
**Pennsylvania College
of Technology**

PENNSTATE



Design Document for Self-Study

Prepared for:

**The Commission on Higher Education
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools**

April 14, 2010

Introduction	4
Institutional Overview: Yesterday and Today	4
Mission and Values	4
Nature and Scope of the Self-Study	5
Specific Goals and Objectives	7
Goals for the Self-Study	7
Time Table	8
Steering Committee Representation	10
Study Groups	11
Study Group Members	11
Group 1 – Mission, Planning, and Resources	11
Group 2 – Institutional Leadership: Standards 4 and 5	11
Group 3 – Integrity and Faculty: Standards 6 and 10	12
Group 4 – Instruction and Outcomes: Standards 7, 11, 12, and 14	12
Group 5 – Student Admissions and Support: Standards 8, 9, and 13	13
Generic Charge to the Study Groups	14
Specific Charges to the Study Groups	15
Group 1 – Mission, Planning, and Resources	15
Group 2 – Institutional Leadership	17
Group 3 – Integrity and Faculty	19
Group 4 – Instruction and Outcomes	21
Group 5 – Student Admissions and Support	23
Study Group Reports	26
Self-Study Format	27
Table of Contents	27
Other Data Resources	28
Spring 2010 College-Wide Activity:	28
Ongoing College-Wide Activities	28
Other Sources	28
Final Documents	29
Visiting Team Profile Descriptors	30
Appendices	31
Appendix A – Penn College Document Resources	32
Strategic Planning and Research Publications	32
Standard Survey Results	32

Statistical Reference Reports.....	33
Planning Reports	33
Special Survey Reports	33
Other Documents Available	34
Penn College Middle States Reports	34
External Document Resources (as necessary)	35

Introduction

Institutional Overview: Yesterday and Today

Pennsylvania College of Technology (Penn College), located in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, was founded in 1989 as a special mission affiliate of Penn State University committed to applied technology education.

Technical education has been offered on the current site since 1914, when an Industrial Arts program was initiated as part of the curriculum for the Williamsport High School. In 1941, the institution became the Williamsport Technical Institute (WTI), which provided technical education to local secondary students as well as post-secondary students from the surrounding region.

Following the passage of the Community College Act of 1963, 20 local school districts supported the transformation of WTI to the Williamsport Area Community College (WACC) in 1964. This resulted in an expansion of the College's service area to the surrounding ten counties, an area of about 7200 square miles. The City of Williamsport became the sponsor of WACC in 1985 after financial concerns prompted the local school districts to withdraw their support. In 1989, through House Bill 1086, the Pennsylvania legislature effected a merger and Pennsylvania College of Technology became a wholly owned affiliate of the Corporation for Pennsylvania State University.

After the transformation, Penn College continued to focus on applied technology majors, including the addition of four-year baccalaureate majors. Enrollments grew significantly to the current level of approximately 6400 students. On-campus housing was added, with more substantial dining facilities, allowing a broader appeal to students from a wider geographical area; about 10% of the current enrollments are out-of-state, mostly from the states contiguous to the Pennsylvania borders.

There are currently about 70 associate and 30 baccalaureate degree majors offered by eight schools in a wide variety of technical disciplines, and almost half of the current students are enrolled in the B.S. majors. Excellent classroom and lab facilities, combined with experienced technical faculty and continued support from business and industries, contribute to an overall placement rate in excess of 90%.

Of significance to our educational and student support activities has been the recent implementation of what is called the "Stage X" construction project. This project is a \$50 million-plus comprehensive addition to the physical facilities consisting of a 250-bed dormitory/dining facility on the west side of campus; expansion and renovation of the automotive technology and welding technology laboratories; and relocation, expansion and renovation of physical and biological science laboratories, including accompanying faculty offices. These changes support improved instructional capabilities as well as support for an increasingly geographically dispersed student body desiring on-campus residence services.

Mission and Values

Mission Statement

Pennsylvania College of Technology is a public institution providing comprehensive, hands-on technical education at the baccalaureate and associate degree levels. Every member of our

College community endeavors to create and sustain excellence in a student-centered environment that promotes personal growth, social awareness, and lifelong learning, all of which help prepare our graduates for success.

Penn College Values

These core values guide Penn College to accomplish our mission and achieve our vision:

- **Hands-on Education:** We believe the best preparation for a successful career is a learning environment emphasizing applied, real-world instruction. We provide experiential learning in small classes and labs with state of the art equipment, mentored by skilled faculty with business and industry experience.
- **Student-Centered Environment:** Our students' best interest is the priority influencing our decision making. As an open enrollment college, believing in the dignity and worth of every individual, we strive to provide a holistic experience that fosters educational, physical, personal, and social development.
- **Business and Industry Partnerships:** As an entrepreneurial institution, we develop cooperative relationships with business and industry to ensure our curriculum remains current, encourages lifelong learning, and prepares our graduates to compete successfully in the global marketplace. This provides opportunities for faculty to enhance their skills, students to acquire work-based experiences, the College to receive technology and scholarship support, and the community to benefit from a highly qualified workforce.
- **Community of Respect:** Each member of the Penn College community is entitled to and expected to contribute to a collegial and mutually supportive environment. As stewards of this campus environment, we promote collaboration and communication, cultivate an appreciation of our differences, and treat each other with respect.

