PENNSTATE

SELF-STUDY DESIGN
for
The Pennsylvania State University
June 24, 2013

Penn State is at a pivotal moment in its history and its leadership recognizes the need for constructive and forward-looking change. However, it is appropriate for this self-study to place the highly publicized and troubling events surrounding the Sandusky scandal in a broader and longer-term context.

It would be overly simplistic to assume that by its very design, Penn State's governance is fundamentally flawed or that the University has been an organizational accident waiting to happen. To the contrary, over the past several decades, Penn State has achieved one of higher education's most remarkable success stories. There is no question that horrible crimes were committed by a former member of the University community, that the institutional response has been questioned, and that Penn State has needed to take corrective action, which it continues to do. But all of that does not necessarily mean that Penn State as an institution is broken. The facts indicate otherwise.

- Over the past 40 years – from 1972 to 2012 – Penn State has grown from an enrollment of about 48,000 students to over 96,000 students.

- It rose from around 30th in annual funded research rankings during the 1970s and early 1980s – Penn State was 33rd in 1972 – to being well-established among the top dozen or so research universities in the United States. Data for the two most recent years available from the National Science Foundation ranked Penn State 9th for fiscal year 2009 and 14th for fiscal year 2010.

- When Bryce Jordan became President in 1983, Penn State had essentially no tradition of fundraising, and a predecessor (Eric Walker) told President Jordan that he doubted that Penn State's development program could rise to the level of even one million dollars per year. By his retirement in 1990, Dr. Jordan had led a fundraising campaign that raised $352 million. The University's current campaign is closing in on its goal of two billion dollars.

- In 1972, Penn State had three faculty members who were fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS represents 261 leading scientific scholarly societies and, among other activities, publishes the peer-reviewed journal *Science*). By 2012, that number had grown to 70.

- Between 1972 and 2012, Penn State added the Pennsylvania College of Technology (in 1989); entered the Committee on Institutional Cooperation/Big Ten (in 1990); opened the 118-acre Innovation Park (in 1994); and added the Dickinson School of Law (in 2000).

- From 1972 through 2012, Penn State's Commonwealth campuses advanced considerably from their historic role as small, two-year feeder campuses. Today, students can complete the first two years of nearly all of the University's 160-plus baccalaureate majors at any undergraduate campus. All 19 of the Commonwealth campuses also offer baccalaureate degrees; Behrend and Great Valley offer master's degrees; and Penn State Harrisburg offers master's and doctoral degrees. In 2013, the Commonwealth campuses provide students with a smaller-college experience along with the quality, programmatic options, and highly regarded faculty characteristic of a world-class public research university.

- When Penn State created the World Campus in 1998, it became one of the first major accredited universities to provide online education. By 2012, the World Campus had grown to over 12,000 unique enrollments and garnered three Sloan Consortium awards for the excellence of Penn State's online educational programming.

- In the mid-1960s, with grants totaling about $71 million from the M.S. Hershey Foundation and the U.S. Public Health Service, Penn State started building a medical school, teaching hospital, and research center. The College of Medicine enrolled its first class of students in 1967, and the Medical Center accepted its first patients in 1970. The College of Medicine currently enrolls over 800 students, and to date it has granted over 3,907 medical degrees and 1,300 graduate degrees. The combined budget of the Medical Center and the College of Medicine is about $1.5 billion, comprising nearly 30 percent of Penn State's operating budget. Basic and clinical research are supported by more than $100 million annually in external funding. The Milton S. Hershey Medical Center is one of only 125 academic medical centers in the nation, and the Center in Hershey has expanded its work in education, research, and patient care through the development of a regional campus at University Park.

- In February 2013 the Penn State Hershey Milton S. Hershey Hospital opened its new 263,000 square-foot Children's Hospital. Since the opening, *U.S. News and World Reports* published its 2013-14 Best Children's Hospitals and Penn State's Children's Hospital ranked in five specialties - cancer, urology, orthopedics, neurology, and heart surgery – two more than last year.

