate a lack of imagination on our part, but we are confident that the IUP community can accomplish the task of aligning the Team's observations with their five themes and four key recommendations.

Standard 1: Mission, Goals and Objectives

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

The last comprehensive and concerted effort of IUP to review and update its mission took place in the mid-1990s, and, in 1996, resulted in the development of IUP's current mission statement as it appears on page 5 of the university undergraduate catalogue. Several intervening events -- decline in regional economic growth, unfavorable demographics resulting in fewer high school students in Southwestern Pennsylvania, increasing competition for college students in IUP's market area, devastating cuts in state appropriations for public higher education in Pennsylvania, and changes in the PASSHE allocation formulas -- have absorbed the attention of IUP personnel and forced them to engage in short term rather than long term planning. Simply contending with the enormous issues confronting IUP precluded any concentrated effort to reengage in a comprehensive review of IUP's mission, goals, and objectives.

Data gathered by IUP and conversations and discussions with IUP personnel during the visit demonstrate a widely held belief among administrators, faculty, and staff that the mission of IUP needs to be revisited and reevaluated to clarify the purpose of IUP, the stakeholders it serves, and the goals and objectives it seeks to accomplish. Most particularly, because the educational role of IUP has evolved from more traditional baccalaureate and teacher preparation programs toward more extensive doctoral, research, and professional programs, it may be helpful to IUP to utilize the proposed comprehensive review of the mission statement as an opportunity to discuss and clarify IUP's institutional priorities, including its doctoral mission, allegiance to students and their successful learning outcomes, and its role within the higher educational system of Pennsylvania.

Several converging events make this an ideal time to engage in the proposed review of IUP's mission statement. IUP has recently installed a new president who has pledged to engage in a comprehensive strategic planning effort. Likewise, surveys conducted as part of the self study process demonstrate that the administration, faculty and staff strongly support the proposed effort to engage in the review of IUP's mission, goals and objectives to achieve greater agreement and consensus regarding the educational purpose of IUP, its distinctiveness, and its articulated values.

Hence, the Visiting Team endorses the Self Study recommendation that IUP undertake the task of reexamining and revising IUP's mission and, in doing so, focus on the university's essential values as an institution of higher education and project an identity consistent with that purpose.

In undertaking this review, IUP should recognize that there are widespread expectations among the faculty that the University Planning Council (UPC), or a similar group, should have a continuing role in strategic planning. The Academic Affairs Division and the Deans Council express great satisfaction with their successful working relationship with the UPC in solving significant budget issues and challenges. Notably, the recent experience of the Deans Council in dealing with the budget cuts appears to have resulted not only in greater collegiality, understanding, and cooperation among the Colleges, but

established Academic Affairs as the leading influencer and driver of strategic planning. The Team agrees that Academic Affairs should pursue its stated objective to lead the strategic planning process while at the same time accommodating the university community's frequently expressed expectation that a broad array of stakeholders be included in the process.

- *Suggestions*

In revising its mission statement, IUP might consider emphasizing strengths that cut across academic units, rather than picking and choosing among specific programs. For example, the outstanding success of IUP graduates and IUP's recognized strength and success in infusing information technology in multiple disciplines might be considered as an identity marker.

IUP should consider putting in place processes that facilitate a review of the existing (and sometimes disparate) mission statements developed by IUP subunits to ensure their coherence and consistency with IUP's overall mission.

In developing its strategic plan, IUP should consider and, where appropriate, incorporate the five themes developed as part of the self study process to ensure that all material factors identified in the self study process are included.

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

Interviews and conversations with administrative leaders of IUP and data and documentation provided by the self study process demonstrate that IUP possesses significant strengths in the area of effective planning processes. These strengths include:

1. The express commitment of IUP's leadership team to engage in and enhance planning and resource allocation processes;
2. The successful development of operations and facilities planning and related campus master plan, which includes replacement of student housing and the development of an economic development center;
3. The strong support provided by the Office of Planning and Analysis to planning and budgeting efforts;
4. The success of the University Planning Council (UPC) in providing recommendations on the resolution of serious budgetary challenges.

Interviews with faculty and staff and comments provided during the Team's open forum expressed particular appreciation for the operations of the UPC and its role in involving a

wide cross section of IUP stakeholders in the planning process during recent and severe budget cuts, and advocated that the UPC (or a similar group) be involved in the next round of strategic planning.

As noted above, the recent success of IUP in responding to significant budgetary challenges resulted in a stronger, more cohesive Academic Affairs division and Deans Council that can exercise leadership in fulfilling the responsibilities of strategic planning. IUP should take advantage of this significant strength, and permit the Academic Affairs to continue to exercise leadership in expeditiously revising IUP's mission, developing a clear statement of IUP's identity as an institution, and engaging in effective strategic planning.

The involvement of IUP in strategic planning has understandably been hobbled by the recent challenges confronting IUP: significant budget cuts, shifting performance standards employed by the PASSHE, lack of predictability in budget allocations and limitations on tuition increases, changing demographics, and increased competition for students within IUP's market. Nonetheless, recent changes in performance enhancements offered by PASSHE, which may provide increased financial support to IUP, enhanced information resources provided by the Office of Planning Analysis, and the commitment of IUP's President to embark on a successful, comprehensive strategic planning process underscore the need to initiate the proposed strategic planning processes, as recommended in IUP's self study report.

The Visiting Team also supports IUP's recommendation that appropriate unit performance indicators be developed in order to assess and ensure that the commitment of resources to goals and objectives achieve desired outcomes. Caution in this endeavor, however, should be exercised, given the widespread diversity of programs and variable program resource requirements. The need to exercise this caution has been recognized by Academic Affairs, which seeks to build on the successful efforts of the College Deans to develop internal faculty allocation formulas tied to the state system benchmarking formulas. Hopefully this success can serve as the basis for an ensuing, thoughtful adaptation of the faculty resource allocation process in the broader arena of resource allocation. In this regard, the resources of the Office of Planning Analysis may assist in developing and testing models and assessing their impact.

- *Suggestions*

IUP might consider testing this resource allocation process within the program review model to insure adaptability to the particular needs of each academic program.

The Team also encourages IUP to pay close attention to effective communication of strategic planning processes to university stakeholders and to consider building the strategic planning process directly into the academic calendar so that stakeholders are more attuned to specific steps and accomplishments in the new planning process.

- *Recommendation*

In light of the very recent appointments of the senior management team, the Team recommends that IUP be asked to report in a progress letter to MSCHE on its progress in mission redefinition and development of a strategic plan within two years of the Team visit.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

IUP fiscal resources are fairly representative of public colleges and universities with a range of funding sources, including the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, tuition and mandatory fees charged to on-campus and off-campus students, federal and state financial aid, grants and contracts, endowment income, and sales of University services. IUP's administration prides itself on "clean" audit reports without exceptions, and its management has clearly established proper control mechanisms throughout the organization.

PASSHE has instituted a performance funding system that reallocates 7% of the annual state appropriation to each individual institution in the System, with IUP receiving an appropriate share of these performance funds. IUP and other PASSHE institutions have suffered from significant budget cuts in the recent past, as the Pennsylvania economy has slowed down and collective bargaining agreements have taken a bigger bite out of annual operating budgets.

IUP has a strong faculty base that has grown modestly with the introduction of masters and doctoral programs over the past decade. The number of full-time tenure-track faculty has stayed fairly constant over the past few years, while the Administration has begun to make strategic faculty investments in certain key areas. It is noted that the Administration is constrained by a collectively-bargained limit on the number of part-time adjunct faculty of 7%.

