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Subject of the Follow-Up Report:

“At its session on June 25, 2015, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted:

To reaffirm accreditation. To request a monitoring report, due April 1, 2017, documenting (1) further implementation of the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance (Standard 4); (2) further implementation of the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of administrative structures and services (Standard 5); (3) review of the enrollment management plan for recruitment, retention, marketing, and advertising, particularly with respect to the enrollment of under-represented students, consistent with the institution's priorities and values (Standard 8); (4) further implementation of the assessment of general education outcomes within the institution's overall plan for assessing student learning, and evidence that such assessment results are utilized for curricular improvement (Standards 12 and 14); and (5) further evidence of articulated student knowledge, skills, and competency levels within existing certificate programs (Standard 13).”
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Executive Summary

As requested in the June 25, 2015, reaffirmation of accreditation letter, The Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) provides this monitoring report to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) to demonstrate Penn State’s ongoing implementation of its recommendations. As shown by some of the initiatives included in Penn State’s current strategic planning cycle, Penn State has been working on these issues continuously. The MSCHE recommendations further catalyzed Penn State to focus resources in specific areas, making progress as follows:

Recommendation #1: Leadership and Governance (Standard 4)

The University has implemented a periodic assessment of the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance for the Board of Trustees, University president, and executives. In January 2016 and January 2017, the Board of Trustees participated in professional development retreats. Before each retreat, Trustees completed a survey focused on Board identification and evaluation of issues facing the University. Dialogue from the 2017 retreat is driving the work of the Governance and Long-Range Planning Committee and the full Board as appropriate.

The evaluation of the President’s performance included input from Trustees and various University constituents via an online instrument. Each executive reporting directly to the President is asked to conduct an annual self-reflection of accomplishments related to established goals and objectives. Throughout the evaluative year, during the President’s one-on-one meetings with senior officers, progress reports, and feedback are provided.

Recommendation #2: Administration (Standard 5)

Based on the MSCHE recommendation, the institution has developed a process to periodically assess academic and non-academic administrative structures and services. Penn State piloted an evaluation process and forms with the administrators and executives in our Finance & Business Division during the 2015-2016 performance management cycle.

The results of the pilot serve as a foundation for the administrative review process that will be managed by the Office of Human Resources. The University is in the process of implementing its Human Resources Business Process Transformation. As part of this project, a standard process for evaluation of non-academic administrators, incorporating lessons learned during the pilot in Finance & Business, will be included in the new online review system.

Recommendation #3: Student Admission and Retention (Standard 8)

Recruitment, retention, marketing, and advertising with respect to underrepresented students are strong institutional commitments. Penn State has several new initiatives designed to expand the enrollment of underrepresented students, including those who are of the first generation in their families to attend college, those from families with low incomes, Hispanic/Latino/a and Black/African American students, and students of color from mixed racial/ethnic heritage. Efforts include pre-college outreach programs across Pennsylvania, transition programs, student support programs at Penn State, and financial assistance.
Diversity at Penn State is a foundational component of “Our Commitment to Impact: The Pennsylvania State University’s Strategic Plan for 2016 to 2020.” Cross-University teams are connecting diversity initiatives to five thematic areas (Transforming Education, Enhancing Health, Stewarding Our Planet’s Resources, Advancing the Arts and Humanities, and Driving Digital Innovation) and three supporting areas (Organizational Processes, Infrastructure and Support, and Constitutional Outreach and Engagement) as part of the strategic plan. The University’s development plan for 2016-2021 includes an “Open Doors” component with the vision to “empower capable, hard-working students – regardless of their heritage, individual characteristics, or financial well-being – for lifetimes of success with degrees that are both affordable and world-class.”

**Recommendation #4: General Education (Standards 12 and 14)**

In response to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education Team Report (March 2015), University leadership made substantial changes to institutional structures and processes that support student learning assessment through a coordinated University-wide strategy. To ensure central oversight, the University created the Office of Planning and Assessment (OPA), led by the Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment. In September 2016, the Executive Vice President and Provost sent a letter to the University community (Appendix 4.A.) articulating that assessment of student learning is required at all levels, including the following:

- Undergraduate degree assessment (baccalaureate and associate)
- Graduate degree assessment (master’s and doctorate)
- Undergraduate and graduate certificate assessment
- General education assessment

To oversee the ongoing administration of the general education assessment process, the University Faculty Senate, in collaboration with the Office of the Provost, appointed a Joint Committee on General Education Assessment (Appendix 4.F.). A member of the Faculty Senate and the Associate Vice Provost for Learning Outcomes Assessment co-chair the committee. The Department of Learning Outcomes Assessment and the new Office of General Education provide operational support for the new assessment process. As of January 2017, the University has made significant progress toward integrating General Education assessment into the overall assessment process.

**Recommendation #5: Certificate Programs (Standard 13)**

In fall 2015, the Provost charged the Office of Planning and Assessment to work with the leadership in Undergraduate Education, the Graduate School, the Commonwealth Campuses, and the Faculty Senate to develop a certificate assessment process for the University. The new process, reviewed and approved by the Provost in summer 2016, ensures that all certificates offered by the University are reviewed by the appropriate bodies and have: 1) learning objectives; 2) direct and indirect assessment measures of objectives; and 3) a formal process for systematic review of assessment evidence in order to make curriculum changes as warranted.

The new process resulted in a standard procedure that all faculty will use to assess and report on any certificate. All existing certificates are required to develop and file a certificate assessment plan with the Office of the Provost by March 31, 2017. As of this report, 84% of undergraduate certificates and 100% of graduate certificates have submitted assessment plans. Subsequently, faculty will complete certificate assessment reports and submit them to the Office of the Provost by summer 2017. Finally, all certificates
must be reviewed and reapproved every five years, with a new application and assessment plan submitted to the appropriate authorizing unit.
History and Context

Penn State was chartered in 1855 at the urging of the Pennsylvania State Agricultural Society as a publicly supported agricultural college (then named the Farmers’ High School). Designated in 1863 as the state’s land-grant institution under the Morrill Land-Grant Act (1862), the University (then named Agricultural College of Pennsylvania) was created with a three-part mission of teaching, research, and public service.

Penn State is one of four universities in the Commonwealth that are considered “state-related” (along with the University of Pittsburgh, Temple University, and Lincoln University). While not state-owned or state-operated, these institutions receive annual state appropriations.

Penn State’s 38-member Board of Trustees includes:

- Five trustees who serve in an ex officio capacity by virtue of their positions within the University or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. They are the President of the University (non-voting); the Governor of the Commonwealth (non-voting); and the state secretaries of the departments of Agriculture, Education, and Conservation and Natural Resources.
- six gubernatorial appointees,
- six individuals elected by delegates from agricultural societies,
- six individuals elected by boards representing business and industry,
- nine individuals elected by alumni,
- three individuals elected by the Board at-large,
- the immediate past president of the Penn State Alumni Association,
- one student trustee and one academic trustee.

Penn State’s Mission

Penn State is a multicampus public research university that educates students from Pennsylvania, the nation, and the world, and improves the well-being and health of individuals and communities through integrated programs of teaching, research, and service.

Our instructional mission includes undergraduate, graduate, professional, and continuing education offered through resident instruction and online delivery. Our educational programs are enriched by the cutting-edge knowledge, diversity, and creativity of our faculty, students, staff, and alumni.

Our research, scholarship, and creative activity promote human and economic development, global understanding, and progress in professional practice through the expansion of knowledge and its applications in the natural and applied sciences, social sciences, arts, humanities, and the professions.

As Pennsylvania’s land-grant university, we provide unparalleled access and public service to support the citizens of the Commonwealth. We engage in collaborative activities with industrial, educational, governmental, and agricultural partners here and abroad to generate, disseminate, integrate, and apply knowledge that is valuable to society.

While Penn State’s largest campus is located in University Park, the University has 24 Commonwealth Campuses throughout Pennsylvania plus the World Campus. This structure provides unparalleled access to programs and services and, reinforces the University’s support of the land-grant mission. All Penn State Commonwealth Campuses report to one President.
University Park is the administrative hub for the University and home for 12 academic units led by deans: Agricultural Sciences, Arts and Architecture, Business, Communications, Earth and Mineral Sciences, Education, Engineering, Health and Human Development, Information Sciences and Technology, Liberal Arts, Nursing, and Science. The 19 Commonwealth Campuses, led by the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses, include: Abington, Altoona, Beaver, Berks, Brandywine, DuBois, Erie (Behrend), Fayette, Greater Allegheny, Harrisburg, Hazleton, Lehigh Valley, Mont Alto, New Kensington, Schuylkill, Shenango, Wilkes-Barre, Worthington Scranton, and York. Five of these campuses (Abington, Altoona, Berks, Erie, and Harrisburg) have stand-alone college status, with the remaining 14 constituting the University College.

In addition, the University has four campuses with unique, professional education missions:

- Penn State Great Valley supports the needs of working adults through graduate professional studies.
- The Pennsylvania College of Technology, located in Williamsport, offers certificate, associate, and baccalaureate degree studies with a strong focus on technology (and is independently accredited through MSCHE).
- The Penn State College of Medicine at the Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, located in Hershey, delivers medical education.
- Dickinson Law (in Carlisle) focuses on legal education and Penn State Law and the School of International Affairs (both in University Park) focus on legal education and international education, respectively.

Penn State’s World Campus, launched in 1998, provides distance education in more than 100 accredited graduate degrees, undergraduate degrees, certificates, and minors. In 2016, about 47,000 students were enrolled at the University Park campus, about 31,000 were enrolled at the other campuses in Pennsylvania, and about 13,400 were enrolled through the World Campus.

In early 2015, Penn State completed its most recent self-study. In June 2015, the MSCHE reaffirmed the University’s accreditation. The Commission also made recommendations related to several of the standards.

“At its session on June 25, 2015, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted:

To reaffirm accreditation. To request a monitoring report, due April 1, 2017, documenting (1) further implementation of the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance (Standard 4); (2) further implementation of the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of administrative structures and services (Standard 5); (3) review of the enrollment management plan for recruitment, retention, marketing, and advertising, particularly with respect to the enrollment of under-represented students, consistent with the institution's priorities and values (Standard 8); (4) further implementation of the assessment of general education outcomes within the institution's overall plan for assessing student learning, and evidence that such assessment results are utilized for curricular improvement (Standards 12 and 14); and (5) further evidence of articulated student knowledge, skills, and competency levels within existing certificate programs (Standard 13).”
Penn State initiated actions in those areas prior to formal receipt of the Commission letter, as indicated in a letter dated May 8, 2015, and as noted below.

- **Recommendation 4, Leadership and Governance (Standard 4):** Penn State launched an assessment process for executives and asked them to establish similar processes for their management-level staff.

- **Recommendation 2, Administration (Standard 5):** Penn State began implementing an assessment process for non-academic departments and administrators.

- **Recommendation 3, Student Admission and Retention (Standard 8):** Penn State was in the process of filling its Vice Provost for Educational Equity position, and diversity was identified as one of the foundational principles in the forthcoming University strategic plan.

- **Recommendations 4 and 5, General Education (Standard 12); Related Educational Activities (Standard 13); and Assessment of Student Learning (Standard 14):** Penn State created a position, Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment, and a new Department of Learning Outcomes Assessment led by an Associate Vice Provost.

Further actions related to and progress on these initiatives during the past two years are addressed in the following pages.
**Recommendation #1: Leadership and Governance**

**MSCHE’s Request**

In its letter dated June 26, 2015, MSCHE asked that Penn State’s monitoring report provide information on the “further implementation of the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance.”

**Penn State’s Response**

Since the completion of the self-study and visit in 2015, Penn State has been enhancing and expanding its processes for assessing the effectiveness of the leadership and governance of the Board of Trustees, the President, and Senior Officers.

**Board of Trustees**

As a best practice, the Board of Trustees undertakes robust opportunities for self-evaluation and assessment to determine how best to fulfill its trusteeship responsibilities.

In January 2016, trustees participated in a professional development retreat, which was moderated by Stanley Ikenberry, President Emeritus at the University of Illinois and former President of the American Council on Education. It included several esteemed individuals who participated in the retreat as panelists or presenters. Before the retreat, trustees completed an online assessment survey focused on several Board evaluative areas: 1) Strengths; 2) Improvement Opportunities; 3) Major Issues Facing the University; 4) Utilization of Trustee Talents and Experiences; and 5) Open-Ended Solicitation of Comments and Opinions. Dr. Ikenberry received the survey results before the retreat.

Richard Chait, Professor of Education Emeritus at Harvard University, laid the foundation for discussions with his keynote presentation, “University Boards at Their Best.” Dr. Chait also participated in a panel discussion on “What Makes a Good Board Great.” Joining Dr. Chait on the panel were Brit Kirwan, Chancellor Emeritus of the University of Maryland; Janet Reid, Founding Partner and Retired Director, Global Novations, and Trustee, The Ohio State University; and Donna Shalala, former President of the University of Miami.

The keynote presentation, panel discussions, and pre-retreat reading materials provided the context within which Dr. Ikenberry reviewed the assessment survey results and facilitated a conversation about the findings. After these presentations and discussions, trustees separated into small groups to discuss further the key challenges identified through the survey. The retreat was summarized in a confidential document provided to all trustees, with specific action items identified for continued conversation.

The 2016 retreat resulted in more generative and strategic discussions throughout the 2016 Board meeting cycle, both in full Board and committee settings. In addition, several of the issues identified in the 2016 survey assessment and retreat discussions remain priorities for attention and action.

In January 2017, the Board again convened for a retreat. Before the event, trustees received and completed the “2017 Board of Trustees Assessment Survey.” The tool focused on several areas, including: 1) Board Effectiveness in Achieving goals, Fiduciary, Strategic and Generative Obligations; 2) Effectiveness of Board Discussions and Deliberations; 3) Effectiveness of Committees; and 4) Factors
Regarding the Board’s Values. In addition, several open-ended questions invited observations on Board effectiveness, an assessment of recommendations from the 2016 retreat, and the relevance of any outstanding items for consideration in 2017. The questions in the “2017 Board of Trustees Assessment Survey” are included in Appendix 1.A.

The 2017 Board retreat began with a reconciliation of the 2016 retreat feedback. Trustees assessed where progress had been made from the 2016 action plans and where gaps or opportunities remained in 2017. The retreat’s opening session included a discussion of the 2017 pre-retreat survey responses.

After trustees reviewed and discussed those items, the stage was set for a facilitated dialogue regarding Board dynamics, which included discussion of individual and group expectations, a skill set inventory update, and how best to leverage those skills, and a review of governance topics. Doug Hensch, President, DRH Group and Executive Coach, facilitated this discussion. John J. Cheslock, Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education and Associate Professor in the Education Policy Studies Department at Penn State, then presented on “The Future of Higher Education – Mega Trends.” The presentation provided valuable context for the Board to assess where Penn State is positioned with respect to emerging trends and themes within the broader higher education landscape. Faculty and students then joined the Board to further discuss issues and trends affecting the University.

Jeffrey J. Selingo, columnist and author of “College (Un)Bound: The Future of Higher Education and What it Means for Students,” delivered the keynote address for the 2017 retreat. Mr. Selingo addressed the transformative shifts in and the future of higher education, focusing on the decade ahead. This session enabled the Board to consider its responsibilities, including the need to stay informed of trends and patterns in areas such as demographics, student and faculty expectations, and new approaches to teaching and learning. The conversation then transitioned to strategic financial planning and the realities facing the University and the broader higher education community.

Discussions are ongoing regarding the Board’s Expectations of Membership, which are articulated in the Board’s Standing Orders. The Committee on Governance and Long-Range Planning, which has jurisdiction for considering governance document changes to recommend to the full Board, is most engaged in this area. During the 2017 retreat, Board members discussed their mutual expectations of each other, focusing on how adherence to an agreed-upon set of expectations might increase the Board’s effectiveness. During the February 2017 meeting of the Committee on Governance and Long-Range Planning, a working group was authorized to re-examine the Expectations of Membership and make recommendations to the Committee regarding possible modifications or clarifications.

Another example of ongoing self-reflection involved taking an inventory of skill sets among existing trustees to inform the selection and election processes for Board composition. The endeavor facilitated identification and assessment of current trustees’ skills and suggested competencies that might be valuable among new trustees.

This topic came to an important conclusion as the results of a self-assessment were reviewed and analyzed. This effort will result in the Committee on Governance and Long-Range Planning reviewing and adopting a white paper that will allow for selection and election processes and gains in skill sets and professional diversification among the Board’s membership.

These efforts have provided the Board with forward-looking generative and strategic topics, after several years of focus on various legal proceedings and investigations arising out of criminal charges brought against former officers, a former administrator and a former employee of the University. The challenges moving forward will be to ensure that the open dialogue and governance best practice areas remain at the forefront and the continuation of the generative nature of the discussions, rather than operational focus.
The President

The President’s performance assessment, a key responsibility of the Board of Trustees, is designed to contribute to institutional performance by establishing clear expectations and fostering open communication between the President and the Board. Critical components, which are consistent with effective leadership assessment practices in higher education, include: 1) self-assessment; 2) evaluation; 3) communication; 4) process; and 5) goal-setting.

There were several considerations in the process, including input from: the President, members of the Penn State Board of Trustees’ Compensation Committee, all trustees, and various University constituencies. Information was gathered via a third-party administered survey instrument, which was used for the evaluation of performance for 2015-2016; the “Presidential Performance Evaluation for 2015-2016” is included in Appendix 1.B.

There were several learning outcomes, which included:

- There was a high level of participation—60% response rate.
- The online assessment tool enabled ease of use.
- Receiving Board and leadership input on formatting, tone and style of questions included on the assessment was helpful.
- The goal-setting process was vetted through the Board and leadership and cascaded downward through the evaluation of the President’s direct reports.
- The evaluation process ensured the President’s alignment with the strategic plan.
- Inclusion of open commentary from participants was valuable.
- The full Board interacted with the President during the process to set 2016-2017 goals.
- An annual market review of compensation ensured presidential performance was appropriately linked to proposed compensation changes.

Opportunities to monitor and improve the process going forward include:

- Compensation Committee review of the prior year’s assessment tool for shifts in evaluation strategy driven by University strategy or market peers.
- Consideration of a more comprehensive review every four to five years or at the time of contract renewal, with a longer-term strategic focus.
- Consideration of a more comprehensive review that involves select Board members and key stakeholders to clarify responses and gain additional context on evaluation.
- Identification of ways to increase the response rate, which might include a more representative sampling of constituencies in future years.
- Consideration of advance discussion and consensus-building on the following year’s goals before completing the current year’s assessment.
- Seeking ways to communicate and share presidential goals with other University leaders/managers to ensure alignment.