- Penn State has come a long way from 40 years ago when a largely *ad hoc* approach was used for issues of diversity and educational equity. In 1990, Penn State established the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity and in 1998, implemented the University-wide *Framework to Foster Diversity* strategic planning process, which continues to promote inclusivity, educational access, advocacy, and a positive climate for faculty, staff, and students. *The Education Trust* in recent years has repeatedly recognized Penn State as one of the nation's "top gainer" colleges or universities for both Hispanic and African American students. For example, in its most recent (2012) report,

The Education Trust ranked Penn State 18th among public colleges and universities, for simultaneously maintaining or increasing enrollments of Black students while also closing the Black-White graduation rate gap. In 2012, average years to graduation were almost identical across race and ethnicity: 4.3 years for Hispanics and Latinos, 4.3 for Asian Americans, 4.3 for African Americans, and 4.2 years for white undergraduates.

- Student life at Penn State is a distinct asset. The Penn State Dance Marathon is a particular point of pride, and a wonderful reflection of some of what's best about the University's students. In the first THON, in 1973, 78 students danced for 30 hours in the ballroom of the student union, raising more than $2,000 for the Butler County Association for Retarded Children. The year 2013 marked THON's 41st anniversary, as the Bryce Jordan Center hit capacity several times with more than 700 dancers joined by families, children, volunteers, and supporters. THON 2013 raised $12.4 million for the fight against childhood cancer.

- Penn State's economic contribution is substantial. According to a 2008 analysis by the independent research firm Tripp Umbach, Penn State – through its faculty, staff, students, and alumni – generates more than $17 billion annually in overall economic impact. For every dollar invested by the Commonwealth, the University returns over twenty-five dollars.

- In 2010, the National Research Council assessed doctoral programs in more than 60 fields. Penn State was one of 212 universities covered by that review. Sixty-nine Penn State Ph.D. programs were included. The NRC's complex methodology does not specifically rank programs; NRC eliminates the best and the worst scores, and then suggests that the true placement of a program is somewhere between the best and worst remaining scores. With that caveat in mind, it is fair (though a slight simplification) to say that 32 Penn State programs were the top 10% of the NRC rankings.

- A distinctive strength of research and graduate education at Penn State is its success in interdisciplinarity collaboration. Thirty-eight percent of Penn State's programs in the NRC assessment ranked in the top 10 percent of their respective fields for the percentage of interdisciplinary faculty.

- In the most recent (2010) Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), Penn State was identified as one of the top 50 universities in the world. The ARWU ranking (sometimes called the "Shanghai Ranking") is accorded considerable credibility in academe because of its reliance on objective metrics such as per capita research funding, publications, and citations.

- Penn State Libraries rose in Association of Research Libraries rankings from 25th in 1980 to 10th in 2011.

In short, Penn State has been one of American higher education's most notable success stories. It has been on an upward trajectory for decades, and remains one of the very best public research universities in the world with a stellar faculty, staff, and student body. While many challenges

have been encountered and many surely lie ahead, Penn State is and will strive to remain one of the very best universities in the world.

Nature and Scope of the Self-Study

Penn State has had perhaps the most extensive, ongoing, institution-wide planning experience of any major university in the United States. For thirty years, Penn State has continued this commitment to strategic management both for the University as a whole, and for all major academic and administrative units. This productive, action-oriented approach has strengthened the University's ability to make tough, informed choices and to allocate resources according to evidence, judgment, and priorities. The University has long approached the Middle States self-study as a helpful tool, and continues to view the Middle States accreditation process as a valuable activity that contributes to organizational learning and strategic management.

The timing of Penn State's self-study will coincide with events that will be crucial for the University. What follows places the nature and scope of the self-study in context with significant transitions and institutional planning initiatives at the University.

Anticipated leadership transitions

Clearly, one pertinent contextual element is that the self-study will be occurring in the midst of major leadership changes at Penn State over the next year or so. In particular, the new executive vice president and provost will begin July 1, 2013, and the appointment of a new president by about July 2014.