IUP has a strong committed group of middle managers who are perceived to have grappled with significant leadership problems prior to President Atwater's tenure. These staff members are to be commended for their efforts to "pull together" during a difficult period in the life of the University.

IUP Trustees appear to have a strong affinity for and commitment to the institution coupled with an unusual degree of knowledge and engagement in its affairs. The Team believes the Trustees are one of IUP's most important resources.

Relations with local corporate, civic and political leadership appear to be strong, as exemplified by the University's negotiation of a Payment in Lieu of Taxes that is related to the construction of new, replacement residence halls on campus.

Operating resources at IUP have dropped significantly with recent budget cuts and little new money has been available for critical academic and support activities. The University is also constrained by issues of access and affordability, with recent tuition increases limited to ~3%.

However, efforts are under way to expand the resource base of IUP. For example, a review of the class-hour schedule is under way that may allow for more appropriate class scheduling into 50-minute periods. This would permit more course offerings, and more efficiently utilize the available classroom space. In addition, the expansion of revenue-positive off-campus programs and a renewed interest in on-campus summer offerings could bring in new net resources. The expansion of research activities has the ability to develop new resources that support the research enterprise, and also the University's research infrastructure. Major efforts are also under way to develop the area of Institutional Advancement, including the IUP Foundation and alumni giving, both of which could provide significant funding for student support at both the undergraduate and graduate level, along with support for major academic initiatives such as endowed faculty chairs.

While capital budgets continue to be lean at IUP and PASSHE universities generally, a combination of state and university capital funds are available annually for deferred maintenance and capital renewal. Through a variety of funding sources, ~$8.5 million is currently available for facility renewal. While addressed in the section on Standard Five, it is evident that Facilities staff members are reviewing these projects and priorities with Administration and Trustees. Significant improvements are evident in the designation of the campus as an Arboretum, and in the quality of many of the historic buildings on campus. Attention is being paid to renewal of academic space, which will be improved further as a new Physical Master Plan is developed for the campus. The Facilities staff members should be commended for their work to provide a quality teaching and learning environment on campus.

Finally, the Team was very impressed with the state of Information Technology at IUP. It is apparent that the University made an early investment in the installation of a fiber backbone for the campus, which has been distributed to all academic and support facilities. Efforts are also being made to establish wireless networks on campus. The IT staff is to be commended for providing this leadership for the campus community, and for endeavoring to maintain IUP's prominence in this area. While IUP has invested in Banner as its platform for many administrative systems, PASSHE has adopted SAP as its enterprise systems provider. Close coordination between University and PASSHE IT staffs will be necessary to ensure proper integration and implementation of these new enterprise systems.

- *Suggestions*

As the university grows and develops, a stronger role should be explored for the Trustees in conveying the IUP message to key legislators and the Executive Branch in Harrisburg.

The Team suggests that the new strategic plan should include a focus on the priority for maintaining and enhancing IUP's already strong position in academic and administrative information technology.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

IUP is one of fourteen institutions within the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE). PASSHE is governed by a Board of Governors. The Chancellor is the CEO of the System and reports to the Board of Governors. IUP is led by a President and a Council of Trustees. The Council has limited governance powers. Employees are unionized. A union contract sets the legal terms for faculty working conditions, as do other contracts for staff members. The faculty is represented at the System level by the Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties. Professional staff members also are represented by a System-wide union. Non-exempt employees are represented by a union that represents members at institutions of higher education as well as at state agencies. Students are represented by graduate and undergraduate student organizations on campus.

The self-study provides high quality analysis and demonstrates a pride in, and a strong commitment to, IUP by its faculty, staff, and students. The Team was impressed during its visit by the strength and intensity of this commitment. The Team was also impressed by the loyalty to IUP, the knowledge of higher education, and the engagement of the four trustees with whom the Team met.

The Team found a healthy respect for shared governance across the IUP community. An environment appears to exist at IUP in which issues concerning vision, mission, planning, resources, and other issues are discussed openly. The self-study provides evidence for this and the visit confirmed this impression. A variety of governance bodies exist, as do other advisory committees that facilitate policy making and decision making. Staff as well as faculty participate in committees and decision-making. Staff members often take the initiative and exercise leadership to resolve problems as the need arises. Many aspects of shared governance appear to be institutionalized, and the Trustees Council is viewed positively by those on the campus. The Team does note, however, that the role of graduate students in governance could be better defined and possibly strengthened. This will be increasingly important as IUP becomes more focused on graduate programs.

During most of the period during which the Self Study was developed, IUP leadership was in flux. At the time of the team visit, a new president had been in office for approximately twelve months, and all but one vice president had recently been recruited from the outside. The provost took up her position two weeks before the team visit, and the vice president for administration and finance arrived the first day of the visit. The Self Study Report explicitly looks prospectively to the new president for guidance and direction in planning and defining a mission. The team found during its visit that, with a president in place, campus stakeholders continued their desire to work with the new president to address the issues identified in the Self Study. The Team commends the campus for producing an excellent Self Study during a time of strife and instability and believes that the Self Study will be of great value to the new IUP management team, especially by providing a sense of governance history and organizational structure.

The new management team will have to determine how best to use the existing shared governance structure and advisory bodies to move a new campus planning process forward. Many of those interviewed expressed the importance that the President and his team be responsive to the work of the campus that produced the Self Study. Given the recent history of the campus and the apparent success of the University Planning Committee (UPC), it is widely and strongly desired that the campus be kept informed of processes and decisions. Communication across divisions and between administration and the faculty, staff, and students will be critical to success.

It appears that President Atwater is actively engaged in improving communications with the campus. He has held a retreat with department chairs, he attends and participates in meetings and discussion sessions with the faculty union, he attends University Senate meetings, he is encouraging attendance at trustees' meetings, and he has initiated monthly meetings with the President's Student Advisory Network.

The Self Study calls for a clarification of roles for the provost and others. As the president, provost and the vice presidents shape their response to the Self Study, it will be important to define the relation of the provost to the other vice presidents, especially if the president increases his time devoted to external relations. The deans' and chairs' councils have the potential to be important communication and education vehicles for the campus, especially for the faculty. During the visit, issues arose as to the role and potential for the Chairs' Council, suggesting a need for further discussion and definition within the Academic Affairs Division.

The Self Study speaks of IUP identity and relationship to PASSHE. The visit confirmed a continuing concern about IUP's status within the System and general external image. It will be an important role for President Atwater and campus constituents to define and advance IUP's interests and image in the region, system and state. While the president carries much of this responsibility, it is critical that others also make this their mission as they interact with their peers and colleagues within the system, community groups and state legislators. There is a need to be proactive in advancing IUP's interests. For example, it will be important to publicize and promote IUP's uniqueness within the

system and the achievements of its faculty and students if it is to advance the research, graduate and doctoral aspects of its mission. IUP's new leadership team is a strong one capable of advancing IUP's interests off campus, and the IUP case is one that needs to be more effectively communicated. The entire IUP community, not just the management team, must accept that responsibility as opportunities arise.

There is concern about the migration of issues from campus to the System. While IUP must present its case as is appropriate, it must recognize that tension between institutions and their system is natural and probably unavoidable. IUP leadership should work with SSHE leadership and others to ensure that system policies appropriately recognize IUP's uniqueness within the system and allow IUP to pursue its mission while contributing to overall System goals.

Standard 5: Administration

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

Based on a review of the Self Study Report, other institutional documents, and interviews with faculty, staff, and students, the Team observed:

1. A University leadership committed to continuing growth and development of the University, especially in the area of graduate studies;
2. An evident team approach to problem solving and strategic thinking among the President's Cabinet and Deans Council;
3. A new group of University vice presidents who seem to be well positioned to lead their areas and interact appropriately with the academic administration of the University, including the Provost and the academic deans;
4. Senior staff in the critical areas of budget, facilities, and campus planning that recognize and appreciate the importance of linking their activities to the academic development of the campus.