Senior Officers

The assessment process for executives reporting directly to the President involves multiple steps. This assessment is initiated using two forms, “Executive Assessment – Employee Feedback” and “Executive
Self-assessment.” Each executive gives the President a yearly self-reflection of accomplishments, successes, and challenges related to established goals and objectives, with emphasis on no more than 10 strategic goals for the year. Areas of specific focus include: 1) Support for Institutional Mission and Goals; 2) Strategy and Planning; 3) Talent Management; 4) Communication; 5) Innovation; 6) Board Relations/University Governance; 7) Interaction; 8) Student Centeredness; and 9) Culture. In addition, each executive shares with the President his or her strategic goals for the coming year. After the self-assessment and employee feedback are received, the President then meets with each executive to discuss his or her performance assessment and goals for the upcoming review year. Throughout the evaluative year, at the President’s one-on-one meetings with senior officers, progress reports are provided. The text from each of the documents used for this assessment is included in Appendices 1.C1. and 1.C2.

Beginning in 2017, this evaluative process will be augmented by having one-third of the President’s direct reports (on a rotational basis) engage in an in-depth 360-degree performance review that involves collection of input and information from constituents who are impacted by the executive, either as colleagues, direct reports, or subordinates. This information will then be integrated into the executive’s evaluative review, goal-setting, and opportunities for enhancement and improvement.

**Academic Leadership**

Penn State Policy AD14, “Academic Administrative Evaluation,” describes the ongoing review process for those academic administrative offices that report directly or indirectly to the Executive Vice President and Provost, the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs, or the Dean of the College of Medicine. Such offices and their officers are reviewed at regular intervals, and the policy provides guidance on assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each office and its leadership. Typically, four academic administrative reviews are done during each academic year. Major revisions were made to AD14 in 1988; it was last updated in 2014 to reflect improvements in the evaluation process.
Recommendation #2: Administration

MSCHE’s Request

In its letter of June 26, 2015, MSCHE asked that Penn State’s monitoring report provide information on the “further implementation of the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of administrative structures and services.”

Penn State’s Response

Penn State Policy AD14: Academic Administrative Evaluation describes a review process for an academic administrative office, one that reports directly or indirectly to the Executive Vice President and Provost, the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs, or the Dean of the College of Medicine. The document provides the policy on the assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the operations of that office and its leadership for the purpose of improving the functioning of that office. The process outlined in AD14, as well as the overall performance review philosophy developed for staff, guide the development of an assessment and evaluation process for non-academic administrative structures and services.

Recommended updates to Penn State Policy HR92, Employment Conditions for Employees Classified as Administrator, have been drafted to include material outlining the performance management process. Under the recommendations, each administrator will receive a performance evaluation on an annual basis. The performance evaluation process for administrators is designed to assess effectiveness of leadership and to identify areas of strength and potential professional development opportunities. The annual administrator performance evaluation consists of evaluating progress made toward annual goals, behavioral competencies, and the support of key initiatives. Each executive is responsible for ensuring that the administrators in their areas receive annual reviews.

In addition to the annual evaluation process, a more comprehensive review of administrators will be conducted periodically (i.e. every five years) at the discretion of the executive. The purpose of the more detailed review is to gather input from a variety of stakeholders to assess the administrator’s performance and to identify areas of strength, suggestions for improvement, and potential development opportunities. Human Resources provides a toolkit for the annual review and the more detailed review.

Pilot of Evaluation Process

In spring 2015, an annual evaluation process, form and timeline for Penn State administrators and executives were developed and vetted through the President’s Council; components included goal setting and core competencies. It was agreed that a conventional annual evaluation would be conducted, with a more in-depth evaluation to occur every two to three years. The Senior Vice President for Finance & Business (F&B) piloted the process within his unit during the 2015-16 performance management cycle for F&B administrators and executives. Executives from the F&B leadership team also used the short form to document their end-of-year conversations with the administrators on their teams, including providing overall performance ratings. A few other teams within F&B used the forms for non-academic administrators. These short and long forms, “Administrator/Executive Performance Review,” are provided in Appendices 2.A and 2.B.
Review of the data and the process used with this group for the 2015-16 pilot performance management cycled has indicated the following:

- It is important to keep this process simple and consistent. The main focus of the evaluation process pilot has been goal setting and examining progress made toward goals; the “long form” has not yet been fully utilized. A suggestion was made that the long form could be used every two to three years for a more in-depth look at an individual’s performance.
- Documenting the results of the ongoing conversations and the end-of-year review is still a bit “clunky” due to the nature of the form and lack of a centralized online tool.

**Penn State’s Human Resources Business Process Transformation**

In 2013, Penn State's Human Resources (HR) community embarked on a multiyear initiative, The Human Resources Business Process Transformation (HRBPT). This initiative focuses on creating a new HR service delivery model that provides more strategic HR support and increased customer service by more efficiently and effectively aligning HR resources, and leveraging redesigned policies and business processes with updated tools and technology.

Slated to be operational in June 2017, the HRBPT will create a more business-focused human resources organization that is accountable, adds value as a business unit, is aligned across the University, and maintains some flexibility in delivering services.

HR strategic partners have replaced the previous HR representatives in all of the University’s organizational units. HR strategic partners primarily serve as advisors to senior leadership, helping to implement the strategic priorities of their respective colleges, units, and campuses.

During the 2015-16 performance management cycle, HR strategic partners emphasized the importance of conducting ongoing performance conversations and end-of-year performance evaluations/reviews for all full-time employees, including non-academic administrators.

The strategic partners have verified that conversations between non-academic administrators and their managers are occurring. The immediate focus has been to ensure that all full-time staff members and their supervisors follow a consistent performance management process. This effort includes mid-year check-ins and end-of-year reviews.

In early 2017, the Vice President for Human Resources met with the HR strategic partners who have non-academic administrators in their units to standardize and institutionalize the performance evaluation process for them.

Subsequently, this preliminary process was developed.

- Non-academic administrators will provide their supervisors with a self-assessment every year. The text of this evaluation is provided in Appendix 2.C.
- Non-academic administrators will be reviewed annually on progress made toward goals and the University’s core competencies.
- The non-academic administrators will also participate in an individual 360-degree review process, as well as a review of their offices/departments/units, every five years. The scope of the review will depend on the non-academic administrator’s position/role in the institution.
This process and an online tool will be transitioned to the Workday Human Capital Management System being implemented as part of the HRBPT. Lessons learned from the Finance & Business pilot program and ongoing HR strategic partner discussions will be incorporated into the implementation of the Workday System and the HRBPT.

After all processes and forms have been finalized, leadership will revisit and assess the process at the end of the 2017-2018 performance management cycle to discuss challenges and successes and to identify any needed revisions.
Recommendation #3: Student Admission and Retention

MSCHE’s Request

In its letter of June 26, 2015, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education asked that Penn State’s monitoring report provide information documenting the “review of the enrollment management plan for recruitment, retention, marketing, and advertising, particularly with respect to the enrollment of underrepresented students, consistent with the institution’s priorities and values.”

Penn State’s Response

Penn State is committed to addressing the issues raised in this recommendation. Retention and graduation of underrepresented student populations require an intentional enrollment strategy. Penn State believes that after students have matriculated, support services for students and engagement in co-curricular programs contribute significantly to retention and graduation. The University’s strategy is to engage its students throughout their educational experiences, pre-matriculations through post-graduation. In all approaches, we are focusing programs on ensuring that students make academic progress so they can graduate in four years. We are working to change the financial equation for students, because the number one way to drive down the cost of an education is to reduce time to degree.

The University’s strategic plan, approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2016, emphasizes these institutional values. Diversity at Penn State is one of the foundational components of “Our Commitment to Impact: Penn State’s Strategic Plan for 2016 to 2020.” Cross-University teams are working on initiatives in five thematic areas (Transforming Education, Enhancing Health, Stewarding our Planet’s Resources, Advancing the Arts and Humanities, and Driving Digital Innovation) and three supporting areas (Organizational Processes, Infrastructure and Support, and Constitutional Outreach and Engagement). Each team has at least one member advocating for the plan’s foundational value of Fostering and Embracing a Diverse World. The University’s development plan for 2016-2021 includes an “Open Doors” component with the vision to “empower capable, hard-working students – regardless of their heritage, individual characteristics, or financial well-being – for lifetimes of success with degrees that are both affordable and world-class.”

Penn State’s unit-level strategic plans were developed before the University-wide strategic plan. The 2014-2019 strategic plan for Penn State’s Office of Undergraduate Education identifies access and affordability as one of its key priorities. Objectives supporting this priority include:

- increasing avenues of access;
- targeting recruitment efforts to enroll a diverse and inclusive population;
- addressing financial barriers for students and families; and
- improving retention of low-income and minority students.

Units within the Office of Undergraduate Education, including the Undergraduate Admissions Office, Office of Student Aid, Division of Undergraduate Studies, Office for Student Orientation and Transition Programs, Summer Sessions Office, Penn State Learning Resource Center and Morgan Academic Center, and the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence have undertaken numerous initiatives to achieve the strategic plan’s objectives. Programming initiatives for underrepresented groups include:

- outreach to prospective students while they are still in high school, as well as forming partnerships with some middle schools;
• providing funding to support students’ education after they matriculate to Penn State;
• assisting in their transition to campus, whether from high school, from one Penn State campus to another, or to Penn State from another institution; and
• supporting them as they progress toward graduation.

Programs are also provided to assist faculty in addressing diversity in the classroom. These programming initiatives support a range of underrepresented student populations, including those who are of the first generation in their family to attend college, those from families with low incomes, Hispanic/Latino/a and Black/African American students, and students of color from mixed racial/ethnic heritage.

Here we provide a representative sampling of relevant programs and services designed to address these issues, many of which were started or have been enhanced since the drafting of the self-study report in 2014-15. Appendix 3 provides more detailed, but not exhaustive, program information.

**Pre-college programs**

Preparing prospective students to attend college should begin as early as possible. This preparation includes increasing student awareness of the opportunities that a college education offers, assisting and enabling academic preparedness for college-level work, and addressing questions about finances and affordability. Penn State addresses all of these issues and is reaching out to prospective students in both the densely populated urban areas of the state, including Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, and the more isolated rural areas of Pennsylvania.

- The Raise.me micro-scholarship program, introduced at Penn State in 2014, enables high school students to earn credit, beginning in the ninth grade, toward a scholarship to be applied upon their admission. Students can earn a renewable award of up to $4,000 for each of their four years at the University by taking advanced courses in high school, earning A’s, participating in community service or leadership roles, or engaging in other activities that will advance their readiness for college. The program is offered at 24 urban and rural high schools.

- In Philadelphia, Penn State supports the public schools’ “Engineering and Math Challenge Philadelphia.” Penn State also convenes the “Philadelphia Honors Convocation” to recognize the top four underrepresented rising seniors from each Philadelphia public high school.

- In Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Harrisburg, Penn State’s Schreyer Honors College sponsors essay writing workshops to better prepare students for the college application process.

- Dual enrollment (completing college courses for credit while still enrolled in high school) is available across the state at all Penn State undergraduate campuses. For example, Penn State Lehigh Valley offers a dual enrollment program to students at four high schools (three Title 1 schools and one charter school) in the Allentown area. Students receive a 50 percent tuition reduction.

- In 2015, Penn State became a founding member of the Coalition for Access, Affordability, and Success. The Coalition and its shared college application focus on early engagement supports for under-resourced students during their college preparation and application processes.
**Student Funding**

The affordability of a college education is a national issue. Penn State has enhanced its efforts through philanthropy and most significantly with the Provost Scholarships and Bunton-Waller funding. During “For the Future: The Campaign for Penn State Students,” Penn State raised $519 million for undergraduate scholarships, which resulted in 91,000 privately funded scholarships for 45,000 students across Penn State. The University has also partnered with several foundations that provide college scholarships to students from low-income and underrepresented populations to ensure that students receiving that funding receive the support needed while at Penn State to enable success.

- Penn State’s Provost Scholarships were offered to an inaugural cohort in 2013. Criteria were adjusted for the 2014 and 2015 cohorts, to improve the diversity of the recipient population and serve more students with high financial need.

- As noted later in this report, Penn State also provides transition and ongoing support to students receiving the following scholarships.
  - The Maguire Foundation provides annual scholarships to up to 20 student scholars from low-income families in the Philadelphia area who are attending Penn State.
  - The Brook J. Lenfest Trustee Scholarship Program provides financial and academic support to underrepresented students with high financial need from schools in the Philadelphia area who are attending Penn State.
  - Bunton-Waller funds are awarded by individual colleges at Penn State to develop a student body that more closely reflects the cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity in Pennsylvania and the nation.

**Student Transition**

Going to college, or transferring from a familiar institution or campus to another, can be a significant and disruptive change. Penn State recognizes the impact such transitions can have on future success. The University has designed and is regularly reviewing and enhancing transition programs to address this issue and has tailored programs to specific student populations. Following are two examples:

- Pathway to Success: Summer Start Program (PaSSS), started in summer 2015, serves at-risk first-year students – those from low-income or first-generation families, underrepresented racial and ethnic minorities, and those students underprepared in math. It is an intensive summer program designed to increase the likelihood of graduating on time. It offers students the opportunity to take summer classes before they begin their first full year and their second year. The students receive scholarships to help cover tuition, and they are guaranteed a job on campus or in the community so they can earn extra money while taking classes. In addition, they are involved in a peer mentoring program.

- Penn State’s Office for Student Orientation and Transition Programs (SOTP) grew out of goals included in Penn State’s 2009-10 to 2013-14 strategic plan to enhance student success. The Office opened in late 2012 and offered Penn State’s first cycle of two-day orientation programs through the summer of 2013. SOTP organizes numerous transition events and activities to support students who are starting at Penn State, transferring to Penn State from another college or university, or moving among Penn State’s campuses. Specific experiences
are designed for students participating in the Millennium Scholars and the Lenfest and Maguire Scholarship Programs. The Office also works with a Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Group to ensure that all programs are welcoming, inclusive, and supportive of underrepresented students and their families.

**Support While at Penn State**

Once they arrive at Penn State, students who are not in the majority population, whether viewed from a geographic, economic, racial and ethnic, or other perspective, may be distracted from focusing on their studies by the challenges of dealing with an unfamiliar culture. Penn State addresses this need through numerous support groups, on the University level, through building cohorts for particular academic groups, and within a college. Following are a few noteworthy examples:

- **Penn State’s Multicultural Resource Center** sponsors activities to support multicultural students. The Center also provides advising and counseling services. In 2015-16, the Center had 3,971 interactions with 1,049 students. Students interacting were 40 percent Black/African American and 21 percent Hispanic/Latino/a. Discussion topics included academics, financial issues, adjusting to college life, and careers. Several support groups for underrepresented student populations were started or expanded in 2015.

- **Penn State’s Millennium Scholars Program** aims to increase the diversity of leadership in STEM fields, specifically through increasing the number of students who go on to STEM-related graduate study and academic careers. The GPA for the first cohort, started in summer 2013 and expected to graduate from Penn State in spring 2017, was 3.62 at the end of the spring 2016 semester. In summer 2016, 29 students started in the six-week summer bridge program. Of the 29, 60 percent are African American, 23 percent are Hispanic/Latino/a, and 69 percent are women. Growth to 40 new entering students is planned for fall 2017.

- **The College of Engineering** offers bridge programs to prepare students for entry to the major across four campuses. This includes a five-year program started in 2016 and funded by a National Science Foundation grant that provides opportunities for research with faculty mentors. In each case, the College ensures that students from underrepresented populations have the opportunity to participate. In addition, the Engineering Diversity Roundtable, in existence for three years and comprised of the leadership of student engineering organizations, meets regularly, and works with the dean on related initiatives.

- **Approximately 25 percent of the undergraduate students enrolled in the Eberly College of Science**, many from underrepresented populations, attend a Penn State Commonwealth Campus for their first two years. The College instituted the Science Dean’s Scholarship (SDS) program in 2013, with a grant from the National Science Foundation, to increase retention of the math and science students changing campus to University Park. The program’s combination of scholarships, academic programming, and peer mentoring has increased GPAs and retention within the Eberly College of Science for students participating in the SDS program.

- In fall 2016, Penn State launched “All In,” an initiative to support inclusivity University-wide and developed at the request of students. This initiative is focused on contributing to the creation of a University climate that is safe and welcoming for everyone, regardless of background, and providing an atmosphere and forums for discussion of diversity. The initiative also includes the creation of the human resources position of senior director of talent and inclusion, a calendar to illustrate all events throughout the year focused on inclusion, and a capstone that will be a permanent tribute to represent the University community’s commitment to “All In.”
Results of Recent Initiatives

Penn State has implemented and enhanced numerous initiatives to increase recruitment and retention of underrepresented populations, including but not limited to African American students since the time of the University’s self-study in 2014-15. While it is too soon to see the full extent to which these efforts are affecting graduation rates, the first-year retention rates of African American students in the 2015 entering cohort are noticeably higher than the rates of their peers in the 2011 entering cohort. Also, for the 2015 cohort, first-year retention for African American students is consistent with that for the total first-year population at Penn State as well as with first-year African American students and the total first-year population at peer institutions.

Penn State’s current performance in retention of students from underrepresented populations is consistent with five of its peers, as can be found in a review of Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data.
Overview of first-year retention of full-time, degree-seeking students at Penn State University Park compared to public Big Ten Academic Alliance schools (N=5) that share this information publicly

Note: Retention by race/ethnicity only available for Ohio State, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, and Wisconsin; data available on their public websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Penn State University Park - All</th>
<th>Penn State University Park - Black/African American</th>
<th>Peer - All</th>
<th>Peer - Black/African American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Going Forward – New Initiatives**

- “Fostering and Embracing a Diverse World” is one of the “foundational elements” in Penn State’s strategic plan for 2016-2020. This foundation is woven throughout the plan’s five thematic priorities and three supporting elements. Additionally, Penn State’s Office of Educational Equity has developed four goals related to climate, diversity of both student and staff populations, and curriculum:
  - Create a welcoming and inclusive campus climate,
  - Advance and build a diverse student body,
  - Advance and build a diverse workforce,
  - and develop a curriculum that fosters United States and international cultural competencies

- Penn State introduced a new online advising system, Starfish, in fall 2016. In addition to the academic advisers who now have expanded access to data for the students they advise, advisers in Penn State’s Multicultural Resource Center are better able to track the underrepresented students they are advising. The new platform also enables course instructors to provide regular progress reports to students enrolled in their classes, including feedback on their accomplishments and citing areas for potential improvement.

- In July 2016, the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education and the Vice Provost for Educational Equity established a new standing committee, the Administrative Council on University Funded Scholarships. The committee’s purpose is to support and enhance the recruitment and retention of underrepresented student populations.

- In fall 2016, Penn State began monitoring students with unmet financial need who may be at risk. The goal of this effort, called the “Complete Penn State Micro-grant Program,” is to increase degree completion rates, particularly for undergraduate students who are first generation, adult learners, or from underrepresented groups. While these students may begin their education at Penn State, some have difficulty completing a degree in their final semesters due to financial hardship. The Complete Penn State Micro-grant Program is designed to help at-financial-risk students in their final semesters to complete their degrees.