Unit-level strategic planning

Current unit-level strategic plans cover the period 2008-09 through 2012-13. If past practice had been followed, the provost would have distributed unit planning guidelines to deans, vice presidents, and chancellors in June 2012, giving colleges, campuses, and major administrative units one year to develop strategic plans for the period beginning in 2013-14. However, taking into account the press of other matters that Penn State faced in 2012, the president and provost decided to delay the cycles for both unit planning and University-level planning by a year. Thus, the process has now begun (with preparation and sharing of draft unit planning guidelines), as of spring 2013, to ask the leaders of Penn State's strategic planning units to develop their plans for 2014-15 through 2018-19.

Integrated planning

Penn State has what it calls an "integrated planning" process, which it developed in the 1990s specifically to help the Commonwealth campuses. These smaller campuses – which can be especially sensitive to small enrollment fluctuations – benefit particularly from considering holistically the relationships among enrollment, staffing, facilities, and budget planning.

Integrated planning mostly parallels unit-level strategic planning. Just as the start of unit planning was delayed by a year, so will the start of integrated planning be postponed. Integrated planning is now scheduled to occur during 2013-14, and will cover the period 2014-15 through 2017-18. (Integrated planning originally used the same five-year horizon as unit planning, but experience has shown that three or four years of enrollment projections are about all that is practical for this purpose.)

University-level strategic planning

Historically, Penn State's University-level plan has been informed by its unit-level plans, so University planning cycles lag unit planning by a year. The University continues to see great value in that sequence.

As noted above, both unit-level and University-level plans have been postponed by one year. The University's current strategic plan is *Priorities for Excellence: the Penn State Strategic Plan 2009-10 through 2013-14.* The next University-level plan will encompass 2015-16 through 2019-20, and will occur primarily during 2014-15.

Overview of MSCHE self-study process timelines

A detailed timeline for the MSCHE self-study review and accreditation process is provided later in this document; key milestones include the following.

- Penn State accreditation steering committee charge: March 2013
- Finalize self-study design and submit to MSCHE: June 2013
- Steering team and subcommittees draft sections of the self-study: Fall 2013 – Spring 2014
- Compilation, review and revision, and finalization of the draft self-study: Fall 2014
- Spring 2015 – Middle States site visit

Proposed Self-Study Design and Theme

Penn State's MSCHE self-study design will be comprehensive, with emphasis on the theme of *Living the Land-Grant Mission in a Global Context.*

Rationale for the self-study theme

The self-study theme and design builds from Penn State's historic objectives toward what the land-grant mission means for the University today.

- The Morrill Act of 1862 defined the land-grant purpose as follows:
  "without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactic, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and

practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

- Penn State is at a decisive moment in its long, rich history, so this self-study can help the University look to the past while creating the future.
- The University continues to provide an accessible, affordable education to the sons and daughters of Pennsylvania, even as it has evolved into one of the top 50 research universities in the world.
- Penn State serves Pennsylvania as one university geographically dispersed.
- Penn State has a global reach and impact, as witnessed in its research programs, the numbers of Fulbright scholars, the enrollment of international students, and the growth of the World Campus.
- The thematic emphasis of the self-study provides an opportunity to recognize and preserve the University's fundamental strengths, while pointing out areas that need to be addressed as Penn State continues to evolve into a truly global, 21st century, land-grant institution.

Intended Outcomes

The intended outcomes of the self-study will include the identification of both strengths and challenges that the University faces in 2013 and going forward. A related intended outcome will be to crosswalk the self-assessment to the 14 Middle States standards and to opportunities for Penn State to better achieve its mission.

To achieve these separate but overlapping outcomes, the self-study process will be guided by a Steering Committee. Four subcommittees have been charged to undertake detailed, frank, and evidence-based assessments. The self-study will be structured around these four thematically organized subcommittees:

- Institutional Context and Foundation
- Planning, Budgeting, and Governance
- Educational Context and Offerings
- Student Experience, Success, and Development

A majority of the substance of the four subcommittee reports will no doubt be reflected in the final self-study document submitted to Middle States. However, the self-study will not be a simple compilation or assemblage of those subcommittee submissions.

Even when the standards are grouped thematically, there will be dimensions of effectiveness – for example, achievement of the University's goals for diversity and educational equity – that cut across standards, themes, and subcommittees. The Steering Committee will, therefore, be expected to identify and consider such cross-cutting topics. Much of the Steering Committee's responsibility will focus on building a coherent institutional self-study based upon the work of the subcommittees.

