**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, a shared commitment to diversity, 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:** We are committed to diversity, inclusiveness, tolerance and civility. We recognize that respect of individual differences is the foundation of civil behavior across the College community.
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Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

Pennsylvania College of Technology, a public institution located in north central Pennsylvania, offers two-year and four-year majors in more than 100 career fields, emphasizing applied technologies and hands-on learning. Between the College’s main campus in Williamsport, PA, an Aviation Center in nearby Montoursville, PA, and an Earth Sciences facility in Allenwood, PA, 6,364 (Fall 2011) students are enrolled in an academic environment with modern facilities, exceptional services, and majors that lead to excellent graduate placement with “degrees that work®.”

This document – the decennial self-study in support of continuing accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education – represents work begun Fall 2009, undertaken by approximately 56 staff and students from across the campus. Given that the previous two self-studies were focused on selected topics, the decision to complete a comprehensive self-study represents the College’s commitment to using the process to identify areas of both strength and weakness while setting the agenda for ongoing improvement.

The true core of the educational practice and student learning at Penn College is best summarized by our mission, a statement truly embraced by faculty and staff.

ORGANIZATION OF THE SELF-STUDY

With the appointment of the steering committee co-chairs (a faculty member and an administrator) and the decision to take a comprehensive approach to the self-study—made upon consideration of the president, senior staff, and key faculty—work began to assemble the study groups.

Several standing committees existed whose charges from the president encompassed many of the fundamental elements of the Middle States standards. The president and the steering committee co-chairs determined that the expertise of these working groups could serve the College as an excellent foundation for the study groups. Accordingly, the standards were assigned as follows:

- **Study Group One: Standards 1, 2, and 3**
  
  In 2007, the Planning Review Work Group, chaired by the vice president for academic affairs/provost and the senior vice president, was formed. The president charged this group with reviewing the College’s approach to long range planning, developing recommendations to address inconsistencies in the planning process, and exploring more contemporary approaches to planning that met the overall needs of the institution. The membership of the Planning Review Workgroup is represented in Study Group One.

- **Study Group Two: Standards 4 and 5**
  
  The Penn College Governance system, an active, engaged body of interested faculty, staff, and students, provides a College-wide mechanism for input into shared planning, decision-making, and evaluation through elected and appointed representatives. Members of College Governance served on Study Group Two.

- **Study Group Three: Standards 6 and 10**
  
  While no existing committee was working directly with elements related to these standards, three experienced faculty members from different schools were appointed to the steering
The committee examined issues related to the faculty, as well as integrity, a characteristic that crosses multiple standards and directly affects students, faculty, and staff.

- **Study Group Four: Standards 7, 11, 12, and 14**
  The Quality Through Assessment Committee (QTA) reports directly to the president and is charged with (1) reviewing the nature and extent of assessment efforts underway throughout the campus and (2) identifying best practices in assessing student learning and institutional effectiveness. It is composed of constituents from throughout the College who have a direct involvement with assessment. Its members served on the study group for these four standards.

- **Study Group Five: Standards 8, 9, and 13**
  The Foundations of Excellence® (FoE) Committee was formed to carry out a comprehensive self-study (2010) to examine the College’s approach to the students’ first-year experience, under the guidance of John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education. The FoE self-study resulted in a number of recommendations, which, while primarily intended for first-year students, ultimately will have positive effects on all students. FoE members served on the study group for these three standards.

To ensure that all areas of the College had representation in the study, additional faculty, staff, and students from across the institution were solicited to add to the groups’ expertise and diversity. A list of the members of each study group is included at the end of this document.

Each of the study groups approached the self-study as a reflective and honest discussion of where the College is now and how it should approach future challenges. As a tool for the future, a self-study must have clearly defined goals that form the roadmap for the future academic success of the students. To that end, the goals of this self-study were established as reported in the self-study design document:

- 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 compliance with the Middle States Commission of Higher Education Standards for Accreditation through the College’s commitment to quality educational programs and services.
- Ensure that the self-study process portrays a realistic picture of the institution by encouraging 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.

The Steering Committee and the study groups both confirm the College’s compliance with the Characteristics of Excellence and affirm that the goals of the self-study were met. The College has significantly benefited from the time and effort taken to critically examine what is done, how it is done, how the students benefit, and how improvements can be made in the future.

**COMMUNICATING WITH THE COLLEGE COMMUNITY**

A meaningful and reflective self-study requires candid input from all areas of the campus. To that end, the Steering Committee developed and implemented several College-wide forums and communication strategies to solicit input about areas of excellence and areas of concern; these efforts also kept the faculty, staff, students, and other stakeholders informed of the progress and findings of the self-study.
In January 2010, multiple focus group sessions were organized on Convocation day, first for all employees, and then for all faculty. Through these sessions, which occurred immediately after the president’s all-College address, all employees had the opportunity to learn about the self-study process and purpose, express concerns, and offer suggestions for investigation. A second round of sessions for faculty, immediately following the general sessions, gathered information about faculty perceptions of assessment and core education goals recently established by the College. The feedback and comments from both sessions were analyzed for recurring themes and the information given to the relevant study groups for further investigation.

A similar session occurred in the January 7, 2011, all-College meeting, with the chairs of the study groups providing an update of the study and also gathering information using a unique interactive text-messaging technique to allow instant feedback from an audience poll. Again, the intent was both to inform and to gather additional feedback. A final session was conducted in August 2011 to inform College members of the findings and preliminary recommendations, and to provide them, yet again, with the opportunity to offer feedback and comments. Feedback and comments from all sessions were excellent in quantity and quality. Results were shared with the College community via a printed piece and an electronic summary, and ultimately, a self-study draft was released for College-wide review and input.

OUTCOMES OF THE SELF-STUDY: IMMEDIATE AND LONG TERM

Each of the groups examined the College’s policies, processes, structure, and outcomes data in relation to the assigned standards, the results of which are reported in the individual chapters in this report. Every group encountered issues to be addressed; where possible, those issues were immediately forwarded to the appropriate division, school, or department for consideration and action. For example, Study Group Three obtained faculty feedback that indicated a frequent lack of understanding of how professional development funds were allocated within the schools. The vice president for academic affairs/provost has now charged the deans with annually informing the faculty at a school meeting about the allocation of development funds, school priorities for use of the funds, and alternative funding available. In another example, Study Group Three found that while the College has well-established policies and procedures, many had not been recently reviewed and no regular schedule of review existed. Under the guidance of the senior vice president, a process was subsequently established for regularly reviewing all policies and procedures, assigning responsibility for that review, and recording review and revision dates in a master file.

Notable Impact of Complementary 2009-10 Assessment Project

As this self-study was underway, an equally “global” study was concluding: Foundations of Excellence® (FoE), a project of the National Policy Center on the First Year (now the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education). The FoE initiative involved more than 100 faculty, staff, and students in an intensive review that included a campus audit and year-long review/discussion yielding nine recommendations and 37 action items. Of those action items, 17 have been completed (FoE Final Report is available on the College portal; progress report is included as Appendix 3). More about the FoE self-study and its resulting action items follows in Chapter One.

The FoE work informed the review of the 14 standards addressed in this self-study while also providing additional data. Conversely, the Middle States self-study provided additional support for the post-FoE projects. The synergyism of the two self-studies and resulting institutional initiatives and improvements has, consequently, resulted in a fewer number of recommendations coming from this self-study. The four recommendations presented herein focus on processes regarding governance, distance learning, core curriculum, and services to the academically underprepared.
Self-Study Recommendations

As mentioned above, while the self-study enabled the College to confirm its compliance with the 14 Characteristics of Excellence, it also yielded four important recommendations, which will require comprehensive efforts to frame the relevant questions, gather and analyze data, and implement necessary actions. The data and analysis that produced the recommendations are discussed more fully within the chapters, but the following are offered as summary descriptions:

Recommendation #1: Strengthen Governance Assessment (Chapter Four)

Establishing a regular, systematic assessment process with established timelines will enable the governance system to be proactive and thus more agile in effectively supporting the institution in a rapidly changing higher education climate, in contrast to a pattern in which changes often occurred as a consequence of Middle States accreditation self-study activities. Elements of the recommendation include:

• Establishing criteria for determining which issues brought before College Council are informational only and which require formal action.
• Assigning responsibility for reporting on and moving proposals/recommendations through the governance system and reporting actions taken back to committees.
• Orienting new Governance members to their responsibilities and Governance procedures and policies, as well as Roberts Rules of Order, with special emphasis on professional development for committee chairs.

Recommendation #2: A Review and Improvement of Current Distance Learning Practices (Chapter Nine)

While Penn College is in compliance with the Distance Education Programs: Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education (Online Learning) document, a number of related areas have been identified as appropriate for additional study/implementation. Retaining the current Distance Learning Taskforce through the next academic year will allow the continuing focus on these areas:

• Developing a formal philosophy and purpose that encompass course-level and programmatic approaches to developing, offering, and supporting distance learning at Penn College.
• Publishing a current and effective Distance Guidelines handbook for faculty and administration reference.
• Creating a presence on the website and portal to support effective communications about distance learning courses, programs, support services, and contact information.
• Providing focused professional development for faculty and administrators, on both pedagogical and technical matters, which allows accurate assessment of all aspects of distance learning and web-supplemented courses.
• Evaluating and implementing necessary technical support for students and faculty.

Recommendation #3: Review of the Core Curriculum Goals (Chapter Ten)

The review of the goals of the core curriculum shall be undertaken by a to-be-identified task force, which will use all available goal assessments in completing its task by December 2016. The provost will determine the membership, timeline, and process and will ensure the involvement/assistance of QTA and the office of Assessment, Research, and Planning (ARP).
Recommendation #4: A Comprehensive Study of Developmental Education at Penn College (Chapter Ten)

An ad hoc committee should be formed to assess the level of under-preparedness of entering students with regard to the College’s curriculum portfolio/academic requirements. The assessment should include both the data gathered in the course of the self-study and any additional data as required to form a complete picture. In addition, the committee should review relevant academic policies and the adequacy of services available for under-prepared students. To ensure the adequacy of data to support findings/changes, the study should take a three-years approach. The College’s commitment both to serve a diverse population and to effectively support retention and graduation of all students should direct the committee’s efforts.

Implementation of the Recommendations

Responsibility for implementation of Recommendations 2, 3, and 4 will lie with Academic Affairs, under the overall purview of the vice president for academic affairs/provost. These appear as initiatives in the College strategic plan as well as the Academic Affairs division plan. The provost will determine membership and composition of the responsible committees, establish timelines, allocate necessary resources, provide updates to the strategic plans, and implement action items/recommendations from the responsible committees. Items or recommendations that affect academic issues and curriculum will be submitted to the relevant Governance committees for approval.

Recommendation #1 will be the responsibility of College Council, which will establish any necessary committees, determine timelines, and make recommendations for Council action. Recommended changes will be included in the Governance bylaws, as appropriate or necessary.
Fall 2011 Largest Majors (Headcount)

1. Pre-Nursing (AAS) – 230
2. Welding/Fabrication Engineering Technology (BS) – 129
3. Building Construction (AAS) – 124
4. Automotive Technology (AAS) – 115
5. Welding Technology (AAS) – 112
6. Network Specialist (BS) – 108
7. Civil Engineering Technology (BS) – 103
8. Business Management (AAS) – 102
9. Physician Assistant Pre-Major – 100
10. Nursing (AAS) – 99
Chapter One: Institutional Overview

As was noted in the 1992 and 2002 self-studies,

*What we call the beginning is often the end.*  
*To make an end is to make a beginning,*  
*The end is where we start from.*  

—Eliot, *Four Quartets*

This self-study began with the “end”; that is, it began with the recommendations resident in the 2002 self-study/team response and in the 2007 PRR. Those ends (findings, suggestions, recommendations, updates) became the beginning for this self-study, including the decision to pursue a comprehensive self-study, rather than a selective topics approach, so as to provide the impetus to review the College as a whole.