As Penn State moves forward in these areas, we anticipate a systematic approach to further progress. This will include continuing and expanded assessment, benchmarking, and evidence-informed decision making. We will leverage the knowledge and experience of experts to identify and implement recruitment and retention best practices. We will build staff capacity for recruitment and retention through professional development. We expect this comprehensive approach will continue to expand and enhance the enrollment, educational experience, and graduation of a diverse student population.
Recommendation #4: Assessment of Student Learning & General Education Assessment

MSCHE’s Request

In its letter of June 26, 2015, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education asked that Penn State’s monitoring report provide information on “further implementation of the assessment of general education outcomes within the institution’s overall plan for assessing student learning, and evidence that such assessment results are utilized for curricular improvement (Standards 12 and 14).”

Penn State’s Response

Learning Outcomes Assessment

In response to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education Team Report (March 2015), University leadership embarked on substantial changes to institutional organization and processes that support student learning assessment. To ensure central University oversight, the Office of Planning and Assessment (OPA), led by the Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment, was created. The Office’s principal purpose is to oversee and coordinate institutional and student data reporting and analysis. OPA consists of two new departments, the Department of Planning and Institutional Research (PIR) and the Department of Learning Outcomes Assessment (LOA). The LOA is charged with the development and implementation of a University-wide strategy for learning outcomes assessment at all levels and across all University campuses.

In September 2016, the Executive Vice President and Provost sent a letter to the University community (Appendix 4.A.) articulating the requirement that student learning be assessed at all levels of the University, including the following:

- undergraduate degree assessment (both baccalaureate and associate),
- graduate degree assessment (master’s and doctorate),
- undergraduate and graduate certificate assessment, and
- general education assessment.

The new model is designed to ensure efficient and effective processes to support learning outcomes assessment by University units. The process integrates LOA coaching and consulting, streamlined assessment planning and reporting templates, and information flow that emphasizes asking key student learning questions, investigating them with strong assessment data collection and analysis, and closing the loop through implementation of curricular changes that address findings (Figure 1).
The University Committee for Assessment of Learning

The Associate Vice Provost for Learning Outcomes Assessment chairs the new University Committee for Assessment of Learning (UCAL). Formed in September 2016, the committee is charged by the Provost with overseeing the University’s student learning assessment processes, commissioning education research studies related to improving student learning, and advising University leadership on student learning issues. During its first meetings in fall 2016, the committee approved policies and procedures to ensure high-quality, effective student learning and assessment processes. In February 2017, the committee initiated planning for a University-wide assessment management system to organize student learning assessment data for use by academic units. UCAL has made significant progress toward implementing the assessment process for graduate and undergraduate programs.

In 2016, UCAL assumed oversight of the undergraduate degree assessment process from the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education (ACUE) assessment committee. The new assessment process for undergraduate programs streamlined the planning and reporting process by implementing new assessment plan and report templates. It also strengthened connections between annual degree assessment reporting and investigation of student learning concerns through the inclusion of new assessment planning elements, such as curriculum maps and encouraging use of multiple assessment data sources. As of January 2017, degree assessment plans using the revised plan template had been submitted for more than 80 percent of all undergraduate degree programs. LOA staff are reviewing the plans and will provide feedback as part of spring 2017 workshops. Degree assessment reports are also required and must be submitted by summer 2017. A sample undergraduate degree assessment plan is presented in Appendix 4.C.

For the first time, in 2016, the University developed a program assessment process for all graduate degrees. As of January 2017, degree assessment plans using the UCAL guidelines and template were completed for 249 of 298 graduate degrees (84 percent). LOA staff are reviewing plans and will provide feedback as part of the spring 2017 workshop and 1:1 consultation. Assessment reports for the graduate...
degree programs are also required and must be submitted by summer 2017. A sample graduate degree assessment plan is presented in Appendix 4.B.

General Education Assessment

In 2013, the University Faculty Senate and the Provost initiated a process to review and revise the University’s General Education curriculum and assessment (Appendix 4.D.). General Education Task Force work was completed in April 2015, and recommendations were submitted to the Faculty Senate (Appendix 4.E.). After Faculty Senate approval of the recommendations, the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Senate initiated preliminary work to develop a process to assess General Education. The University Faculty Senate approved the proposal for General Education assessment in March 2016 (Appendix 4.H.).

In brief, the revised general education curriculum requires baccalaureate degree students complete 45 credits of courses from a distribution of courses in Writing (GWS), Quantification (GQ), Arts (GA), Humanities (GH), Health and Wellness (GHW), and Natural Sciences (GN). Associate degree students complete a similar set of course distributions for a total of 18 credits. Under the new curriculum each of the current general education courses must be “recertified” by the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee and show that it addresses the new general education learning objectives (outlined in Appendix 4.E.). The new learning objectives align with the eight outcomes specified by MSCHE Standard 12.

To oversee ongoing administration of the general education assessment process, the University Faculty Senate, in collaboration with the Office of the Provost, appointed a Joint Committee on General Education Assessment (Appendix 4.F.). A member of the Faculty Senate and the Associate Vice Provost for Learning Outcomes Assessment co-chair the committee. The Department of Learning Outcomes Assessment and the new Office of General Education provide operational support for the new assessment process. As of March 2017, assessment of University General Education has made significant progress.

General Education Outcomes Assessment: Initial Findings

The Joint Committee on General Education Assessment’s initial work focused on investigating course enrollment patterns and performance, as well as the degree alignment of current General Education courses with the seven General Education Key Learning Objectives approved by the Faculty Senate (Appendix 4.E.).

The committee prepared a course enrollment dataset of General Education courses completed by all undergraduates during academic year 2014-2015 to investigate course enrollment patterns by: (a) foundation and knowledge domain, (b) student grades by course, (c) student major(s) at time of taking course, (d) student academic term, and (e) campus where course was completed. The data collection and analyses were performed in fall 2015, spring 2016, and fall 2016. The initial reviews led to the development of the new General Education Assessment process.

Fall 2015

The committee’s review of the enrollment dataset found that a majority of students complete only a relatively small subset of all available General Education courses in each Foundation or Knowledge Domain. The committee found that 70 percent of all undergraduates enrolled in:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation or Knowledge Domain</th>
<th>70% of all AY14-15 students completed # courses in this Domain:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GQ</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHW</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student performance concerns were primarily an issue for the Quantification (GQ) courses. Overall, 15 percent of all students received a grade below C, which is below the new GQ minimum C grade requirement. The committee recommended that the GQ Math and Statistics faculty meet to discuss ways to use pedagogy and assignments to strengthen student performance. It was also recommended that GQ faculty be encouraged to participate in pedagogy and assessment workshops offered by the University.

Spring 2016

In spring 2016, the committee began work needed to prepare faculty to recertify their courses according to the revised General Education Key Learning Objectives. The committee developed and piloted a course form, called a memo, to gather preliminary information on:

- alignment between current General Education courses with the revised General Education Key Learning Objectives (e.g. effective communication, critical and analytical thinking),
- what pedagogies are used to support student development,
- and what assessment methods are used to measure achievement of course objectives.

A pilot utilizing the course memos gathered information from a sample of 60 courses across all domains. Courses were chosen from those offered on two campuses, University Park and Worthington Scranton.

The review of the 60 course memos found that, when unrestrained in the number of Key Learning Objectives they should indicate, many faculty members checked nearly all as being addressed in their courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Courses</th>
<th># of Courses with Effective Communication</th>
<th># of Courses with Key Literacies</th>
<th># of Courses with Critical and Analytical Thinking</th>
<th># of Courses with Integrative Thinking</th>
<th># of Courses with Creative Thinking</th>
<th># of Courses with Global Learning</th>
<th># of Courses with Social Responsibility and Ethical Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Courses</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of this review, the committee recommended that General Education course guidelines clarify the importance of emphasizing a smaller number of Key Learning Objectives through intensive course activities and assessments.
**Fall 2016**

In fall 2016, the committee developed a second pilot course memo to further support faculty preparation for course recertification (Appendix 4.G.). The goal was to gather initial course assessments that align with the revised General Education Learning Objectives. The pilot memo asked faculty to:

- align course learning objectives with General Education Key Learning Objectives (choose at least 2 and no more than 4);
- align course learning objectives with Foundation or Knowledge Domain Learning Objectives (choose at least 3);
- select and provide direct assessment evidence as to how the course assesses at least one Key Learning Objective and one Foundation or Knowledge Domain Learning Objective;
- and describe at least two course pedagogies and activities used to develop student abilities toward achievement of the General Education Learning Objectives described above.

To show how faculty are “closing the loop” by using assessment evidence to improve student performance, faculty were also asked to share performance expectations for each assessment described, whether students met performance expectations, and what actions were planned to improve the course.

An analysis of fall 2016 course memos further highlighted the wide range of innovative course activities, including pedagogies and assignments used by faculty to develop student abilities. The committee reiterated the importance of an online information repository for faculty to gain ideas for course design and assessment. Analysis of the course memos also revealed that many faculty are already using course improvement practices to “close the loop.” The tables reveal that faculty are setting performance expectations for each learning assessment, comparing assessment findings with expectations, and making course changes as a result.

Finally, the committee also observed that some faculty members were unclear about how to develop strong, measurable course learning objectives, assessments or performance expectations. The committee recommended offering faculty development workshops to help faculty understand and utilize knowledge of course design and assessment methods. These initial findings led to the development of the current general education assessment and evaluation process. A sample of the data gathered through this process can be found in Appendix 4.I.

**General Education Assessment Process: Phase I and II**

In full recognition of the General Education Task Force Implementation Report recommendations and findings from the initial General Education course memos, the Joint Committee on General Education Assessment developed an overall assessment and evaluation process. The primary goal of the process is to gather General Education course assessments developed by faculty and use these assessments as the primary basis for determining achievement of General Education Learning Objectives as well as Foundation and Knowledge Domain Learning Objectives. The gathered assessments will be reviewed as a curriculum. It is not expected that any single General Education course should achieve all General Education Learning Objectives. The complete General Education Assessment and Evaluation Process can be found in Appendix 4.J.

The assessment and evaluation of General Education cannot be fully implemented until most general education courses have undergone recertification by the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee.
Therefore, implementation of the General Education Assessment and Evaluation Process will take place in two phases.

**Phase 1 (AY 16-17) - Pre-Recertification Assessment and Evaluation**

The Joint Committee on General Education Assessment will focus on preparation of current General Education courses for the Faculty Senate’s course recertification process. The committee will prepare a course enrollment dataset to investigate course enrollment and performance patterns by domain, major, and campus. The committee will also gather sample course data to inform the degree to which current General Education courses align with the revised General Education learning objectives, how well current pedagogy and course activities support student development toward achievement of the General Education Learning Objectives, and how well assessments designed by faculty align with the General Education Learning Objectives. This information will be used by faculty to develop course proposals for recertification, as well as by the Senate Curricular Affairs subcommittee in course proposal review. The committee is also planning a survey designed to capture student self-assessment regarding the General Education Learning Objectives and their impressions of the role of the General Education curriculum in their undergraduate education.

Using current course assessment practices and nationally recognized rubrics such as the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics as a guide, the committee will draft University guidelines and rubrics to evaluate alignment of General Education course assessments with General Education Learning Objectives. The committee will pilot test the guidelines and rubrics through the evaluation of representative course assessments gathered from General Education courses during Phase 1.

Phase 1 will also include assessment and evaluation activities related to the new Integrative Studies curriculum requirement. The draft General Education rubrics will be piloted in review of representative Integrative Studies course assessments.

**Phase 2 (Starting AY 17-18) - Post-Recertification Assessment and Evaluation**

Once the Faculty Senate’s course recertification process is well under way, the assessment committee will begin Phase 2 assessment and evaluation activities. One step in this phase includes completing a comprehensive curriculum mapping dataset that aligns recertified courses with the revised General Education Learning Objectives. Along with information on course enrollment patterns, this information will be used to advise the General Education Office and Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee regarding the degree of exposure students within and across majors and campuses experience with respect to each of the General Education Learning Objectives.

In this phase, the committee also will begin formal implementation of General Education assessment and evaluation. Validated General Education rubrics will be used to evaluate representative student work gathered from a sample of General Education courses in a small sample of courses across all Foundation and Knowledge Domains according to the five-year timetable below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Foundation or Knowledge Domain Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Key Learning Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018, Spring term only</td>
<td>GWS</td>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>GA and GH</td>
<td>Creative Thinking, Critical and Analytical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>GWS and GN</td>
<td>Integrative Thinking, Global Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>GS and GQ</td>
<td>Key Literacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>Integrative Studies</td>
<td>Social Responsibility and Ethical Reasoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University has carefully considered the membership of the UCAL and Joint Committee on General Education Assessment to ensure sufficient overlap. Both committees are chaired or co-chaired by the Associate Vice Provost for Learning Outcomes Assessment to reinforce the connection of the General Education Assessment to the larger University assessment efforts described earlier in this section.
Recommendation #5: Certificate Program Assessment

MSCHE’s Request

In its letter of June 26, 2015, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education asked that Penn State’s monitoring report provide information on “further evidence of articulated student knowledge, skills, and competency levels within existing certificate programs (Standard 13).”

Penn State’s Response

In fall 2015, the Provost charged the Office of Planning and Assessment to work with the leadership in Undergraduate Education, the Graduate School, Commonwealth Campuses, and the University Faculty Senate to develop a certificate assessment process for the University. The new process, reviewed and approved during summer 2016 by the Provost, ensures that all certificates offered by the University are reviewed by the appropriate individuals and groups and have:

- learning objectives,
- direct and indirect assessment measures of objectives, and
- a formal process for systematic review of assessment evidence in order to make curriculum changes as warranted.

The new process led to a standard procedure that all faculty will use to assess and report on any certificate. All existing certificate programs are required to develop and file a certificate assessment plan with the Office of the Provost as of March 31, 2017. As of this report, 84% of undergraduate certificates and 100% of graduate certificates have submitted assessment plans. Faculty will complete certificate assessment reports and submit them to the Office of the Provost by summer 2017.

Finally, all certificates must be reviewed and reapproved every five years by submitting a new application and assessment plan to the appropriate authorizing unit.

New Certificate Definition, Review and Approval Process

In spring 2016, the University Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee reviewed certificate definitions, a new certificate application, and a certificate review process. In fall 2016, the Committee recommended and the Faculty Senate approved the following certificate definition:

Certificate Definition:
Undergraduate certificates can reflect emerging academic areas, necessary professional development requirements, or groups of courses that do not constitute a degree program. A certificate is intended to foster incremental or targeted development in an area of specialty or competency within a discipline or field of study. Certificates are earned either in conjunction with a major or independently of associate or baccalaureate degrees, so they may be suitable for both degree candidates and non-degree candidates (Senate Policy 59-20).

To limit redundant work by faculty in the development of certificate assessment plans, and to ensure that all new certificates have a certificate assessment plan in place, all University units authorized to review and approve certificates use a common certificate assessment plan template and incorporate it into their review and approval processes.
Undergraduate Certificates

Prior to fall 2016, undergraduate certificates were approved by each college and campus. Faculty posted the creation of the new certificate through the online University “eCert” system. This information was entered directly into the Registrar Bulletin system to publish certificate information to students. Effective in fall 2017, the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education (ACUE) and the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee will collaborate to implement a new certificate application and renewal process that incorporates the Faculty Senate’s curriculum review and consultation procedures and the University’s certificate assessment plan template. Faculty must renew each certificate every five years.

Graduate Certificates

In fall 2016, the Graduate School improved its certificate application and renewal process and announced the changes to all University Park colleges and other campuses where graduate certificates are offered. This new process is similar to that used for undergraduate certificates and requires submission of the University certificate assessment plan. The online application system is the same “eCert” system. Certificates must be renewed every five years.

Certificate Assessment Process: Assessment Plan Submission and Review Procedures

The guidelines, templates, and examples for the new certificate assessment process were released in September 2016. The LOA staff worked with leadership in Undergraduate Education, the Commonwealth Campuses and the Graduate School to identify all active certificates. The Learning Outcomes Assessment (LOA) staff then worked with each college and campus leadership team to identify faculty who would complete the certificate assessment plans by March 2017. The LOA staff offered support to faculty in completion of the plans through weekly face-to-face workshops, online ZOOM workshops, and one-on-one consultations. An example of a completed certificate assessment plan can be found in Appendix 5.


To ensure all currently offered certificates complete at least one assessment cycle, including planning and reporting during the 2016-17 academic year, the University has developed a certificate assessment report template. Faculty are required to submit a report to the Office of the Provost by summer 2017, if there are graduates of the certificate program during the current academic year.

The template includes the following:

- Information on certificate completions including campus(es) where completed
- Certificate learning objective assessment
- Assessment measure description
- Performance criterion for assessment measure
- Assessment findings
- Actions to be taken if assessment findings did not meet performance criterion
- Supporting assessment documents
Assessment plan for the next certificate assessment cycle

After reports are submitted, faculty will receive written feedback to help strengthen their certificate assessments. Going forward, this process will support the continuous improvement of Penn State’s certificate programs.

Certificate Assessment Cycle and Continuous Improvement

Each certificate is assigned one faculty contact who is responsible for developing the certificate assessment plan and report. Because certificates may be completed on any Penn State campus, faculty contacts for each one have been asked to track certificate completion data annually by campus. The University Registrar’s Office is developing a certificate completion report for faculty members’ use.
Conclusion

As noted in each section for which MSCHE requested additional information in the monitoring report, Penn State has made significant progress. Procedures are in place to continue regular assessment of the performance of the Board of Trustees, the President, Senior Officers, and leaders of non-academic units. Recruitment and retention efforts of underrepresented student populations have increased. This improvement is expected to have a ripple effect on both graduation rates and future increased enrollment of these student populations. A University-wide effort for assessment of all programs offered by Penn State is becoming institutionalized and will continue to enhance our educational effectiveness.

Also, as noted for each of the standards addressed, there are plans for learning from the assessment of current initiatives, with the intent to continue exploring new approaches and expanding our efforts in each of these areas.
Appendices
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2.A. Penn State Administrator/Executive Performance Review Short Form
2.B. Penn State Administrator/Executive Performance Review Long Form
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Section 3: Recommendation #3 – Standard 8 – Student Admission and Retention
This section provides more detailed information about the various recruiting and retention initiatives mentioned in the narrative response.
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4.A. Provost letter from September 2016 regarding establishment of Department of Learning Outcomes Assessment
4.B. Graduate Degree Assessment Plan
4.C. Undergraduate Degree Assessment Plan
4.D. Executive Summary of the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force on the Revision to General Education Curriculum approved by the Senate Council, April 14, 2015, to be placed on the April 28, 2015, Faculty Senate agenda
4.E. Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs Implementation of Updated General Education Learning Objectives dated March 15, 2016
4.F. Senate Committee on Committees and Rules Establishment of the Standing Joint Committee for General Education Assessment dated January 24, 2017
4.G. General Education Assessment Course Memo AY 2016-2017
4.H. Revised Penn State University General Education Learning Objectives
4.I. Summary Tables of Gen Ed GQ and GH - Sample
4.J. General Education Assessment and Evaluation Plan

Section 5: Recommendation #5 – Standard 13 – Related Educational Activities – Certificate Program Assessment
5. Undergraduate and Graduate Certificates Assessment Plan – Sample
1.A. 2017 Board of Trustees Assessment Survey

Please rate the effectiveness of the Board of Trustees
- Effectiveness of achieving its overall goals
- Effectiveness of achieving fiduciary (oversight) obligations
- Effectiveness of achieving strategic (foresight) obligations
- Effectiveness of achieving generative (insight) obligations

Please rate the effectiveness of the Board's discussions and deliberations
- Thoroughness of discussions and deliberations
- Ability to be candid at meetings
- Opportunities to weigh-in regarding my point of view
- Effectiveness of the Board in leveraging the skills I bring to the table

Please rate the effectiveness of Board Committees
- Effectiveness of current Committee structure
- Effectiveness of Committee meetings

Please rate the following quantitative factors regarding the Board of Trustees values
- Trust and respect amongst Board members
- Belief in fellow Trustees to "do the right thing"
- Your pride in serving on the Board
- Communications amongst and between Trustees

Open-Ended Inquiries:
- What aspects of the Board of Trustees do you find to be the most effective?
- What aspects of the Board of Trustees do you find to be the least effective?
- What would you suggest to improve the Board of Trustees effectiveness?
- What changes or practices would you recommend to improve the Board culture?
- What should be included in the agenda for the 2017 Board retreat?
- What recommendations from last year's Board retreat are still relevant for this year's Board retreat?