Nature and Scope of the Self-Study

The proposed self-study will be comprehensive in its scope, examining how the institution's processes and procedures comply with all of the 14 Standards of Accreditation within the *Characteristics of Excellence*. The 2002 accreditation self-study was a special-topics study that focused on Governance and Planning, Information Literacy, and Outcomes Assessment. Previous studies focused on the significant changes that occurred after the formation of Pennsylvania College of Technology. Given the time that has lapsed since the College looked at its entire operations, a comprehensive examination will reveal a more complete and relevant picture for future guidance.

Significant support of this model comes from a Foundations of Excellence (FoE) study made during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 semesters. This study provided a comprehensive look at resources and processes for first-year students, with the goal of generating recommendations that improve retention and academic success of new college students. As noted on the FoE website:

The engine of The Foundations of Excellence process is a campus-based task force - a group with broad representation from across the campus. The work of the task force begins with a campus audit of the first year for new and transfer students (the " Current Practices Inventory ") and continues with a nine- to twelve-month process of evaluation using the Foundational Dimensions and related performance indicators (P.I.'s), and culminates in the development of a strategic action plan for

campus improvement. Institutions that participate in the Foundations of Excellence process will have access to a wide array of services and support.

Data and reports resulting from this study will clearly support the work of the self-study teams. Additionally, some of the FoE structural elements will be used by the steering committee to guide the self-study process. More information about the Foundations of Excellence can be found at <http://www.fyfoundations.org/>.

Another significant support of this self-study will be the past, current, and future work of the Quality Through Assessment (QTA) Committee. A wide variety of assessment activities already occurs within the eight schools as a result of individual program accreditations and endorsements, periodic program reviews, industry and advisory board inquiries, state and federal reporting requirements, and faculty and department initiatives. The Quality Through Assessment Committee was formed to develop a comprehensive plan that would draw together all the assessment activities into a unified plan, thus enabling college members to take advantage of information learned from assessments conducted elsewhere in the institution, as well as those activities conducted in their own work areas. Having an overall view of assessment activities within the institution has also increased the use of assessment results in planning and resource allocation.

Specific Goals and Objectives

The decennial accreditation process through self-study offers a unique opportunity for Penn College to examine its processes, resources, and outcomes in a reflective and honest discussion of where we are now and where we want to go as we serve the many stakeholders of our unique institution. The self-study is primarily a tool for the future and, thus, must have clearly defined goals that will form the roadmap for our future academic success.

Goals for the Self-Study

Meeting these goals will ensure that the process results in a realistic appraisal of the College's strengths and weaknesses, and will form the basis for recommendations that will further strengthen our ability to fulfill the mission of the College. To that end, the self-study will:

- Produce a self-study report that outlines recommendations for the benefit of the College's present and future students, and effective strategies for their implementation.
- Affirm the College's ability to meet the Middle States Commission of Higher Education Standards for Accreditation through its commitment to quality educational programs and services.
- Ensure that the self-study process portrays a realistic picture of the institution by allowing all stakeholders to provide input.
- Achieve a vision of the College's mission and future that is understood and shared by faculty, staff and students.
- Strengthen the College community members' relationships with one another.
- Strengthen the College's relations with external constituencies.

Time Table

Early October, 2009	Meet with Steering Committee Members to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review and confirm type of study b. Discuss process and structure for work c. Discuss “kick-off” on January 8
End of October/ Early November	Steering Committee Organizes Study Groups
January 7, 2010	Meeting with facilitators and note takers to discuss duties, process for facilitating nominal group processes.
January 8, 2010	Following the President’s address, two meetings: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All-College assigned to cross-community groups, followed by refreshments; and 2. Faculty assigned to cross-discipline, cross-school groups to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. learn about SS Purpose/Process; b. provide input regarding overarching questions; and c. build community.
January	Charges and questions to Study Groups finalized, including (as appropriate) information generated during January 8 meetings
Mid-February	Study Groups begin meeting formally, plotting their process for completing their tasks and identifying required data (especially that to be housed in resource room)
End of February/Early March 2010	Design document completed for review by Middle States staff, drawing upon feedback from College community members’ input
March 1 & 2	Meetings with Dr. Robert Schneider, Middle States Liaison
Spring 2010	Additional data and other resources required are identified and gathered for resource room where it will be available for all Study Groups and for MSCHE Team (eventually)
End of April	Study Groups have completed plans for their work during the Fall
August, 2010	Review of early research with College community
Fall 2010	Study Groups continue research, investigation and preliminary analysis
December 3, 2010	Steering Committee reviews preliminary findings with Study Groups
January 2011	Report to the College community preliminary findings and solicit feedback

By February 2011	Draft reports with analysis and recommendations completed by Study Groups
April 2011	Review with ad hoc and formal groups (SGA, Dean's Council, etc.) the draft report and recommendations to solicit feedback.
May to early July 2011	Revised draft of report written
August & September 2011	Review revised draft of Report with Board of Directors
August 2011	Update College community on status of revised draft; solicit last community-wide input before finalizing report
October 2011	Review of Report by Corporate Advisory Board prior to completion
November 2011	Initial visit by Team Chair
October – December 2011	Feedback incorporated from all sources; additional work undertaken if necessary, and Report completed for submission to Middle States
January non-instructional days	Report to College community the plans for implementing the recommendations that resulted from the Self-Study (perhaps folding them into initiatives).
January – February 2012	Report published
End of February 2012	Final Report sent to Middle States
April 2012	MSCHE Team Site Visit
June 2012	Middle States Commission action on self-study and team visit

Steering Committee Representation

The following are members of the Self-Study Steering Committee:

- Ms. Elizabeth Meyer – Faculty, Human Services (Co-Chair)
- Mr. Tom Gregory – Associate Vice President for Instruction (Co-Chair)
- Dr. William Martin – Senior Vice President
- Mr. Eugene McAvoy – Assistant Dean, School of Integrated Studies
- Dr. Gerri Luke – Faculty, Business Administration/Management & Marketing
- Ms. Lisette Ormsbee – Director of the Madigan Library
- Ms. Nancy Grausam – Faculty, Education and Early Childhood Education
- Mr. Daniel Brooks – Faculty, Architectural Technology
- Ms. Mary Jo Saxe – Faculty, Dental Hygiene
- Ms. Veronica Muzic – Special Assistant to the President for Academic Affairs
- Ms. Kathleen McNaul – Advisement Center Specialist
- Ms. Carolyn Strickland – Assistant Vice President for Academic Services
- Mr. Ward Caldwell – Special Assistant to the President for Student Affairs
- Dr. Robert Dunham – Chairman, Board of Directors
- Mr. Adam Yoder – Student, Building Automation Technology
- Ms. Megan Hawn – Student, Business Administration

Study Groups

The study groups were established with the goal of avoiding multiple and overlapping assignments for members who, with their normal and volunteer activities, might have to serve on an excessive number of committees. Existing committees such as Governance College Council, the Quality Through Assessment (QTA) Committee, the Planning Committee, and the Foundations of Excellence (FOE) Committee were pressed into service, with some modifications, to form the five study groups necessary to address all of the standards. For members on more than one existing committee, invitations were based on where their expertise might serve the goals of the self-study more effectively.

The five study groups are:

Group 1 – Mission, Planning and Resources: Standards 1, 2, and 3

Group 2 – Institutional Leadership: Standards 4 and 5

Group 3 – Integrity and Faculty: Standards 6 and 10

Group 4 – Instruction and Outcomes: Standards 7, 11, 12, and 14

Group 5 – Student Admissions and Support: Standards 8, 9, and 13

Study Group Members

Group 1 – Mission, Planning, and Resources

Dr. William Martin – Senior Vice President (Co-Chair)

Mr. Eugene McAvoy – Assistant Dean, Integrated Studies (Co-Chair)

Ms. Ann Reichelderfer – Faculty, Nursing Programs

Ms. Suzanne Stopper – Vice President for Finance/CFO

Mr. Al Thomas – Faculty, Collision Repair

Mr. Jim Cunningham – Vice President for Information Technology and Business Process Improvement

Mr. Joseph Geffre – Director of Mail, Document, and Shipping/Receiving Services

Mr. Rob Fisher – Vice President for Business Operations

Mr. Michael Hersh – Assistant Director of Student Activities for Programming

Group 2 – Institutional Leadership: Standards 4 and 5

Dr. Gerri Luke -- Faculty, Business Administration/Management & Marketing (Co-Chair)

Ms. Lisette Ormsbee – Director of the Madigan Library (Co-Chair)

Mr. Mark Ciavarella – Faculty, Business Administration/Management

Dr. Cliff Coppersmith – Dean, School of Integrated Studies

Dr. Dennis Ringling – Faculty, Forestry

Mr. Don Caldwell – Police Officer

Ms. Connie Rice – Library Document Delivery and Mail Services Manager
Dr. Jennifer McLean – Director of Counseling, Career, and Disability Services
Ms. Molly Steele-Schrimp – Customer Service Assistant, Workforce Development and Continuing Education
Mr. Marc Bridgens – Dean, School of Construction and Design Technologies
Mr. Barry Stiger – Vice President of Institutional Advancement
Mr. Kyle Pfueller – Student, President, Student Government Association (SGA)
Ms. Laurie Nau – Student, Forest Technology

Group 3 – Integrity and Faculty: Standards 6 and 10

Ms. Nancy Grausam – Faculty, Education and Early Childhood Education (Co-Chair)
Mr. Daniel Brooks – Faculty, Architectural Technology (Co-Chair)
Ms. Mary Jo Saxe – Faculty, Dental Hygiene (Co-Chair)
Ms. Katherine Walker – Faculty, Drafting and Computer-Aided Design (CAD)
Mr. Denny Dunkleberger -- Registrar
Ms. Diana Kuhns – Faculty, Mathematics
Mr. Brett Reasner – Assistant Dean, School of Natural Resources
Mr. Eric Pruden – Faculty, Collision Repair
Ms. Mary Robinson – Adjunct Faculty, Drafting and Computer-Aided Design (CAD)
Dr. Eric Albert – Faculty, Machine Tool Technology/Automated Manufacturing
Ms. Kay Dunkleberger -- Coordinator of Disability Services
Ms. Barbara Natell – Director of Occupational Therapy Assistant Program
Student members (2) -- TBD

Group 4 – Instruction and Outcomes: Standards 7, 11, 12, and 14

Ms. Veronica Muzic – Special Assistant to the President for Academic Affairs (Co-Chair)
Ms. Kathleen McNaul – Advisement Center Specialist (Co-Chair)
Dr. Nasrin Fatima – Assistant Vice President for Assessment, Research and Planning
Dr. Tina Evans – Faculty, Dental Hygiene/Applied Health Studies
Mr. Ward Caldwell – Special Assistant to the President for Student Affairs
Mr. Brian Johnson – Director of Residence Life
Ms. Rhonda Davis – Faculty, Legal Assistant
Dr. Barbara Shepperson – Institutional Research Analyst
Mr. Colin Williamson – Dean, School of Transportation Technologies