Self-study group members reviewed both the original reports to the Commission and the response by the reviewers. The 2002 process yielded several suggestions, all of which have been acted upon, including the suggestion that the College act upon its own findings and recommendations with which the visiting team concurred. The visiting team’s single recommendation echoed the College’s own recommendation to

*develop and implement a comprehensive learner-centered outcomes assessment plan...[with] focused attention directed to course-level student learning outcomes in the program and within the general education core competencies.*

The PRR reviewers provided suggestions (e.g., to use external benchmarking) and noted that the

*College has demonstrated its commitment in addressing the recommendation(s) made by the visiting team and in the self-study.*

They also noted that

*The College has developed a comprehensive student learning outcomes assessment plan which is integrated with the strategic planning and budgeting process.*

Following the internal reviews of 2002 and 2007 and close analysis of the reviewers’ assessments, changes have occurred as would be expected, including a change in the practice of assessment. Many of those changes actually resulted from the 2002 and 2007 work, including the decision to participate in the Foundations of Excellence® activity, which is one of the examples of the benchmarking suggested by the PRR reviewers. Thus said Eliot: *There is no end, but addition.* Penn College’s 2012 self-study bears out that truth.

HISTORY

As the College is on a “Countdown to the Centennial,” its history is being documented in photos, oral accounts, and artifacts; the celebration in 2014 will elaborate on the outline below.

*From 1914 to 1941*

- The facility operated as the Williamsport High School industrial shop.
- In addition to high school classes, adult education focused on vocational training was offered.
- Among the adults were WWI veterans.
• Among the programs were Machining and Automotive, majors that continued through the decades to today.

• “The Williamsport Plan” was touted nationally as a response to the economic recovery, post-depression—a re-training focus in cooperation with industry.

**From 1941 to 1965: The Williamsport Technical Institute (WTI)**

• WTI was built on the industrial program in the Williamsport School District but was separated from the district, operating as a free-standing entity.

• Defense industry needs included training of workers, leading WTI to operate on a 24-hour schedule.

• The Institute attracted returning WW II veterans, including those injured during the war, thus becoming a training/retraining center for people with physical disabilities.

**From 1965 to 1989: The Williamsport Area Community College (WACC)**

• With passage of the Community College Act in 1963, came the decision to seek community college status.

• Twenty school districts in a ten-county area sponsored the institution.

• Enrollment included a large number of Vietnam veterans.

• Transfer-ready academic programs and general education were added to the existing vocational-technical focus of the curriculum portfolio.

• Economic shifts led school districts to withdraw sponsorship when the original 20-year agreement expired; the City of Williamsport stepped in so as to keep the College open under the requirement to have a local sponsor.

**From 1989 forward: Pennsylvania College of Technology**

• Presidents of The Pennsylvania State University and the Williamsport Area Community College, with the Governor of Pennsylvania, announced the intent to create an affiliation between the two institutions.

• On July 1, 1989, Williamsport Area Community College became "Penn College" with the official affiliation with Penn State. Chapter Four provides details of the structure, and Exhibit 1.1 includes the official documentation.

• The affiliation enabled the institution to offer baccalaureate programs and on-campus housing.

**In summary from 1914 to 2011:**

• Focus on technology remains, with logical outgrowth of industrial and vocational training.

• Services to veterans continue; recognition as a Military-Friendly college is a logical outcome.

• Connectivity to industry and business continues and is formalized.

• Commitment to hands-on learning remains a focal point of the College’s mission.

• Service to the Commonwealth continues not only by providing an educated, employment-ready citizenry, but also by offering education and training serving the Commonwealth through initiatives such as WedNet (detailed in Chapters Three and Nine), the state’s largest “guaranteed free” worker-training program.

• Campus itself – though significantly enlarged since 1914 – sits upon the original footprint.
PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION (FACULTY AGREEMENT)

Full-time faculty are eligible for membership in the Association (PCEA), an arm of the Pennsylvania Education Association and of the National Education Association. Established in 1971, the Association functions as the bargaining agent for the faculty. While initially confrontational, the relationship between the Association and the College has been mutually satisfactory, focused on the College mission. Proof of that relationship can be tracked to first, the lack of formal grievances, and second, to the willingness of both parties to forego full-scale negotiations in favor of discussion that results in the updating of the full Agreement.

- Agreement of 1996-99 updated through multiple “Amendments” – the most recent full-scale negotiation occurred in 2000
- Agreement of 2009-12, result of additional amendments, extending the document through 2014-15.

The Agreement governs key matters of faculty teaching loads, salaries, academic calendar, and benefits (copy provided to the team). Accreditors are often surprised by the teaching load of 15 credits or 20 hours/semester. The teaching load underscores the institutional commitment to teaching, rather than to research, and through that commitment, the College ensures that the majority of instruction is provided by full-time faculty. Another seeming anomaly is academic rank having no impact on salary; nor is rank covered within the Agreement. Like teaching assignments (not load) and faculty evaluation, rank is covered through College policy (Academic Rank and Promotion Requirements).

The relationship with PCEA, along with the fact that no other employee groups are unionized, suggests positive administrative-employee interactions that are mutually respectful and – as important – workplace effective.

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

As stated in the College values, “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.” The open enrollment policy and the applied technology majors that appeal to wide varieties of secondary students lead to a broad range of student demographics and levels of academic preparation.

For the 745 students entering in 2011 who reported SAT scores, the average math score (MSAT) was 475, the average reading and verbal (RSAT and VSAT) score was 455, and the average writing score (WSAT) was 432. (SAT scores are required only for entrance to a baccalaureate major.) Information about how entering students fare based on placement, of which SAT scores are a part, is provided in Chapter Ten.

According to the 2010-2011 Sourcebook, approximately 60% of the entering students fall in the bottom 50% in class rank, and only 11% are within the top 20%. (Estimates are based on the 68% of students who reported a class rank.) The College provides multiple avenues of support for these under-prepared students, and recent efforts to address retention and graduation issues are discussed in Chapter Ten.

In Fall 2011, 5,976 enrolled students accounted for 5,520 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) students, of which 63.3% were male, 36.7% female, and 9.6% minority. An abundance of traditionally male-oriented majors accounts for the preponderance of male students. The geographic areas from which the majority of students are drawn account for the relatively low minority student population (41.8% from north-central...
Pennsylvania). The low population of minority students reflects the broader population of the north-central Pennsylvania region (8.1% reported minority population in Lycoming County, 2010 census data). Out-of-state students account for about 10.5% of enrollments. Of the enrolled students, 83.1% are full-time (average 14.9 credit hours) and 16.9% are part-time (average 6.6 credit hours).

The 2010-2011 Sourcebook shows the mean age for all full-time students as 21.7, which has held nearly constant over five years. Mean age for part-time students has decreased from 28.5 in 2006 to 27.6 in 2010, with the average age of all students being 23.0 in 2010.

Penn College collectively offers more than 100 academic majors, which include degrees, certificates, minors, and competency credentials in eight academic schools:

- Business and Computer Technologies (BCT)
- Construction and Design Technologies (CDT)
- Health Sciences (HS)
- Hospitality (HOS)
- Industrial and Engineering Technologies (IET)
- Integrated Studies (IS)
- Natural Resources Management (NRM)
- Transportation Technology (TT)

The School of Integrated Studies is primarily responsible for offering general education courses, although eleven majors, such as Graphic Design, Applied Human Services, and General Studies reside in the school as well.
Enrollments rose steadily from 1989 through 2007, but have generally declined since that time, as the chart below indicates. Most individual schools have also been affected by declining enrollments, although the School of Health Sciences has seen a steady increase in enrollments, reflecting national trends in the demand for health-care personnel. Since the budget is largely tuition-driven, this decline has prompted several responses by faculty and staff, discussed within this self-study, which reflect greater emphases on student retention, advising, and developmental course offerings.

![College-wide Enrollments](image)

**Figure 1.2:** Chart comparing College enrollment by year.

![School Enrollments](image)

**Figure 1.3:** Chart comparing academic school enrollment by year.

**FOUNDATIONS OF EXCELLENCE®**

During the 2009-10 academic year, Penn College participated in the Foundations of Excellence® (FoE) initiative, coordinated by the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence (Foundations of Excellence website). FoE is a comprehensive, externally guided self-study and improvement process for colleges and universities focusing on the first year. Motivation to participate in this intense project stemmed from a recognized need to benchmark the College against the Gardner Institute’s aspirational vision of the first year of college; to strengthen collaboration between departments and more purposefully engage faculty.
Chapter One: Institutional Overview

and staff in first-year efforts; to broaden the conversation on retention; and to utilize data to strategically identify the College’s next steps in developing a plan to improve student services.

The FoE Final Report contains both a synopsis of current College practices, appropriately noting identified strengths and areas for improvement, and a resulting series of data-driven recommendations that fell into nine themes:

- Foundational Goal Statement
- Organizational Structure to Support the First Year
- Assessment
- Professional Development
- Learning
- First Year Experience Class
- Academic Advising
- Diversity
- Student Support Services

A comprehensive vetting process was developed to ensure opportunities for the campus community to both question and validate the findings and recommendations included in the FoE Final Report. In addition to a portal site through which the entire campus community could review and respond to the report, the report was presented and discussed with the Student Government Association, College Council, Corporate Advisory Board, and the Board of Directors. Also notable was the review conducted by Dr. John Gardner, whose feedback included the comment “It (the report) is truly outstanding, as fine a report as I have received in my FoE life and times! Congratulations.”

Upon approval of the FoE Final Report, the College moved quickly from planning to implementation and has, to date, fulfilled 17 of 37 action items. These action items have been incorporated into the strategic plan and responsibilities have been assigned to individuals and departments based upon the items’ focus.

Because the first year of college is the foundation for a student’s entire collegiate experience, the outcomes of FoE will reach not only first-year students, but all students. For example, the FoE-driven actions to improve academic advising for new students will result in a strengthened process for all students. Significant efforts have been initiated in several key areas that will have positive effects on student success. Among these efforts are the following:

- A re-envisioning and re-organization of academic support services that now incorporates expanded student services such as an online early-alert referral system, mentoring, increased tutoring access, and a writing center (now known collectively as the Academic Success Center).
- Implementation of FYE101, a required, one-credit First Year Experience course (FYE 101) for all new students, including transfers with fewer than 24 credits.
- An increased focus on advising with expanded faculty development offerings and improved resources for faculty and students.

The FoE self-study serves as an illustration of the College’s assessment-driven planning process: a need was perceived; data was gathered from multiple college-wide sources; recommendations evolved from analysis of the data; goals and action items were developed from the recommendations and incorporated into the strategic plan; and resources were allocated during the budgeting process to accomplish those goals. Incorporating these goals in the strategic plan ensures a sustained focus with continuous assessment and appropriate allocation of resources. An update of the progress achieved to date is included in Appendix 3 of this self-study.