    A. Individual Vice-Presidential Areas:

The Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF) began his appointment at the University during the Team's visit. He has already promoted a senior staff member to the position of Associate Vice President. The Interim Vice President has returned to his former position of Assistant VP for Administration. The University has received clean audit reports for the past two consecutive years, and management's response indicates a very well managed and organized set of financial controls. As the strategic planning process develops, this vice-presidential area should play a significant role in managing funds available to IUP, and along with the Provost and Deans should facilitate the development of newly established strategic objectives.

The Campus Planning area reports to the VPAF and is led by two seasoned veteran administrators. Substantial funding is available (currently $8.5 million) to conduct deferred maintenance and capital renewal projects on campus. There is a Physical Master Plan that was developed in the 1990's, which forms the basis of annual deferred maintenance and capital renewal efforts. Unfortunately, the Physical Master Plan is not linked to a strategic academic plan, though there is evidence that projects undertaken annually are reviewed with Academic Administration and Trustees. A Housing Master Plan was developed under Interim President Reinhard, and is in the process of being implemented. The Housing Master Plan will replace 3,800 student beds with new, modern, apartment-style units over the next several years. There is also a Regional Development Center in planning, that will add additional land area to the campus, and in which will be located new athletic/recreational facilities, business incubator(s), the Murtha Center for Homeland Security, and other needed facilities. Fund raising is underway for this project. Finally, a significant new campus area was acquired south of the main campus, which now contains additional recreational facilities and the new official President's residence. The University has been forward thinking in terms of its future land requirements, and should be commended. While the team did not meet with any Borough officials, it appears from discussions with staff and Trustees that there is good dialogue between University and Borough planning officials. This activity should continue to be encouraged for the mutual benefit of both.

Physical Master Planning is best expressed as an outcome of the institution's Academic Master Plan, which is still to be developed. In the meantime, this area's efforts to create a campus-wide space inventory and to develop a gap analysis of existing space needs are two important inputs to future academic and physical master planning efforts. Both the space inventory and the gap analysis should be concluded in advance of the Academic Master Plan and the revised Physical Master Plan to help develop a coherent and connected set of strategic objectives. Further work needs to be done to clarify the master plan for the Regional Development Center to make sure that its objectives and build out meet the long term needs of the University and Indiana region.

The Vice President for Institutional Advancement (VPIA) is a recent addition to the President's Cabinet at IUP. The VPIA heads an organization that comprises the IUP Foundation, the Alumni Affairs Office, a Marketing and Communications division, and a Government Relations department. The VPIA seems to be a bright, energetic, and savvy addition to the University's leadership team, and expresses a desire to work with a wide range of internal and external constituencies to develop an advancement plan and to work jointly with constituencies to implement the plan. The VPIA demonstrates an understanding of working to achieve the goals set by the academic leadership of the University, including the Provost and Deans.

IUP is in the process of closing its Capital Campaign, and is now rethinking its strategic approach to University Advancement. The VPIA is preparing plans for an aggressive fundraising program to support the annual fund and a new capital campaign.

The VPIA also directs the IUP Alumni Affairs office. While the Annual Fund is being reorganized, there is substantial annual alumni giving. According to the VPIA, alumni giving in the current fiscal year is approximately $900,000, through the end of February, 2006. The Alumni Association represents ~100,000 alumni, and the Alumni office has current addresses for ~90-95% of the alumni base. That is an extraordinarily high number, and IUP should be commended for it. Approximately 6.5% of the alumni are actual donors, and the average annual donation is ~$220, also very good. Alumni leaders are represented on the Board of Trustees. Alumni development should be a key objective of the Administration over the next several years as the Academic Plan develops, and IUP moves into implementation.

The IUP Foundation is a separately incorporated 501(c3) corporation founded by IUP. It has an endowment of approximately $34 million, and the annual proceeds are used primarily to support student scholarships (approx. $1.7 million), with some operating funds used to support the fund raising infrastructure. The Foundation is preparing to take on a major role in the continuing development of the resource base at IUP. The Foundation is overseen by a separate Board, with members from the Indiana area, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and from other parts of the US.

During its visit, the Team heard many concerns about the lack of institutional marketing and the perceived poor communications about the strengths and programs that IUP offers. The VPIA is developing a marketing and communications program with the help of STAMATS, a nationally known consulting firm in this area. The VPIA expresses the desire to link the marketing and communications plan with the development of the Academic Plan. These efforts are critical to the ongoing growth and development of IUP as a teaching/learning institution, and should be carefully tested both with internal constituencies and key external constituencies prior to implementation. IUP has significant distinctiveness compared with other PASSHE institutions, and this distinctiveness should be clearly articulated in all messages that are developed to market and brand the institution. IUP recently received a $1 million Performance Fund grant for marketing, which largely will be used to develop the data and information required, to fund the STAMATS consulting effort, and to fund a small $25,000 allocation to each of the colleges for individual messages that represent their major interests. It is important to note that these efforts will be jointly led by the VPIA and the Provost.

Finally, according to the VPIA, there has been no previous sustaining and strategic effort to establish a Governmental Affairs function at IUP. A new effort to create a strong State and Federal Relations effort would be welcome as IUP prepares to tell its story regionally and across the Commonwealth. Resources are becoming available for Federal relations efforts.

B. Research Administrative Infrastructure

As the University continues to develop the teacher/scholar model on campus, a vital and vibrant research infrastructure will become increasingly important. As graduate programs have developed, along with doctoral programs, the percentage of faculty with

terminal degrees or final degrees has grown significantly. This is a credit to the University. Leadership for research is vested in the Provost, and operationally falls under the direction of the Interim Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School.

Earlier administrative recognition that the University research administrative infrastructure needed to be enhanced led to the development of the Research Institute (RI). The RI is a separately incorporated 501(c)(3) with an independent Board of Directors that administers much of the grant and contract activity at the University. The Team heard that the RI allows the University to avoid some of the counterproductive bureaucratic red tape that accompanies its state-agency status. Under PASSHE regulations, however, direct grants from the Commonwealth and intramural research funds must pass through University accounts and procurement regulations, so some duplication in the research infrastructure is evident.

It is apparent that a systematic approach to the distribution of Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) funds is in place at IUP. Approximately 50% of the expected returns are allocated to the Research Institute for administration. The remaining 50% of the expected ICR is allocated to a variety of administrative and academic functions, including approximately a 25% return to academic units. Individual deans are responsible for allocating any returns to reinvest in further research efforts in the department.

The ICR (or F&A) rate was recently established by agreement with the relevant Federal agency. The IUP rate is 42.5% (of net total direct costs), and represents the amount of effort on the average that the University puts into support of the research enterprise, primarily in the facilities and administration areas. This rate appears to be low for the amount of effort expended to support the research effort at IUP. One of the reasons why this rate may be low is that space inventory data are not adequate to justify a higher F&A rate. Apparently, there is no centralized space management system that can readily identify the amount of space (and the quality of the space) available for research activities. A consultant has been hired to complete an initial space audit for the campus.

C. Legal Services

Legal services for IUP and its other constituent Universities are provided by PASSHE. This is a common arrangement in state university systems. However, it is also common practice for individual institutions in state university systems to maintain their own legal staff to provide direct and immediate legal advice on local matters peculiar to that institution. As has been noted in many places in this report, IUP has significant elements that distinguish it from other universities in PASSHE. For example, IUP has developed doctoral programs that require significant investments in research activities of the faculty. These inevitably raise intellectual property issues. A new Research Institute has been established to strengthen the research administrative infrastructure. IUP has begun to develop public/private partnerships through its Housing Master Plan to replace significant portions of its on-campus housing stock. Also, the University looks forward to the development of the Regional Development Center which may have public/private partnership components.