Please enter your full name below. Your evaluation will remain anonymous and your commentary will not be attributed to you. This field is required.

Name:

Please select the group that best represents your affiliation with the University:

( ) Board of Trustees Member
( ) President's Council Member
( ) Dean
( ) Chancellor
( ) Chairs and/or Student Government Presidents
I. Advancement of Penn State-specific goals for 2015-2016

To the extent you have feedback specific to a goal, enter your comments in the table below.

You may wish to print out or view Dr. Barron's full self-evaluation (PDF) as you fill out this evaluation (it will open in a new tab/window).

Evaluators need not provide commentary for every goal. Ratings are required for each goal.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator Comments</th>
<th>Dr. Barron successfully advanced the following goal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree*</td>
<td>Agree*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Successfully launch access and affordability initiative

Seek opportunities for increased savings and increased revenue

Successfully launch the economic development, job creation and student career success initiative

Address major issues of campus and public concern for higher education

Prepare to launch the next capital campaign for Penn State

Create a framework for advancing diversity and inclusion

Create a framework for advancing student engagement and engaged scholarship

Create a framework to advance innovations in teaching and learning

Establish a strong, positive relationship with the Wolf administration and the Pennsylvania legislature

Address any limitations/recommendations related to Middle States accreditation

Ensure that the University’s strategic enterprise creates a path for continued and enhanced excellence
II. Alignment with Penn State Leadership Categories

To the extent you have feedback specific to a leadership category, enter your comments in the table below.

You may wish to print out or view the definitions for each Leadership Category as you fill out this evaluation (it will open in a new tab/window).

You may wish to print out or view Dr. Barron's full self-evaluation (PDF) as you fill out this evaluation (it will open in a new tab/window).

Evaluators need not provide commentary for every goal. Ratings are required for each category.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Category</th>
<th>Evaluator Comments</th>
<th>Dr. Barron successfully models behaviors in the following leadership categories:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Institutional Mission and Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Relations/University Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Centeredness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Development of Penn State-specific goals for 2016-2017

Dr. Barron will provide his goals for 2016-2017 to the Board of Trustees prior to the July meeting. If you have any recommendations or specific thoughts regarding next year's goals for the President's consideration, please comment below.

IV. Additional evaluator comments

Please comment on any other aspect of Dr. Barron's 2015-2016 performance.

V. Overall performance rating for 2015-2016

Based on the details of your evaluation, please select Dr. Barron's overall performance rating for 2015-2016.

This rating is required.

() Exceptional Contributor: Demonstrates and applies exceptional level of knowledge and skills; consistently excels; significant achievement relative to goals

() Successful Contributor: Consistently proficient in individual evaluation components; may be strong in several areas; meets goals and job requirements; consistently demonstrates competencies & behaviors

() Needs Improvement: Demonstrates a lack of knowledge and/or skills in one or more areas; does not perform consistently; does not achieve goals

Thank You!
# 1.C1. Executive Assessment – Employee Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Please rate the executive’s performance in each leadership category using the following: 3=Exceptional; 2=Successful; 1=Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Support for Institutional Mission and Goals
- Drives initiatives in support of University’s Strategic Plan
- Demonstrates commitment to the Capital Campaign
- Fosters the Penn State Values through action and ideas (Integrity, Respect, Responsibility, Discovery, Excellence, and Community)
- Demonstrates responsible stewardship of University resources

## Strategy and Planning
- Develops a high-quality strategic vision for the unit while anticipating emerging opportunities and trends
- Demonstrates ability to achieve buy-in for the vision
- Effectively formulates strategies, tactics, and action plans to achieve results
- Effectively drives and manages change

## Talent Management
- Coaches and mentors staff
- Empowers staff to achieve desired results
- Develops staff for future opportunities
- Holds staff accountable
- Ensure areas of oversight; maintains compliance obligations (lead by example)

## Communication
- Is an effective communicator
- Keeps key stakeholders informed
- Listens to what is said and is sensitive to the reactions of others
- Demonstrates effective negotiation and persuasion skills

## Innovation
- Seeks out and implements continuous improvement
- Conceives creative solutions
- Takes risks and challenges the status quo

## Board Relations/University Governance
- Provides appropriate leadership to the Board
- Effectively works with Board members
- Keeps Board members appropriately informed

## Interaction
- Builds and maintains effective networks
- Collaborates across units and departments
- Has the ability to influence others

## Student-Centeredness
- Devotes resources to student-centered facilities and programs
- Fosters engaged scholarship opportunities for students

## Culture
- Creates an atmosphere that enables faculty and staff to do their best work
- Creates an environment free from fear of retaliation, discrimination, and harassment

**COMMENTS:**
1.C2. Executive Self-assessment

NAME:______________________________________ POSITION:____________________________________
DATE:_______________________________________

Please list and describe your accomplishments/successes during the past year as they relate to the areas below and the current year’s goals and objectives. Consider any areas within your institutional role or goals that you had difficulty achieving, as well as major initiatives and successes.

1. Support for Institutional Mission and Goals
   - Drives initiatives in support of University’s Strategic Plan
   - Demonstrates commitment to the Capital Campaign
   - Fosters the Penn State Values through action and ideas (Integrity, Respect, Responsibility, Discovery, Excellence, and Community)
   - Demonstrates responsible stewardship of University resources

2. Strategy and Planning
   - Develops a high-quality strategic vision for the unit while anticipating emerging opportunities and trends
   - Demonstrates ability to achieve buy-in for the vision
   - Effectively formulates strategies, tactics, and action plans to achieve results
   - Effectively drives and manages change

3. Talent Management
   - Coaches and mentors staff
   - Empowers staff to achieve desired results
   - Develops staff for future opportunities
   - Holds staff accountable
   - Ensure areas of oversight; maintains compliance obligations (lead by example)

4. Communication
   - Is an effective communicator
   - Keeps key stakeholders informed
   - Listens to what is said and is sensitive to the reactions of others
   - Demonstrates effective negotiation and persuasion skills

5. Innovation
   - Seeks out and implements continuous improvement
   - Conceives creative solutions
   - Takes risks and challenges the status quo

6. Board Relations/University Governance
   - Provides appropriate leadership to the Board
   - Effectively works with Board members
   - Keeps Board members appropriately informed

7. Interaction
   - Builds and maintains effective networks
   - Collaborates across units and departments
   - Has the ability to influence others

8. Student-Centeredness
   - Devotes resources to student-centered facilities and programs
• Fosters engaged scholarship opportunities for students

9. Culture
• Creates an atmosphere that enables faculty and staff to do their best work
• Creates an environment free from fear of retaliation, discrimination, and harassment

10. List your strategic goals (5-7) for the coming year.
2.A. Penn State Administrator/Executive Performance Review Short Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit/Department/College</th>
<th>Period of Evaluation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATING DEFINITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful (S)</td>
<td>Performance meets most or all goals and expectations. Produces expected results that meet the needs and expectations of the role and for the unit. Consistently demonstrates competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional (E)</td>
<td>Demonstrates and applies exceptional level of knowledge and skills; consistently excels; significant achievement relative to goals. Notable, visible and impactful contributions are widely recognized throughout the University. Produces high-impact results beyond role and demonstrates behaviors beyond the competency expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement (NI)</td>
<td>Performance is inconsistent. Demonstrates a lack of knowledge and/or skills in one or more areas. May have met some performance objectives but has not yet met all goals and behavioral expectations. Improvement and/or growth is needed. Differentiate in the Comments section between: Learning = New to role or position with additional learning required. Performance = Immediate improvement is needed due to inconsistent performance and/or behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION I:**

**SUMMARY OF ROLE/RESPONSIBILITIES:**
(enter summary here):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Successful:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Exceptional:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Needs Improvement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION II: GOALS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (enter Goal #1 here):</td>
<td>□ Successful □ Exceptional □ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (enter Goal #2 here):</td>
<td>□ Successful □ Exceptional □ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (enter Goal #3 here):</td>
<td>□ Successful □ Exceptional □ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (enter Goal #4 here):</td>
<td>□ Successful □ Exceptional □ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (enter Goal #5 here):</td>
<td>□ Successful □ Exceptional □ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION III: OVERALL EVALUATION:
Include areas of strength and areas for improvement. The overall rating need not be an average of all ratings. Take into consideration the essential and most important factors when selecting the overall rating.

Overall Rating:

☐ Successful
☐ Exceptional
☐ Needs Improvement

Supervisor Comments:

EMPLOYEE COMMENTS:

SIGNATURES: A signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the content of the appraisal.

Employee Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Supervisor(s) Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
2.B. Penn State Administrator/Executive Performance Review Long Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit/Department/College</th>
<th>Period of Evaluation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATING DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful (S)</th>
<th>Performance meets most or all goals and expectations. Produces expected results that meet the needs and expectations of the role and for the unit. Consistently demonstrates competencies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional (E)</td>
<td>Demonstrates and applies exceptional level of knowledge and skills; consistently excels; significant achievement relative to goals. Notable, visible and impactful contributions are widely recognized throughout the University. Produces high-impact results beyond role and, demonstrates behaviors beyond the competency expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement (NI)</td>
<td>Performance is inconsistent. Demonstrates a lack of knowledge and/or skills in one or more areas. May have met some performance objectives but has not yet met all goals and behavioral expectations. Improvement and/or growth is needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differentiate in the Comments section between:
Learning = New to role or position with additional learning required.
Performance = Immediate improvement is needed due to inconsistent performance and/or behavior.

SECTION I:

SUMMARY OF ROLE/RESPONSIBILITIES:
(enter summary here): | Rating |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisor Comments: | □ Successful: |
|                     | □ Exceptional: |
|                     | □ Needs Improvement: |
Name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION II: GOALS:</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (enter Goal #1 here):</td>
<td>□ Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Comments:</td>
<td>□ Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (enter Goal #2 here):</td>
<td>□ Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Comments:</td>
<td>□ Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (enter Goal #3 here):</td>
<td>□ Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Comments:</td>
<td>□ Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (enter Goal #4 here):</td>
<td>□ Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Comments:</td>
<td>□ Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. (enter Goal #5 here):</td>
<td>□ Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Comments:</td>
<td>□ Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION III: COMPETENCIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication: Presents information and ideas in a thoughtful and compelling manner; actively listens with understanding and respect; is clear and concise in oral and written communications; maintains open, two-way communication that keeps people informed and provides opportunities for input; addresses disagreements, complaints and negativity in a constructive manner; is influential and persuasive when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Comments/Examples:</td>
<td>□ Successful □ Exceptional □ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership: Understands and models organizational mission, vision, goals and values; creates a positive and inclusive work environment by demonstrating a strong commitment to diversity principles; trains and develops employees, provides constructive and accurate performance feedback, and takes appropriate actions to address performance and conduct issues in a timely manner; displays and fosters integrity and high ethical standards by treating others with honesty, mutual trust and respect; acts as a steward of University resources and demonstrates fiscal responsibility; promotes cross-unit interaction and collaboration; represents the unit well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Comments/Examples:</td>
<td>□ Successful □ Exceptional □ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Drives Quality and Quest for Excellence: Demonstrates the ability and commitment to deliver high-quality work; defines, models and communicates clear standards for quality and excellence; effectively uses data and feedback to identify and prioritize opportunities for improvement; promotes continuous improvement in work processes, procedures and organizational structures; is committed to demonstrating personal excellence; understands and internalizes the University's quest for excellence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Comments/Examples:</td>
<td>□ Successful □ Exceptional □ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Change Agent: Involves others in creating a shared vision and clear goals in a way that fosters ownership and follow through; mobilizes resources and leads others to agreed-upon outcomes; communicates the benefits of change to get others’ support, buy-in and action; employs sound strategies to plan for and successfully implement change; helps others to accept, prepare for and navigate change; demonstrates sound judgment; promotes critical thinking and systematic problem solving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Comments/Examples:</td>
<td>□ Successful □ Exceptional □ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION IV: SUPPORT OF COMPLIANCE STANDARDS:

Demonstrates commitment to a healthy and safe environment; personally complies with training and education to meet regulatory and compliance requirements; ensures that all employees within unit/college comply with training and education to meet regulatory and compliance requirements.

**Supervisor Comments/Examples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUPPORT OF DIVERSITY:

Fosters a learning and workplace climate that is friendly and welcoming to all; demonstrates sensitivity toward individuals in terms of age, race, gender, employment classification and other individual differences; treats others in a fair and equitable manner; capitalizes on the diversity of others’ learning/work styles and individual strengths; responds appropriately to prejudice, bullying and intolerant behavior in others.

**Supervisor Comments/Examples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUPPORT OF SUSTAINABILITY:

Understands the need for change toward sustainable ways of doing things—individually and collectively; possesses sufficient knowledge and skills to decide and act; recognizes and rewards other peoples’ decisions and actions to become more sustainable in their day-to-day practices; champions the use of environmentally-sensitive sustainable resources and practices.

**Supervisor Comments/Examples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION V: OVERALL EVALUATION:
Include areas of strength & areas for improvement. Consider all the ratings for each component and give an overall rating below. The overall rating need not be an average of all ratings. Take into consideration the essential and most important factors when selecting the overall rating.

Supervisor Comments:

Overall Rating:
- □ Successful
- □ Exceptional
- □ Needs Improvement

EMPLOYEE COMMENTS:

SIGNATURES: A signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the content of the appraisal.

Employee Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Supervisor(s) Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
2.C. Penn State University Self-Assessment for Non-Academic Administrator Performance Review
Name:
Date:

1. List and describe your accomplishments/successes during the past year as they relate to your role and goals.

2. List and describe any areas within your role or goals that you had difficulty achieving. What challenges did you encounter?

3. List your proposed strategic goals for the coming year:

4. Other comments:
Section 3: Standard 8 – Student Admission and Retention

This section provides more detailed information about the various recruiting and retention initiatives mentioned in the narrative response.

Pre-college Programs

- **Raise.me** began in 2014 as a collaboration with five high schools in the Philadelphia area. In 2015, six rural high schools were added. In 2016, 13 high schools in the Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and rural areas were added. High school students have the potential to earn credit that can later be applied to Penn State tuition and fees, up to $4,000 per year for four years ($16,000 total). High school students log activities such as earning an A, participating in a student organization, or engaging in community service to earn these credits. These funds will then be available to them to apply toward tuition and other expenses if they attend Penn State, and these are stacked on other financial aid awards up to the cost of attendance.

  - In fall 2015, 55 Raise.me students attended Penn State: 19 at University Park, 31 at Abington near Philadelphia, and 4 at other campuses, with earned scholarships totaling $112,642. In spring 2016, at the end of its first year, the 2015 (first) cohort completed an average of 30.1 credits with an average GPA of 3.04. Of the 55 students in this group, 24 percent were African American, 13 percent were Hispanic/Latino/a, 47 percent were low income, and 67 percent were first generation. Forty-nine of these students successfully completed the fall 2016 semester.

  - In 2016, a second cohort of 121 students was offered admission. Fifty-eight of these students accepted the offer of admission and enrolled. Twenty-two percent were African American, 17 percent were Hispanic/Latino/a, 52 percent were low income, and 55 percent were first generation.

Planning is under way to offer summer workshops and other programming for the high school students tracking Penn State through Raise.me. These activities will be offered at Penn State’s regional campuses and recruiting centers, and include information on financial planning for college, the application process, math and writing tutorials, and other topics. Raise.me students who are now attending Penn State will be involved in delivering these programs. Raise.me will be expanded to include all Pennsylvania students receiving free and reduced lunch (FRLP) in 2018.

- **Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Harrisburg Recruiting and Admissions Outreach**
  - Philadelphia Engineering and Math Challenge – The purpose of this program is to enhance the teaching and learning of problem solving and communication in Philadelphia’s public schools. This competition is hosted in the Penn State facilities at the Navy Yard, and Penn State provides T-shirts, an admissions presentation, and lunch for the two-day event. It is offered to two cohorts of 50 students each.
  - Philadelphia Honors Convocation – The top four underrepresented rising seniors in each Philadelphia public high school are invited to a lunch recognizing their accomplishments and sponsored by Penn State. Students have an opportunity to meet with representatives from the colleges and the Millennium Scholars Program. There are 100 student attendees. In 2015, 53 of those attendees applied to Penn State. As of the end of January 2017, 37 of the 2016 attendees have applied to Penn State.
  - Schreyer Honors College Essay Writing Workshop – Local high school counselors saw a need to better prepare their students for the college application process. Penn State helps meet that need
with this workshop. The program was initially offered in Pittsburgh, where 30 high school students participated. The program is being expanded to Philadelphia and Harrisburg.

- **Dual Enrollment** – All of Penn State’s undergraduate campuses across the state offer dual enrollment to high school students. For example, Penn State Lehigh Valley offers high school students at three area Title 1 high schools and one charter school the opportunity to enroll in Penn State courses while they are in high school. Students take the courses offered either at their high schools or at the Penn State Lehigh Valley campus. Students pay only 50 percent of the standard tuition, and at one high school, a “Twenty-first Century” grant provided scholarships to cover that balance. Many of the students are low income and the first in their family to attend college.

- **Coalition Application Member** – Penn State was a founding member in 2015 and is one of more than 80 institutions that are members of the Coalition for Access, Affordability, and Success. The Coalition focuses on early engagement support for under-resourced students. Planning tools are available online at no cost to high school students in ninth, tenth, and eleventh grades. Penn State expects to use this additional avenue to engage students in the college search process earlier and give them and their families more time to plan for their education after high school.

**Student Funding**

- **Penn State’s Provost Awards** – The Provost Awards began in fall 2012 for a cohort entering in summer/fall 2013 to address a decline in applications. Eligibility criteria were adjusted to improve the diversity of the awards for the 2014 and 2015 cohorts and serve more students with high financial need. For the 2015 cohort, $25 million was available, and $20.1 million was awarded to 1,722 recipients. The 2016 cohort comprised 1,994 awardees.

- **Maguire Foundation** – Penn State is one of 28 colleges and universities partnering with the Maguire Foundation. This organization provides scholarships to up to 20 low-income student scholars per year attending Penn State from the greater Philadelphia area who have attended high schools affiliated with the Maguire Foundation. While at Penn State, students meet regularly with a program adviser, meet as a group, participate in community service programs, and develop their leadership skills.