CAMPUS FACILITIES

Pennsylvania College of Technology’s Main Campus is located in the City of Williamsport, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania. Williamsport is the largest city in the area, with a population of 29,304 (2009 data),
and is situated 90 miles north of the state capital of Harrisburg, 160 miles northwest of Philadelphia, and 200 miles northeast of Pittsburgh. College facilities include the Earth Science Center (15 miles south of Williamsport), the Aviation Center (6 miles east of Williamsport), the Advanced Automotive Technology Center (3 miles west of Williamsport), and the North Campus (60 miles north of Williamsport). A breakdown of Penn College properties, including non-instructional sites includes:

- **Main Campus**, 125.2 acres
- **Aviation Center**, 5.8 acres
- **Earth Science Center**, 383.7 acres
- **Morgan Valley**, 439.7 acres (a wooded tract with a small-group retreat center)
- **North Campus**, 35.4 acres (noncredit adult education only)
- **Advanced Automotive Tech Center**, 2.0 acres
- **General Services**, 5.4 acres (warehouse, vehicle maintenance and storage, general services staff offices, Weatherization Center)

Total size: 997.2 acres

Main campus consists of 23 buildings, including five student housing complexes (1,710 beds in mostly apartment-style arrangements), the Madigan Library, Student and Administrative Services Center (SASC), the Bush Campus Center (also has classrooms and labs), the Police Department, the Center for Business and Workforce Development (which includes classrooms/labs for electronics technology students), the Field House (a student-built sports and fitness center), the Victorian House (student-designed and student-built bed and breakfast facilities), and the Thompson Professional Development Center (student-built conference center). A listing of all campus buildings with square footage is available in the 2010-2015 Facilities and Site Master Plan (Exhibit 1.2). A map of the Main Campus is provided on the back cover of the self-study. Other maps of various locations are available on the Penn College website.

All student housing areas are air-conditioned, with cable and Internet services, 24/7 maintenance and night security, and are staffed by full-time professional coordinators and student resident assistants.

**Stage X Building Project**

The most recent development in regard to campus facilities was the completion of what is called the “Stage X (ten)” building project. The Stage X building program was funded through bond proceeds ($45.27 million). The program was three years in the design phase and another two years in construction. The Stage X building program completed all of the major components of the 2004-2009 Facilities and Site Master Plan. The major components of the program included the following:

- Renovation and addition to the Automotive Technology Center
- Renovation and addition to the Metal Trades Center
- Renovation and addition to the Lifelong Education Center
- Construction of Dauphin Hall student residence and dining facility
- Construction of the Construction Masonry Building
- Renovation of the SASC third floor for the executive offices
- Renovation of the Madigan Library’s third floor for College Information & Community Relations
- Demolition of the Rose St. Warehouse and construction of the General Services Warehouse
The Stage X program allowed substantial expansion of enrollment in the Automotive and Welding programs, which formerly operated at capacity. Dauphin Hall provided a new approach to student housing, with single and two-person rooms combined to form a suite. Several suites share a common area. In addition, theme and program-based learning communities were established in this facility.

Following the major construction projects associated with Stage X, a number of significant “backfill” renovations were undertaken. These expanded the School of Business & Computer Technologies’ facilities, Student Health Services, and student organization spaces on campus. These projects are detailed in the latest iteration of the Facilities and Site Master Plan approved in June 2011.

RECOGNITION BY EXTERNAL BODIES

As the College has progressed through the decades, it has steadily built an enviable reputation as a viable, responsible, and responsive institution, focused on excellence. It has also sought external validation as a means of identifying its strengths and its weaknesses, allowing for ongoing improvement. Among the recent validations are the four detailed below.

Standard and Poor’s Bond Rating — When interest rates in the municipal market declined in the fall of 2010, the College began to evaluate the potential refinancing of outstanding debt. In the past, the College had obtained bond insurance in lieu of a public rating. Given the recent collapse of the bond insurance market, the College needed to obtain a public financial rating to issue new debt. To that end, in October 2010, the College contracted with Standard & Poor’s and obtained an ‘A’ rating (see Exhibit 1.3), with a stable outlook. This rating facilitated the refinancing of the College’s bond series of 2000 in June 2011. Coordinated by President’s Council, College administration and staff collected comprehensive information regarding the fiscal and institutional health (available in Exhibit 1.4) to present to the rating team.

Great Places to Work Survey — In 2009, Penn College was included among 39 institutions to receive Honor Role recognition in the Chronicle of Higher Education’s “Great Places to Work For” survey. The Honor Roll lists the top 10 four-year colleges (and the top three community colleges) in each of the survey’s size categories, based on the number of times they were recognized within individual categories. According to the survey, Penn College achieved top-10 rankings in 23 categories – more than any other institution receiving “honor roll” status. Survey results are available in Exhibit 1.5.

Military Friendly — Penn College has been selected for inclusion in the 2011 list of “Military Friendly Schools” issued by G.I. Jobs. The designation is reserved for the top 15 percent of colleges, universities, and trade schools that do the most to “embrace America’s veterans as students,” according to the publication. Among the criteria for listing as a Military Friendly School are the following: efforts to recruit and retain military and veteran students, results in recruiting military and veteran students, and academic accreditations. Institutions on the Military Friendly Schools list also offer benefits to student veterans such as on-campus veterans’ programs, credit for service, military-spouse programs, and more. G.I. Jobs polled more than 7,000 schools nationwide to compile the list. For the Fall 2010 semester, Penn College certified 316 student veterans to the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

Website Awards – As a primary vehicle for presenting information to the public regarding our academic programs and facilities, the College’s website is often the very first contact prospective students have with Penn College. The quality, functionality, and integrity of the site are demonstrated by several significant awards over the recent past.

- In 2007, the College was the highest-rated school in the north and second among the top-10 rated schools in the nation in the National Research Center for College & University Admissions annual rankings of admissions websites, a research-based analysis of more than 3,000 postsecondary institutions that rates the functionality and design of college and university websites.
In 2010, the www.pct.edu website achieved “University Standard of Excellence” recognition in the Web Marketing Association’s WebAward 2010 competition, judged by a panel of independent Internet experts in such areas as design, interactivity, technology, content, innovation, copywriting, and ease of use to the target audience. Penn College was one of 15 institutions from around the world recognized in the university category.

Also in 2010, the website was recognized by the International Academy of Visual Arts, with a Silver Award in the School/University category of its W3 Awards competition. The academy is an invitation-only body consisting of top-tier professionals from a "Who's Who" of acclaimed media, interactive, advertising, and marketing firms.

**CAMPUS-AS-LABORATORY**

Penn College students “live” the degrees that work catchphrase as they apply classroom theory or as they observe or experience the outcomes of their peers’ accomplishments on campus:

- The Victorian House, designed by a student in the architecture major; constructed, plumbed, and electrified by students in other majors; landscaped by yet another group of students; walkways and pavers installed by masonry students
- Bicycle racks constructed by students in welding
- Trees regularly pruned by forestry students
- LeJeune Chef kitchens and restaurants providing a fine dining option with students functioning as managers and as staff in both the front and back of the house
- Children’s Learning Center designed to allow observations and to provide Early Childhood students and Health Sciences students practice in working with early learners
- Dental Hygiene lab offering patient care opportunities to students in the program and to other students who opt to serve as patients

This short list demonstrates the “ultimate” form of student learning outcomes: a showplace construction project; healthy campus arboriculture; fine dining experience; applying lesson plans in early-learning setting; even healthy dentition.
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Current Strategic Goals & Initiatives

**GOAL: Provide hands-on education, preparing students for careers in an evolving world.**
- Develop and implement targeted credit and non-credit curriculum modifications to support expanding career opportunities in the regional natural gas industry.
- Systematically review the entire degree portfolio to validate continued offerings, programmatic integrity, and learning outcomes.
- Retrofit academic campus spaces vacated through Stage X construction.

**GOAL: Foster a student-centered environment both inside and outside the classroom.**
- Implement Stage X building program for Dauphin Hall.
- Develop, implement, and evaluate new academic advising strategies based on research and best practices.
- Retrofit non-academic campus spaces vacated through Stage X construction.
- Complete the development and implement the operation of a comprehensive program for academic support services that meets the needs of all Penn College students.
- Explore NCAA affiliation and provide recommendation to the College outlining a potential timeline, possible level of participation (division level), costs and benefits, and impact on student-athletes.
- Create a comprehensive campus-wide awareness campaign focusing on sexual assault response and a parallel education campaign focusing on promoting a campus culture of personal respect and personal responsibility.

**GOAL: Implement approved Foundations of Excellence recommendations.**
- Work toward becoming a more diversity-responsive institution by actively developing culturally sensitive students, faculty and staff.
- Provide ongoing professional development activities related to first year issues of concern for faculty and staff.

**GOAL: Serve as a catalyst for community and economic development.**
- Develop and implement strategies to facilitate the expanding career opportunities in the regional natural gas industry.
- Develop and implement strategies to facilitate the expanding career opportunities in the green industries.

**GOAL: Foster relationships with institutional stakeholders to promote Pennsylvania College of Technology and its mission.**
- Expand articulation efforts with targeted colleges and universities in conjunction with expanded Pennsylvania Department of Education efforts related to PATRAC and Prior Learning Assessment (PLA).
- Evaluate the implementation of the Integrated Marketing Plan in years one and two (2008-09/2009-10) for continuing implementation within available resources for years three, four, and five (2010-11/2011-12/2012-13).
- Establish a strategy for including students, faculty, staff, alumni, retirees, donors, and friends in College-wide celebrations of the 100-year anniversary in 2014.
- Increase business and industry relationships across all academic schools.
- Conduct a campaign to support the College and Penn College Foundation scholarship programs.

**GOAL: Optimize the use of College resources to support the institution’s mission.**
- Implement the new financial system to improve the management of the College’s financial resources through timely and relevant financial reporting which supports the financial decision making process.
- Measurable objectives and policies to cost-effectively maximize energy efficiency are developed.
- Implement new staffing, programs, and services, through College Health Services, that provide a greater level of health care to both students and employees.
- Implement and evaluate an Ombuds Program to provide employees and supervisors with alternate modes of problem solving/dispute resolution.
- Implement and evaluate on-boarding program to accelerate new employee productivity, efficiency, and engagement, and to promote effective communications/interactions with internal and external clients.

**GOAL: Embrace a culture of assessment and data-driven decision making.**
- Finalize and implement the College-wide outcomes assessment plan.
- Develop a data warehouse/data mining system to support campus planning and assessment initiatives.
- Middle States Commission on Higher Education action on self-study and team visit has affirmed re-accreditation, by June 2012.
- Fully implement the initiative-based strategic planning process and finalize the appropriate documents in support of this new approach.

**GOAL: Increase College Enrollment**
- Expand both outreach and on-campus recruitment activities.
- Review new academic program possibilities on a two-year cycle.
- Expand opportunities for transfer students in order to increase enrollment for that group by 10%.
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Standards 1 and 2

Are the mission and goals used to guide College and program decision making, and are they regularly assessed?

Do institutional goals focus on student learning and institutional improvement?

Are College planning processes collaborative, continuous, and systematic?

Are College planning, resource allocation, and institutional improvement efforts linked to assessment results?