- *Suggestions*

The Team suggests that IUP's research administrative infrastructure be reviewed, together with the regulatory context established by PASSHE and the Commonwealth, in order to determine if it might be possible to revise the regulatory environment to permit streamlining the research administrative infrastructure and reducing duplication.

The Team suggests that the University prioritize the development of the research portion of the space inventory in order to better report the ongoing research activities of IUP so that a new, more appropriate ICR/F&A rate can be renegotiated in the next cycle with the relevant Federal Agency.

The Team suggests that IUP and the appropriate state entities review the legal requirements of IUP to determine if additional local legal resources are required to support the distinctive needs of the University.

Standard 6: Integrity

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

IUP has developed and disseminated appropriate policies to support and promote fairness and protection of academic and intellectual freedoms. These can be found in University policy statements, faculty and student handbooks, the Statement on Civility, in employment agreements, and in various other sources. Campus policies and procedures are readily available on line and in print, although awareness of their accessibility in various formats is noted to be somewhat limited within some segments of the campus community.

The Self Study correctly proposes further approaches to enhance promotion of integrity by improving campus communications, clarifying some areas of policy, and better coordination policies and campus messages. Awareness and access to policies and procedures can be improved by greater emphasis on more sophisticated and utilized campus communications systems, included Web site redesign and integrated marketing/communications. Improved campus communications (i.e. more information sharing and greater transparency in decision making) can also help improve campus perception of the university's adherence to standards of fairness.

Campus policies, procedures and standards reflect a commitment to justice, equity and diversity. This must be consistently and strongly promoted and protected by all members of the IUP community. Concerns over the need for stronger recruitment and satisfaction of students of color were also noted by the Self Study.

Faculty, students, and staff participating in the Team visit expressed a sense of confidence in the campus commitment to respect for diversity of opinions, as well as campus openness and balance.

The proposed Mission Statement process for the University might be extended to include further statements on IUP values. Integrity should be reflected as a key value in future statements of this nature.

- *Suggestions*

The University should address the communications issues identified in the Self Study to promote access to policies and to promote awareness of institutional and leadership commitment to the highest standards of integrity in all aspects of the university.

The University should consider inclusion of integrity as a value in a new Mission Statement.

The University should better coordinate review and access to policies through identification of specific campus officer responsibility, i.e., ensure that they properly reflect integrity standards and promote some form of "one-stop" availability. Many universities find the appointment of an "Ombudsperson" a useful way to accomplish this.

The University should continue to promote and foster campus compliance with standards, campus access to standards, and campus understanding of standards, in an effort to ensure continued adherence and community confidence.

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

Assessment of institutional effectiveness at IUP occurs through performance accountability reporting, annual program reviews, IPEDS reporting, and unit performance reporting. Internal and external benchmarks are used. IUP collects institutional effectiveness data related to student performance and success, unit performance and success, and program performance and success. **Pending revision of the IUP mission and development of a set of overarching institutional goals as the campus transitions to new leadership, the Team finds that the current methods of assessing institutional effectiveness, while not complete, meet the intent of this standard.** It will be incumbent upon IUP to revisit assessment of institutional effectiveness as it seeks to understand its identity, revise its mission and institutional goals, and develop an effective and comprehensive institutional assessment plan that outlines priorities, embeds assessment, focuses on agility and responsiveness to internal and external stakeholders,

and utilizes assessment information for planning, improvement, and allocation of resources.

A primary method of assessing institutional effectiveness at IUP is through the System Accountability Plan (SAP) report, which is required by PASSHE. This report utilizes a series of institutional effectiveness goals, measures and outcomes to assess IUP performance on all standard higher education performance indicators. IUP reports these results to PASSHE as the data relate to each of the performance goals in the SAP, including retention and graduation rates, program and campus enrollment, budget and fiscal performance, business and service unit performance, and other measures of institutional and student success. In addition to a quantitative report of performance measures, there is an accompanying narrative assessment report through which the institution highlights specific areas of performance.

At the unit level, institutional effectiveness is assessed through a system that utilizes state-mandated institutional performance categories (health of the institution, servicing stakeholders, and continuous improvement) to develop unit-based goals and performance measures for managers within each unit. These goals are used to evaluate manager performance for annual salary increases. Results of these evaluations are used to improve manager performance and thus performance of the unit. Plans have been discussed on campus to redesign the unit performance measurement system to facilitate the transition from a focus on individual performance goals and measures to a more comprehensive examination of overall unit performance goals and measures. This has resulted from analysis of current unit effectiveness information that points to the need for broader review of performance.

A third way that institutional effectiveness is assessed at IUP is through the state-mandated performance review process. Each academic program at IUP is required to prepare and submit to the state a performance review report every five years. This report includes program performance measures, goals and objectives of the program, and an action plan for improvement. At each ten-year interval, the program review process must include an external review. Deans follow up informally on action plan steps with their departments on an annual basis between five-year cycles to confirm that the action plan is followed. The Team fully supports the redesign of this process for more comprehensive assessment of unit performance. There is currently a revision process underway at the PASSHE level to require a more complete assessment of student learning outcomes at the program level as part of this process.

There is evidence throughout IUP's assessment of institutional effectiveness that results are being used to improve and gain efficiencies in administrative services and processes. An example of this is the reorganization and expansion of the campus Technology Services Center that resulted from unit performance assessment information that demonstrated the need to realign and redefine the nature of technology services in response to the growing technology needs of a fully wired and technologically savvy campus. Another way that IUP has used assessment results to improve and gain efficiencies in services and processes is seen at the college level where retention data and

graduation rates have led to student support interventions where first year retention rates indicated the need to facilitate first-to-second year transitions for students.

IUP does have an existing written institutional strategic plan but this plan has been dormant during the transition years between significant upheaval of past leadership and the arrival of the new leadership team. The Self Study has recommended the development of a new strategic plan. This process is expected to begin in Fall 2006.

- *Suggestions*

The Team suggests that institutional assessment activities and measures be embedded from the start within the strategic plan that is developed through the strategic management process.

The Self Study recommends formal analysis and evaluation of unit and individual performance outcomes that require goals to be measurable in order to demonstrate accountability as well as cross-functional assessment linked to a long term planning process where assessment results impact decision making.   The Team agrees and suggests that cross-functional assessment be embedded in the institutional effectiveness plan to facilitate connections between and among units, resulting in a more comprehensive institutional assessment process.

The Team also strongly suggests that the themes that guided the Self Study and its recommendations (**identity, priorities, governance and leadership, niches, and agility and responsiveness**) be reflected in the strategic management plan to provide continuity between analysis and assessment of what has been accomplished and plans for what is yet to be achieved.

- *Recommendation*

The Self Study Report states that it is imperative to the success of the University that each unit has a better understanding of the goals, mission, and vision of the University as a whole, and other University units. The document goes on to assert that each unit's goals, mission, and vision as well as assessment procedures should be aligned to support those of the University. The visiting team strongly supports this assertion and recommends that IUP move ahead as planned to implement the process of strategic management for continuous improvement that includes a written institutional strategic plan that reflects clear definition and articulation of institutional mission, goals and objectives. Further, to repeat the recommendation stated above for Standard 2, "In light of the very recent appointments of the senior management team, the Team recommends that IUP be asked to report in a progress letter to MSCHE on its progress in mission redefinition and development of a strategic plan within two years of the Team visit." The Team anticipates, as does the Self Study, that by the time of the Periodic Review evidence will indicate that this system and plan are fully in place and have been assessed institution-wide for their effectiveness.