- **Brook J. Lenfest Trustee Scholarship Program** – This program provides financial and academic support to qualified, underrepresented, high-financial-need students graduating from Mastery Charter Schools or Philadelphia public schools as active participants in Philadelphia Futures and attending Penn State. The financial commitment is for up to five years of support. Scholars at Penn State live in a community with peer assistants and tutorial support, and they take a first-year course with Maguire Scholars and Bunton-Waller Fellows. Graduation rates are in line with or exceed those of the overall student population and minority peers not in the program.

- **Bunton-Waller Funds** – Individual colleges at Penn State can award funds to Bunton-Waller Scholars and Fellows to develop a student body that more closely reflects the cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity in Pennsylvania and the nation. Fellows in the Eberly College of Science live in the same residence hall their first year and participate in a course with Maguire and Lenfest Scholars.

**Student Transition**
• **Pathway to Success: Summer Start Program (PaSSS)** – PaSSS provides at-risk students – students from low-income or first-generation families, underrepresented populations, or those underprepared in math – the opportunity to take two classes during the summer before they begin their first year at Penn State. A scholarship of $1,500 is provided along with the opportunity for campus employment of 10 hours per week to defray the cost of attendance. Students are encouraged to attend the summer session again between their first and second year, with support through a $3,000 scholarship. In the first cohort of 135, beginning in summer 2015 at six campuses, 79 percent completed their first year and enrolled for fall 2016, compared to 67 percent of similar students who did not participate in PaSSS. Eighty percent completed their first year and enrolled in fall 2016, compared to 67 percent of similar students who did not participate in PaSSS. Program participants also earned a higher GPA and enrolled in higher-level math courses than non-participants. In summer 2016, 212 first-year students enrolled in PaSSS at eight Penn State campuses.

• **Student Orientation and Transition Programs**
  o New Student Orientation is a two-day program that includes educational planning and advising, math assessment, and focus on community expectations. Specific experiences are designed for students participating in programs such as the Millennium Scholars Program or the Lenfest or Maguire Scholarships. Of the students participating in the 2013 cycle, 96 percent were enrolled in fall 2014, compared with an overall retention rate of 93 percent for that same time frame.
  o Transfer Student Orientation is a one-day program for students coming to Penn State from another college or university. The program helps students navigate administrative processes and provides information on resources available at Penn State.
  o Link UP is a one-day program for first- or second-year students at one of the campuses away from University Park to explore or plan for their move to the University Park campus.
  o Change of Campus Welcome, Orientation, and Success programs provide information in various areas to students moving from one of the other campuses to the University Park campus.
  o The Office for Student Orientation and Transition Programs works with the Diversity and Inclusion Advisory group to ensure that all programs are welcoming, inclusive, and supportive for underrepresented students and their families. That advisory group guided a revision of the Orientation Leader diversity and inclusion training curriculum. After the revision, the response to the survey question regarding a student making a “meaningful connection with my Orientation Leader during NSO” (New Student Orientation) for students of color rose from 0.11 below that of white peers in 2013 to 0.02 higher than that of their white peers in 2016.

**Student Support While at Penn State**

• **Multicultural Resource Center (MRC) Programs**
  o In 2015-16, the MRC as a unit had 3971 interactions with 1,049 students. Students interacting were 40 percent Black or African American, 21 percent Hispanic/Latino/a, and 20 percent Asian. Students were from all colleges at University Park. Discussion topics included academics (36 percent), financial issues (17 percent), adjusting to college life (10 percent), and careers (9 percent).
  o Asian American Students in Action (AASIA) – High-achieving sophomore, junior, and senior students provide mentoring and college transition assistance to Asian and Pacific Islander American (APIA) students who are new to University Park.
  o Blends of Traditional Heritages (BOTH) – A discussion group for students of biracial or multicultural backgrounds with one parent of African-American descent and the other parent of another racial or ethnic background.
Black Male Empowerment Group (BMEG) and Latino Male Empowerment Group (LMEG) – Assists men of color to fully embrace the Penn State experience through academic success, community service activities, relationship building, and social opportunities. BMEG launched in spring 2013 and works in collaboration with the Center for Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS). BMEG was expanded to include LMEG in spring 2015.

Women of Color Empowerment Group (WOCE) – Provides women of color a supportive space to empower and enhance their voice, and fully embrace the Penn State experience through academic excellence and relationship building. WOCE launched in spring 2015 and works in collaboration with Center for Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS).

Collegiate Leadership Development Program (CLDP) offered by the United States Hispanic Leadership Institute (USHLI) – The curriculum focuses on academic, operational, and administrative procedures, as well as financial literacy and budget management, so students are better prepared to take an active role in enhancing the quality of campus life.

- **Millennium Scholars** – The long-term goal of the Millennium Scholars Program is to increase the diversity of leadership in STEM fields, especially through nurturing the students toward eventual STEM-related graduate study and careers in academia. Applicants must be committed to earning a Ph.D. in a STEM field. The accepted cohort begins with a six-week Summer Bridge program, lives together in dedicated residence hall space for three years, participates in academic year and summer research and internship opportunities, and completes research projects for their senior theses. This is a small, select group, and it is diverse. For the fourth cohort, entering fall 2016, 43 were offered admission to Penn State and 30 accepted; of the 30 students, 60 percent were African American, 23 percent were Hispanic/Latino/a, and 69 percent were female. The first cohort, which entered in summer 2013, is expected to graduate in spring 2017; their average GPA at the end of spring 2016 was 3.62.

- **College of Engineering**
  - Engineering Ahead: Multi-Campus Summer Bridge Program - This five-year program began in 2016 and is funded by a National Science Foundation grant. It is offered at University Park and three other campuses through six first- and second-year bridge programs to prepare students for entrance to an engineering major. Demographic data is considered in accepting individuals, yielding more than 70 percent of participants from underrepresented or first-generation populations.
  - College of Engineering Research Initiative (CERI) – This initiative provides research experience to 75 third-year students who study with faculty mentors. Efforts are made to ensure diversity in this group, including women, people from underrepresented backgrounds, international students, learners from all majors, as well as students who fit the majority demographic. Also, the Multi-Campus Research Opportunity for Undergraduates provides research opportunities, including faculty collaboration, for an additional 50 engineering students across 15 campuses.
  - Engineering Diversity Roundtable – In existence for three years, this group of about 25 student leaders from eight organizations meets regularly as a group and with the dean to identify and collaborate on projects to better serve students in the college.

- **Eberly College of Science** – Approximately 25 percent of the undergraduate students enrolled in the Eberly College of Science are attending one of the campuses away from University Park for their first two years, in a program known as 2+2. Many of these students are in underrepresented populations – low income, first generation, or specific racial or ethnic groups. Ongoing research at Penn State has shown that 2+2 students across the University have a drop in their GPA for the first semester of their junior year when they move to University Park. They do go on to graduate, although it may be in a different major or college. In 2013, with a grant from the National Science Foundation, the College established the Science Dean’s Scholars (SDS), combining scholarships with multifaceted academic
programming and peer mentoring, to increase the number of 2+2 students who both start and graduate in the College of Science. In the three years this initiative has been in place, 58 students have participated. Those students have shown a 93 percent retention rate, equal to that of the University as a whole, and higher than the average retention rate for all 2+2 students who enter science majors. Additionally, compared to a similar group that did not participate, students in the SDS program had less of a semester GPA drop when they moved to University Park their junior year, and then a higher GPA the following semesters.

- **All In** – The “All In” initiative was launched in fall 2016. It was developed at the request of students who approached University President Barron with the idea of initiating a University-wide program that would foster a climate that is safe and welcoming for everyone, regardless of background, and provide an atmosphere for discussion of diversity. The initiative includes a website, educational events, and other activities throughout the 2016-17 academic year. Students were also looking for greater diversity in faculty and staff. As part of the All In program, the University is hiring a senior director of talent diversity and inclusion, responsible for leading the development and implementation of human resources-based diversity and inclusion initiatives covering all Penn State campuses and 36,000 employees.

**Going Forward - New Initiatives**

- **“Our Commitment to Impact: The Pennsylvania State University’s Strategic Plan for 2016 to 2020.** “Diversity is incorporated into Penn State’s strategic plan. One of the “foundational elements” in Penn State’s strategic plan is “Fostering and Embracing a Diverse World.” This foundation is woven through the five thematic priorities and three supporting elements.
  - From the foundational elements, Penn State’s Office of Educational Equity developed four specific goals:
    1. Create a welcoming and inclusive campus climate
    2. Advance and build a diverse student body
    3. Advance and build a diverse workforce
    4. Develop a curriculum that fosters United States and international cultural competencies
  - The Vice Provost for Educational Equity recommended and the Provost appointed a representative to each of eight committees addressing implementation of the thematic priorities and supporting elements. These appointees are charged with ensuring that the four diversity goals are considered and incorporated as specific initiatives in each of the eight areas are developed.
  - The Vice Provost for Educational Equity is a member of the committee overseeing implementation of the strategic plan.
  - Each of the University’s budget units will provide a progress report annually in May on accomplishments related to their units’ strategic plans. Included in these reports will be specific identification of progress made in the areas of diversity and inclusion.

- **Advising with Starfish** – Penn State introduced a new online advising system, Starfish, in fall 2016. This system can provide more information than was available in the previous system regarding early progress reports and indicators of the need for earlier intervention. It also enables increased communication among students, advisers, and faculty. In addition to the academic advisers who will have access to data for the students they advise, advisors in Penn State’s Multicultural Resource Center will have access to data regarding the underrepresented students they are advising. The Administrative Council on Multicultural Affairs, comprising college and campus multicultural coordinators, has also been informed about the improved advising opportunities and the benefits of transitioning to Starfish.
• **Administrative Council on University Funded Scholarships** – In July 2016, the Administrative Council on University Funded Scholarships was established as a new standing committee by the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education and the Vice Provost for Educational Equity. Its purpose is to support and enhance the recruitment and retention of underrepresented student populations. With the goal to increase enrollments of underrepresented populations, the charge to the committee includes direction to:
  o Review and make recommendations for improving or restructuring centrally funded or co-funded scholarships
  o Provide status reports, establish metrics, and track the outcomes and effectiveness of these programs

• **“Complete Penn State” Micro-Grant Program** – The goal of Complete Penn State is to increase degree completion rates, particularly for undergraduate students who are first generation, adult learners, or from underrepresented groups. These students may gain access to Penn State, but have difficulty completing a degree in their final semesters due to financial hardship. There are two current strategies in this program:
  o Identify students with unmet financial need who may be at financial risk early in their relationship with Penn State. This monitoring started in fall 2016.
  o Identify students who have a financial shortfall in their junior year and set up a contractual agreement to provide financial support in exchange for a commitment to regular advising and a completion plan in order to finish their degree. The Office of Undergraduate Education, in conjunction with the academic colleges, assisted students with unpaid tuition balances to clear those shortfalls after the fall 2016 semester so they could register for classes in the spring 2017 semester. Funds will be sought to continue this pilot and to evaluate its success in graduating at-risk students.

• **College Student Aid Advisers** – A proposal has been developed to place a dedicated student aid adviser in each academic college. The Office of Undergraduate Education is considering initial funding for a pilot in the Division of Undergraduate Studies.
4.A. Provost letter of Sept 2016 regarding establishment of Department of Learning Outcomes Assessment

Date: September 19, 2016

To: Deans, Associate Deans, Chancellors, DAAs

From: Nicholas P. Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost

Subject: University Learning Outcomes Assessment Process

As the regional accrediting association for Penn State, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) is responsible for review of higher education institutions for educational quality. In its decennial review of our University in 2014, the MSCHE Evaluation Team praised the overall quality of a Penn State education. The team identified several areas related to learning outcomes assessment where improvements are required to meet accreditation standards. In its March 2015 report, the team recommended that:

Penn State implement appropriate governance, support and reporting structures that ensure that all units are assessing student learning across the university, including undergraduate and graduate education, certificate programs and non-credit learning outcomes. (p. 30)

MSCHE has requested that the University report on its progress in a Monitoring Report by April 2017.

In response, the new Department of Learning Outcomes Assessment within the Office of Planning and Assessment has partnered with the Faculty Senate, Undergraduate Education, the Graduate School and Commonwealth Campuses to develop new processes for learning outcomes assessment for all baccalaureate, associate, and graduate degrees, general education and certificates.

Many of you have already met, or have scheduled time to meet, with the Learning Outcomes Assessment (LOA) team to learn of details of the new processes for baccalaureate, associate, and graduate degrees and certificate assessment, and to develop college and campus LOA Action Plans for moving forward. Action Plans, designed in partnership with college and campus leadership, connect LOA guidelines, reporting templates, and tailored discipline examples to existing college and campus processes. In addition, brief and tailored college and campus faculty workshops ensure that faculty can complete the process efficiently and effectively. In the next two weeks, the LOA team will be reaching out to the remaining colleges and campuses to schedule Action Plan meetings or to schedule faculty workshops.

The University timeline for progress is as follows:

- September 2016: Develop action plans for degree and certificate assessment at college and campus level in consultation with LOA
- December 2016: Degree and certificate assessment plans submitted to LOA
- June 2017: Degree and certificate assessment reports submitted to LOA

The Learning Outcomes Assessment team is now in place to provide support to colleges and campuses. By developing an action plan with LOA, I am confident that each college and campus will be able to meet these important milestones. LOA encourages colleges and campuses to contact Associate Vice
Provost for Learning Outcomes Assessment, Barbara Masi, bam85@psu.edu, to develop its plan. Additional information can be found at opa.psu.edu.
4.B. DOCTORAL DEGREE IN ECOSYSTEM SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT

ASSESSMENT PLAN
Degrees: Forest Resources, Soils, and Wildlife and Fisheries
College: Agricultural Sciences
Campus where offered: University Park
Director of Graduate Studies: Dr. Jack Watson

Graduate Council Scholarly and Professional Goals for All Graduate Students

1. KNOW: Demonstrate appropriate breadth and depth of disciplinary knowledge, and comprehension of the major issues of their discipline.

2. APPLY/CREATE: Use disciplinary methods and techniques to apply knowledge, and – if appropriate to the degree – create new knowledge or achieve advanced creative accomplishment.

3. COMMUNICATE: Communicate the major issues of their discipline effectively.

4. THINK: Demonstrate analytical and critical thinking within their discipline, and, where appropriate, across disciplines.

5. PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE: Know and conduct themselves in accordance with the highest ethical standards, values, and, where these are defined, the best practices of their discipline.

I. Program learning objectives
Directions: List program learning objectives. Note whether program learning objective addresses one or more of the five Graduate Council Scholarly and Professional Goals. See definition of terms below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Objectives (PLO)</th>
<th>Addresses Graduate Council Goal #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. KNOW: Graduates in these three doctoral programs will have obtained the knowledge of the core theories and methods at the bachelors and/or master’s levels. Graduates will exhibit breadth and depth of understanding in their respective disciplines in courses completed at the doctoral level.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **APPLY/CREATE**: Graduates in these three doctoral programs will be able to clearly synthesize literature and theories in their disciplinary areas and/or in their specialized thesis/dissertation topics. Such synthesis will help generate new ideas or methods to develop unique solutions to the problems in the three disciplinary doctoral programs.

3. **COMMUNICATE**: Graduates in these three doctoral programs will effectively communicate ideas, arguments, and rationales in clear, concise, well-organized publications (abstracts, papers, proposals) and presentations (conferences, seminars, and research meetings).

4. **THINK**: Graduates in these three doctoral programs will be able to critically analyze the work of others in their fields of specialty. Such analyses will help graduate students to demonstrate proficiency in designing a research strategy to answer important questions and to improve their own work.

5. **PROF. PRACTICE**: Graduate students in these three doctoral programs will demonstrate the highest ethical standards and core values (including Penn State Core Values) within their disciplines and other diverse scientific backgrounds.

**Definitions:**

**Goal**: Broad learning outcomes and concepts (what you want students to learn) expressed in general terms.

**Program learning objective**: Specific skills, values and attitudes that graduates of a program should exhibit. There are three types: cognitive (what students know and can do), affective (what graduates think or care about) and psychomotor (manual/physical skills). PLOs often start with “Graduates will be able to” followed by an action verb, chosen from Bloom’s Taxonomy of Learning Objectives, indicating level of intended learning and a statement providing disciplinary context for the action.
IIa. Map of Program Learning Objectives and Major Milestones (Direct Student Assessments)

**Directions:** Along top row, list the major milestones (direct student assessments) completed by doctoral candidates in order of completion. Indicate whether milestone is completed by candidates during the introductory phase “I”, intermediate or practice phase “P” or advanced or demonstration of mastery phase “D” of graduate education.

*See definitions of terms below table. Examples in table are for illustration only and can be deleted.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Course Assessments</th>
<th>SARI Training</th>
<th>Candidacy Exam</th>
<th>Advisory Committee approval of research proposal</th>
<th>Supervised teaching</th>
<th>Comprehensive Exam</th>
<th>Colloquia and national meeting presentations</th>
<th>Dissertation Defense</th>
<th>Approval of Dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1. KNOW</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 2. APPLY/CREATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 3. COMMUNICATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P/D</td>
<td>P/D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 4. THINK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 5. PROF. PRACTICE</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>P/D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions:**

**Student assessments:** Measures implemented to determine if students are achieving stated program learning objectives

**Direct student assessment:** Require students to display their knowledge and skills as they respond to the assessment instrument (e.g. exam)

**Indirect student assessment:** Require students to provide reflection, feedback or perceptions of learning rather than to demonstrate it (e.g. survey)

**Doctoral program phases**

- **Foundations or Introductory Phase “I”:** Students are receivers of knowledge, and demonstrate comprehension and ability to apply knowledge within the field of study. (assessment examples: grades in core courses or selection of assessments from core courses, review of lab rotation work, review of advanced seminar paper or presentation)
• **Intermediate or Practice Phase “P”:** Students expand abilities to apply, synthesize, critique and create knowledge in the discipline. Students receive significant feedback from faculty in this formative or “practice” phase. (assessment examples: review of candidacy exam, review of dissertation proposal)

• **Advanced or Demonstration of Mastery Phase “D”:** Students demonstrate mastery of knowledge domain and proficiency in using skills to create substantial works in their fields. (assessment examples: review of oral defense, review of paper for publication)

IIb. Map of Program Learning Objectives and Indirect Student Assessments

**Directions:** Along top row, list the indirect student assessments. In table boxes below, mark with “x” whether indirect student assessment will provide information that will be used to measure a program learning objective. See definitions of terms below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Indirect Student Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conference Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1. <strong>KNOW</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 2. <strong>APPLY/CREATE</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 3. <strong>COMMUNICATE</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 4. <strong>THINK</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 5. <strong>PROF. PRACTICE</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions:**

**Student assessments:** Measures implemented to determine if students are achieving stated program learning objectives

**Direct student assessment:** Require students to display their knowledge and skills as they respond to the assessment instrument (e.g. exam)

**Indirect student assessment:** Require students to provide reflection, feedback or perceptions of learning rather than to demonstrate it (e.g. survey)

III. Program Assessment Plan for AY 2016-2017

**Directions:** Respond to each question in table. See definition of terms below table.

A. **PLO:** Which program learning objective will you assess this year?
B. **Student assessment name and description**: Provide a title or name for the student assessment that you plan to implement and report on this year. Briefly describe the student assessment measure.