<center>**Research Questions**</center>

As stated, an intended outcome of the self-study will be to address each of the 14 Middle States standards. This approach will enable Penn State to identify opportunities for the University to better achieve its land-grant mission within a global context. Summarized here is the organizational framework (four subcommittees in relation to the 14 standards) that will guide the achievement of this outcome.

Institutional Context and Foundation Subcommittee (Lori Bechtel-Wherry – Chair)

Standard 1. Mission and Goals
Standard 5. Administration
Standard 6. Integrity
Standard 10. Faculty

Planning, Budgeting, and Governance Subcommittee (David Monk – Chair)

Standard 2. Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
Standard 3. Institutional Resources
Standard 4. Leadership and Governance
Standard 7. Institutional Assessment

Educational Context and Offerings Subcommittee (Christopher Long – Chair)

Standard 11. Educational Offerings
Standard 12. General Education
Standard 13. Related Educational Activities

Student Experience, Success, and Development Subcommittee (Philip Burlingame – Chair)

Standard 8. Student Admissions and Retention
Standard 9. Student Support Services
Standard 14. Assessment of Student Learning

With broad intended outcomes and the approach described above in mind, the subcommittees will be guided by the following self-study research questions.

Institutional Context and Foundations Subcommittee

- How well do the current mission and vision statements serve Penn State and its ability to carry out its land-grant mission?
- How effectively are the University's mission, vision and goals carried out through the strategic management of the various campuses, colleges, and major administrative units?
- What are the most significant challenges and opportunities facing Penn State in achieving its core mission as a public land-grant research university?

- How successfully does the University support and facilitate collaboration, research, teaching, and service by faculty – especially the highly productive, diverse, innovative faculty needed by a 21st century, world-class research university?
- How effective are the University's procedures for faculty recruitment and retention, compensation, evaluation, professional development, and promotion and tenure?
- What has been accomplished, and what remains to be addressed, regarding how Penn State demonstrably adheres to high ethical standards in the conduct of all programs and activities?

Planning, Budgeting, and Governance Subcommittee

- To what degree has the University been able to support its mission (that is, including research and online education) with necessary infrastructure (buildings, renovations, IT, staff support, enterprise information systems, and the like)?
- How are resources allocated and expended, and how sufficient are the evaluative processes in place to monitor this?
- How actively and extensively does Penn State interface with, share with, and learn from peer institutions regarding matters of planning, resource allocation, and governance?
- How deliberately and systematically are the University's processes for planning, resource allocation, and governance assessed, with an eye toward improvement opportunities?
- How and to what extent do structures, policies, and procedures ensure adequate participation in shared governance by appropriate groups (administrators, Trustees, faculty, students, and external stakeholders)?
- How, and how well, do communication mechanisms and practices support planning, budgeting, and governance?
- To what extent are planning and resource allocation decisions informed by evidence?
- To what extent do planning, budgeting, and governance structures create a framework for the accomplishment of institutional goals and improvement?
- What has been the University's response to the Freeh recommendations and what are the early indications of the results, including the costs on the University's ability to function?

Educational Context and Offerings Subcommittee

- How well articulated are the program goals and learning objectives of majors, minors, general education, and co-curricular experiences? What is the framework that ensures that curriculum is aligned with the program goals and learning objectives?
- How well communicated to students and faculty are the program goals and learning objectives of programs including general education?
- What institutional mechanisms are in place to ensure periodic, meaningful, systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of curricular and co-curricular offerings and experiences? How is action taken on the results of these assessment processes?

- In view of the changing landscape of higher education in general, and the needs and context of the Commonwealth in particular, how is the University positioning itself, especially with regard to the flexibility of the curriculum and variety of delivery methods?
- What processes are there to ensure that the quality and rigor of teaching and learning are comparably high across campuses and delivery methods?