Standard 8: Student Admissions

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

IUP has appropriate polices and procedures that support and reflect its current mission, shares relevant materials and information with prospective students (including financial aid information), and attempts to assess student satisfaction and success through a variety of means.

Accomplishments include expanded admissions efforts such as urban outreach (e.g., in Philadelphia), campus visit days, invitations for increased academic and faculty involvement, and quality materials. IUP admissions materials have been nationally recognized for their design and quality.

The admissions materials and presentation have been periodically updated and reflect current information and messages about the IUP education and experiences. There are some quality control measures in place to promote material accuracy and effectiveness.

However, both the Self-Study and our Team visit have correctly drawn attention to several kinds of student admissions issues requiring campus attention and response. These include:
1. The need for new IUP mission and vision statement, with attendant goals for IUP's student body;
2. The need for clearly articulated student learning goals, at both the university-wide level and the disciplinary level (cf. Standard 14);
3. The need for an integrated University marketing plan, which must include prospective students as a principal audience;
4. A declining Western Pennsylvania high school graduate population;
5. The need to attract more applicants and more prospective student visits to the campus;
6. Widely-expressed concerns (reality or perception?) about the academic preparation and quality of incoming students, in the face of increased competition for students in the region;
7. The need for improved campus communications, including Web site redesign;
8. The importance of a continued commitment to diversity;
9. The need for greater access to scholarship funding.

In addition, the Team found strong campus support and desire for far greater Academic Affairs engagement in the admissions efforts and the need for clearly articulated student learning outcomes. These are necessary to ensure admission of IUP students whose "…interests, goals, and abilities are *congruent* with its mission."

The reader will recognize that the above set of important student recruitment and admissions issues cuts across just about every other Standard addressed in the IUP Self

Study and this Team Report. That is as it should be, because a university's students, present or prospective, are the heart of its existence and purpose. It follows that all of the issues above must be addressed by the entire University community, regardless of the academic or administrative unit within which its members may find themselves.

- *Suggestions*

The Team suggests even closer alignment of Academic Affairs with admissions efforts.

The Team suggests very direct and clear alignment of admissions marketing efforts with Institutional Advancement.

The Team suggests placing even greater priority on enrollment management, including the role of transfer students, in the next strategic plan and on-going resource management processes.

The Team suggests some out-of-the-box thinking about who IUP's students should be, and where they might come from. If not twenty-year-olds, how about adults? If not Western Pennsylvanians, how about Eastern Pennsylvanians, or New Yorkers, or Ohioans, or Marylanders? If not rural high school graduates, how about urban high school graduates from Philadelphia, or Pittsburgh – or Baltimore, or Washington? Or, for on-line programs, how about residents of Moscow, Mumbai, or Ulan Bator?

Standard 9: Student Support Services

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

IUP meets or exceeds this standard by providing student support services that are more than "reasonably necessary" to enable students to meet the goals presently set for them. However, the University will need to take further steps to continue compliance.

Accomplishments in this area include strong and experienced leadership, admissions marketing awards, technology "connected campus" recognition, competitive NCAA II athletic program, centralized unit locations, one-stop student service center, modern recreation facilities, and many other quality services and programs.

IUP offers a broad array of academic support services based on institutional, and well-articulated divisional and unit missions. There are extensive services, programs, and activities available to extend the academic experience. These efforts appear to be purposeful and meaningful and are subject to assessment tools which are valued.

IUP has self-identified significant concerns in the critical area of student advisement and has made appropriate initial recommendations for program improvement, properly involving both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Likewise, an IUP commitment to improve campus communications will enhance student awareness of avenues to obtain campus information and access to university problem-solving mechanisms.

It should also be noted that the Self Study may not fully reflect some significant student support services, their current impact on campus life, and potential major future developments including residential life and intercollegiate athletics. A $250 million student housing initiative, aimed at IUP mission, values, and vision, can have a dramatic impact on the student experience, as well as recruitment, retention, satisfaction, and the overall learning environment. It must be clear that IUP has integrated this effort into the general campus plan, the upcoming strategic plan, as well as into self study analysis. The initiative is exciting and needs to be properly reflected in the future considerations on the forward course of the university.

Likewise, the role and impact of intercollegiate athletics must be fully considered by the campus, particularly in an environment where the question of moving up to a higher level of NCAA competition has been raised. The Team advises appropriate caution on the issue of expanded or upgraded intercollegiate athletics, based on concerns over costs vs. benefits and the experiences of other institutions that have made moves in recent years. The answer to the athletics question, as well as the residential initiative, need fuller consideration in future self-examination, like the forthcoming strategic plan.

Enrollment management, including retention, is another area of appropriate study concern. IUP has several "grassroots" college efforts and broader Student Affairs initiatives aimed at addressing the issue. There is demonstrated commitment to supporting student success by those involved. Access to performance funding has been critical to developing these new efforts. The next logical step may be institutional efforts based on the success of unit endeavors.

An area of Middle States concern is the apparent absence of clearly identified institutional learning goals for undergraduate students. Some divisions and units express their own versions of desired outcomes and effectively use them, such as Student Affairs. But there remains a lack of consistency, institutional adoption or campus-wide "buy in", and none of these standards are universally accepted or used. This restricts the ability of the university to be truly mission-driven and to attract students who truly understand, accept, and appreciate the experience they will have at IUP. It also limits the ability of the university to assess student achievement. Campus representatives suggested during the Team's visit that the on-going review of the Liberal Studies curriculum should lead to the adoption of campus-wide learning outcomes.

The subject of institutional student learning goals is clearly an issue that could be relegated to the compartment of Standard 14. However, we thought it important to

include the previous paragraph in this section on Standard 9 to illustrate how many -- and probably most -- of the issues IUP confronts are cross-cutting issues that span the entire institution and the whole spectrum of the fourteen MSHEC standards.

- *Suggestions*

IUP should intensify its focus on enrollment management (also see Standard 8 response), with appropriate and necessary links to Academic Affairs, to better identify students needs and to provide appropriate retention and persistence support.

IUP should re-establish its program of data collection on post-graduation experience (i.e. percentage of graduates working in their field? In graduate school? Military? Other?) and alumni satisfaction (i.e. would they recommend an IUP education to family/friends?)

IUP should be sure to reconsider its international student services in the course of redefining its mission, strategic plan, and student profile, as they are developed.

Standard 10: Faculty

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

IUP has a strong, dedicated, hard-working, and talented faculty who are poised and anxious to begin work in earnest in order to achieve the University's new shared vision and mission.

IUP's faculty are credited by students and other stakeholders with creating a teaching-learning environment that has "excellent teaching" as its heart. Other terms used to describe the IUP faculty and experiences are "like family," "responsive," "open," "accessible," and "passionate about learning."

The caliber of IUP's faculty is such that striving toward the vision of being a Doctoral Research University under their recently revised Carnegie classification is certainly attainable.

IUP's Self Study team has identified the importance of curricular/programmatic "niches," including expanding graduate education opportunities in terms of programs offered, delivery methods, and student and community needs addressed.

IUP's faculty and administration are committed to seeking and employing only appropriately prepared and qualified faculty and professional staff. While budgetary challenges are ever present, faculty continue to attempt to meet the needs of students through creative scheduling, such as offering hybrid courses, summers-only degree

courses for cohorts, and on-line courses for students who would otherwise not be able to enroll in courses because of work schedules or family obligations.

Faculty are engaged in the design and updating of the curricula for their majors and programs. They embrace the expectation that they document "need" and "student demand" for programs as a part of the curriculum planning process. The review process that includes the Curriculum Committee and the University Senate seems appropriately rigorous, inclusive, and transparent.