Mr. Tyler Frederick – Student, Network Specialist

Mr. Curtis Woodson – Student, Pre-Nursing

Group 5 – Student Admissions and Support: Standards 8, 9, and 13

Ms. Carolyn Strickland – Assistant Vice President for Academic Services (Co-Chair)

Mr. Ward Caldwell – Special Assistant to the President for Student Affairs (Co-Chair)

Mr. Paul Mach – Faculty, Hospitality Management/Culinary Arts

Mr. Steve McCoy – Coordinator for Matriculation and Retention, School of Construction and Design Technologies

Mr. Bill Mack – Assistant Dean, School of Industrial and Engineering Technologies

Mr. Elliott Strickland – Special Assistant for Student Affairs and Student Development

Mr. Nathan Smyth – Assistant Dean, School of Health Sciences

Ms. Kim Cassel – Director of Student Activities

Ms. JoAnna Pruden – Faculty, Mathematics, (Developmental/Career)

Ms. Jennifer Hammond – Coordinator of Tutoring

Mr. Dennis Correll – Associate Dean for Admissions and Financial Aid

Mr. Adam Yoder – Student, Building Automation Technology

Ms. Megan Hawn – Student, Business Administration

Generic Charge to the Study Groups

In addition to the specific charges to the study groups enumerated in the following section, each study group will:

- Honor all deadlines established by the Steering Committee.
- Generate and maintain all documentation related to the study group's research, including agendas and minutes, reports, research data, and surveys.
- Address the Charges to the Study Group within the framework of the College mission and the Standards of Excellence. As necessary during the study period, each group will formulate new goals or tasks and recommend them to the Steering Committee.
- Develop a plan to fulfill the charges, drawing upon the Steering Committee's early discussions and brainstorming, as well as items from secondary research and College-wide input sessions.
- Fulfill the charges efficiently by devising and following specific, structured agendas; creating subgroups as necessary on discrete, relevant topics; and fostering and maintaining communications among all relevant groups.
- Facilitate an inclusive process of investigation by involving faculty, staff, students, and when appropriate, individuals and groups outside the College community.
- Complete primary research (focus groups, observations, surveys, interviews) and secondary research (in-house data, documents, and reports) to educate Study Group members, provide a knowledge-base for activities, and gain sufficient input to the study process.
- Write reports that are analytical, coherent, concise, and supported by qualitative and quantitative data, using the format devised by the Steering Committee. Early drafts will be shared with group members and Steering Committee members for comment and input, and revisions will be made in a timely manner.
- Participate in the campus-wide dissemination and discussion of the Self-Study Report.

Specific Charges to the Study Groups

Group 1 – Mission, Planning, and Resources

MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence	Charges to the Study Group	Questions for the Study Group	Sources of Relevant Data
<p>Standard 1 – Mission and Goals</p> <p>Standard 2 – Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal</p> <p>Standard 3 – Institutional Resources</p>	<p>Determine to what extent the College’s Mission and Values are understood and supported by internal and external stakeholders.</p> <p>Review the College’s activities and policies to determine general adherence to accreditation Standards 1, 2, and 3 in the context of observed and analyzed strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>Determine the extent to which College leadership is guided by the Mission and Values in planning and resource allocation; the degree to which the College community understands that process; and the extent to which the effectiveness and outcomes are assessed and analyzed for future planning.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Document the recently completed Mission review and revision and identify how effectively the product and process by which it was changed align with the fundamental elements for Standard 1. 2. How effectively do the College’s operations implement the Mission and accomplish the goals? 3. How well do school and department missions and goals align with the institutional mission and goals? 4. Document the process and identify how effectively the assessment of student outcomes guides institutional planning and resource allocation. 5. Document and evaluate the College’s strategic plan and mechanism for program review in terms of the recently completed revisions to the processes and the resulting products. 6. How might the College introduce a greater degree of transparency into its mechanism for resource (financial, physical, and human) allocation? 	<p>College Mission and Values</p> <p>Current Long Range Plan</p> <p>Cumulative Long Range Plan</p> <p>Strategic Plan</p> <p>School and department missions and goals</p> <p>Sourcebook</p> <p>General Institutional Characteristics</p> <p>Governance minutes</p> <p>Assessment Plan</p> <p>Program Reviews</p> <p>School 3-year/5-year plans</p> <p>Targeted Focus Group Surveys (representative user constituencies)</p> <p>Institutional Advancement (fundraising for equipment and scholarships)</p> <p>Budget documents</p> <p>Master Equipment Lists (MELS)</p> <p>Renovation plans</p> <p>Facilities and Site Master Plan</p> <p>On-line Catalog</p> <p>IPEDS Institutional data</p> <p>Departmental Plans (e.g., Information Technology Services, Library)</p>

MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence	Charges to the Study Group	Questions for the Study Group	Sources of Relevant Data
		<p>7. How effectively does the College maintain and adjust its strategic goals in a rapidly evolving external environment?</p> <p>8. How effectively does the recently implemented base budgeting process ensure that College operating units are allocated sufficient resources to accomplish departmental goals?</p> <p>9. How effectively does the College ensure the effective and efficient use of facility and equipment resources and prioritize the acquisition of new or replacement of existing resources?</p> <p>10. How effectively does the College ensure that it has adequate resources to meet its needs in an environment of declining governmental support for higher education?</p>	<p>Grant proposals and awards</p>