Student Experience, Success, and Development Subcommittee

- What are Penn State's processes and strategies for enrollment management and how do these processes and strategies help the University to achieve its admissions and retention goals?
- How, and how well, is the University positioning itself to respond to demographic and economic shifts in Pennsylvania, nationally and globally – especially in the areas of:
    - Residential instruction enrollments;
    - World Campus enrollments;
    - The interface of enrollments between degree and non-degree programs; and
    - Emerging online learning options (MOOC's, certificates, and badge credentialing)?
- How is Penn State developing and achieving its goals to provide access for middle/low-income and traditionally under-represented students in the Commonwealth?
- What post-admission diagnostic and placement tests are used to guide the placement of first-year students into courses? How is the effectiveness of this testing assessed?
- How has Penn State's new student orientation evolved in recent years to support the academic success and transitional adjustments of first-year, transfer, change of campus, and new graduate students?
- How does the University assess the achievement of curricular and co-curricular goals for student experiences and student development? What data are collected to identify opportunities for improvement?
- How will Penn State ensure a high quality student experience and provide adequate student support services at all campuses, including the planned growth in enrollments in the World Campus?
- How well do all academic programs (e.g., including general education, baccalaureate, and graduate) and cocurricular educational programs define desired outcomes?
- How do Penn State's assessment strategies provide sufficient data to effectively measure intended outcomes? How does Penn State use assessment data on student learning to inform decisions? What are some examples of actions taken on the basis of assessment findings?
- How can Penn State's structures, mechanisms, and strategies for assessing student learning (both curricular and co-curricular) be improved?

Organization of the Steering Committee and Subcommittees

In February 2013, an 18-member steering committee to lead the self-study process was appointed by President Rodney A. Erickson upon the recommendation of Interim Executive Vice President and Provost Robert N. Pangborn. Blannie E. Bowen, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Accreditation Liaison Officer, was appointed as Chair of the Steering Committee. Michael J. Dooris, Executive Director of the Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment, was appointed Vice Chair of the Committee. The other members of the Steering Committee were appointed by virtue of their positions and standing within the University community. The goal was to assemble a high-level committee that will be able to bring a broad yet deep institutional perspective to the self-study process. Members of the Committee along with their positions are listed below:

Steering Committee
(* Denotes a member of both the Steering Committee and a Subcommittee.)

Steering Committee Membership

Francis Achampong, Chancellor, Penn State Fayette, The Eberly Campus (Effective August 1, 2013, Dr. Achampong will be the Chancellor at Penn State Mont Alto.)

Marianne Alexander, President Emerita of the Public Leadership Network and member of the Board of Trustees

Katherine Allen, Associate General Counsel, Office of the Vice President and General Counsel

Janine S. Andrews, Director of the Office of the Board of Trustees

Lori J. Bechtel-Wherry, Chancellor, Penn State Altoona*

Blannie E. Bowen (Chair), Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Philip J. Burlingame, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs*

Barbara I. Dewey, Dean, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications

Michael J. Dooris (Vice Chair) Executive Director, Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment*

Yvonne M. Gaudelius, Associate Vice President and Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, Office of Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education

David J. Gray, Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer

Daniel R. Hagen, Professor of Animal Science, College of Agricultural Sciences*

Christopher P. Long, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and Resident Instruction, College of the Liberal Arts*

David H. Monk, Dean, College of Education*

Karen O'Brien, Coordinator of Institutional Reporting, University Budget Office

Lisa Powers, Director, Department of Public Information

Wayne D. Smutz, Associate Vice President for Outreach and Executive Director of the World Campus, Office of the Vice President for Outreach

Regina Vasilatos-Younken, Senior Associate Dean, The Graduate School

Charge to the Steering Committee

On March 11, 2013, Interim Provost Pangborn charged the Steering Committee. In his charge, Provost Pangborn articulated his expectations for the Steering Committee:

- Determine the key issues for self-study and develop a self-study design.
- Establish and charge subcommittees and coordinate their work on the issues to be studied.
- Ensure that a reasonable timetable is implemented.
- Think through how best to communicate about the self-study process within the University.
- Arrange for institution-wide review of responses to the draft of the self-study document.
- Oversee completion of the final report and any other related documents.