IUP's general education curriculum is currently being reviewed and updated by the Liberal Studies Committee. The Team strongly supports the process it observed, and hopes that it reaches a successful conclusion. Once completed and formally approved, the student learning objectives that are the backbone of IUP's general education curriculum should be widely disseminated to current and prospective students and other stakeholders via electronic means as well as traditional publications such as University catalogs.

It was evident to members of the Team that IUP values excellence in teaching and related support activities such as scholarly endeavors and service. Those whose teaching, scholarly works, and/or service are exceptional do appreciate recognition – especially when that recognition is broadly shared and does not need to be self-initiated.

IUP's approval of and funding for faculty development and teaching excellence should be reexamined in light of increased emphasis on scholarships/funded research, graduate education, on-line delivery of courses, student learning outcome assessment, programs, off-site, and the changing undergraduate academic profile.

IUP's faculty support what they view as the natural linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, research, and service. At IUP, recognition of these is underscored by a universal set of expectations established through the current union contract. In the current fiscal situation, faculty and staff live the reality that these endeavors which are linked synergistically also compete for time and funding.

The current faculty union contract provides a published source for standards for and procedures for all faculty and other professionals with regard to actions such as appointment, promotion, tenure, grievance, discipline and dismissal that are based on principles of fairness with due regard for the rights of all persons. Standards appear to be implemented in all divisions and colleges. However, some faculty expressed a desire to have the implementation procedures assessed. As new faculty and staff join the university, there will be an on-going need to provide information about the review of individuals that is clear, concise, and timely.

The current faculty union contract provides a published source for the appointment, supervision, and review of teaching effectiveness for part-time, adjunct, and other faculty consistent with those for full-time faculty.

During our visit, faculty verified for members of the Team that IUP adheres appropriately to principles of academic freedom.

- *Suggestions*

The Team suggests adding a "search" feature to the University's Web site and/or other electronic information sources to facilitate locating information quickly.

IUP leaders should exercise care and vigilance in continuing to build upon the solid foundation of graduate education programs in order to maximize buy-in from as many faculty, staff, and students as is feasible. Most, if not all, units of the university -- such as advising, supporting developmental needs of undergraduates, provision of student stipends, and other forms of financial aid, retaining students, achievement of desired levels of performance measures -- will be impacted by this significant endeavor.

The Team suggests that IUP assess the effectiveness and sufficiency of faculty development services, especially including those provided by the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), since faculty will continue to be at the front lines of most major university initiatives as well as the driving force for the monitoring of student learning and the continuous improvement of teaching and learning .

The Team suggests that, consistent with its reputation as a strong teaching university, IUP consider options for making the Center for Teaching Excellence more visible and central to the work of both students and faculty. This should include assessing the extent to which the CTE should become the University's primary focal point for guiding and assisting faculty as they work toward their personal and professional goals related to scholarship, teaching, student learning, research, and service.

The Team suggests that IUP assess the various processes through which the published standards and procedures are implemented and, if needed, identify opportunities for improvement with regard to the procedures themselves and/or the communication of information about these procedures.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

The Self Study includes as one of its key recommendations that IUP's mission be revised and updated to reflect, among other things, the university's commitment to graduate education at both the master's and doctoral levels. One challenge for IUP will be to strike an acceptable balance between what IUP's vision is for the university with that expressed by the State – both directly and by virtue of the level of support provided.

The use of assessable student learning outcomes (which may differ from course objectives) to guide curricula at IUP varies from program to program. Those who are using this most consistently and effectively are programs that have external/professional accreditation. This seems to be an issue that merits further discussion.

IUP has an exemplary "virtual library" and numerous resources to support on-line and other forms of hybrid courses.

IUP's faculty recognize that the availability and accessibility of adequate learning resources, such as library services and the technology to support distance learning, are essential to their providing quality higher learning experiences for all students. The importance of library and other resources will be especially important as the university implements its vision of a growing commitment to graduate education and information literacy.

The Provost appointed the Information Literacy Task Force (ILTF). The members of the ILTF consisted of library and other teaching faculty. The ILTF was chaired by the Dean of the Libraries. The ILTF's recommendations were forwarded to the Liberal Studies Committee for consideration and/or implementation.

IUP seems to be cognizant of the needs of various types of students, including adult learners. However, the data suggest that due to budgetary constraints the University is often limited in its ability to be responsive to the needs of non-traditional students.

IUP requires that course syllabi incorporate course objectives. However, there is no evidence that course objectives are linked to program objectives consistently across all colleges.

- *Suggestions*

The Team suggests that IUP devise a flexible format for communicating student learning outcomes as well as an approach to ensuring that the assessment of student learning occurs regularly and that the results are shared and used for continuous improvement.

The library faculty and staff should take the initiative in implementing the goals stated in the IUP Libraries 2004 Program Review.

Library faculty and staff should establish a formal and inclusive process of involving department faculty liaisons and students in the development of goals and strategies for the library as well as for the implementation of these goals. The goals and strategies developed should be widely disseminated to members of the university community, which includes students.

The current form for requesting approval to offer a distance learning course should include information about what library resource should be available to support teaching and learning.

IUP should consider appointing a librarian to the Liberal Studies Committee or otherwise provide for formal continuity between the librarians and faculty to provide for continuity with recommendations from the Information Literacy Task Force.

Library faculty and staff should engage in collaboration with the faculty library liaisons to develop a marketing program to increase awareness of these substantial and important informational resources.

Library faculty and staff should engage, in collaboration with the faculty library liaisons and the university institutional research resources, in regular assessment of their marketing program and the resulting student use of library resources. This comprehensive assessment of information and learning resources should provide data and other information to inform the planning of services and acquisitions.

IUP should continue to refine its process for ensuring that comparable quality of teaching/instruction, academic rigor and educational effectiveness of its courses and programs is universal across its courses and programs regardless as to the location as to where the courses and/or programs are taught.

IUP's plans for new courses and curricula should include from the outset a well-thought-out assessment process that will assure students and other stakeholders that these new offerings will include comparable quality of teaching/instruction, academic rigor, and the same level of educational effectiveness found universally across its other courses and programs.

Standard 12: General Education

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

IUP's current general education program reflects a traditional distributive model. In the late 1980s, when IUP's general education program was adopted, the university's general education program was viewed as a model for undergraduate programs. Its synthesis requirement, which consists of interdisciplinary capstone courses, is praiseworthy. Its attention to oral as well as written communication is also praiseworthy. During the Team's open forum with students, the students commented favorably on the program**.**

With the passage of time, however, IUP's Liberal Studies program is no longer viewed as innovative or among the leaders in the field. Materials shared with the Team describing the program, faculty speaking about the program during the visit, and the Self Study failed to communicate the relationship of general education to the majors, to articulate student learning outcomes, or to explain the importance of general education to student

success. It was reported that an increasing number of requests for exceptions to the general education requirements are being made by students, and Liberal Studies courses are often ignored in program reviews. The Self Study's subcommittee report on this standard concluded that "the Liberal Studies curriculum at IUP is dated and in need of comprehensive revision."

Reform of the general education curriculum at IUP has in fact been under way for some time. A University Student Learning Outcomes work group has been working since 2004. It is about to take a proposal for university learning outcomes to the University Curriculum Committee. If approved, the proposal will then be forwarded to the University Senate for approval in late spring. IUP should be commended for funding activities related to the reform efforts. However, much still must be done, including course development and approving a structure for the revised program. If these efforts are to be successful and to be approved within the proposed 2008 timeframe, the academic leadership (i.e., president, provost, and deans) of the campus must be clear and explicit about the need for reform and its support of the reform effort. Continued resource support also will be essential to its success.