Group 2 – Institutional Leadership

MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence	Charges to the Study Group	Questions for the Study Group	Sources of Relevant Data
<p>Standard 4 – Leadership and Governance Standard 5 – Administration</p>	<p>Determine the extent to which the College’s governance and administrative systems clearly define stakeholder roles in policy development and decision-making.</p> <p>Determine the extent to which the College’s leadership and decision-making process support the Mission and Values, and promote a culture of continuous improvement in personal and organizational success.</p> <p>Determine the extent to which institutional leadership and operations are evaluated and assessed for effective implementation of the Mission.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does the Board interact with faculty, staff, and students to ensure fulfillment of the mission with strong educational programs? 2. How are the faculty and staff effectively empowered to provide leadership and influence decision-making? 3. To what extent do staff professional development programs support the mission and goals of the College? 4. Do the organization and qualifications of the administration effectively support the needs of stakeholders in the fulfillment of the Mission? 5. How does the organization of the Schools and departments support the effective implementation of the College’s Mission and goals? 6. How does the administration empower students in a governance process that is both responsive and efficient? 7. Examine the qualifications, selection and assessment of institutional leadership to determine its effectiveness in reflecting the College Mission as well as meeting the needs of an ever changing student body. 8. Does the orientation and continuing education of faculty and staff adequately prepare and develop 	<p>Board of Directors Agendas and Minutes Board of Directors By-Laws Organizational Chart Governance portal Governance committee agendas and minutes Governance annual reports, By-Laws College Policies and Procedures Graduate Survey Leaver Survey NSSE/CIRP Surveys Faculty Handbook New faculty and staff orientation materials SGA By-laws, agendas, minutes Faculty Evaluation - Development Plan Position Announcements College Annual Reports School and Department Mission Statements Faculty and staff position descriptions Faculty Agreement Annual reports from schools and departments Chronicle of Higher Education – Survey – Great Colleges to Work For</p>

MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence	Charges to the Study Group	Questions for the Study Group	Sources of Relevant Data
		<p>employees to assume their responsibilities?</p> <p>9. Do we appropriately identify and service our internal customers enabling them to service our students in an effective manner?</p> <p>10. Are administrative communications methods to stakeholders clear, timely, accurate, and demonstrably effective in their purpose?</p> <p>11. Does the quality and quantity of administrative staff effectively support student success?</p>	

Group 3 – Integrity and Faculty

MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence	Charges to the Study Group	Questions for the Study Group	Sources of Relevant Data
<p>Standard 6 – Integrity Standard 10 – Faculty</p>	<p>Explore how the College’s curricular and related programs, support for students and employees, service to the public, and relationships with its varied constituencies reflect adherence to ethical standards, the College’s mission and policies, and the principles of academic freedom.</p> <p>As qualified faculty and professionals are essential to fulfillment of the institution’s mission and students’ academic success, determine how the College ensures these individuals’ ability to excel in teaching and support student learning.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How effectively do the required and elective course offerings (availability, section sizes, types, etc.) enable students to achieve program goals and to graduate within the published program length? 2. How well does the College foster respect among students, faculty, staff and administrators irrespective of diverse backgrounds, ideas and perspectives? 3. Explore how the College effectively ensures that its policies and procedures are consistently applied across the institution in the creation, advertising, selection, hiring, transfer, promotion and firing of employees? 4. How are practices and processes understood and applied to facilitate fairness and consistency in treatment of students across Schools in such areas as academic requirements and policies, student discipline, student evaluation, student complaints regarding faculty, and student grievance procedures. 5. How does the College ensure that both full-time and adjunct faculty and other professionals are appropriately prepared and qualified for the positions they hold? Does the number of adjuncts versus full-time faculty adequately support Schools’ and programs’ goals and the institution’s commitment to excellence 	<p>College Policies and Procedures Faculty Handbook Student Guidebook Chronicle of Higher Education Survey Spring 2010 College-wide Survey Governance By-Laws New Faculty Orientation materials Faculty Evaluation - Development Plan Program reviews Master Schedule Program/major marketing materials Admissions publications Faculty and Staff position descriptions Faculty Agreement Student Evaluation summaries Full-time/Adjunct faculty lists Part-Time/Overload data</p>

MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence	Charges to the Study Group	Questions for the Study Group	Sources of Relevant Data
		<p>in teaching?</p> <p>6. Given the diverse nature of the College's Schools, how is faculty and staff evaluation implemented and how are professional development opportunities provided to foster growth and excellence and to ensure consistency and fairness?</p> <p>7. What feedback mechanisms ensure that policies and procedures achieve their intended purposes and are modified when indicated?</p>	