<div align="center">

Subcommittees

</div>

Subcommittee Appointment

Once the Steering Committee was appointed, Interim Provost Pangborn then appointed subcommittees consistent with the goal of following the comprehensive model. Given that the self-study will be organized around four areas critical to the functioning of the University now and into the future, each subcommittee was populated with a broad array of knowledgeable and highly respected individuals. The subcommittees include faculty, staff, students, administrators, and a member of the Board of Trustees. Four highly respected and experienced administrators have been appointed to chair the subcommittees. These four chairs will also serve as members of the Steering Committee

Institutional Context and Foundation Subcommittee

Standard 1. Mission and Goals
Standard 5. Administration
Standard 6. Integrity
Standard 10. Faculty

Lori Bechtel-Wherry (Chair), Chancellor, Penn State Altoona*
Regis W. Becker, Director, University Ethics and Compliance
Daniel R. Hagen, Professor of Animal Science, College of Agricultural Sciences*
Samuel E. Hayes, Jr., Board of Trustees Member (effective July 1, 2013)
Ronald J. Huss, Associate Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer, Office of the
        Vice President for Research
Thomas E. Mallouk, Evan Pugh Professor of Materials Chemistry and Physics, Eberly College
        of Science
Michael Minutello, Graduate Student and Ostar Fellow, Higher Education Graduate Program

Planning, Budgeting, and Governance Subcommittee

Standard 2. Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
Standard 3. Institutional Resources
Standard 4. Leadership and Governance
Standard 7. Institutional Assessment

Anthony Atchley, Associate Dean for Research and Administration, College of Engineering
Ingrid Blood, Professor of Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Health and
     Human Development
Patricia A. Cochrane, Financial Officer, Office of the Vice President for Commonwealth
     Campuses
Michael J. Dooris, Executive Director, Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment*
Paula Milone-Nuzzo, Dean, School of Nursing
David H. Monk (Chair), Dean, College of Education*
Thomas G. Poole, Vice President for Administration, Office of the President
Cheryl A. Seybold, Director of Strategic Initiatives and PMO, Administrative Information
     Services
Rachel E. Smith, University Budget Officer, University Budget Office

Educational Context and Offerings Subcommittee

Standard 11. Educational Offerings
Standard 12. General Education
Standard 13. Related Educational Activities

Cole W. Camplese, Senior Director for Teaching and Learning with Technology, Information
     Technology Services
Penny H. Carlson, Senior Director of Academic Services, Records and Assessment, Office of
     the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses
Coral J. Flanagan, Undergraduate Student, English and Comparative Literature and member of
     the Presidential Leadership Academy
Betty J. Harper, Senior Planning and Research Associate, Office of Planning and Institutional
     Assessment
Angela R. Linse, Executive Director and Associate Dean, Schreyer Institute for Teaching
     Excellence
Christopher P. Long (Chair), Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and Resident
     Instruction, College of the Liberal Arts*
Andrew F. Read, Professor and Director, Center for Infectious Disease Dynamics, Eberly
     College of Science
Richard W. Robinett, Professor of Physics, Eberly College of Science
Margaret J. Slattery, Assistant Professor of Bioengineering, College of Engineering
Marcus Whitehurst, Assistant Vice Provost for Educational Equity, Office of the Vice Provost
     for Educational Equity

The Student Experience Subcommittee

Standard 8. Student Admissions and Retention
Standard 9. Student Support Services
Standard 14. Assessment of Student Learning

Philip J. Burlingame (Chair), Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, Office of the Vice
     President for Student Affairs*
Jacqueline Edmondson, Associate Vice President and Associate Dean, Office of Vice President
     and Dean for Undergraduate Education
Tanya Furman, Assistant Vice President and Associate Dean, Office of Vice President and Dean
     for Undergraduate Education
Anna M. Griswold, Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education and Executive
     Director for Student Aid, Office of Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate
     Education
R. Keith Hillkirk, Chancellor, Penn State Berks
Tracy S. Hoover, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, College of Agricultural
     Sciences
Anne L. Rohrbach, Executive Director of Undergraduate Admissions, Office of Vice President
     and Dean for Undergraduate Education
Barbara J. Rowe, Executive Director of Education Abroad, Office of the Vice Provost for
     Global Programs
Blaine E. Steensland, Senior Director of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management,
     Penn State Berks
Alexander Yin, Senior Planning and Research Associate, Office of Planning and Institutional
     Assessment