Many of the elements that affirm the College’s compliance with Middle States’ Standard 1 (Mission and Goals) and Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal), as well as the mission and goals themselves, have undergone significant revision over the past several years. For example, a significant revision of the College mission statement was completed in Spring 2009, after which extensive review and revision of the planning process were initiated. The mission and values were further modified in Spring 2011 as a result of recommendations growing from the Foundations of Excellence® self-study completed in Spring 2010. Likewise, the planning, budgeting, and program review processes have experienced significant change in just three years. For this reason, the study group focused its analysis on documenting, where applicable, the former processes, examining the changes in those processes, and determining how and to what extent the existing processes demonstrate the fundamental elements of Standards 1 and 2.

The College satisfies Standard 1 through clearly defined institutional and unit-level (administrative division, academic school, and department) missions and goals that are collaboratively developed and clearly communicated to appropriate stakeholders. The College mission guides planning for and operation of the departments throughout the College and shapes the development of programs within the academic schools. Primary evidence for these conclusions grows from a review of the existing institutional and unit mission and goal statements as well as an analysis of the alignment between these statements.

The College also satisfies Standard 2 through clearly articulated planning and resource allocation processes. These processes grow out of the institutional and unit missions and goals, and are informed by assessment at both levels. Institutional and unit goals are incorporated into administrator appraisals to ensure accountability; and assessment is incorporated into a variety of institutional and unit plans, as both a goal or objective, and is an integral stage in the planning process. Primary evidence for these conclusions grows from a review of the existing College Strategic Plan and Planning Manual, as well as curriculum activity, facility maintenance and expansion expenditures, and planning actions completed since the last self-study and the Periodic Review Report (PRR).

MISSION AND PLANNING

Between 1989 and 2009, the College’s former comprehensive Long Range Plan included and was guided by a philosophy, a mission, and a vision. The comprehensive Long Range Plan also included a large number of goals that were organized into five goal areas, with multiple task statements residing under each goal. Additionally, major institutional initiatives were drafted at the beginning of each academic year to highlight the most important activities taking place at the College that year. The plan was updated and
published annually to report the progress of each task and each Governance action and to create new
tasks or retire completed tasks.

A companion document, the Long Range Plan Cumulative Update, provided as Exhibit 2.1, was also
published each year. It included all status reports and all Governance actions affecting the comprehensive
Long Range Plan over a five-year period. Given the comprehensive nature of the Long Range Plan, the
Cumulative Update represented a five-year operational history of the institution.

The former planning process involved multiple constituencies. All modifications to the plan required the
approval of College Council and, in most cases, the appropriate Governance subcommittee. (See Chapter
Four for details about the structure and role of Governance committees, including College Council.)
Additionally, the president’s approval was required to indicate organizational concurrence with Long
Range Plan modifications. For changes to the philosophy and mission statements or major institutional
initiatives, concurrence by the Board of Directors was required as well.

A periodic examination of the planning process in 2007 revealed that the comprehensive Long Range
Plan’s strengths and weaknesses were often the same: while the plan accounted for all activity taking
place at the College and was a useful reference, it was excessively bureaucratic, unwieldy, and required a
great deal of effort to update, especially in the annual provision of status reports. While democratic, the
process for modifying the plan was rarely employed by those outside of senior administration.
Additionally, the planning cycle did not align well with the budgeting cycle, especially in the identification
and approval of major institutional initiatives.

In 2007, with these primary concerns in mind, the president convened the Planning Review Work Group,
chaired by the vice president for academic affairs/provost and the senior vice president, to review the
College’s approach to long range planning, to develop recommendations to address perceived
inconsistencies in the planning process, and to explore more contemporary approaches to planning that
met the overall needs of the institution. The Planning Review Work Group embraced its task from both a
structural and process perspective. In the spring of 2008, the group recommended elimination of the
philosophy statement, revision of the mission statement, and the creation of a list of values. The
recommendation was approved, and in January of 2009, after review by a number of constituencies
including President’s Council and Deans’ Council, the group presented its formal proposal to College
Council. In keeping with its role in the planning process, College Council held open forums throughout the
semester to solicit input from the campus community through both in-person and electronic means. On
April 28, 2009, College Council approved the proposed changes, which were then approved by the Board
of Directors on June 25, 2009.

Upon approval of the mission and values statements in 2009, the Planning Review Work Group turned its
attention to the body of the Long Range Plan. The group recommended eliminating goal statements that
were routine and replacing them with a smaller number of goals representing a more strategic approach
to planning and under which institutional initiatives could reside. This recommendation was approved by
College Council on April 27, 2010, after solicitation of input from the College community. The
recommendation was subsequently approved by the president. The resulting initiative-based Strategic
Plan is much shorter, with a greater focus on initiatives rather than on routine institutional functions.
Specific indicators of success were then developed for each initiative. From a process standpoint, the new
approach to planning retained the most favorable elements of the former plan while also introducing
significant process improvements. College Council approved all elements of the plan on behalf of the
internal governance system and, thus, the College community, on April 27, 2010. The president and the
Board of Directors approved the plan on April 29, 2010.

Also in 2007, concurrent with the activity of the Planning Review Work Group, the internal governance
system initiated a Governance Review Task Force, whose efforts complemented the work of the Planning
Review Work Group by determining how the internal governance system could more meaningfully
contribute to institutional planning. To ensure alignment of purpose, the two groups shared some
members. To combat the perception that governance was merely a “rubber stamp” for planning efforts and, especially, to ensure that participation in the planning process was recognized as a responsibility of the entire College community rather than a single governance committee, the Governance Review Task Force recommended elimination of the Long Range Planning Committee. The task force held a series of campus-wide, face-to-face meetings and solicited feedback on the proposal. College Council implemented the Task Force Recommendations in January of 2009. College Council has assumed the remaining planning responsibilities previously assigned to the Long Range Planning Committee.

During 2009-10, the College participated in Foundations of Excellence® (FoE), a comprehensive, externally guided self-study and improvement process for the first year. One result of this self-study was the recommendation that the institution revise its mission and values statements to more directly highlight the College’s commitment to diversity. A special committee convened during 2010-11 recommended revisions of the mission and values statements, which were approved by President’s Council and Deans’ Council prior to being presented to College Council. In February 2011, College Council unanimously approved the proposed changes. The revised statements were subsequently approved by the Board of Directors in April 2011.

**CURRENT INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING PROCESS**

Components of the initiative-based Strategic Plan:

- Mission, Vision, and Values
- Strategic Goals
- Strategic Initiatives
- Success Indicators

All components of the planning process share certain commonalities:

- The planning process is bi-cameral. No component is added to the plan without the approval of College Council and the Board of Directors. Similarly, all progress reports through completion are reviewed by each body.
- The planning process is transparent so that the results of assessment, the formulation and budgeting of initiatives, and the establishment of operational plans are open to input from all appropriate stakeholders.
- Annual progress reports are made to the College’s Board of Directors and to College Council. Normally these are drafted after the conclusion of the fiscal year.
- A cumulative planning archive of completed initiatives is maintained by the office of Assessment, Research and Planning (ARP).

**Mission, Vision and Values:** Review of the College’s Mission, Vision, and Values will be completed every five years to correspond to and facilitate accreditation activities and as determined appropriate by the president, who also determines the mechanism for the review. The results of such a review are presented to College Council, which ensures that the College community is given the opportunity to provide input prior to approval of any changes. Following the approval of College Council, the Board of Directors reviews or approves the changes, as appropriate.

**Strategic Goals:** Goals may be initiated by any member of the campus community through Governance action. Addition or modification of a goal requires College Council approval.

**Strategic Initiatives:** Strategic initiatives are actions implemented to achieve a strategic goal. President’s Council reviews the results of assessment in the fall and develops the resulting initiatives in time for
budget preparation. These plan components are reviewed and approved by College Council and the College Board. However, strategic initiatives can be proposed by any member of the College community through Governance and can be approved at any time through the year.

**Success Indicators:** Success indicators are quantifiable results or documentable milestones that measure the outcome of a strategic initiative. The effectiveness of initiatives will be assessed, in part, through these measures. Integration of the planning, assessment, and budget development processes is visually depicted in Figure 2.1.
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**Figure 2.1:** Image representing the assessment, planning, budget development, operations cycle.

*Note: “Results of assessment” in the figure above refers to the annual assessment reports of academic schools and operating units as well as the Quality Through Assessment (QTA) Committee annual assessment report.*

To ensure accountability and the accomplishment of the initiative-based Strategic Plan, strategic initiatives are included in the annual employee performance objectives at the director level and above, thereby ensuring that the plan grounds their year’s work. Thereafter, as mid-year and annual employee reviews are conducted, attention is paid to the accomplishment of those initiatives.

As presented in the Strategic Plan and on the College website, the College’s Mission, Vision, and Values appear inside the front cover of this report; the strategic goals and initiatives can be found on the divider page that precedes this chapter. Additionally, the president’s public website includes summaries of her convocation and end-of-year messages (archived from PCToday articles), in which she regularly describes key elements of her vision for the College.
SCHOOL AND DEPARTMENTAL MISSIONS AND GOALS

College practice among the eight academic schools and within some departments is to craft a mission and set of goals appropriate to guide the operations in that work area. These unit-level mission and goal statements have been reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with those of the College. College, academic school, and department missions and goals are presented on the Assessment, Research, and Planning portal. All academic schools and most departments within the College have articulated a mission that grows from or otherwise supports that of the College. Additionally, all of the academic schools and departments that deal directly with students have a combination of mission and goals that encompasses the mission, values, and goals of the College. While these combinations of statements are predictably varied, they reflect the diverse ways in which the schools and departments implement the institution’s mission and values.

To ensure even greater alignment of institutional and academic school missions and goals, the provost and school deans initiated a review of existing mission and goal statements for the academic schools during Fall 2010. Concurrent with the review by the academic schools, the senior vice president initiated a review of existing mission and goal statements for departments that deal directly with students. These reviews were completed in Fall 2010, and changes resulting from them, while minor, further strengthened alignment between the mission, values, and goals of the College with the missions and goals of its schools and departments.

The various mission and goal statements, like those of the College, are published in a variety of locations, such as the school websites, for viewing by external stakeholders.

SCHOOL AND DEPARTMENT PLANNING

Planning at the school and department level is completed primarily through the three-year (in some cases, five-year) planning process, which is designed to allow for quick response to changes in needs and external conditions identified through ongoing assessment activities including, at the school level, program review (Program Review guidelines). Three- and five-year plans for the academic schools and departments are offered as Exhibit 2.2.

At the beginning of each academic year, school and department plans are reviewed and revised. At the end of the academic year, the plans are again reviewed (including an assessment of the plan’s performance) and updated. Every three years, all College degree programs also undergo a rigorous program review, which further assesses the effectiveness of unit-level plans. While the formats of individual plans vary across departments, assessment, curriculum, equipment, facilities, and staffing are among the major planning areas for which specific objectives and improvement initiatives are identified. Success indicators for each initiative are identified as well as specific ties to the budget. Input for a three-year plan may come from all operating levels; this broad and inclusive approach, which results in significant faculty and staff input, is a strength of the current planning process.