Group 4 – Instruction and Outcomes

MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence	Charges to the Study Group	Questions for the Study Group	Sources of Relevant Data
<p>Standard 7 – Institutional Assessment</p> <p>Standard 11 – Educational Offerings</p> <p>Standard 12 – General Education</p> <p>Standard 14 – Assessment of Student Learning</p>	<p>Determine how effectively a comprehensive approach to assessment informs decision making, planning, and resource allocation so that programs, processes, and services support student learning and align with the College mission and goals.</p> <p>Evaluate how well College faculty and staff understand assessment and use it effectively to ensure academic rigor and acquisition of essential skills.</p> <p>Determine the need for and content of professional development opportunities to assist faculty as they apply the Program Review template and respond to the assessment requirements.</p> <p>Determine the extent to which established assessment protocols have been validated by measured improvements of desired outcomes.</p> <p>Review curricular materials and determine the specificity and connectivity with the College’s Mission and Values.</p>	<p>1. How will the College operationalize the outcomes assessment plan and process, identifying the locus of control and level of transparency and ensuring its ongoing application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To demonstrate institutional effectiveness and confirm student learning outcomes • To demonstrate mastery of general education in response to the revised core curriculum with special attention to information literacy and technical competence • To integrate the revised program review and self studies of accredited majors • To ensure support for the college mission and to connect to resource allocation • To include both direct and indirect measures <p>2. By what means will Plan/Process be reviewed, revised, and updated to ensure its functionality?</p> <p>3. What institutional data sources support and facilitate assessment of institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes, non-academic and academic support areas, as well as admissions practices? What</p>	<p>Graduate Survey</p> <p>NSSE/CIRP Data</p> <p>FOE Surveys</p> <p>Advising Survey (Spring 2009)</p> <p>QTA Survey of institutional data sources</p> <p>Sourcebook</p> <p>Cumulative Long Range Plan</p> <p>Unit level plans (e.g. ITS plan, school, and Library 3 year plans)</p> <p>Accreditation Reports, 2002 – 2009 for majors</p> <p>FOE recommendations</p> <p>Budget development protocols</p> <p>Faculty Advising Survey, Jan. 8, 2010</p> <p>Program reviews</p> <p>Goals and objectives for administrators (part of evaluation process)</p> <p>Unit mission statements</p> <p>Chronicle, Best Places to Work</p> <p>Satisfaction surveys (e.g. Tutoring Center)</p> <p>Mathematics, two strikes study</p> <p><i>A Comparison of Developmental and Regular-Admit Students’ Academic Achievement and Retention at a Northeastern Public Technical School</i></p>

MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence	Charges to the Study Group	Questions for the Study Group	Sources of Relevant Data
		<p>sources provide major-specific data that is both current and substantive? Assess the reliability of institutional sources, the provision of longitudinal data and data validity (multiple measures).</p> <p>4. Do academic programs and courses specify goals and outcomes that reflect the College Mission and Values?</p> <p>5. What examples exist to illustrate the “closing of the loop” part of the Assessment Plan/Process?</p> <p>6. What are the most effective strategies for assisting faculty in applying assessment tools?</p> <p>7. How do the data resources—both institutional and programmatic—ground planning, resource allocation, and decision making?</p>	<p>FYE Fall 2009 student assessment</p> <p>Student graduation awards</p> <p>Curriculum Manual</p> <p>Faculty Handbook</p> <p>Faculty Evaluation – Development Plan</p> <p>Abstracts/Syllabi</p> <p>Matrices (incl. Health Science)</p> <p>FYE Proposal</p> <p>Transition Plan of new VPAA</p> <p>Preceptor assessments</p> <p>Internship assessments</p> <p>Student competitions and industry recognitions (e.g. SkillsUSA)</p> <p>Commercially prepared assessment instruments</p> <p>Ford performance report</p> <p>Capstone projects</p> <p>Culinary competitions</p> <p>Faculty certifications/awards</p> <p>Synthesized student evaluations of faculty</p> <p>Living-Learning Community report</p> <p>EBI Survey (Residential Services)</p>

Group 5 – Student Admissions and Support

MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence	Charges to the Study Group	Questions for the Study Group	Sources of Relevant Data
<p>Standard 8 – Student Admissions and Retention</p> <p>Standard 9 – Student Support Services</p> <p>Standard 13 – Related Educational Activities</p>	<p>Analyze how well the College responds to the full spectrum of diverse student needs, abilities, and culture within the framework of its admissions, support, and retention programs.</p> <p>Consider and determine the extent to which students are provided support to achieve academic success, physical and emotional well-being, and social development.</p> <p>Explore how the College’s portfolio of academic programs, activities, and services characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship align with the College’s mission and goals.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does the College’s stated value of being an “open enrollment” institution reconcile with the number of programs with selective admissions criteria and conversely the high percentage of students needing developmental coursework? 2. How does the College ensure that students have sufficient information to be able to make informed decisions about academic expectations, educational opportunities, financial aid resources, and academic support and co-curricular activities? 3. How effectively does the College assess and integrate campus wide retention initiatives and use results to more fully meet students’ needs? 4. To what extent do the programs, services and policies designed to assist underprepared students achieve their stated student learning and development goals? 5. How well do the College’s student transfer policies and practices support students’ academic goals? 6. How does the College effectively educate and prepare faculty, staff, and students about appropriate and successful academic advising 	<p>Sourcebook</p> <p>School Website/Info</p> <p>Online Catalog</p> <p>FOE Highest Enrollment and Drop/Fail/Withdrawal/Incomplete Data Analysis for key classes</p> <p>Placement Test Results, data</p> <p>Placement Testing FAQs</p> <p>Connections Program data</p> <p>Connections Agenda</p> <p>K-12 Outreach reports and data</p> <p>Dual enrollment data</p> <p>FYE Course Syllabus</p> <p>Hobsons’ data</p> <p>Financial Aid Handbook</p> <p>Paying for College handout</p> <p>NSSE Report</p> <p>Leaver Survey</p> <p>Tutoring Center and Smart Thinking Usage</p> <p>Project Success 2008-09 Analysis</p> <p>Admissions Communication Plan</p> <p>Advising Center Advising Materials</p> <p>Academic Support Services Assessment outcomes</p> <p>Review Athletics mission and strategic plan</p>