Charge to the Subcommittees

Each subcommittee was charged by Blannie Bowen and Michael Dooris in their roles as Steering
Committee chair and vice chair, respectively, to provide a seamless self-study process. One of
the major early responsibilities of the subcommittees was to review the proposed research
questions generated through the Steering Committee. The subcommittees were asked to revise,
supplement, and as deemed appropriate to and consistent with the design, create additional
questions to guide the self-study. All subcommittees made suggestions for revisions. Final
approval of the questions resided with the Steering Committee.

The subcommittees were also charged to gather and analyze the evidence, information, and data
needed to answer the questions. Each subcommittee will be responsible for drafting its
respective section of the self-study report consistent with the overall goal of the review. The
subcommittees will also consider and make revisions as per the recommendations of the Steering
Committee.

Timetable for the Self-Study and Evaluation

Summer before Academic Year 1
(Summer 2012)
- ➢ MSCHE reminds institution of the pending evaluation and invites it to The Self Study Institute.

Fall, Academic Year 1
(Fall 2012)
- ➢ Self-Study Institute held to orient institutions beginning self-study.
- ➢ Steering Committee Chair (Blannie Bowen) and Vice Chair (Michael Dooris) chosen.
- ➢ MSCHE staff liaison schedules self-study preparation visit to the institution.

Internal/Concurrent Penn State Considerations
- • Middle States liaison visits Penn State and meets with Bowen, Dooris, and Jeanie Andrews.
- • Bowen, Dooris, and Andrews meet with the Provost to discuss 1) the make-up of steering committee, and 2) the scope of self-study, i.e., Comprehensive or Selected Topics Model.
- • After the decision is made regarding what model we will use, Bowen, Dooris, and Andrews meet to identify and recommend subcommittees and subcommittee chairs.
- • Bowen and Dooris attend Self-Study Institute – November 8-9.

Spring, Academic Year 1
(Spring 2013)
- ➢ Institution chooses its self-study model.
- ➢ Steering Committee members appointed.
- ➢ Institution determines types of subcommittee that will be needed.
- ➢ Draft Self-Study Design finalized, including charge questions for subcommittees.

Internal/Concurrent Penn State Considerations
- • March 11, 2013: Charge meeting with Steering Committee. Review and discussion of subcommittees, including membership and expectations; discussion of standards, assessment issues, and timetable.
- • May 2013: Steering Committee identifies and finalizes key questions for each subcommittee to address. Any adjustments are made to subcommittee titles in order to clarify the scope of their reports and make them most useful as self-study is developed.
- • Ensure that assignments and expectations for subcommittees are clear and understood.
- • Adjust Steering Committee and subcommittee membership as needed.
- • June 2013: Steering Committee completes self-study design. Design submitted to staff liaison for initial review. Committee makes revisions and then resubmits the design for final approval (timing will vary depending upon wishes and schedule of the staff liaison).

Spring, Academic Year 1 – Fall, Academic Year 2
(Spring 2013-Fall 2013)
- ➢ March 26, 2013: MSCHE staff liaison conducts self-study preparation visit.
- ➢ Staff liaison approves institution's self-study design.

Internal/Concurrent Penn State Considerations
- March 26, 2013: MSCHE preparation visit to meet with Steering Committee and others to discuss nature and scope of self-study.
- Map out meetings/logistics of Steering Committee as well as all subcommittees.

Fall-Spring Academic Year 2
(Fall 2013-Spring 2014)
- ➢ Steering Committee oversees research and reporting by subcommittees.
- ➢ Subcommittees involve the University community.
- ➢ Subcommittees submit reports.

Internal/Concurrent PSU Considerations
- Bulk of subcommittee work occurs Fall 2013-Spring 2014.
- October 2013: Steering Committee meeting to allow subcommittee chairs to report on their progress and discussions of their subcommittees; outlines submitted and discussed by full Steering Committee.
- December 2013: Steering Committee meets to review and discuss outlines of all subcommittees. Committee agrees on a due date for submission of completed subcommittee reports.
- March 1, 2014: Submission of all subcommittee reports.