Recent changes in the institutional planning, budgeting, and assessment processes, however, have necessitated modification of the school and department-level planning process. Deans’ Council, under the leadership of the provost, recently completed an assessment of this process in Academic Affairs and modified the division planning documents to improve their effectiveness, efficiency, uniformity, clarity, and transparency. Thus, planning at Penn College has been a vigorous process over the past five years, a process characterized by a realistic assessment of existing processes with the goal of improvement.
RESOURCE ALLOCATION

One of the perceived weaknesses of the former institutional planning process was a disjunction between the calendars for developing major institutional initiatives and the College's annual budget. The initiatives were often drafted and approved after the budget was prepared. As noted earlier, the Planning Review Work Group corrected this condition and, in doing so, was assisted by another major change occurring simultaneously at the College. In 2008, budget development took a new approach. Rather than drafting and defending an entire departmental budget each year, cost center administrators were given a base budget that carried forward from one year to the next. Each department kept approximately the same annual spending level, adjusted for inflation and other external realities. Increases in a departmental budget were tied to specific initiatives. Budget development and review were simplified.

Connections between planning and budgeting became easier to forge, and the perceived disjunctions were eliminated. The planning cycle (see Figure 2.1) now calls for the results of research and assessment to drive the formulation of initiatives, which come to President's Council in the fall of the year. Once the initiatives are approved, budget development takes place. The initiatives are approved on an annual basis by both College Council and the Board of Directors, which also approve the College's budget in June. To ensure regular and appropriate assessment, progress reports on the initiatives are made each year to both College Council and the Board. The process is described in more detail in the Planning Manual, as shown in Appendix 2, which illustrates the dynamic nature of the web-based document at a stage prior to final approval by College Council and the Board of Trustees. The recommended revisions have since been incorporated into the current operating plan, available to employees on the portal site and the external stakeholders on the public website.

INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL

One significant measure of an institution's vitality can be captured in the dynamic nature of its academic programs. This is particularly true in the case of colleges with a technical focus, where maintaining a curriculum that meets the rapidly evolving needs of technical occupations in the workplace becomes a major institutional commitment. For Penn College, therefore, institutional renewal involves the intentional evaluation of existing programs and practices, with the input of multiple stakeholders, to affirm the effectiveness of those programs and practices or to identify necessary improvements. Close linkages with business and industry are necessary to ensure that graduates obtain the skills necessary for entry into their career fields.

Curriculum maintenance is the responsibility of the departmental faculty and is informed primarily, though not solely, by periodic program review. Soliciting input from external advisory committees and working with the school dean, program faculty develop, revise, and, when circumstances warrant, recommend elimination of program curricula. All curricular actions require approval of the College’s Curriculum Committee within the governance system. The review of this committee’s annual activity since the last self-study, offered as Exhibit 2.3, provides evidence of the institutional renewal activity from the all-important perspective of the College’s academic programs. Since the last reaccreditation self-study, the College has

- created 27 new curricula, including bachelor and associate's degrees, certificates, and competency credentials;
- created 11 new minors;
- processed 74 significant curriculum revisions (exclusive of title changes);
- course revisions, additions, deletions; and
- terminated 35 curricula.
The information provided in Exhibit 2.3 reflects Governance action only on the curricular level. The Curriculum Committee also reviews and must approve course revisions involving significant or minor changes. Dozens of these revisions are processed each year, and the portrait of curricular vitality that emerges from this record is impressive. Additionally, the College responds expeditiously to the curricular needs of the external community. Just a few examples of this are the addition of noncredit offerings through the Office of Workforce Development and Continuing Education (WDCE) to support recent activity in the Marcellus Shale industry, and the quadrupling of capacity in terms of students and courses offered through the Weatherization Training Center in less than a year.

Additional examples of institutional renewal include the recent changes in the planning and budgeting processes discussed earlier, as well as the evolution of the College’s new student orientation program into the Connections program. The former orientation program was a single, large, one-day event conducted as part of Welcome Weekend; the Connections program is a smaller, two-day event conducted several times over the summer. In addition to format changes, Connections underwent content changes with a focus on providing students and parents with the information needed on the first day of classes. Dozens of stakeholders from Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, and Business Affairs were involved in evaluating the previous orientation program, assessing student and parent needs and expectations, and exploring best practices to identify a program appropriate for the College. Ongoing assessment of the Connections program has been a hallmark of the new approach and has resulted in several relatively minor modifications since the program’s inception. These changes include expanding the Classroom Expectations session to include academic advising topics, adding a Mathematical Mindsets Matter session to emphasize the importance of attitude in math success, and merging two sessions—one on academic support and the other on counseling and career services—into a single session: Crafting College Success.

A further example of institutional renewal comes from Dining Services. After an extensive assessment that involved an outside consultant, a review of industry best practices, a study of facility use, and a survey of student needs and expectations, significant changes in menu, payment options, operating hours, and food service venues were implemented, including additional venues and specialized menus at particular venues across campus. Importantly, this was not a one-time assessment; a Dining Services Advisory Committee of students meets regularly with Dining Services staff members to discuss and provide a student perspective on new initiatives.

Equally compelling is the College’s participation in the Foundations of Excellence® (FoE) self-study in 2009-10, referenced previously in the Executive Summary and Institutional Overview, which serves as another example of assessment and the resulting institutional renewal. Of note, all implementation plans resulting from the FoE Final Report’s recommended actions were required to incorporate a formal assessment component.

Closely related to this initiative was the formation of the Retention Committee in 2008 to examine different methods of improving retention at the College. Among the improvements that resulted from the committee’s work and were affirmed by the Foundations of Excellence® self-study were the expansion of the First Year Experience course to be required of all students new to Penn College and several initiatives to raise the visibility of and to enhance academic advising. Finally, even recent changes in food choices and meal availability grew out of the assessment of student needs and expectations.

Another indicator of institutional renewal can be inferred from actions that a college takes to expand or improve its physical plant. Since the last self-study for reaccreditation, the College has continued its aggressive posture in the area of facilities development. Planning and executing building programs such as those listed in the Facilities and Site Master Plan involve a substantial number of faculty and staff. Penn College involves the end-users of the facility throughout the design development to ensure that the completed product meets the needs of the program or service unit to the greatest possible degree. The major projects that have been completed since 2002 are listed in Exhibit 2.4.
In addition to major construction projects, Penn College has aggressively tended to the needs of the existing physical plant. In most cases, College renovations are approved to enhance academic or student service facilities, or to accommodate new instructional or laboratory technologies. As with facility development, these renovation requests are submitted by the organizational unit associated with the space, and the ultimate users of the space are closely involved throughout the review, approval, and execution process. Table 2.1 below reveals the annual expenditures for renovations since the last self-study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>General Services Operating Budget</th>
<th>Renewal and Replacement Fund</th>
<th>Bond Fund Expended for Capital Projects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$423,540</td>
<td>$27,123</td>
<td>$6,006,428</td>
<td>$6,457,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>249,048</td>
<td>308,650</td>
<td>24,459,286</td>
<td>25,016,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>551,744</td>
<td>29,236</td>
<td>10,767,621</td>
<td>11,348,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>625,286</td>
<td>77,592</td>
<td>4,170,848</td>
<td>4,873,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>542,330</td>
<td>505,149</td>
<td>1,485,314</td>
<td>2,532,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>664,058</td>
<td>438,554</td>
<td>1,819,547</td>
<td>2,922,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>802,873</td>
<td>75,476</td>
<td>807,962</td>
<td>1,686,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>391,570</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>10,644,041</td>
<td>11,035,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>437,192</td>
<td>454,470</td>
<td>36,366,076</td>
<td>37,257,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$4,687,641</td>
<td>$1,916,250</td>
<td>$96,527,123</td>
<td>$103,131,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Facility development expenses, 2001 through 2010.

*No allocations due to Stage X construction project.

While the availability and acquisition of additional land is a considerable challenge, since the last self-study, the College has managed to increase its main campus site by approximately 10% through the purchase of 11.9 acres of land. In addition, the College’s Earth Science Center, located in nearby Allenwood, grew by 25.4 acres through the acquisition of a highly desirable parcel adjacent to that campus.

A review of actions associated with the planning process by College Governance gives some indication of the dynamic nature of College operations. As explained previously, the College’s former planning process was comprehensive and required College and Governance approval for the Long Range Plan to be altered in any way, normally by modifying, adding, or retiring tasks or goals. During the period from the previous self-study report until June of 2009, when the new initiative-based planning process was adopted, the following actions were completed.

- 33 task statements were added to the comprehensive Long Range Plan, or modified in some way, many in conjunction with the self-study process.
- 43 task statements were retired from the Long Range Plan, indicating completion.
- 3 goals were modified or added to the Long Range Plan.

A review of recent editions of the Cumulative Update of the Long Range Plan, Exhibit 2.1, for the same period documents the actions taken above and further provides an annual update for each active task. Updates to the initiative-based Strategic Plan are documented on the Strategic Planning portal site.

Finally, a significant indicator of institutional renewal as well as evidence of institutional effectiveness is offered in the Annual Report presented in each fall’s special edition of One College Avenue. Copies of these Annual Reports for the past eight years are available as Exhibit 2.5.
In the process of evaluating the College’s compliance with standards, the study group identified several opportunities for improvement and recommended such improvements to the appropriate personnel. As a result, several initiatives have already been inaugurated. For example, while the College clearly communicates its mission and goals to current employees, no evidence suggests that it does the same for new employees or students. The College has, therefore, taken action to ensure that new employees and students are apprised of the College’s mission and goals. Efforts are currently underway to incorporate information regarding the mission and goals into new faculty and staff on-boarding (orientation) programs and into the student FYE 101 – First Year Experience class. Additionally, an evaluation of the planning process revealed that both the process and its product (the initiative-based Strategic Plan) should be evaluated annually by the College’s internal governance system. The requirement for this review and resulting annual report to College Council has been incorporated in the Planning Manual.

SELF-STUDY OUTCOMES

Adherence to Standards 1 and 2 is evident in the College’s integrated approach to planning and resource allocation. Penn College’s mission and goals form the heart of the College’s initiative-based Strategic Plan, the components of which are reviewed for currency and appropriateness every five years to correspond with and facilitate accreditation activities. The strategic plan informs and is supported by division, academic school, and department three- and five-year plans. Operational outcomes aimed at institutional improvement are articulated and annually assessed through these plans; learning outcomes are articulated and regularly assessed at the course, program, and institution levels. From faculty and staff involvement in the development and assessment of school and department plans to internal governance review and approval of institutional plans, the planning process at Penn College involves all categories of employees in a collaborative and systematic process to ensure that the institution continues to accomplish its mission.

Furthermore, the assessment of College performance is directly linked to the resource allocation process. Assessment results are reported annually at the end of the academic year and assist in the development of initiatives upon which budgets are then constructed. This process ensures that the College remains continually aware of how well it is performing in accomplishing its mission and goals, develops appropriate initiatives to improve its performance in these areas, and funds those initiatives to ensure continual improvement. Finally, this assessment-driven approach to planning and resource allocation ensures a dynamic environment characterized by vibrant renewal of the course and program portfolio, student support activities and events, and the physical plant.
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**Budget 2011-12**

**TOTALS BY FUND**

- Operating: $99,885,400
- Auxiliary: $24,224,091

**Total current funds: $124,109,491**

- Restricted Funds: $18,038,700
- Plant & Debt Funds: $619,000

**Total College: $142,767,191**

- State Appropriations: $13,584,000
- As a % of Total: 9.5%

**Tuition and Fees 2011-12**

- $453 per credit hour (includes capital fee, student activity fee, health service fee and technology fee)
- Lab instruction fee of $36 per lab hour
- Average annual in-state tuition and fees $13,590 (30 credit hours)
- Out-of-state tuition 1.3 times the in-state rate
- Room and Board Costs
  - $2,833 per semester (variable rates in Rose Street Commons)
  - $5,666 per year
  - $1,486 per semester for the minimum required 10 meal board plan
  - $2,972 per year
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Standard 3

How are financial planning and budgeting processes tied to the College’s mission and goals?