Reform of general education is difficult under most any circumstances. IUP has made positive use of advice and resources of higher education associations such as the American Association of Colleges and Universities. Members of the Liberal Studies Committee clearly have benefited from these contacts.

Budget constraints can complicate the politics of general education reform. However, successful reform can reinvigorate an undergraduate program and contribute to student success. If it is innovative and its relevance is clearly explained, it may attract students to the campus. Given the challenges of reform, it may be advisable for IUP to maintain the successful and innovative aspects of its current program while reconceptualizing the program itself.

Members of the Liberal Studies Committee and others at IUP should be commended for the attention that they have given to the need for an assessment plan as they develop the new program. IUP has a good amount of experience with assessment, especially in areas that are accredited. Much remains to be done, but IUP has a solid base upon which to build.

IUP should continue its efforts to develop student learning outcome goals for general education and for the university. These student learning outcome goals should be consistent across programs and their assessment should be included in all program reviews.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

IUP has a number of off-campus sites where it serves a variety of constituencies:

Punxsutawney: There are two major programs at this site, a one-year certificate program in culinary arts and a residential first-year college program primarily for students who have been admitted to IUP, but with credentials considerably lower than students studying on the Indiana campus.

Northpointe: The major emphasis at this site is a program in electro-optics to train students who want to enter this growing industry in the area or who wish to earn a 4 year degree from either IUP in physics or from Penn State in nanotechnology. The site also serves about 75 area students who opt to take their first year classes at this site.

Community College of Allegheny County (CCAC), either the Boyce or Allegheny centers: The students at Boyce can earn a bachelor's in business and those at Allegheny a degree in education and be certified in elementary education (geared primarily to encourage inner city males to enter the profession although others can apply for the program as well). A study of graduation rates at CCAC-Allegheny shows that its graduation rates are well above the rates for IUP as a whole, and a large number of the program's graduates are employed in various positions in school systems.

Monroeville: This site offers a variety of graduate degrees.

Some other sites, including one in Lanham, MD, are designed for specific programs such as Safety Science at the Maryland site.

Members of the Team visited three of the sites (Northpointe, CCAC-Boyce, and Monroeville) but spoke with the Dean at Punxsutawney and the Director at CCAC-Allegheny.

The oldest of the sites (Punxsutawney) was opened in 1962, and through the years the focus and programs at that site and additional sites changed often and without a sense of what was most desirable for the programs. In 1998, IUP conducted a major study of the off campus sites and determined that the university needed to establish a clear focus and also to support the regional sites.

During the Team's visit it was obvious that IUP has established that focus and has developed a variety of regional sites that are well run, successful in attracting students, and supported well. Each of the sites has a well defined curriculum with faculty who are full faculty at the Indiana campus. Most of the regional sites have faculty who travel to the site from Indiana or who are permanently assigned there. The faculty participate in the life of their departments at Indiana. Some courses are taught through distance learning, but in one case, in Maryland, a faculty member drives from Indiana one day a week to meet with the students. IUP academic departments make the decisions on

staffing. Courses are part of the regular curriculum and go through the recognized procedures at IUP.

Students at the regional campuses receive, where possible (excluding campus organizations or athletic teams), the same services as Indiana students: scholarship support, student services and library access. Several of the sites have full or part-time librarians. All have computer access to the IUP library.

The regional site physical facilities are excellent. Punxsutawney has a new residential facility and will open a new learning center in fall, 2006. Northpointe has a new facility that opened in August 2005, and Monroeville will move to expanded quarters in May, 2006. The CCAC facilties are excellent as well.

As for distance learning, IUP has an office that is dynamic in offering support to faculty who wish to create online courses, including a staff member who is available 24/7 to help solve technical problems. All on-line courses undergo rigorous review before approval. The faculty contract provides compensation guidelines. IUP students are making increasing use of online courses , especially during the summer break.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

The institution meets this standard.

- *Summary of evidence and findings*

Assessment occurs on many levels at IUP. Periodic five-year program reviews mandated by PASSHE, professional accreditation processes, and varied department- and course-level assessment initiatives take place in pockets of excellence across the institution. The IUP Self Study Report states -- and the Team concurs -- that "the university is making good progress on assessing student learning but much work remains to be done." With a new leadership team to guide the institution, IUP is ready to begin a strategic management process for continuous improvement that will include a revision of the mission statement, articulation of clear, campus-wide student learning outcomes, and coordination of the learning outcomes assessment process to ensure consistency and effectiveness of assessment efforts at IUP. The Team believes that IUP has the commitment, the excellence, and the ability to implement a systematic program of campus-wide assessment of student learning, and finds that the institution meets the intent of this standard based on its current assessment practice. The team fully expects that evidence will support the success of this comprehensive assessment at the Periodic Review.

Assessment of student learning is the third element of a four-step teaching-learning-assessment cycle that begins with clearly articulated learning outcomes, offers courses that provide purposeful opportunities for students to achieve these outcomes, assesses

student achievement of these outcomes, and uses the results of assessments to improve teaching and learning and to inform planning and resource allocation. Effective assessment processes must be useful, cost-effective, reasonably accurate and truthful, carefully planned, and organized, systematic, and sustained. There must be evidence that institutional leaders support and value a culture of assessment, that goals, including learning outcomes, are clearly articulated at every level, that appropriate and systematic assessment is implemented or at least planned, that assessment results provide convincing evidence that the institution is achieving its mission and goals, including key learning outcomes, that assessment results have been shared and have led to appropriate decisions, and that assessment processes have been reviewed. Since the last self-study ten years ago, IUP sees itself as positioned to move ahead with assessment. The results of the Team's visit confirm the good work that IUP has been doing in assessment. The institution must now connect the dots of its assessment initiatives, reduce duplication and redundancies in assessment efforts, and provide greater consistency and predictability of assessment through a systematic, coordinated and institutionally-supported learning outcomes assessment program.

Assessment is now occurring across campus, in different ways, with different requirements, although there is little coordination across campus, or in some cases even within a college. Having listed "identity" as a driving theme in the Self Study, the campus is working to define and articulate the identity of the IUP student/graduate. As that discussion continues, a series of comprehensive, institution-wide student learning outcomes must be developed and agreed upon by the campus before effective, coordinated, and comprehensive assessment can occur. While there are currently no formally articulated institution-level student learning goals, the Liberal Studies committee is currently working to revise the Liberal Studies curriculum and has developed a set of proposed university learning outcomes that will be reviewed by the University Senate in April, 2006. The Team recognizes and applauds the efforts of this committee to articulate institution-wide student learning goals, and supports campus-wide input into these goals as they go through the revision process. The Team also anticipates that once these goals have been approved, the development of a coordinated program for assessing student learning across the institution will be developed and implemented prior to the next Periodic Review.

One way that assessment of student learning is occurring at IUP is through the annual Program Review process required by PASSHE. Each academic program at IUP is required to prepare and submit a performance review report every five years. This report includes program performance measures, goals and objectives of the program, and an action plan for improvement. At each ten-year interval, the program review process must include an external review. Deans follow up informally on action plan steps with their departments on an annual basis between five-year cycles to confirm that the action plan is followed. The Team fully supports the redesign of this process for more comprehensive assessment of unit performance. There is currently a revision process underway at the PASSHE level to require a more complete assessment of student learning outcomes at the program level as part of this process.