		<p>strategies, processes, and policies?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. How effectively does the College assess academic support services and make evidence-based decisions to develop programs and services to more fully meet student needs? 8. How do athletics and other co-curricular activities complement the academic mission of the College? 9. How can the College demonstrate that students are appropriately informed about their rights related to the maintenance of academic records? 10. How well do certificate programs align with the academic rigor and program requirements of the Schools in which they are housed and complement related degree programs? 11. How consistent across Schools is the evaluation and award of credit for life experience and experiential learning? 12. To what extent does the non-credit portfolio align with the College's mission? How does the College effectively assess the non-credit program to ensure the same level of quality expected of the for-credit programs? 13. What strategies are employed to ensure integration of programs and services offered at other locations with those at the main campus? 	<p>Registrars' information</p> <p>Review of tests and measures used to place students in developmental courses</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>14. What system is in place to ensure that distance learning courses meet the same standards of quality, academic rigor and the fulfillment of competencies that are expected in traditional course formats? To what extent are faculty prepared to teach distance learning courses?</p>	
--	--	---	--

Study Group Reports

The final report to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education will be the document the Visiting Team members review to affirm our conformance to the Standards of Accreditation, and from which they will generate an agenda for personal and group interviews, document reviews, and visits to schools and departments. The final document is limited to 100 single-spaced (200 double-spaced) pages and the Steering Committee will review, edit, and combine the study group reports to fit within these guidelines.

Study group reports should be accurate, concise, and analytical, with evidence, conclusions, and recommendations supported by data. All aspects of the Standards should be addressed as they apply to Penn College, and authors should understand that graphs and charts have the ability to convey information much more concisely and effectively than narrative, and thus should be used whenever possible.

The final report of each study group should include the following:

- An overview of the group's charge and the major issues it addressed;
- A discussion and analysis of the issues that incorporate questions addressed and other relevant components of the standards;
- An explanation of how the group's findings, conclusions, and recommendations support the accreditation standards;
- An explanation of where overlap with other study groups occurred and how it is addressed through collaboration;
- Recommendations for improvement based upon the evidence collected and analyzed.

Documents should be prepared and submitted electronically, using Word and Excel. Document format should be in accordance with the following guidelines:

- Use 1-inch margins, left-aligned body text, double-spacing,
- One blank line between headings, paragraphs, and sections,
- Use Times New Roman, 12 point font.
- The first time acronyms are used, they should follow (in parentheses) the term for which they stand. Thereafter, the acronym may be used.
- Write in active voice. Use plural terms, as much as possible, to avoid the awkward use of he or she.
- Every document should have a right-aligned header in which the file name, the date of most recent revision, and page x of y is listed in 9 point font.

Use of these guidelines will facilitate the physical combination of the individual study group reports.

Self-Study Format

The study group reports will be compiled and integrated into a complete report of no more than 200 single-spaced pages, with charts and figures as necessary to present and explain key supporting data. The anticipated layout of the document is illustrated by the following Table of Contents:

Table of Contents

List of Steering Committee Members
List of Tables, Figures, Appendices
Executive Summary
Overview of Pennsylvania College of Technology
Standards 1, 2, and 3
Standards 4 and 5
Standard 6
Standards 8 and 9
Standard 10
Standards 11 and 12
Standard 13
Standards 7 and 14
Plan for Implementing Recommendations
List of Study Group Members
Appendices

Other Data Resources

Other data sources used by the Steering Committee and the respective study groups will include at least two College-wide activities that follow convocation meetings in the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. These activities will consist of multiple focus groups that address specific issues related to the accreditation self-study.

Spring 2010 College-Wide Activity:

This activity was conducted after the Spring 2010 Convocation meeting and consisted of two 1-1/2 hour sessions. The first session was for the entire College community and was focused on the individual standards. The audience was divided into 20 separate focus groups, each of which was further broken down into four groups to discuss particular Standards. Each focus group was assigned a facilitator and note-taker charged with using the nominal group technique to develop and record the participants' questions, comments, and concerns related to each of the standards. These were recorded and submitted to the individual study groups for consideration when developing the charges and the questions to be addressed during the self-study. Each of the participants was also asked to complete a survey about the effectiveness of the discussions.

The second session was intended for faculty. Using the same process, 12 focus groups were established to address assessment of core goals and student advising. In addition to the group discussions, all participating faculty (approximately 250 of the 320 full-time faculty) completed pre- and post-discussion surveys about their role in assessment and advising. These surveys will be available to all study groups during the research process.

Ongoing College-Wide Activities

A series of events will be coordinated through Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 to communicate the study groups' progress to the college community and to seek input that will affirm or redirect the investigative strategies and directions. In addition, a portal site will be established to aid these communications and allow review of documents, resources, discussions, and reports.

Other Sources

Issues developed by these college-wide focus groups will be used to further direct the investigations of the study groups, which may in turn develop other data sources. These may include interviews of specific groups or individuals, surveys, or additional focus groups. Each study group will also conduct literature searches of current relevant articles and books. Study group members also may attend relevant conferences or seminars as they become aware of their applicability. The flexibility in the choice of inquiry tools will allow each group to pursue their charges in a way that is most logical to the group members.

Final Documents

Three documents will be presented to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education in February of 2012.

- The first document is the Long range Planning Sourcebook, which is produced regularly by the Office of Assessment, Research, and Planning (ARP). This document provides a factual profile of Penn College and its environment. It contains information on student demographics and characteristics, retention and graduation, student outcomes, human resources, facilities, and finances.
- The second document is the Long range Plan, also produced regularly by the ARP. This document contains an overview of the planning process at Penn College; task statements for individual goal areas; and a planning manual detailing the process for revisions of items such as the mission statement, college philosophy, goals, and tasks.
- The final document will be the Self-Study Report. This document will present the work of the study groups and will function as a summary report to the College and Middle States Commission on Higher education.