How is the effective and efficient use of institutional resources determined?

How is infrastructure planning tied to the College’s mission and goals?

Though less than with Standards 1 and 2, some processes relating to Middle States’ Standard 3 have also undergone significant modification over the past few years. Specifically, the budgeting process was overhauled in 2008. For this reason, the study group necessarily focused part of its analysis on documenting, where applicable, the former process, examining changes in this process, and determining how and to what extent the new process demonstrates the fundamental elements of Standard 3. Additionally, the study group examined the myriad ways in which the College generates revenue and, generally, how those revenues are disbursed.

The College satisfies Standard 3 through a multi-faceted approach to generating revenue and distributing resources in support of the College’s mission. The recently implemented base-budgeting process ensures continued funding for routine operations and responds to environmental changes while also focusing on new initiatives in department plans and in the institution’s Strategic Plan. Each of these plans is informed by continuing assessment activities, thereby ensuring consistency in planning and resource allocation. Primary evidence for these conclusions grows from a review of the Strategic Plan, unit plans, the Facilities and Site Master Plan, the Master Equipment List, and a series of budgets.

BUDGET DEVELOPMENT

As detailed in the discussion of Standards 1 and 2, the College transformed its budgeting process in 2008. Cost centers, such as individual academic schools, Residence Life, Dining Services, etc. are now allocated a budget based upon the previous year’s operating budget and adjusted annually for inflation and other environmental impacts. Each cost center submits initiatives tied to the College’s Strategic Plan (formerly the Long Range Plan) with statements of financial need and appropriate justification. Budget review by President’s Council, therefore, focuses on the proposed initiatives and the availability of funding based upon projected revenues.

This process ensures that changes in the annual budget are tied to, and are the product of, institutional planning. In preparation for budget development, enrollment projections, based upon school assessments and historical data, are reviewed. Program review and other assessment vehicles, human resources, and curricular needs guide the schools and departments in formulating initiatives. The Facilities and Site Master Plan guides budget development in those areas, and equipment renewal budgeting is drawn from the Master Equipment List maintained by Academic Affairs. The College’s Information Technology Services department budgets hardware and software upgrades according to a maintenance and replacement schedule and as instructional and administrative needs are identified during the planning and budget development cycles.

REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

As shown in Figure 3.1, the unrestricted budget for fiscal year 2011-12 includes the following sources of funds: state appropriations (10.9%), student tuition and fees (66.6%), and other revenues (such as
auxiliaries, 22.5%). The College is sensitive to the significant proportion of its budget derived from tuition. This condition is the result of historically low state funding proffered through a line item on The Pennsylvania State University budget. Penn College is, in fact, the least supported public institution in the Commonwealth, and our state support per FTE has remained largely unchanged since 1989 (see Figure 3.2). As a result, the College is diligent in its efforts to compensate for this inadequate state support through fiscal responsibility, grant acquisition, and fundraising. This diligence has continued as demonstrated in the 2012 budget development: when the state appropriation increased, the College decreased the proposed tuition hike from 4.08% to 2.99%.

Figure 3.1: Chart showing Fiscal Year 2011-12 budgeted revenue sources.

Figure 3.2: Per FTE comparison of state funding for public institutions (Fall 2009).

Note: The state university total refers to the 14 institutions in the State System of Higher Education, a system of state-owned and governed universities. The Pennsylvania State University and Penn College are considered state-related institutions; they receive some state support but are independently governed. The state-owned institutions receive the
lion’s share of state support awarded on a per-FTE basis. The state-related institutions, including Penn State and Penn College, receive an appropriation that is not based on FTE.

As shown in Figure 3.3, the unrestricted budget for fiscal year 2011-12 includes the following budgeted expenditures: instruction, student services, auxiliary enterprises, general institutional support, physical plant operations, and academic support.

Two years of College operating budget information appear in Exhibit 3.2.

Figure 3.3: Chart showing Fiscal Year 2011-12 budgeted expenditures.

Note: Auxiliary enterprises are intended to be self-supporting activities and to provide support to students, faculty, and staff in the form of goods and services for a fee. Examples include the College Store and Dining Services. Though included among College expenditures, auxiliary enterprises generate revenues in excess of their expenditures. This revenue is included under “other revenue” in Figure 3.1.

BUDGETING AND PLANNING

The processes to more closely connect planning, budgeting, and operations have already been discussed in the section on Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal. As an example of the relationship among the three, the following information identifies specific institutional initiatives supporting the College’s Strategic Goals as drawn from the Strategic Plan that are funded in the 2011-12 budget.

Strategic Goal 1: Provide hands-on education, preparing students for careers in an evolving world.

- Reaccreditation of Civil/Surveying and Plastics programs
  
  Total funding amount: **$29,000**

Strategic Goal 2: Foster a student-centered environment both inside and outside the classroom.

- Improving wireless connectivity in residence halls
- Enhanced services at the College Health Services center

  Total funding amount: **$155,700**
Strategic Goal 3: Implement approved Foundations of Excellence recommendations.

- Development of first-year programs
  
  Total funding amount: $23,000

Strategic Goal 4: Serve as a catalyst for community and economic development.†

Strategic Goal 5: Foster relationships with institutional stakeholders to promote Pennsylvania College of Technology and its mission.

- Marketing initiatives focused on alumni and others
  
  Total funding amount: $12,400

Strategic Goal 6: Optimize the use of College resources to support the institution’s mission.†

Strategic Goal 7: Embrace a culture of assessment and data-driven decision making.

- Surveys
- Assessment - NOCTI
  
  Total funding amount: $9,000†

Strategic Goal 8: Increase College enrollment.

- Additional sections of heavy equipment
- Implemented use of MAP-Works to improve first-year retention
  
  Total funding amount: $45,500

Grand Total: $274,600

†Note: Initiatives associated with Strategic Goal 4 received $985,000 and initiatives associated with Strategic Goal 6 received $312,000 in the 2010-11 budget. Progress toward the accomplishment of these goals as well as evolving institutional priorities have resulted in the situation in which no initiatives associated with these goals this year require separate funding; initiatives associated with these goals are funded under other operational unit budgets. It is important to note that there is no expectation that every goal will be accompanied every year by new initiatives that require separate funding. Additionally, it is important to note that the initiatives reflected here are not the only initiatives associated with each Strategic Goal. For example, the value associated with Strategic Goal 7 includes only those items that correspond directly to assessment-related activities in the ARP office. Additional assessment-related expenditures, such as program review and professional development, are embedded within individual operating unit budgets.

As part of the College’s annual budget process, President’s Council is charged with a review of the entire College budget. This group meets and evaluates the needs of the organization based on the Strategic Plan, routine operations, and available resources. Each member is responsible for the budget submissions under his/her area of responsibility and is prepared to respond to questions. President’s Council evaluates the reasonableness of budget submissions, the rationale for funding allocations, and the applicability of policies and procedures as appropriate.

On an annual basis, an independent audit is also performed. Any internal control weaknesses identified in the required auditor communications under Statement of Auditing Standard numbers 114 and 112 are evaluated and remedied as appropriate. In addition, the audit findings are reviewed with the Board of Directors. The College’s consolidated financial statements were recently audited in accordance with
auditing standards generally accepted in the United States as of June 30, 2011, and an unqualified opinion was received.

The study group’s evaluation revealed a weakness in communication, which has been addressed. While the College endeavors to share information about the allocation of institutional resources with all stakeholders, it should strive to improve the clarity of communication and the dissemination of existing information regarding resource allocation, especially through cost center administrators at the department level. The study group offered this suggestion to the appropriate personnel. The result has been an increased number of meetings between Financial Operations and cost center administrators, some with the president speaking, to discuss budget issues and explicit expectations regarding the sharing of budget information with employees in those cost centers.

INSTITUTIONAL FUNDRAISING

The Office of Institutional Advancement, consisting of Alumni Relations, Corporate Relations, the Pennsylvania College of Technology Foundation, and Special Events, focuses on fostering good will and increasing support to enhance the educational opportunities for Penn College students. The office is responsible for the coordination of all fundraising activities for Pennsylvania College of Technology and the Penn College Foundation. The Penn College Foundation, which celebrated its 30th anniversary in 2011, is a separate 501 (C) ((3)) non-profit that exists to raise scholarship support for Penn College students. Significant fundraising programs initiated in the past several years include:

- A Charitable Gift Annuity (CGA) program was started in 2002. Since that time, 20 CGAs have been executed for a total of $571,246.
- A capital campaign was held from 2005-2010 to support the construction of the Madigan Library. This campaign raised $1,615,419 to support this important addition to campus.

Donor recognition and stewardship efforts initiated in the past several years include the following:

- A formal Donor Wall was dedicated in 2005 to recognize individuals, companies, and organizations who have donated $25,000 or more on a cumulative basis to the College or Foundation since 1981. To date, the names of 169 constituents, including Penn College employees, have been placed and recognized on this wall.
- In 2006, The Pillar Society was established to recognize individuals who have included Penn College or the Foundation in their long-term charitable plans through a deferred gift. Currently, the society has 55 members.
- The 1914 Society, a leadership giving society, was formed in August 2010. The 1914 Society recognizes College and Foundation constituents (individuals) who donate $1,000 or more per year.
- A reception is held each May to thank scholarship donors and give them an opportunity to meet the students who have received their scholarships.

The following table summarizes the results of College and Foundation fundraising activities from 2004-05 through 2010-11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>In-Kind</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Library Campaign</th>
<th>Total Giving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$809,032</td>
<td>$1,344,714</td>
<td>$9,582</td>
<td>$2,163,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10*</td>
<td>716,819</td>
<td>1,024,333</td>
<td>115,479</td>
<td>1,856,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>777,964</td>
<td>983,098</td>
<td>278,136</td>
<td>2,039,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>918,653</td>
<td>823,087</td>
<td>199,639</td>
<td>1,941,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>In-Kind</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Library Campaign</th>
<th>Total Giving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>731,028</td>
<td>848,252</td>
<td>328,965</td>
<td>1,908,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>1,004,338</td>
<td>715,798</td>
<td>548,593</td>
<td>2,268,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>1,407,116</td>
<td>874,098</td>
<td>216,839</td>
<td>2,498,053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: College and Foundation fundraising 2004-2011.

*Reduction in 2009-10 due primarily to the effects of the economic downturn.
†Library capital campaign in progress.

Among the largest contributors to the College are its employees. The following table summarizes the result of employee giving to the College from 2004-05 through 2010-11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>PC Annual Fund</th>
<th>Total Employee Giving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$102,802</td>
<td>$136,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>96,830</td>
<td>124,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>81,669</td>
<td>114,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>71,048</td>
<td>118,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>70,706</td>
<td>209,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>62,876</td>
<td>125,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>66,080</td>
<td>96,289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Employee giving 2004-2011.

‡Significant increase in 2005-06 and 2006-07 is due to substantial contributions to the Library capital campaign.