D. **Graduate Education Phase**: Does the assessment take place in introductory, practice or demonstration of mastery phase?

E. **Performance criterion**: Identify the performance criterion or target level that is associated with this student assessment.

F. **Implementation plan**: Who is responsible for the design and implementation of the assessment?

G. **Program review and action**: Describe how the program plans to review the results of this student assessment (e.g. annual graduate studies retreat, annual graduate student evaluation meeting). Who will responsible for acting on findings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Assessment Plan for AY2016-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. PLO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Student assessment selection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Student assessment description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Graduate education phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Performance criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Implementation plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Program review and action</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions:**

**Performance criterion/ target level**: Desired level of performance as measured by the assessment method. *(We expect 90 percent of graduate students will satisfactorily demonstrate communication skills during their defense. We expect that all students will receive a score of good or above on four out of the six criteria on the written and on the oral communication evaluations.)*
4.C. UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES ASSESSMENT PLAN – American Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic year:</th>
<th>2016-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program name:</td>
<td>American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program code:</td>
<td>AM ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus(es)/College(es) where offered:</td>
<td>Penn State Harrisburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty contact(s) for this report:</td>
<td>John Haddad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the program learning objectives shared with degree programs on other campuses? Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes, the learning objectives have been shared with American Studies faculty at PS Abington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will programs on other campuses collaborate in assessment planning and implementation this year? Yes/No</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If “yes,” will programs submit ONE report together or submit SEPARATE reports?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Program Learning Objectives
List all program learning objectives.

The American Studies Program at Penn State Harrisburg has a total of eight learning objectives that are divided into three groups: 1. American Studies Bodies of Knowledge; 2. American Studies Theories and Methods; and 3. Applied Theory and Methods.

1. American Studies Bodies of Knowledge

A. *The Origins and Evolution of American Studies*. Students will be able to describe the origins of American Studies in the 1940s, the methods that distinguished the field from History and English, and the changes it underwent at various historical junctures in response to social, political, cultural, and academic movements.

B. *American Intellectual and Cultural History*. Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of America’s intellectual and cultural history, from 1600 to 2000.

2. American Studies Theories and Methods
A. Symbol and Myth Analysis. Students will be able to interpret texts from America’s past by isolating symbols and myths that were culturally meaningful to the people at the time.

B. Ethnographic Analysis. Students will be able to analyze living groups of Americans and subgroups within the United States by conducting fieldwork that employs ethnographic and folkloric methods.

C. Historical and Cultural Analysis. Students will be able to use their knowledge of historical, cultural, economic, and political currents to interpret texts – novels, films, musical works, paintings, political speeches, or even household objects.

3. Applied American Studies

A. Exhibition of Primary Sources and Artifacts. Students will be able to construct an exhibition of archival objects and materials that explains the cultural significance of these items to the general public.

B. Oral Presentation. Students will be able to present American Studies research orally in a clear and organized fashion.

C. Writing. Students will be able to compose thesis-driven essays that require research into primary and secondary sources, that involve textual analysis and close readings of images and passages, that cite sources correctly, and that use supporting evidence in an organized fashion to analyze texts and topics.

IIa. Map of Program Learning Objectives and Curriculum

Directions: Respond to information request in table below. See definitions below table.

A. List all program degree requirements including courses, capstones or internships in the general order that they are completed by students. You should include each required core course that all students complete. You may include restricted electives as a labelled course group rather than adding each course as a line item (e.g. COURSE GROUP: German Culture and History, Health Care Finance)

B. In table boxes, indicate how each required course or learning experience contributes to each PLO. Indicate whether each course or other experience is designed to introduce “I”, reinforce or practice “P” or demonstrate mastery “D” of each program learning objective. You may add or delete table columns and rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Courses or Other Experiences</th>
<th>Program Learning Objectives Group 1: American Studies Bodies of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1. ORIGINS &amp; EVOLUTION of AM ST</td>
<td>PLO 2. AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Courses or Other Experiences</td>
<td>PLO 1. SYMBOL MYTH ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM ST 100</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Group: Literature</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Group: History</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Group: Art, philosophy, and religion</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Group: Social Sciences</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM ST 491W</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Courses or Other Experiences</td>
<td>PLO 1. EXHIBITION PRIMARY SOURCE &amp; ARTIFACTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM ST 100</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Group: Literature</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Group: History</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Group: Art, philosophy, and religion</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Group: Social Sciences</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM ST 491W</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions: Undergraduate program phases**

- **Foundations or Introductory Phase “I”:** Students are receivers of knowledge, and demonstrate comprehension and ability to apply knowledge within the field of study.
- **Reinforcement or Practice Phase “P”:** Students expand abilities to apply knowledge in the discipline. Foundation concepts and abilities are reinforced through practice. Formative feedback from faculty is key in this stage.
- **Demonstration of Mastery Phase “D”:** Students demonstrate mastery of knowledge domain and proficiency in using what they have learned.
IIb. Indirect Measures of Program Learning Objectives

Directions:

A. Please list any indirect measures of program learning objectives that your program may regularly use or is using this academic year.

B. Mark with “x” which PLOs are measured by each indirect measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect measure</th>
<th>Program Learning Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition: Indirect measures of student learning require students or alumni to provide reflection, feedback or perceptions of learning rather than to demonstrate it (e.g. student surveys, senior exit survey, post-graduation survey, alumni survey, student focus groups or interviews).
### III. PLO and General Education Course Alignment

Directions: We would like your help in gathering information that will be used for general education assessment.

A. List all general education courses that are required by the program. If more than one course is allowed for a given general education requirement, list all courses.

B. In table boxes, indicate with an “x” whether each course is expected to address one or more of the program learning objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General education requirement</th>
<th>Required general education courses</th>
<th>PLO 1. ORIGINS &amp; EVOLUTION of AM ST</th>
<th>PLO 2. AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL &amp; CULTURAL HIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing/ Speaking (GWS)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts (GA)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (GH)</td>
<td>AM ST 100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences (GS)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantification (GQ)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (GN)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Physical Activity (GHÁ) <em>(not required for Associates)</em></td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education requirement</td>
<td>Required general education courses</td>
<td>PLO 1. SYMBOL MYTH ANALYSIS</td>
<td>PLO 2. ETHNOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing/ Speaking (GWS)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts (GA)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (GH)</td>
<td>AM ST 100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences (GS)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantification (GQ)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (GN)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Physical Activity (GHA)</td>
<td>(not required for Associates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General education requirement</th>
<th>Required general education courses</th>
<th>PLO 1. EXHIBITION PRIMARY SOURCE &amp; ARTIFACTS</th>
<th>PLO 2. ORAL PRESENTATION</th>
<th>PLO 3. WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing/ Speaking (GWS)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts (GA)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (GH)</td>
<td>AM ST 100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences (GS)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantification (GQ)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (GN)</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Learning Objectives Group 2: American Studies Theories and Methods

Program Learning Objectives Group 3: Applied American Studies
IV. Program Assessment Plan- AY 2016-2017: PLO Choice and Student Learning Concerns

- **PLO**: Which program learning objective will you assess this year?
- **Observed student learning concerns**: What particular questions, issues or concerns about student learning or performance have been identified by faculty that relate to achievement of this PLO? Are there particular courses or other experiences where student learning concerns related to this PLO have been observed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO</th>
<th>Program Assessment Plan for AY2016-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentation.</td>
<td>Students will be able to use programs like PowerPoint or Prezi to present American Studies research orally in a clear and organized fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed student learning</td>
<td>There has not been any specific concern. In recent years, the faculty has focused more on skills (exhibition, oral presentation, and writing) that transfer well to any career pathway or graduate degree program. In recent years, the faculty has assessed writing. However, oral presentation has not been assessed in many years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment measures to be implemented in AY2016-2017

Please use the table below to describe at least one assessment measure that will be used to measure the PLO that you have chosen. You may choose to include more than one assessment measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Assessment description</th>
<th>Student work in AM ST 100 (introduction to major) and AM ST 491W (capstone course) will be assessed according to a common rubric for oral presentation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Measure type (direct/indirect)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Implementation plan</td>
<td>Faculty assessment representative will work with faculty for both AM ST 100 and AM ST 491W to coordinate observation of student oral presentations and the assessment of the same presentations in conjunction with a common rubric. Evaluations made on 100-point scale, with each of 5 criteria (see below) valued at 20 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Performance criterion</td>
<td>Meets assignment guidelines, Quality of sources and context in presentation, Quality of analysis of evidence, Organizational pattern of presentation (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions), and Clarity of presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Program review and action plan</td>
<td>The data will provide a snapshot of two groups of students – those entering the major and those nearing completion of it. The American Studies faculty will meet at end of Spring 2017 term to review results and determine next steps. For example, if students in AM ST 491W are not substantially more skilled than those in AM ST 100, the faculty might explore ways to improve the teaching of this skill in other AM ST courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.D. Executive Summary of the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force on the Revision to General Education Curriculum approved by the Senate Council April 14, 2015, to be placed on the April 28, 2015, Faculty Senate agenda

The General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force was jointly charged by the Faculty Senate and Provost in March 2013 to revisit and propose updates to General Education. In addition to studying current research on General Education and our current program, the General Education Task Force widely solicited student, faculty, and stakeholder engagement through a series of Senate reports, multiple retreats, campus and college visits, and web-based public forum (gened.psu.edu). This open and deliberative process generated multiple ideas, culminating in the recommendations presented in this report.

The process was guided by a commitment to a General Education curriculum that embraces breadth of knowledge and facilitates intellectual engagement and flexibility. It was also guided by a commitment to framing the curriculum by a set of contemporary learning objectives that reflect the mission and values of Penn State and enable assessment of the General Education program. Finally, this process was balanced with the understanding that all change requires time and resources.

This report is presented in three sections. The first two sections present recommendations for Senate approval. The third section presents areas where the General Education Task Force suggests further consultation and collaboration with appropriate Senate committees.

The individual recommendations presented in this report are intended to each stand on their own: no recommendation depends on acceptance of another. Each recommendation presents an opportunity to enhance student learning in General Education in complementary ways. A cost estimate, as required by Senate procedures in a legislative proposal, is included with each recommendation. This Summary offers an overview of the recommendations presented later in the report.

Description of appendix

A. Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs
B. Revised General Education Learning Objectives
C. Senate Committee on Committees and Rules
D. Spring 2016 General Education Course Memo
E. General Education Assessment Course Memo AY 2016-2017
Introduction

On April 28, 2015, the Penn State Faculty Senate approved the following in Recommendation 1 of the General Education Task Force report, “Revise the current statement on General Education goals to include updated Learning Objectives as presented.”

The following is the Learning Objectives and preamble as presented in the April 28, 2015, report.

The General Education curriculum will enable students to acquire skills, knowledge, and experiences for living in interconnected contexts, so they can contribute to making life better for others, themselves, and the larger world. General Education encompasses the breadth of knowledge involving the major intellectual and aesthetic skills and achievements of humanity. This must include understanding and appreciation of the pluralistic nature of knowledge epitomized by the natural sciences, quantitative skills, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, and arts. To achieve and share such an understanding and appreciation, skills in self-expression, quantitative analysis, information literacy, and collaborative interaction are necessary. General Education aids students in developing intellectual curiosity, a strengthened ability to think, and a deeper sense of aesthetic appreciation. General Education, in essence, aims to cultivate a knowledgeable, informed, literate human being.

An effective General Education curriculum shall facilitate teaching and learning through seven key objectives:

EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION – the ability to exchange information and ideas in oral, written, and visual form in ways that allow for informed and persuasive discourse that builds trust and respect among those engaged in that exchange, and helps create environments where creative ideas and problem-solving flourish.

KEY LITERACIES – the ability to identify, interpret, create, communicate and compute using materials in a variety of media and contexts. Literacy acquired in multiple areas, such as textual, quantitative, information/technology, health, intercultural, historical, aesthetic, linguistic (world languages), and scientific, enables individuals to achieve their goals, to develop their knowledge and potential, to lead healthy and productive lives, and to participate fully in their community and wider society.
CRITICAL AND ANALYTICAL THINKING – the habit of mind characterized by comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating a conclusion. It is the intellectually disciplined process of conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action.

INTEGRATIVE THINKING – the ability to synthesize knowledge across multiple domains, modes of inquiry, historical periods, and perspectives, as well as the ability to identify linkages between existing knowledge and new information. Individuals who engage in integrative thinking are able to transfer knowledge within and beyond their current contexts.

CREATIVE THINKING – the capacity to synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of performing, making, thinking, or acting in an imaginative way that may be characterized by innovation, divergent thinking, and intellectual risk taking.

GLOBAL LEARNING – the intellectually disciplined abilities to analyze similarities and differences among cultures; evaluate natural, physical, social, cultural, historical, and economic legacies and hierarchies; and engage as community members and leaders who will continue to deal with the intricacies of an ever-changing world. Individuals should acquire the ability to analyze power; identify and critique interdependent global, regional, and local cultures and systems; and evaluate the implications for people’s lives.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICAL REASONING – the ability to assess one’s own values within the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, describe how different perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Individuals should acquire the self-knowledge and leadership skills needed to play a role in creating and maintaining healthy, civil, safe, and thriving communities.

This report includes three recommendations necessary to implement these learning objectives as the foundation for our General Education program and curriculum and one recommendation to keep the program current.

Discussion and Rationale

Several key things need to happen to establish the new Learning Objectives as the foundation of our General Education curriculum. First, all General Education courses need to demonstrate alignment with the new Learning Objectives; faculty and administration need to be aware of how courses will be evaluated with respect to this alignment. Second, faculty and students need to recognize when they are engaging with the General Education curriculum and students should to
be clearly informed of what Learning Objectives they can expect to practice and achieve in for each General Education course. Third, all current General Education courses need to be reviewed under the new criteria. This will be a time consuming and expensive process, but it is necessary to fully implement the already adopted Learning Objectives. A cost estimate for implementing the new General Education curriculum was included in the General Education Taskforce report dated April 28, 2015. A phased review process is proposed to distribute this workload over a manageable timeframe. Finally, General Education, like the academic environment in which it is housed, needs to be dynamic and responsive to student needs and assessment feedback. Therefore, we propose that General Education courses undergo rolling periodic evaluation.

Recommendations

The following four recommendations are made to address the important points discussed above. The first recommendation specifies the materials and information that must be provided for review as a General Education course. For comparison, the current text from the Guide to Curricular Procedures under heading “2. Criteria for General Education Courses” is Attachment 1. It is worth noting that the number of items to be answered by the proposer has been reduced from ten (10) to four (4).

RECOMMENDATION 1: The Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs will request the following information on course proposals and use it to determine if a course meets the Learning Objectives of General Education.

All General Education Course proposals must be responsive to the following prompts:

1. Which of the seven General Education Learning Objective(s) will be addressed in the course? A minimum of two (2) Learning Objectives must be clearly addressed in the course; it is recommended that each course address two to three (2-3) Learning Objectives and not more than four (4).
2. What component(s) of the course will help students achieve the General Education Learning Objectives covered in the course? Provide evidence that students in the course have adequate opportunities to achieve the identified Learning Objectives.
3. How will students be assessed to determine their attainment of the Learning Objective(s) of General Education covered in the course? This assessment must be included as a portion of the student’s overall performance in the course.
4. Please provide a copy of the current or proposed syllabus.

It is important for students to be cognizant of when they are participating in a General Education course and what Learning Objectives they are working to achieve.
RECOMMENDATION 2: Course syllabi for all General Education courses must clearly identify the course as a General Education course and which of the General Education Learning Objectives the course will address.

All existing General Education courses need to be reevaluated and aligned with the new General Education Learning Objectives. Therefore, the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs proposes an evaluation process reviewing all General Education courses take place over a three (3) year process. This timeline is proposed to distribute the workload associated with this process over a manageable timeframe while significant progress in aligning our current courses with the new learning objectives. Additionally, a subsequent periodic review of courses is proposed to monitor concerns of curricular drift as well as keep the information about each course reasonably current.

RECOMMENDATION 3: The senate must review all current General Education courses for alignment with the Learning Objectives adopted by the Faculty Senate on April 28, 2015. This process should be distributed over three years and under the direction of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs. This process should be complete by the end of the 2018-2019 academic year. Any efforts that can be made to streamline the process and reduce burden to the faculty and staff in completing this process should be made. This may include to the extent possible ad-hoc committee formation to expedite proposal review as well as streamlined proposal submission and completion.

RECOMMENDATION 4: General Education courses are to be re-evaluated for alignment with the General Education Learning Objectives on a rolling five (5) year basis. This review process will occur under the direction of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs.

Effective Date

Immediately with completion of the initial review of General Education courses by the end of spring 2019.
Attachment 1

Current text from the Guide to Curricular Procedures (http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/guide-to-curricular-procedures/) under Heading “G. General Education 2. Criteria for General Education Courses”.

The criteria given below have been derived from the objectives for General Education approved by the Senate on April 30, 1985, and on December 2, 1997.

No one course must achieve every General Education objective, but each proposal must specify clearly which objectives it proposes to meet. The Senate legislation of December 2, 1997, and February 27, 2001 (see Appendix “D” of the 2/27/01 Agenda and 2/27/01 Senate Record), requires that typically three or more core competencies, activities and strategies for enhanced learning be integrated in the courses offered in the areas of Health and Physical Activity, Natural Sciences, Arts, Humanities, and Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Core Competencies, Activities, and Strategies for Enhanced Learning:

Knowledge domain courses must require each student to engage in activities promoting learning course content through practicing, typically, three or more of the following core competencies, activities, and strategies for enhanced learning:

a. writing, speaking and/or other forms of self-expression,
b. information gathering, such as the use of the library, computer/electronic resources, and experimentation or observation,
c. synthesis and analysis in problem solving and critical thinking, including, where appropriate, the application of reasoning and interpretive methods, and quantitative thinking,
d. collaborative learning and teamwork,
e. activities that promote and advance intercultural and/or international understanding,
f. activities that promote the understanding of issues pertaining to social behavior, scholarly conduct, and community responsibility,
g. a significant alternative competency for active learning designed for and appropriate to a specific course.