Visiting Team Profile Descriptors

The Steering Committee has discussed suggestions for the composition of the Visiting Evaluation Team, and submits the following recommendations to the Commission. These descriptors reflect the institutional character of Penn College as well as our concerns related to the comprehensive nature of the self-study.

- Experience with both two- and four-year academic programs
- Academic expertise in technology education
- Familiarity with an internal governance model, as opposed to a faculty senate model, of participation in the institution.
- Familiarity with institutions that focus primarily on teaching and learning as opposed to research.
- Knowledge of independent institutions unaffiliated with larger state-related systems.
- Insight into the needs of students who are underprepared for college study and beset by personal challenges

Appendices

Appendix A – Penn College Document Resources

Appendix A – Penn College Document Resources

Strategic Planning and Research Publications

Standard Survey Results

Graduate Survey

Short-term (6-to-12 month) graduate follow-up, to explore initial education and career outcomes and satisfaction with student services and program instruction (annual cycle; pub date of July 2009)

Alumni Survey

Extended (3-to-5 year) graduate follow-up, to explore longer-term educational and career outcomes and satisfaction (5-year cycle; pub December 2004)

Employer Survey

Follow-up of graduate employers, to assess satisfaction with graduate occupational skills and abilities (5-year cycle; February 2002)

Leaver Survey

Short-term (6-to-12 month) follow-up of non-graduating, non-returning students, to analyze attrition/retention, determine factors/reasons why students leave, and explore educational and career outcomes and satisfaction (3-year cycle; August 2003)

Non-Matriculant Survey

Short-term (6-to-12 month) follow-up of accepted applicants who do not enroll, to analyze matriculation process, determine factors/reasons for not entering, and other colleges selected (3-year cycle; last pub October 2009 on 2007 population)

Project Profile

Application questionnaire data combined with standard admissions and student records data, used for comparative analyses of several student sub-populations (data collected routinely, reported on 2-3 year cycle; January 2010)

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

Benchmarked survey of freshman and seniors to gauge the level of student engagement. (published in 2006 and 2008 on a 2-year cycle)

Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey

A survey administered to freshman students that collects data such as parental income and education; ethnicity; secondary school achievement and activities; educational and career plans; values, attitudes and beliefs; and other demographic data.

Statistical Reference Reports

General Institutional Characteristics (GIC)

Semester enrollment and grade reports, produced at end of every semester.

Third Week Preliminary Enrollment Report

Early/preliminary version of GIC enrollment data, produced after third week of semester.

Sourcebook

This document is an annual, factual profile of the College and its environment, providing five years of detailed historical data. (May 2009 latest)

Planning Reports

Facilities & Site Master Plan 2004-2009

Plan designed to direct campus physical development from 2004 to 2009. A new plan is scheduled to be developed during the 2010/2011 academic year.

Long-Range Plan Annual Update

Documents changes to College's long-range-plan (creation/vision/retirement of goals and tasks) and annual status reports for on-going planning tasks (pub. July 2009)

Cumulative Long-Range Plan

Constitutes up to 5 years recent history of long-range planning activities and outcomes (pub. September 2009)

Unit-level plans; e.g., Information Technology Services Plan; School 3 – year plans; Library Master Plan

Special Survey Reports

Chronicle of Higher Education Best Places to Work Survey

The survey was administered electronically to faculty and staff and submitted to the Chronicle, and used to compare institutions' employee attitudes and working conditions.

Foundations Of Excellence (FOE) surveys

Surveys administered to faculty and staff and students to gather information related to the first year experience at Penn College.

Faculty Advising Survey

This survey was administered to faculty on January 8, 2010, during an all-College focus group to gather information for the Middle States Self-Study.

A Comparison of Developmental and Regular-Admit Students' Academic Achievement and Retention at a Northeastern Public Technical School. Wallace, Steven H., 2010: Applied Dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, Fischler School of Education and Human Services

This survey was administered to all new students during the Fall 2009 semester to gather data for a doctoral dissertation related to student retention of students who enter college with developmental needs.

Other Documents Available

Accreditation Reports, 2002-2009, for Majors

Report on Connections

Report on Fall 09 FYE Classes

Policies and Procedures Manuals (on-line at <https://mypct.pct.edu/PolicyandProcedure/default.aspx>)

Program Reviews for Majors

Foundations of Excellence recommendations

Penn College Middle States Reports

Self-Study Report to Middle States, 2002

This is the completed self-study report for the 2002 selected topics self-study.

Team Report from Middle States, 2002

This report is the document written by the MSCHE accreditation team in response to the self-study and the findings from their visit in the Spring 2002 semester.

Periodic Review Report, 2007

This report was written as a mid-term update to MSCHE, describing changes and current financial status, as well as progress on the 2002 Team Visit recommendations.

External Document Resources (as necessary)

Chairing and Hosting an Evaluation Team (MSCHE)

Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Standards for Accreditation (MSCHE)

Designs for Excellence: Handbook for Institutional Self-Study (MSCHE)

Distance Learning (Policy Statement) (MSCHE)

Framework for Outcomes Assessment (MSCHE)

General Education Requirements in Specialized Programs (Policy Statement)(MSCHE)

Guidelines for Distance Learning Programs (MSCHE)

Handbook for Evaluation Teams (MSCHE)

Outcomes Assessment (Policy Statement)(MSCHE)

Outcomes Assessment Plans: Guidelines for Developing Outcomes Assessment Plans at Colleges and Universities (MSCHE)

These documents are available at <http://www.msche.org/>