The Office of Institutional Advancement, consisting of Alumni Relations, Corporate Relations, the Annual Fund Campaign, the Pennsylvania College of Technology Foundation, and Special Events, focuses on fostering good will and increasing support to enhance the educational opportunities for Penn College students. Implicit in this mission are fundraising efforts to provide scholarship support to students. This support builds endowed and annual scholarships and the general scholarship fund. Scholarship support from the College and Foundation in 2010-11 totaled $810,000 in 805 awards. Securing in-kind donations of equipment and technology is also very important to the College and a priority in Institutional Advancement. Examples of in-kind donations from business and industry in 2010-11 include:

- Federal Express Corporation donated a Pratt & Whitney aircraft engine for instructional use in the Aviation majors.
- Synthes donated a Mitsubishi Wire EDM machine for instructional use in manufacturing majors.
- Alban Engine Power Systems donated four marine transmissions for instructional use in the Diesel Technology major.
- Tyco Electronics Corporation donated fiber optic test equipment for instructional use in Electronics majors.

Securing in-kind donations for instructional use provides students hands-on experience with the most current technology available—technology that may not otherwise be affordable to the institution without significantly increasing student tuition and fees.
GRANT ACTIVITIES

Penn College’s Grants & Contracts Office (GCO) supports the acquisition and utilization of external funds for a wide array of programs and services in direct support of the institution’s mission and goals. Total approved funding of $15.1 million for 44 projects for the most recent fiscal year of 2010-11 included:

- Instructional equipment, software, curriculum, and faculty professional development
- Academic success services
- Student career and placement services
- Workforce assessment, training, and technical assistance
- Tuition assistance and student fellowships
- Secondary recruitment, teacher development, and articulation
- Library acquisitions
- Sports programming
- Clinical affiliations
- Student wellness events and community outreach
- Statewide Guaranteed Free Training (WEDnetPA) program

The activities have resulted in over $1.6 million in unrestricted indirect funds to the institution from 2001-02 to 2010-11. Grant activities bring increased national recognition through partnerships with other postsecondary institutions and significant positive press.

Sponsored programs are supported from a variety of public and private sources, with the majority of the 2010-11 funds (more than $10 million) from the Commonwealth of PA for statewide WEDnetPA management. Exclusive of WEDnetPA, funding was 79% federal, 20% state, and 1% private. Sources from each include:

- State: PA Dept. of Education, PA Dept. of Community & Economic Development, PA Dept. of Labor and Industry, Ben Franklin Technology Partnership, PA Dept. of Health, PA Liquor Control Board

Since 2002, the GCO’s success rate has on average increased steadily, from 33 approved applications in 2001-02 to 44 approved in 2010-11.
Figure 3.4: Annual funding through Grants & Contracts Office, Fiscal Years 2001-2010.

Note: The Workforce and Economic Development Network of Pennsylvania (WEDnetPA) helps to strengthen the statewide business environment by providing guaranteed free training to Pennsylvania companies. WEDnetPA, managed by Penn College, affords access to training funds through an alliance of 33 educational providers throughout the state. While WEDnetPA does produce a 2% management fee for the College and funds three full-time positions in Harrisburg, the vast majority of funding is pass-through funding.

Although fairly level from 2001-02 to 2005-06, dollar acquisitions have been erratic in recent years, with contributing factors being the national economic downturn, Commonwealth budget struggles, and the influx of Recovery Act funds. Auspiciously, general funding (excluding WEDnetPA) increased 55% from 2008-09 ($2.8 million) to 2009-10 ($4.4 million), although six state-funded programs were cut and institutional decisions led to the termination of two others. Over $3 million in federal funding accounted for the bulk of the increase. A further example of Commonwealth budget cuts, WEDnetPA has been slashed by 59% from 2007-08 levels.
One indication of the College’s financial health is the long-term “A” rating the College received from Standard & Poor’s Ratings Services in late 2010. In assigning this rating, S&P noted that the financial outlook for the College is stable and that the “A” rating reflected their view of the College’s general financial obligation supported by its

- status and role as a wholly owned subsidiary of The Corporation for Penn State (and a consolidated entity in Penn State’s [AA/Stable] audited financial statements);
- historically stable financial performance and the receipt of modest, but consistent annual operating appropriations from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (AA/Stable);
- stable enrollment and a good matriculation rate; and
- satisfactory liquidity, for a publicly supported institution, with fiscal 2010 expendable resources equal to approximately 26% of operating expenses and 24% of pro forma debt.

SELF-STUDY OUTCOMES

Satisfaction of Standard 3 is accomplished through a multi-faceted approach to generating revenue and allocating resources in support of the College’s mission and goals. Student tuition and fees, augmented by state appropriations and other revenues such as auxiliaries, generate revenue for the unrestricted budget. Additionally, to meet specific student needs or provide additional educational services, the Office of Institutional Advancement coordinates fundraising for the College and the Penn College Foundation, while the Grants and Contracts Office supports the acquisition of external funds.

Resources are allocated to support the College mission and goals in conjunction with the strategic planning process whereby assessment results are used to develop College and unit initiatives, which, in turn, are a major consideration in the development of operating budgets. Upon submission of proposed budgets, President’s Council evaluates the reasonableness and rationale of proposed budgets in terms of
the Strategic Plan, unit plans, the Facilities and Site Master Plan, the Master Equipment List, routine operations (reflected primarily in the base budget adjusted for inflation and environmental conditions), and available resources. Based upon this evaluation, President’s Council allocates appropriate resources to meet organizational needs, and the Board of Directors approves the budget.

Effective and efficient use of College resources is assured through ongoing assessment of the College’s budget performance and, most significantly, other measures of student learning and success, including the results of program review, program accreditations, and ongoing assessment in accordance with the Penn College Plan and Process.
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Standards 4 and 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the system of governance provide opportunity for constituent voice in decision making?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the governance structure promote a culture of constant improvement consistent with the mission of the institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there appropriate opportunity for students’ input regarding decisions that affect them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the institution’s administration organized with clearly defined roles and responsibilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are staff development programs sufficient to support the mission of the institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there periodic assessment of administrative effectiveness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Penn College, although an affiliate of The Pennsylvania State University, is governed by an independent Board of Directors. Guided by a well-designed administrative structure, the College’s skilled and experienced leaders partner with an active Governance body to respond flexibly to internal and external conditions, and to effectively fulfill the College’s mission and achieve its goals. Established reporting lines and open communication effectively support the institution’s core purpose: providing comprehensive, hands-on technical education at the baccalaureate and associate levels. Through this structure and culture of open communication and shared governance, the College complies with Standards 4 and 5.

A SPECIAL MISSION AFFILIATE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

On July 1, 1989, the Williamsport Area Community College became a wholly owned subsidiary of The Corporation for Penn State by the Pennsylvania College of Technology Act (Exhibit 1.1), signed into law by then Governor Robert P. Casey. Pennsylvania College of Technology is a special mission affiliate of Penn State, committed to applied technology. It may not confer baccalaureate degrees in the fine arts, social sciences, natural sciences, or humanities without approval of the Commonwealth in accordance with the State Board of Education. The College retains its own mission and goals and is governed by a separate 11-member board of directors.

Pennsylvania College of Technology Board of Directors

By law, nine directors are appointed by The Corporation for Penn State, one by the speaker of the House, and the other by the president pro tempore of the Senate. The president and chairman of the Board recommend members to the Corporation. The legislation also established that Penn College receives its state appropriation through a separate line item in Penn State’s budget appropriation. The president of Penn State University presents the University’s budget to the General Assembly each year.

College Policies and Procedures and documents that come before the Board of Directors in public meetings, including minutes taken and approved at such meetings, are considered public records and are governed by both The Pennsylvania College of Technology Act and College policies and procedures for access, consistent with Pennsylvania’s Sunshine Act (1998) and open to the public (College Policy and
Procedure, Provision of Public Records). In addition, the agendas and minutes are posted on the public website and a press release follows all Board meetings and details activities and decision making.

The Board meets every other month beginning in June, for a total of six meetings per year. Specific matters to be brought to the Board of Directors are also addressed by the Role of the Board of Directors policy. Matters requiring Board approval fall under categories related to College organization and policy; examples include the following:

- Changes of educational policy
- Authorization to grant degrees to graduates
- Approval of College philosophy, mission, and strategic plan
- Change in fiscal policies
- Budget and real estate transactions
- Final building construction plans

As established by College Policy and Procedure, all Board members are required to disclose any possible conflict of interest, normally a financial interest, prior to the Board’s acting on an issue before it. The remaining Board members will determine whether or not a conflict exists and pursue a course of action. If a Board member has failed to disclose an actual or possible conflict of interest, the Board may investigate and take appropriate and corrective action (College Policy Statements, Board of Directors Conflict of Interest).

OTHER BOARDS

The Pennsylvania College of Technology Corporate Advisory Board is composed of 10 members from business, industry, and public service. Its mission is to promote the active exchange of ideas and information for the mutual benefit of the College and its community; for example, this self-study was reviewed and endorsed by this group. Board members are nominated by the president and approved by the Board of Directors. This “local voice of the College” meets at least twice per year (Exhibit 4.1 Corporate Advisory Board Member List).

The Pennsylvania College of Technology Foundation, formerly The Williamsport Area Community College Foundation, is a non-profit, tax exempt organization, established in 1981; currently, the Foundation Board has 44 members. The Foundation engages in a variety of activities to provide financial support for Penn College and its mission, including, but not limited to, providing student scholarships and other financial assistance, soliciting and acquiring financial donations, and assisting in the general promotion of the College. The College’s annual report for 2010-11 reports the following accomplishments:

- The 25th annual Golf Classic, featuring Masters Champion and Campion Tours golfer Craig Stadler, raised in excess of $50,600 for the Penn College Foundation Golf Classic Scholarship Fund. This was the largest amount ever raised by this event.
- The Foundation and College made 805 scholarship awards totaling $810,000 during the 2010-11 academic year.
- The Foundation established 18 new scholarships in 2010-11.

The Foundation provided $248,712 in direct scholarship aid to Penn College students in 2010-11. During the fall semester, the Foundation hosts a biennial dinner auction on campus. In Fall 2010, the biennial dinner auction set a new record, raising $58,000, with all proceeds going to Penn College Foundation scholarship awards.
INTERNAL GOVERNANCE SYSTEM

Penn College believes participatory decision making results in better decisions and in broader understanding of and support for decisions made. The policy statement for the Internal Governance System, formally expresses the philosophy that all members of the College community—students, faculty, administrators, and non-academic personnel—should be appropriately involved in the development of recommendations to satisfy institutional needs. Figure 4.1 shows the organizational structure, composed of College Council and the four standing sub-committees: Academic Standards and Issues (AS&I); Curriculum; Elections and Communications; and Student Affairs.

The governance system achieves participatory decision making through campus-wide representation, as shown on the Composition Chart (Exhibit 4.2). The standing committees’ membership includes elected staff and faculty from across campus, SGA-appointed students, and select seats filled by appointed staff to ensure representation from appropriate areas of the campus. College Council, led by an elected chair, includes the chairs of each standing committee, elected faculty from each academic school, elected staff from various employee groups, three students, and two president-appointed representatives from senior administration who serve as non-voting liaisons between the president and College Council.

In the two committees focused on academic concerns, AS&I and Curriculum, full-time faculty play a primary role and account for a majority of the membership. Further, only a full-time faculty member may serve as chairperson of each of these committees.