A second way that assessment of student learning is occurring at IUP is through the professional accreditation process at IUP. Currently, of the IUP programs that are eligible for discipline-based accreditation, all but two are accredited (95%). These remaining two programs are actively pursuing accreditation. The College of Education and Educational Technology NCATE accreditation initiative stands out as a model for effective assessment of student learning at the college level and across campus through teacher education courses outside the college. Utilizing a system of authentic course assessment that identifies key assessments for each course and program (KARS), the college utilized an electronic portfolio system that tracked student progress through the teacher education program, collected student learning outcomes information, and utilized these data for program improvement purposes. The KARS system has been identified on campus as an assessment program that may be expanded beyond the College of Education and Educational Technology, but the Team acknowledges some concerns among other IUP departments that this system may not be appropriate for assessment of all programs. The Team concurs with the Self Study recommendation that "while coordination of assessment efforts should receive institutional support and leadership, faculty must be recognized as the key decision makers regarding assessment outcomes, approaches, and data collection. The Team would add, however, that coordination of assessment efforts across campus must occur at the institutional level. The Team would also like to recognize that the Eberly College of Business and Information Technology has also successfully completed the professional accreditation process through AACSB, which also requires a well defined and implemented system of student learning outcomes assessment.

A third way that assessment of student learning at IUP is occurring is through college-level assessment. The College of Health and Human Services is an excellent example of this. The college has developed and implemented a college-wide assessment plan that is based on a set of clearly defined and articulated college-level student learning. Each department within the college has developed and implemented a department-level assessment plan, determined appropriate assessment methods for the plan, collected and analyzed assessment data, and used the results for improvement of student learning.

A fourth way that assessment of student learning at IUP is occurring is through assessment of learning outcomes through Student Affairs. The Student Affairs division has been assessing student outcomes and satisfactions since 1998 and currently has in place a comprehensive and effective assessment system that begins with division-wide goals and objectives and continues through to each unit in the division through assessment of unit-level goals and objectives. This effort acknowledges and reinforces the importance of co-curricular learning to student success and must become an active and participatory voice as coordination of institutional assessment moves ahead at IUP.

While there is not yet a coordinated consistent campus-wide plan for assessment of student learning, assessment is occurring at each level of IUP. When speaking with faculty, the Team found a general consensus that assessment can be positive and useful, and sensed that faculty are not opposed to assessment itself but are frustrated by what appear to be inconsistent and conflicting requirements. Faculty cite lack of coordination

of assessment requirements, lack of clarity of expectations, concern over use of data, and insufficient support and resources as barriers to effective assessment of student learning on the IUP campus. When asked what would help, faculty respond that functional and fiscal resources to support the work required for effective assessment, clearly articulated support and recognition from leadership on the direction and importance of assessment on campus, and the ability to assess (within college- and program-level goals) the aspects of student learning that are important and meaningful to them within the context of their specific disciplines and the courses they teach. They also request the ability to choose the most effective and appropriate assessment methods for their students. Faculty also requested an office of assessment, an assessment coordinator, or at least a central location where common assessment data could be collected and stored for use by departments across the institution. Additional resources and support for assessment are clearly warranted. The campus has in the past committed resources to student learning assessment initiatives (e.g., the Liberal Studies Task Force) and the Team anticipates that IUP will continue this practice. The state has recently allocated a percentage of performance funding to IUP and the IUP leadership indicate that a portion of this funding will be allocated for assessment support services.

Throughout the Self Study, assessment is recognized as a vehicle for improving student learning and the limitations of assessment at IUP are clearly acknowledged, as is the institution's willingness to engage in a more effective assessment process. Also within the Self Study, and from conversations with campus constituencies during the site visit, there is clear and positive anticipation of what the new president will bring to the institution in the form of strategic guidance and purpose. It is at this point unclear how the recommendations from the Self Study will shape the priorities of the president and his new leadership team and the extent to which assessment will rank at the top of those priorities. According to the Self Study, assessment must be integrated into the curriculum, goal driven, coordinated with plans for improvement, given adequate resources, and used foremost for the purpose of improving the quality of students' education. While acknowledging the importance of assessment is a strong beginning and the pockets of excellence in assessment on campus are encouraging, assessment of student learning that begins with a set of university student learning outcomes and continues through a consistent and systematic campus wide student learning outcomes assessment process is essential.

- *Suggestions*

To support the existing culture of assessment at IUP and to facilitate the development and implementation of a consistent and participatory institution-wide assessment plan, the Team suggests that the President explicitly assert and proclaim his support for the assessment of student learning, and articulate a clear vision for institution-wide assessment.

To respond to the clearly articulated need for support with assessment processes and collection of assessment information and data, the Team suggests that IUP develop and implement a support process to facilitate the collection of common assessment data

across campus and the coordination of institution-wide assessment initiatives, including consideration of an assessment coordinator, an office of assessment, or a designated staff support person or office.

To acknowledge that the most effective assessment of student learning occurs through campus-wide participation of representatives from each area of the institution, the Team suggests that IUP consider convening an institutional assessment committee to oversee coordination of the assessment process.

- *Recommendations*

The Self Study asserts that "a set of student outcomes goals must be developed at the institutional level and linked to the university's mission." The Liberal Studies Task Force has developed a draft set of university-wide student learning outcomes that will soon be submitted to the University Senate for review. The Team recommends that IUP articulate and agree upon common expectations of student learning outcomes at each level of the institution (institution-wide, college, general education, and department) that are consonant with the institution's mission and the standards of higher education and of the relevant disciplines, that are based on a cross-campus discussion of who the IUP student is and should be, that incorporate feedback and input from each area of the campus community, and that are used to guide the development and implementation of an effective and systematic plan to assess student learning.

The Self Study concludes that, while all areas cannot use the same form of assessment, "greater systemization in the assessment process be implemented university wide to assure a long term institutional perspective is included in the process, effective collaboration among units is fostered, and feedback on viable strategies is provided." The Team fully agrees with this statement and recommends that IUP develop a written plan that describes student learning assessment activities being undertaken by the institution at each level, including the specific methods to be used to validate articulated student learning goals and objectives, and insuring a systematic and consistent assessment process across campus.

As effective assessment can only occur within a feedback cycle that identifies student learning outcomes, selects appropriate methods of assessment, implements these methods and collects results, analyzes assessment data, and uses assessment results for continuous improvement of student learning, the Team recommends that IUP collect, in a consistent and systematic process, evidence that student learning assessment information is used across campus to improve teaching and learning.

V. Summary of Team Recommendations

The Team recommends that the Commission reaffirm the accreditation of Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

The Team further recommends that IUP be requested to report to the Commission on the progress of its strategic planning efforts in a progress letter to be submitted within two years of the Team's visit (March 19, 2008). Some explanation of what the Team envisions here is in order.

In the view of the Team, IUP has come through a very difficult period with flying colors, and is now well positioned to reconceptualize itself and to plot a course for making substantial institutional advances over the next decade. With a new leadership team in place, it is now on the verge of beginning this process. Over the next several years it will develop a vision, a mission, and a strategic plan, including implementation plans. The Team has included several recommendations in its discussion above of Standards 2, 7, and 14. These should be viewed not as separate and independent recommendations, but as components of a single recommendation concerning the nature and content of the strategic plan. For example, the Team believes it is very important that the plan incorporate a thorough and comprehensive treatment of the issue of defining student learning goals and expectations and designing student performance assessment systems incorporating those goals.

Needless to say, IUP is embarking on a huge and very complex project. It is also a critically important project, one that deserves to be pursued with ardor and vigor. The Team believes that a feasible timeline for the project would involve having its results in place, implemented, functioning, and initially assessed by the time of the University's next Periodic Review in 2011. Thus, the Team believes it would be appropriate for the Commission to request that the University focus its next Periodic Review Report on this project, and also to request a progress letter within two years, as recommended above.