Rationale:

Students should be actively involved in a significant part of their own learning in all General Education courses at Penn State. Through the use of active learning in assignments, exercises, and other formal activities associated with a course, students become engaged participants in the particular course’s content and, simultaneously, build competencies, skills, and abilities that are necessary to promote learning in any situation. A successful General Education course typically will involve students in several active-learning activities, not all of the same type. However, evidence of significant involvement by students is more important than the count of activities. Activities that promote intercultural and international competence, or that help students assess social behavior and scholarly conduct in the community, are especially valuable.
Criteria for determining whether a course meets the general objectives of General Education

All General Education Course proposals must be responsive to the following questions:

1. Does the course proposal show which of the following general objectives will be addressed in the course?
2. Through General Education courses, students:
   a. should enhance their key competencies for active learning,
   b. should develop their intercultural and international competence,
   c. should be enabled to acquire knowledge through critical reading,
   d. should learn how to acquire information and data through a variety of means (including electronic),
   e. should learn how to analyze and evaluate, where appropriate in a quantitative manner, the acquired information and knowledge,
   f. should learn how to integrate knowledge from a variety of sources and fields,
   g. should learn how to make critical judgments in a logical manner,
   h. should learn how to communicate effectively.
3. Does the course proposal outline methods for achieving the General Education objectives identified as important components of the course?
4. Does the course proposal show how key competencies for active learning are integrated in the course?
5. Does the course proposal identify means through which the intercultural and international competence of the students is enhanced?
6. Does the course proposal show how the course assignments develop the ability of the students to analyze problems or questions and evaluate them critically?
7. Does the course proposal identify opportunities for students to integrate knowledge acquired from a variety of sources?
8. Does the course proposal show opportunities for students to formulate and express informed judgments?
9. Does the course proposal indicate how students will be examined to determine their attainment of the general objectives of General Education?
10. Does the course proposal show how the course is related to other fields of study or courses and how this relationship is communicated to students?
4.F. Senate Committee On Committees And Rules

Establishment of the Standing Joint Committee for General Education Assessment

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

BACKGROUND

On April 19, 2016, the University Faculty Senate approved a legislative report entitled “Recommendations for General Education Assessment,” which was brought forward by the Special Joint Senate Committee on General Education Assessment. This report included three recommendations for the establishment of a new committee entitled “Standing Joint Committee on General Education Assessment.” This committee will guide regular curricular review and the on-going assessment of student learning as it pertains to General Education.

Standing Joint Committee for General Education Assessment

SCOPE

The new standing joint committee should recommend the development of datasets to inform general education assessment. Such datasets should include, but not be limited to:

1. A General Education Curricular Inventory that shows patterns of course offerings, student enrollment, and student grades by major and location.

2. General Education curriculum mapping that shows the relationship between General Education and undergraduate majors.

3. General Education course objective mapping that shows the relationship to General Education learning objectives.

4. The new standing joint committee should collect and use data in an ongoing way to examine student outcomes, such as (1) student success (e.g., time-to-degree, graduation rate, and other institutional data) and
(2) student learning (e.g., course work, engaged scholarship projects, and other factors that provide evidence of learning). The data should also be used to inform curricular improvement, including but not limited to: (1) decisions about the General Education curriculum, including questions about the efficacy of pathways to support integrative thinking; (2) effective assessment practices and processes, especially those that can be shared across disciplines; and (3) decisions about availability of General Education curricular components across the University, including gaps and trends. The goal should be to develop an analytic assessment plan, supported by data that informs curricular improvement and evolves over time.

**MEMBERSHIP**

i. Associate Vice Provost for Learning Outcomes Assessment; Co-Chair

ii. Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee; Co-Chair

iii. An associate vice president and associate dean for Undergraduate Education, appointed by the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education

iv. Director and Assistant Dean of the Office for General Education

v. A member of the Graduate Council, appointed by the Vice Provost for Graduate Education and the Dean of the Graduate School

vi. An associate dean from Penn State Libraries, appointed by the Dean of Libraries and Scholarly Communications

vii. A student government representative (either UPUA or CCSG), appointed by the Committee on Committees and Rules

viii. Six University Faculty Senators, to represent Commonwealth Campuses and University Park Colleges, appointed by the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules. Faculty Senators will serve rotating three-year, renewable terms.

**SELECTION**

i. The University Faculty Senate, the Office of Undergraduate Education and the Office of Planning and Assessment shall jointly appoint the committee.

**DUTIES**

i. The committee shall work in cooperation with the University-wide assessment working group chaired by the Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment and any subsequently formed University-assessment coordinating body to ensure that assessment efforts are coordinated across General Education, baccalaureate degree programs, and other assessments of academic areas (such as engaged scholarship, minors, certificate programs, etc.).

ii. The committee shall develop data sets to be used for general education assessment, such as curricular inventories that show patterns of course offerings, student enrollment, and student grades by major and location; curriculum mapping that shows the relationship between General Education and undergraduate majors; and course objective mapping that shows the relationship to General Education learning objectives.

iii. The committee shall collect and use data to examine student learning outcomes and to develop analytic assessment plan, which evolves over time and informs curricular improvement.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

- Jonathan Abel
- Mohamad Ansari
- Larry Backer
- Dawn Blasko, Chair
- Mark Casteel
- Pamela Hufnagel
- William Kelly, Vice Chair
- Richard Robinett
- Keith Shapiro
- James Strauss
- Jane Sutton
- Ann Taylor
- Kent Vrana
- Matthew Woessner
PART I. COURSE AND GENERAL EDUCATION OBJECTIVES

A. Please list your course learning objectives.

B. In the GH OR GQ tables below, please mark the General Education Domain or Foundation Learning Objectives that are addressed in your course as part of course activities and formal student learning assessments (e.g. graded assignments, exams). Select at least three of the following learning objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK “X” for at least 3 objectives</th>
<th>GH Domain Learning Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GH1. Explain the methods of inquiry in humanities fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH2. Demonstrate competence in critical thinking about topics and texts in the humanities through clear and well-reasoned responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH3. Critically evaluate texts in the humanities—whether verbal, visual, or digital—and identify and explain moral or ethical dimensions within the disciplines of the humanities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH4. Demonstrate knowledge of major cultural currents, issues, and developments through time, including evidence of exposure to unfamiliar material that challenges their curiosity and stretches their intellectual range.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH5. Become familiar with groups, individuals, ideas, or events that have influenced the experiences and values of different communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK “X” for at least 3 objectives</th>
<th>GQ Foundation Learning Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GQ1. Use mathematical, statistical, or computational models, principles, and processes to integrate, synthesize, generalize, or make judgments about real-world problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ2. Recognize patterns, establish mathematical relations, apply problem-solving skills, and think logically and critically.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ3. Develop, explore, analyze, and reason about multi-variable relationships using quantitative tools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ4. Use probability to reason and make judgments based on data that exhibit variability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ5. Communicate and explain mathematical and statistical ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Please check the General Education Key Learning Objectives that are addressed in your course as part of course activities and formal student learning assessments (e.g. graded assignments, exams). Select at least two, but no more than four, of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK “X” for at least 2 and no more than 4</th>
<th>General Education Key Learning Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K1. EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION – the ability to exchange information and ideas in oral, written, and visual form in ways that allow for informed and persuasive discourse that builds trust and respect among those engaged in that exchange, and helps create environments where creative ideas and problem-solving flourish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K2. KEY LITERACIES – the ability to identify, interpret, create, communicate and compute using materials in a variety of media and contexts. Literacy acquired in multiple areas, such as textual, quantitative, information/technology, health, intercultural, historical, aesthetic, linguistic (world languages), and scientific, enables individuals to achieve their goals, to develop their knowledge and potential, to lead healthy and productive lives, and to participate fully in their community and wider society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K3. CRITICAL AND ANALYTICAL THINKING – the habit of mind characterized by comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating a conclusion. It is the intellectually disciplined process of conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K4. INTEGRATIVE THINKING – the ability to synthesize knowledge across multiple domains, modes of inquiry, historical periods, and perspectives, as well as the ability to identify linkages between existing knowledge and new information. Individuals who engage in integrative thinking are able to transfer knowledge within and beyond their current contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K5. CREATIVE THINKING – the capacity to synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of performing, making, thinking, or acting in an imaginative way that may be characterized by innovation, divergent thinking, and intellectual risk taking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K6. GLOBAL LEARNING – the intellectually disciplined abilities to analyze similarities and differences among cultures; evaluate natural, physical, social, cultural, historical, and economic legacies and hierarchies; and engage as community members and leaders who will continue to deal with the intricacies of an ever-changing world. Individuals should acquire the ability to analyze power; identify and critique interdependent global, regional, and local cultures and systems; and evaluate the implications for people’s lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K7. SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICAL REASONING – the ability to assess one’s own values within the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, describe how different perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Individuals should acquire the self-knowledge and leadership skills needed to play a role in creating and maintaining healthy, civil, safe, and thriving communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II. STUDENT ASSESSMENTS

A. GH or GQ objective assessment evidence (Middle States requirement):
   a. Please attach at least one significant or major student learning assessment example from your
course that assesses student learning for at least one of the GH or GQ objectives checked above.
For example, you may attach exam questions or major assignment prompt. The assessment
example may address more than one of the GH or GQ objectives. Make sure that student
assessment example includes information on how the student work was evaluated or scored (e.g.
number of points assigned, grade scale or rubric used to evaluate student work).

b. Note which GH or GQ objective(s) is addressed by this assessment.

c. Please include information on the number of students in the course and on student performance
information for this assessment in the Fall 2016 term. For example, you may attach a list of
individual student scores or grades for this assessment, but do not include individual student
names. Or you may provide information on how many students met your performance
expectations for this assessment (e.g. 8 out of 10 students met assignment performance
expectations of a B grade or better).

d. If students did not perform as well as desired, do you plan to make any curriculum changes the
next time you teach this course?

B. KEY learning objective assessment evidence (Middle States requirement):
   a. Please attach at least one significant or major student learning assessment example from your
course that assesses student learning for at least one of the KEY objectives checked above. For
example, you may attach an exam or major assignment prompt. The assessment example may
address more than one of the KEY objectives. Make sure that student assessment example
includes information on how the student work was evaluated or scored (e.g. number of points
assigned, grade scale or rubric used to evaluate student work). You may use the same assignment
that you included in D above if the assignment also addresses KEY learning objective(s).

b. Note which KEY objective(s) is addressed by this assessment.

c. Please include information on the number of students in the course and on student performance
information for this assessment in the Fall 2016 term. For example, you may attach a list of
individual student scores or grades for this assessment, but do not include individual student
names. Or you may provide information on how many students met your performance
expectations for this assessment (e.g. 8 out of 10 students met assignment performance
expectations of a B grade or better).

d. If students did not perform as well as desired, do you plan to make any curriculum changes the
next time you teach this course?
PART III. COURSE ACTIVITIES

We would like to obtain a selection of information about connections between in-class activities and assessment of student learning. We are particularly interested in your use of traditional and innovative course activities and assessments to engage and motivate student learning in general education courses.

For TWO GQ/GH Objective(s) and TWO Key Learning Objective(s) checked above:
   a. Briefly describe a course activity that helps students to achieve general education objectives (e.g. lecture, field trip, video, discussions).
   b. Very briefly note or describe how student learning is assessed through formal assessments (e.g. exam questions, essays, debate, participation in discussion, presentation).

GQ or GH Objective addressed (use general education learning objective numbers above):
   a. Description of course activity:

   b. Description of related student learning assessment:

GQ or GH Objective addressed (use general education learning objective numbers above):
   a. Description of course activity:

   b. Description of related student learning assessment:

KEY Learning Objective addressed (use general education learning objective numbers above):
   a. Description of course activity:

   b. Description of related student learning assessment:

KEY Learning Objective addressed (use general education learning objective numbers above):
   a. Description of course activity:

   b. Description of related student learning assessment:

PART IV. SYLLABUS

Please attach your course syllabus.
4.H. Revised University General Education Learning Objectives

In April 2016, the University Faculty Senate voted to approve revised General Education learning objectives. The revised learning objectives are organized into three groups: Key, Foundation and Knowledge Domain.

Key learning objectives are core competencies that should be developed as part of any General Education course. According to the Faculty Senate vote, General Education course faculty should show evidence that they develop and assess learning for at least two, but no more than four of the following:

1. **Effective Communication**
   
The ability to exchange information and ideas in oral, written, and visual form in ways that allow for informed and persuasive discourse that builds trust and respect among those engaged in that exchange, and helps create environments where creative ideas and problem-solving flourish.

2. **Key Literacies**
   
The ability to identify, interpret, create, communicate and compute using materials in a variety of media and contexts. Literacy acquired in multiple areas, such as textual, quantitative, information/technology, health, intercultural, historical, aesthetic, linguistic (world languages), and scientific, enables individuals to achieve their goals, to develop their knowledge and potential, to lead healthy and productive lives, and to participate fully in their community and wider society.

3. **Critical and Analytical Thinking**
   
The habit of mind characterized by comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating a conclusion. It is the intellectually disciplined process of conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action.

4. **Integrative Thinking**
   
The ability to synthesize knowledge across multiple domains, modes of inquiry, historical periods, and perspectives, as well as the ability to identify linkages between existing knowledge and new information. Individuals who engage in integrative thinking are able to transfer knowledge within and beyond their current contexts.

5. **Creative Thinking**
   
The capacity to synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of performing, making, thinking, or acting in an imaginative way that may be characterized by innovation, divergent thinking, and intellectual risk taking.
6. Global Learning

The intellectually disciplined abilities to analyze similarities and differences among cultures; evaluate natural, physical, social, cultural, historical, and economic legacies and hierarchies; and engage as community members and leaders who will continue to deal with the intricacies of an ever-changing world. Individuals should acquire the ability to analyze power; identify and critique interdependent global, regional, and local cultures and systems; and evaluate the implications for people’s lives.

7. Social Responsibility and Ethical Reasoning

The ability to assess one’s own values within the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, describe how different perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Individuals should acquire the self-knowledge and leadership skills needed to play a role in creating and maintaining healthy, civil, safe, and thriving communities.

Additional learning objectives are to be addressed in each course that is part of the Foundation and Knowledge Domain general education requirements. Faculty must show evidence they they develop and assess at least three objectives out of five for their given area. The objectives for each area are:

**WRITING AND SPEAKING GWS**

- Demonstrate rhetorical and analytical skills as they explore, compose, interpret, and present a variety of texts.
- Communicate effectively and persuasively to a range of audiences.
- Demonstrate capacities for critical thinking, listening, and generating ideas.
- Demonstrate proficiency in composing processes.
- Employ the conventions of both spoken and written communication with sensitivity to context and venue.

**QUANTIFICATION GQ**

- Use mathematical, statistical, or computational models, principles, and processes to integrate, synthesize, generalize, or make judgments about real-world problems.
- Recognize patterns, establish mathematical relations, apply problem-solving skills, and think logically and critically.
- Develop, explore, analyze, and reason about multi-variable relationships using quantitative tools.
- Use probability to reason and make judgments based on data that exhibit variability.
- Communicate and explain mathematical and statistical ideas.

**ARTS GA**

- Explain the methods of inquiry in arts fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas.
- Demonstrate an expanded knowledge and comprehension of the role that the arts play in various aspects of human endeavor.
- Demonstrate competence in the creation of works of art and design.
- Demonstrate competence in analysis, critical thinking and interpretive reasoning through the exploration of creative works.
• Identify and explain the aesthetic, historic, social, and cultural significance of important works of art and critically assess creative works, their own or others’, through evaluative processes of analysis and interpretation.

HUMANITIES GH
• Explain the methods of inquiry in humanities fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas.
• Demonstrate competence in critical thinking about topics and texts in the humanities through clear and well-reasoned responses.
• Critically evaluate texts in the humanities – whether verbal, visual, or digital – and identify and explain moral or ethical dimensions within the disciplines of the humanities.
• Demonstrate knowledge of major cultural currents, issues, and developments through time, including evidence of exposure to unfamiliar material that challenges their curiosity and stretches their intellectual range.
• Become familiar with groups, individuals, ideas, or events that have influenced the experiences and values of different communities.

HEALTH AND WELLNESS GHW
• Explain the methods of inquiry in Health and Wellness fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas.
• Describe multiple perceptions and dimensions of health and wellness (emotional, spiritual, environmental, physical, social, intellectual, and occupational).
• Identify and explain ways individuals and/or communities can achieve and maintain health and wellness.
• Describe health-related risk factors and explain changes in knowledge, attitudes, behaviors, activities or skills that have the potential of improving health and wellness.
• Disseminate knowledge about health and wellness and demonstrate behavioral practices needed to engage in healthy living across the life span.

NATURAL SCIENCES GN
• Explain the methods of inquiry in the natural science fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas.
• Construct evidence-based explanations of natural phenomena.
• Demonstrate informed understandings of scientific claims and their applications.
• Evaluate the quality of the data, methods, and inferences used to generate scientific knowledge.
• Identify societal or philosophical implications of discoveries in the natural sciences, as well as their potential to address contemporary problems.

SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES GS
• Explain the various methods of inquiry used in the social and behavioral sciences and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas.
• Identify and explain major foundational theories and bodies of work in a particular area of social and behavioral sciences.
• Describe the ways in which many different factors may interact to influence behaviors and/or institutions in historical or contemporary settings.
• Explain how social and behavioral science researchers use concepts, theoretical models and data to better understand and address world problems.
• Recognize social, cultural, political and/or ethical implications of work in the social and behavioral sciences.
The revised General Education learning objectives replace the following General Education learning objectives:

1. Acquire knowledge through critical information gathering, including reading and listening, computer-assisted searching, and scientific experimentation and observation.

2. Analyze and evaluate, where appropriate in a quantitative manner, the acquired knowledge.

3. Integrate knowledge from a variety of sources and fields.

4. Make critical judgments in a logical and rational manner.

5. Develop the skills to maintain health and understand the factors that impinge upon it.

6. Communicate effectively, both in writing and orally, and using the accepted methods for presentation, organization, and debate particular to their disciplines.

7. Seek and share knowledge, independently and in collaboration with others.

8. Gain understanding of international interdependence and cultural diversity and develop consideration for values, lifestyles, and traditions that may differ from their own.