Winter, Academic Year 2
(late Fall 2013-early Spring 2014)
- ➢ MSCHE selects the evaluation team Chair, and the institution approves the selection.
- ➢ Chair and institution select dates for team visit and for the Chair's preliminary visit.
- ➢ Institution sends a copy of the self-study design to the team Chair.

Internal/Concurrent PSU Considerations
- Within one month of the Chair's confirmation, Penn State and evaluation team Chair select dates for visit schedule, including the Chair's preliminary visit.
- The Chair's visit should include 1) president, 2) Steering Committee, 3) student/faculty representatives, 4) key administrative officers, and 5) Senate officers.
- Penn State will contact MSCHE to communicate dates for the team visit (preliminary visit of the chair occurs AT LEAST four months before the evaluation visit).
- Documentation roadmap completed.

Spring-Summer, Academic Year 2
(Spring 2014-Summer 2014)
- ➢ MSCHE selects evaluation team members, and the institution approves the selection.
- ➢ Steering Committee receives draft text from subcommittees and develops a draft self-study report.

Internal/Concurrent Penn State Considerations
- Schedule evaluation team Chair visit (at least four months prior to team visit).
- April/May 2014: Steering Committee meets to review subcommittee reports, focusing on

challenges and recommendations.

- June-August 2014: Bowen, Dooris, and Katryn Boynton complete assimilation of subcommittee reports and re-drafts into a single document; draft document circulated to Steering Committee for review and comments.
- August 2014: Draft report circulated to Steering Committee for review.

Fall, Academic Year 3
(Fall 2014)
- ➢ Campus community reviews draft self-study report.
- ➢ Evaluation team Chair reviews draft self-study report.
- ➢ Institution's governing board reviews draft self-study report.
- ➢ Institution sends draft self-study report to evaluation team Chair, prior to Chair's preliminary visit.
- ➢ Evaluation team Chair makes preliminary visit at least four months prior to team visit.
- ➢ Institution prepares final version of the self-study report.

Internal/Concurrent Penn State Considerations
- August-September 2014: Bowen revises draft after feedback from Steering Committee. Committee meets for final review of draft document. Committee determines how best to circulate draft document for University community feedback; document is circulated.
- September 2014: Bowen assimilates feedback; completes final draft for Steering Committee review.
- October 2014: Self-study draft report forwarded to Evaluation Team Chair.
- Review recommendations made by the Evaluation Team Chair; make necessary revisions as appropriate.
- Schedule and coordinate any campus visits.

Winter or Spring, Academic Year 3
(late Fall 2014 or early Spring 2015)
- ➢ Institution sends final report to evaluation team and to MSCHE at least six weeks prior to team visit.

Internal/Concurrent PSU Considerations
- January 31, 2015: Final document sent to Team and MSCHE (needs to be done at least six-weeks prior to visit).

Spring, Academic Year 3
(Spring 2015)
- ➢ Team visit.
- ➢ Team report.
- ➢ Institutional response.

Internal/Concurrent Penn State Considerations
- Four weeks prior to visit, send any additional documents (maps, transportation, information, etc.) and request team's travel and contact information.
- Target Team Visit for April 2015.

- Penn State response to Team Report.

Summer or Fall after Academic Year 3
(Summer 2015 or Fall 2015)
   ➢ Committee on Evaluation Reports meets.
   ➢ Commission action.

Profile of the Visiting Evaluation Team

Given the *Living the Land-Grant Mission in a Global Context* theme for the self-study, the team should ideally be populated with peers from major research and land-grant institutions that have similar histories, missions, and contexts. The chair of the team should ideally be a current or former president, chancellor, or provost who has had significant leadership responsibilities within the land-grant system. In addition, given the global orientation for the Penn State self-study, it would be helpful to have at least one team member who understands and appreciates the global arena and the inherent intricacies, issues, challenges, and opportunities. There are no other major preferences regarding the composition of the team.