9. Comprehend the role of aesthetic and creative activities expressing both imagination and experience.
4.I. Summary Tables of Gen Ed GQ and GH – Sample

Appended Example: Examples of Good Education Humanities Domain and Key Learning Objectives Samples

---

**Course Code** | **Course Name** | **Type** | **Description** | **Supporting** | **Performance Expectations** | **Summary of Findings** | **Citations** | **Action to Take (if any)**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---

**Gen Ed GQ**

**HERITAGE I**

- **PHILOSOPHY**
  - **Course Code:** PHIL 101/102
  - **Course Name:** Western Heritage I
  - **Type:** Online
  - **Description:** During the Revolutionary War, students will show their familiarity with the experiences and values of during certain point in American history.
  - **Supporting:** Students' ability to recognize patterns in written or visual sources of evidence and to apply their insights.
  - **Performance Expectations:** Students will be able to understand and analyze the experiences of various African Americans.
  - **Summary of Findings:** Students are expected to meet expectations by analyzing and discussing the importance of the author as an original source.
  - **Citations:**
  - **Action to Take:**

**TEXTUAL ANALYSIS**

- **Course Code:** ENGL 101
  - **Course Name:** American Literature/Zietgeist: Read the texts, analyze them, and write about them.
  - **Type:** Online
  - **Description:** To meet expectations, students should be able to develop an understanding of how various literary texts are related to one another.
  - **Supporting:** Students should be able to conduct an interview with an educator who has taught in the classroom.
  - **Performance Expectations:** To meet expectations, students should be able to analyze the perspectives provided in the readings.
  - **Summary of Findings:** Students should be able to produce a piece of quality writing.
  - **Citations:**
  - **Action to Take:**

**PHILOSOPHY**

- **Course Code:** PHIL 201
  - **Course Name:** Western Heritage I
  - **Type:** Online
  - **Description:** During the Revolutionary War, students will show their familiarity with the experiences and values of during certain point in American history.
  - **Supporting:** Students' ability to recognize patterns in written or visual sources of evidence and to apply their insights.
  - **Performance Expectations:** Students will be able to understand and analyze the experiences of various African Americans.
  - **Summary of Findings:** Students are expected to meet expectations by analyzing and discussing the importance of the author as an original source.
  - **Citations:**
  - **Action to Take:**

**HUMANITIES**

- **Course Code:** ART 201
  - **Course Name:** American Pop Culture and Folklore
  - **Type:** Online
  - **Description:** To meet expectations, students should be able to develop an understanding of how various literary texts are related to one another.
  - **Supporting:** Students should be able to conduct an interview with an educator who has taught in the classroom.
  - **Performance Expectations:** To meet expectations, students should be able to analyze the perspectives provided in the readings.
  - **Summary of Findings:** Students should be able to produce a piece of quality writing.
  - **Citations:**
  - **Action to Take:**

**CULTURAL ANALYSIS**

- **Course Code:** ENGL 201
  - **Course Name:** American Literature/Zietgeist: Read the texts, analyze them, and write about them.
  - **Type:** Online
  - **Description:** To meet expectations, students should be able to develop an understanding of how various literary texts are related to one another.
  - **Supporting:** Students should be able to conduct an interview with an educator who has taught in the classroom.
  - **Performance Expectations:** To meet expectations, students should be able to analyze the perspectives provided in the readings.
  - **Summary of Findings:** Students should be able to produce a piece of quality writing.
  - **Citations:**
  - **Action to Take:**

**GLOBAL LEARNING**

- **Course Code:** HIST 201
  - **Course Name:** World History
  - **Type:** Online
  - **Description:** During the Revolutionary War, students will show their familiarity with the experiences and values of during certain point in American history.
  - **Supporting:** Students' ability to recognize patterns in written or visual sources of evidence and to apply their insights.
  - **Performance Expectations:** Students will be able to understand and analyze the experiences of various African Americans.
  - **Summary of Findings:** Students are expected to meet expectations by analyzing and discussing the importance of the author as an original source.
  - **Citations:**
  - **Action to Take:**

**SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICAL REASONING**

- **Course Code:** PSY 201
  - **Course Name:** Psychology
  - **Type:** Online
  - **Description:** During the Revolutionary War, students will show their familiarity with the experiences and values of during certain point in American history.
  - **Supporting:** Students' ability to recognize patterns in written or visual sources of evidence and to apply their insights.
  - **Performance Expectations:** Students will be able to understand and analyze the experiences of various African Americans.
  - **Summary of Findings:** Students are expected to meet expectations by analyzing and discussing the importance of the author as an original source.
  - **Citations:**
  - **Action to Take:**

---

**Data in this table are a small sample of collected data. Additional data and examples are available upon request.**

92
Persons, Morals, and The Good Life

Lehigh Valley Journal Students write one entry per week, reflecting on a topic related to the course, such as readings, questions, critique of a point made in class. Students are expected to "dialogue" with the class and issues raised in the course. Most students did well through journal entries that comment, critique, raise questions, apply ideas to personal experiences, or apply ideas to current events or news. Students will meet the objective through a "good faith effort" to establish an authentic dialogue with the issues of the course in their journal.
### General Education Quantification Domain and Key Learning Objective Samples

Note: Data in this table are a small sample of collected data. Additional data and examples are available on request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Supporting Documents</th>
<th>Performance Expectations</th>
<th>Summary of Findings</th>
<th>Criteria met</th>
<th>Action to be taken if criterion not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G01. Use mathematical, statistical, or computational models, principles, and processes to integrate, synthesize, generalize, or make judgments about real-world problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 125</td>
<td>Plane Trigonometry</td>
<td>Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
<td>Written/Exam</td>
<td>Solve problems, including e.g., converting sine functions to cosine functions, identifying equalities, solving for variables in real-world problems.</td>
<td>Gen Ed Memo</td>
<td>Students will correctly apply skills in trigonometry to solve a variety of equations and find solutions to real-world problems. The exam is worth 60 points.</td>
<td>25 students; average score = 79.3%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Low scoring students provided with support from the learning center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G02. Recognize patterns, establish mathematical relations, apply problem-solving skills, and think logically and critically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMSC 101</td>
<td>Introduction to C++ Programming</td>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>Homework problems</td>
<td>Create a program to solve a programming problem.</td>
<td>Gen Ed Memo; Syllabus</td>
<td>Students will correctly solve the programming problem using appropriate logic and programming conventions.</td>
<td>Almost all students met expectations</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G03. Develop, explore, analyze, and reason about multi-variable relationships using quantitative tools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 100</td>
<td>Statistical Concepts and Reasoning</td>
<td>Bemidji</td>
<td>Group project</td>
<td>In small groups, choose two quantitative variables, conduct correlation and regression analyses, and present results to the class.</td>
<td>Gen Ed Memo; Project; Syllabus</td>
<td>Students will choose appropriate variables, accurately calculate and interpret the statistics, and clearly communicate the results. The assignment is worth 30 points.</td>
<td>33 students; Must achieve A and B, one C.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G04. Use the probability to reason and make judgments based on data that exhibit variability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 200</td>
<td>Introduction to Statistics for Business</td>
<td>Bemidji</td>
<td>Group project</td>
<td>Choose the probability of events given a set of assumptions.</td>
<td>Gen Ed Memo; Project; Syllabus</td>
<td>Students will accurately apply their knowledge of probability to determine possible outcomes in a variety of situations. The quiz is worth 100 points.</td>
<td>25/29 scored 9 or better</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain Objective G05. Communicate and explain mathematical and statistical ideas.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Supporting Documents</th>
<th>Performance Expectations</th>
<th>Summary of Findings</th>
<th>Criteria met</th>
<th>Action to be taken if criterion not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 100</td>
<td>Problem Solving in Algebra</td>
<td>Missouri State</td>
<td>Portfolio Assessment</td>
<td>Solve problems from the chapter and write about their experience solving the problem; covered with rubric.</td>
<td>Gen Ed Memo; Syllabus</td>
<td>Students will produce a narrative describing what they did when solving math problems, why they did what they did.</td>
<td>20 students; average score = 79.20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Modify the rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 100</td>
<td>Statistical Concepts and Reasoning</td>
<td>Bemidji</td>
<td>Group project</td>
<td>In small groups, choose two quantitative variables, conduct correlation and regression analyses, and present results to the class.</td>
<td>Gen Ed Memo; Project; Syllabus</td>
<td>Students will choose appropriate variables, accurately calculate and interpret the statistics, and clearly communicate the results. The assignment is worth 30 points.</td>
<td>33 students; Must achieve A and B, one C.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Literacies:**
- the ability to identify, interpret, create, communicate and compute using materials in a variety of media and contexts.
- Literacy acquired in multiple areas, such as textual, quantitative, information/technology, health, intercultural, historical, aesthetic, linguistic (world languages), and scientific, enables individuals to achieve their goals, to develop to their knowledge and potential, to lead healthy and productive lives, and to participate fully in their community and wider society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Supporting Documents</th>
<th>Performance Expectations</th>
<th>Summary of Findings</th>
<th>Criteria met</th>
<th>Action to be taken if criterion not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 125</td>
<td>Plane Trigonometry</td>
<td>Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
<td>Written/Exam</td>
<td>Solve problems, including e.g., converting sine functions to cosine functions, identifying equalities, solving for variables in real-world problems.</td>
<td>Gen Ed Memo</td>
<td>Students will correctly apply skills in trigonometry to solve a variety of equations and find solutions to real-world problems. The exam is worth 60 points.</td>
<td>25 students; average score = 79.3%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Low scoring students provided with support from the learning center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Critical and Analytical Thinking:**
- the habit of mind characterized by comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before assessing or formulating a conclusion. It is the intellectually disciplined process of conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Supporting Documents</th>
<th>Performance Expectations</th>
<th>Summary of Findings</th>
<th>Criteria met</th>
<th>Action to be taken if criterion not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMSC 101</td>
<td>Introduction to C++ Programming</td>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>Final Program</td>
<td>Final Program Assessments: create a conversion utility.</td>
<td>Gen Ed Memo</td>
<td>Students will use correct programming conventions and logic, use appropriate user interface conventions to create a user program. Students will be scored 15 points for complete and correct performance for each application.</td>
<td>Almost all met expectations for project</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Creative Thinking:**
- the capacity to synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of performing, making, thinking, or acting in an integrative way that may be characterized by innovation, divergent thinking, and intellectual risk taking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Supporting Documents</th>
<th>Performance Expectations</th>
<th>Summary of Findings</th>
<th>Criteria met</th>
<th>Action to be taken if criterion not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAT 100</td>
<td>Elementary Statistics</td>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>Written/Exam</td>
<td>In groups, complete a linear regression project including answering MC questions and working through a case study.</td>
<td>Gen Ed Memo</td>
<td>Students will analyze their statistical knowledge and skills to answer questions related to their own discipline and to communicate their thoughts effectively in a group.</td>
<td>30 students; average score = 79.20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Supporting Documents</th>
<th>Performance Expectations</th>
<th>Summary of Findings</th>
<th>Criteria met</th>
<th>Action to be taken if criterion not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 102</td>
<td>Symbolic Logic</td>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>Written/Exam</td>
<td>Construct proofs for valid arguments using specific rules in some problems and any method they choose in other problems.</td>
<td>Gen Ed Memo</td>
<td>Students will use their logic skills and combine known rules to construct proofs for valid arguments and counterexamples for invalid arguments.</td>
<td>Over 85% of students met expectations</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.J. GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION PLAN

(*) Shaded blocks: Draft assessment measures in field as of academic year 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>MEASURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: Provide solid foundation of core competencies and breadth of knowledge</td>
<td>General education course offerings</td>
<td>COGNITIVE LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Students will embark on developmental path toward achievement of general education learning objectives</td>
<td>DIRECT MEASURE, IN COURSE: In course signature assessments that align with general education objectives; information gathered from course memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIRECT MEASURE, CROSS-CUTTING ASSESSMENT: General education cross-cutting assessments completed by sample of students across courses and campuses, ideally near point of graduation (e.g. CAT critical thinking test)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIRECT MEASURE: Student survey of importance/development, attitudes, connection to major, quality of learning experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIRECT MEASURE: Alumni survey of importance/development, attitudes, connection to post-graduation career paths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION METRIC: Analysis of general education course completion patterns will show that each student has had sufficient opportunities to achieve General Education learning objectives</td>
<td>MEASURE: General Education course enrollment data set organized to allow examination of course enrollment by domain, student major, campus and student academic term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION METRIC: Students will obtain a C or above in GWS and GQ courses</td>
<td>MEASURE: General Education course enrollment data set organized to allow examination of GWS and GQ course performance by student major, campus and student academic term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: Strengthen links between foundational core competencies and upper level studies along a developmental trajectory</td>
<td>In-major upper level and capstone course offerings</td>
<td>COGNITIVE LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Students will demonstrate achievement of general education learning objectives by meeting performance expectations of discipline-specific in-major learning</td>
<td>DIRECT MEASURE: Alignment of key learning objectives with in-major learning objectives and sample of assessments chosen from in-major upper level and capstone courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIRECT MEASURE: Student surveys of importance/development, attitudes, connection to major, quality of learning experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: Provide opportunities for transformative exploration</td>
<td>General education course offerings</td>
<td>AFFECTIVE LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Students will be both motivated to engage, and find value in general education learning experiences that support their personal and professional growth</td>
<td>INDIRECT MEASURE: Student surveys of importance/development, attitudes, connection to major, quality of learning experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIRECT MEASURE: Alumni surveys of importance/development, attitudes, connection to post-graduation career paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MEASURE: Course enrollment patterns will show students choosing wider range of courses to fit personal learning and topic interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION METRIC: Students will choose to engage in general education courses that link to out of classroom co-curricular and engaged scholarship experiences</td>
<td>MEASURE: Co-curricular and engaged scholarship experience participation tracking by Student Affairs Research and Assessment (SARA) office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education faculty fellows program</td>
<td>General education faculty fellows program</td>
<td>EDUCATION METRIC: Faculty will create general education courses that incorporate a variety of experiences and projects outside the classroom that align with general education objectives</td>
<td>MEASURE: Pedagogical and assessment artifacts that align with general education objectives; information gathered from course memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education integrated studies course seed grants</td>
<td>General education integrated studies course seed grants</td>
<td>EDUCATION METRIC: Faculty will create general education courses that incorporate a variety of experiences and projects outside the classroom that align with general education objectives</td>
<td>MEASURE: Pedagogical and assessment artifacts that align with general education objectives; information gathered from course memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education office collaborations in faculty development workshops</td>
<td>General education office collaborations in faculty development workshops</td>
<td>EDUCATION METRIC: Faculty will create general education courses that effectively</td>
<td>MEASURE: Pedagogical and assessment artifacts that align with general education objectives; information gathered from course memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: Provide opportunities for integrative learning</td>
<td>General education integrated studies course seed grants</td>
<td>EDUCATION METRIC: Faculty will create general education courses that incorporate a variety of experiences and projects outside the classroom that align with general education objectives</td>
<td>MEASURE: Pedagogical and assessment artifacts that align with general education objectives; information gathered from course memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education office collaborations in faculty development workshops with Teaching with Technology, Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence and Office of Learning Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td>EDUCATION METRIC: Faculty will create general education courses that utilize knowledge of pedagogy and assessment</td>
<td>MEASURE: Pedagogical and assessment artifacts that align with general education objectives; information gathered from course memos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education office faculty teaching interest search tool</td>
<td>EDUCATION METRIC: Faculty will regularly partner with others across disciplinary domains in development and delivery of integrated studies courses</td>
<td>Annual tracking of number, rank of faculty engaging in integrated studies course proposals and teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: University curriculum oversight mechanisms will guide and support achievement of general education learning objectives</td>
<td>General education course recertification process</td>
<td>EDUCATION METRIC: Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs recertification process will ensure courses obtain and maintain alignment with general education learning objectives and incorporate assessments to evaluate both learning and programming.</td>
<td>Annual committee review of recertification process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. UNDERGRADUATE and GRADUATE CERTIFICATES ASSESSMENT PLAN

Academic year: 2016-2017
Certificate name: Bioenergy
Certificate Level (Undergraduate or Graduate or NA): Graduate
Credit or non-credit certificate: Credit
College/ Campuses where offered: Agricultural Sciences / World Campus
Faculty Contact: Ali Demirel

I. Certificate Learning Objectives
List certificate learning objectives.

1. APPL TECH: Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge for applied technologies used in production and conversion of biomass into transportation fuels, heat, power, electricity, chemicals, and other value-added products.
2. LOGISTICS: Students will be able to identify and select suitable machine systems for a specific biomass harvesting and handling scenarios based on quantitative evaluations and cost analysis.
3. CONVERSION: Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge for conversions of raw agricultural materials into bioenergy with a focus on liquid biofuels.
4. FEEDSTOCKS: Students will be able to assess characteristics, production, and improvement of the major types of plant biomass feedstocks that are used to produce biomass energy.
II. Map of Certificate Learning Objectives and Certificate Curriculum

Directions:
C. List all certificate curriculum requirements including courses, internships or co-curricular experiences in general order that they are completed by students.
D. In table boxes, indicate whether each course or learning experience contributes to each of the certificate learning objectives.
E. Indicate whether each course or other experience is designed to address each certificate learning objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate Learning Objectives</th>
<th>LO 1. APPL</th>
<th>LO 2. FEEDSTOCKS</th>
<th>LO 3. LOGISTICS</th>
<th>LO 4. CONVERSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A B E 884 Biomass Energy Systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR 880 Bioenergy Feedstocks</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A B E 885 Biomass Harvesting and Logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A B E 888 Conversion Technologies for Bioenergy Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Certificate Assessment Plan for AY 2016-2017

C. Certificate Learning Objective: Which certificate learning objective will you assess this year?
D. Assessment description: Briefly describe the direct assessment that will be used to measure student learning. What is the format? What will it measure? Which group of students will participate in the assessment (e.g. all seniors, sample of seniors)?
E. Measure type: Is this a direct or indirect measure?
F. Implementation plan: Describe the plan for implementation of the assessment. Who designs and reviews the assessment? Is this assessment embedded in a course or outside of courses? What is the plan for gathering samples of student work for review from each campus where certificate is offered? Also describe the formal process for review of student work (e.g. assignment grade scale, grading rubric).
G. Performance criterion: Indicate the performance criterion or target level desired by the program that is used as part of the implementation of this assessment method (e.g. 70 percent of all students will receive a grade of B or above on this assignment; 80 percent of all students will receive a score of 4 or 5 for each of item of the grading rubric used to score student work).
H. Program review: Describe how the program faculty plan to review the results of this student assessment (e.g. annual undergraduate studies retreat). Who will be responsible for acting on findings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate Assessment Plan for AY2016-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Certificate learning objective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO. 1: APPL TECH: Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge for applied technologies used in production and conversion of biomass into transportation fuels, heat, power, electricity, chemicals, and other value-added products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Assessment description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Objective will be assessed using the final Design Project in the course, ABE 884 – Biomass Energy System. For this project diverse groups of 3 - 4 students will conceptualize and design a bioenergy system to meet a particular energy need. Energy needs could derive from residential homes, institutions, companies to industrial sectors, etc. Each project will look at a complete system from feedstock production to fuel or energy products. One hundred (100) points are available for a written report and oral presentation and distributed across specific outcomes as follows: Selection and sustainable sourcing of feedstock (10); Conversion platform and evaluation of alternative technologies (10); System design and creativity (20); Mass and energy balance (10); Economic analysis (10); Ethics, sustainability and environmental considerations (10); Webinar presentation of project (15); critique and interrogation of project design concepts and consideration during Q&amp;A with written feedback (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Measure type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Implementation plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty responsible for ABE 884 will gather results of assessment, complete analysis, and send results to faculty contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Performance criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 70% of the students will receive a score of 80 points allotted to the various components of the final project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Program review and action plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty head for certificate will review results with college or program faculty and determine if a curriculum change is needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that ABE 884 is pre-requisite to all other certificate courses and offered in Summer and Fall semesters. Therefore, the progress report for LO. 1 in 2016-2017 academic year will be available in August 2017 at the end of summer’17 semester.

Definitions:

**Direct student assessment:** Require students to display their knowledge and skills as they respond to the assessment instrument (e.g. exam)

**Indirect student assessment:** Require students to provide reflection, feedback or perceptions of learning rather than to demonstrate it (e.g. survey)

**Performance criterion/ target level:** Desired level of performance as measured by the assessment method. (e.g. We expect that all students will receive a score of 7 or above out of 10 total points on their project presentations.)