Each spring, constituency groups across campus nominate representatives and vote. During 2010-11, full-time employees were elected or appointed to all 32 open seats on College Council and its standing committees. Additionally, 13 full-time employees volunteered to serve on the Subcommittees Pool, and 10 of the 15 seats available to students were filled.

The chart below illustrates the flow of information among constituencies. As reflected in the Bylaws (Exhibit 4.3), College Council presents an annual report to the Board of Directors, linking the Board directly to the governance process. Each year, the chair of College Council is invited to a Board meeting to provide an overview of the report and to answer any questions the Board may have.
First established in 1986, the structure and the Bylaws of the governance system changed little between then and 2002, despite the College’s evolution from a city-supported community college to that of a four-year Penn State affiliate. In preparation for its 2002 self-study report, the College examined, among other elements, the effectiveness of the internal governance system. Over the next few years, extensive research and surveys of the College community were conducted as part of this analysis. In preparation for the 2007 Periodic Review Report (PRR), a Governance Review Task Force was appointed to evaluate and make recommendations regarding the committee structure of the governance system. Directed to examine the “charges, composition, and function of the governance system and to recommend the appropriate changes” (Penn College Governance Review Task Force, 2008), the Task Force issued its recommendations in the fall of 2008.

The major results of the 2002 self-study and subsequent internal assessments (including the 2008 recommendations) resulted in significant revisions to the Bylaws. Some highlights of those changes were:

- The president’s representative on College Council and the President’s Council representatives on all remaining standing committees serve as advisory, non-voting members.
- The past chair serves as an emeritus officer to advise committee and College Council members on operational and procedural matters.
- College Council may fill, by appointment of at-large representatives of the College community, any standing committee or College Council seats not filled during the regular election. At the end of the appointed term, the position reverts to its original work area designation.
- The Executive Committee was redefined and strengthened.
- A new standing committee was created to combine the functions of the former Elections and Communications subcommittees.
Communication between College Council and its constituents was strengthened by establishment of an intranet website (the College’s portal).

Seven standing committees were reduced to four: Academic Standards and Issues, Curriculum, Elections & Communications, and Students Affairs.

The Facilities, Human Resources, and Long Range Planning Committees were dissolved, and their relevant responsibilities assigned directly to College Council, as the tasks and goals of these committees could be quickly accomplished through existing mechanisms and Governance committees.

As a result of the 2007-08 taskforce recommendations and input of the campus community, the internal governance system was affirmed as a participatory representative system in keeping with the size, traditions, culture, and mission of the College (Pennsylvania College of Technology 2009-10 Sourcebook, 2011, p. 11). It should be noted that, as with all governance actions, opportunity for feedback and input from the College community was sought before forwarding final recommendations to College Council for action. The Governance portal site is available to all constituents to review agenda and minutes as well as to provide opportunity for ongoing input from students and employees. Input may be given to a constituent’s College Council representative or provided through use of the My Voice form available on the Governance portal site.

Since 2007, Governance accomplishments include the following:

- Began participation in PSD 100/101 courses to acquaint new faculty with and encourage their participation in Governance.
- Initiated a two-pronged program to acquaint new staff employees with and encourage their participation in Governance.
- Approved an amendment to the Bylaws of the Governance System to increase student representation on College Council and the standing committees.
- Approved a major revision to the Bylaws of the Governance System that strengthened the core academic and student support missions, improved communications, and revised voting rights for executive staff.
- Investigated accessibility issues across campus that impact students with disabilities. Improvement recommendations were placed on the short-term list of the renovation project list and begun in 2009-10.
- Recommended creating a plan for accessible transportation for students wanting to attend College functions or trips off campus. Start of the plan was announced for the Fall 2010 semester.
- Approved the Foundations of Excellence Final Report.
- Endorsed as presented the Major Institutional Initiatives for 2010-11.
- Approved the institution’s new Strategic Plan as presented.
- Approved a motion that an ongoing review process be established for College policies and procedures.
- Endorsed the Summa Cum Laude requirement change from a 4.00 GPA to a 3.90 GPA.
- Approved the Planning Manual.
- Endorsed the Facilities and Site Master Plan as presented.
- Developed a plan to educate the campus community about Governance.
Over the past several years, the governance system at Penn College has made significant improvements, often triggered by the self-study process attendant to Middle States accreditation. Consistent with that history, during this self-study the need for additional improvements to the governance system became apparent. As outlined in the Bylaws, the Duties of the Committee Chairs (Part B, Article B6, section d) states that the chairs shall represent their respective committees and report all actions and recommendations brought to them by their constituents. However, a lack of clarity exists as to which actions and recommendations should be merely reported as informational items and which items should be formally acted upon by College Council. Responsibility for reporting on and moving proposals and recommendations through the system need to be clarified and mechanisms for reporting back to committees need to be strengthened. Given the two-year term limits, new Governance members need an orientation to their responsibilities, the policies and procedures, and Roberts Rules of Order.

Recommendation One

Create a process for the regular, systematic assessment of the internal governance system. As a foundation for this process, clarify responsibility for reporting on and moving proposals through the system and ensuring communication back to committees. Develop a process to orient new Governance members to their responsibilities and the procedures by which Governance operates. Elements of the recommendation include:

- Establishing criteria for determining which issues brought before College Council are informational only and which require formal action.
- Assigning responsibility for reporting on and moving proposals/recommendations through the governance system and reporting actions taken back to committees.
- Orienting new Governance members to their responsibilities and Governance procedures and policies, as well as Roberts Rules of Order, with special emphasis on professional development for committee chairs.

COLLEGE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

As reflected by the organizational chart in Appendix 1, the Penn College organizational structure is represented by the following major areas: (1) Academic Affairs and Provost, (2) Finance, (3) Institutional Advancement, (4) Student Affairs, (5) Human Resources/College Services and (6) Information Technology and Business Process Improvement. Each of these areas is represented by a vice president who reports directly to the president. President’s Council is representative of all functional areas of the College and meets weekly with the president to report on initiatives and issues related to their respective areas. Exhibit 4.4 provides a listing and brief introduction for each of these members.

Each of these functional areas has clearly defined reporting lines that extend the organizational chart into individual departments. The structure supports centralized decision making that is channeled to and through the appropriate executive. For example, degree and certificate programs are housed within Academic Affairs, under the responsibility of the Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost. As noted elsewhere, each of the eight academic schools is led by a dean and assistant dean, and has developed its own mission. Directly aligned with Penn College’s mission, all of the academic school mission statements indicate a focus on the Penn College values of student-centered learning with attention to hands-on education. Together, the deans form a Deans’ Council to discuss academic issues, curriculum, and policy; joined by the associate/assistant vice presidents in discussions, problem solving, and information sharing.
**The Office of the President**

The president of Penn College is appointed by the Penn College Board of Directors. President Davie Jane Gilmour was appointed on May 4, 1998.

Dr. Gilmour joined the College in 1977 as an instructor and curriculum developer in the Dental Hygiene program. In 1983, she accepted the first of many administrative positions, which included coordinator of Dental Hygiene, division director for Health Sciences, and dean of instruction. In 1993, she became the College’s highest-ranking academic officer—vice president for academic affairs, and in 1996, she assumed the position of vice president for academic affairs and provost.

She earned her Ph.D. and M.S. degrees in health education from The Pennsylvania State University as well as a B.S. in dental hygiene education and an A.S. in dental hygiene from West Liberty State College. Prior to beginning her career in education, she was a dental hygienist for a number of Harrisburg area dentists. Her community affiliations and professional activities include:

- Little League International Board of Directors, Chair Elect
- Community Arts Center Board of Directors, President
- Penn College Foundation Board of Directors
- Central Pennsylvania Workforce Development Corporation Board of Directors, Chair of CareerLink Operations Committee
- Williamsport-Lycoming Chamber of Commerce Board, served as Chair for two terms
- Susquehanna Health System Board, Chair of Facilities Development Committee for Project 2012
- First Community Foundation of Pennsylvania Board, Chair

**ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION MAKING**

In the dynamic higher education environment of the 21st Century, the College has recognized the need for continuous assessment and identification of initiatives to support the College’s effort to remain competitive and current. As noted in Chapter Two, the College’s mission drives the strategic planning process; its goals and initiatives are reviewed by the Board of Directors, the president, President’s Council, and the internal governance system represented by College Council. Several departments and/or workgroups provide additional support in decision making and planning. Examples include the following:

**Assessment Research and Planning.** To support the administration’s efforts in data-driven decision making and planning, the Assessment, Research, and Planning Office (ARP) is responsible for collecting, analyzing, and disseminating information in support of institutional effectiveness. Its scope includes assessment, accreditation, planning, policy analyses, academic program review, and collection of data necessary for institutional decision making.

**The Quality Through Assessment (QTA) Work Group.** This team is charged with answering the following questions related to the academic mission: How does the institution know that it is carrying out its mission to provide students with quality academic programs that respond to economic and employment realities? How does the College know if the skills taught will translate into workplace success? QTA is highlighted in the discussion related to Standards 7, 11, 12, and 14.

**Marketing Planning Group.** To address the challenges of marketing and recruitment, the president charged this group with developing an integrated and comprehensive marketing plan to guide the institution. The data-driven plan goes beyond marketing and image-building campaigns to examine the challenges of competition and needs of target audiences. Through the plan, the Marketing Planning
Group proposes strategies to better position the College in its competitive marketplace (Integrated Marketing Plan 2008). The plan is updated annually in response to the higher education recruitment landscape.

**Other Work Groups.** In keeping with the College’s collaborative culture, a variety of representative campus-wide committees and ad hoc workgroups have been established to advance new initiatives designed to address and further the College mission. Team-based work projects are common so as to tap the expertise of a wide variety of employees and respond to new opportunities and initiatives. Two examples of the work achieved through these collaborations, in addition to the marketing plan, follow:

- The periodic review of the College’s matriculation process, accomplished through the oversight of the Enrollment Management Work Group
- The monitoring and improvement of the critical first year of college, realized through the efforts of the First Year Experience Advisory Group

In addition to these formalized means of gathering input, open dialogue from diverse constituents across campus is encouraged through the President’s Open Forums, which are offered periodically through the academic year; Brown Bag Lunches, which bring together varied constituents to discuss current topics of interest; and SGA Open Forums, which provide students a voice in the decision-making process.

**QUALIFIED FACULTY AND STAFF**

The College employs four categories of employees in a full-time or part-time capacity: Faculty; Administrative, Professional, Technical (APT); Classified; and Service. The most recent data (June 2011) for the current academic year for non-faculty employees (faculty are covered in Chapter Six) is displayed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Status</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular part-time</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual part-time</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Number of non-faculty employees by full- or part-time status.

Staffing requirements are an outgrowth of the Strategic Plan and budgeting process. Staffing levels are based on identified internal needs and on external benchmarking by accrediting agencies and other professional associations. Similarly, job descriptions and position expectations are created and updated at the discretion of the supervisor. Area assessments are conducted in conjunction with the budget planning cycle, and recommendations stem from the results of those assessment activities.

Human Resources will assist, seek clarification, review, measure against equivalent positions, and ultimately approve each job description; however, the current approach places the majority of the responsibility for establishing qualification standards on the supervisor. The College employs the PeopleAdmin Position Management system to manage its positions, including position descriptions, announcements, search process, hiring, and staff appraisals. Once the position description is created, positions are posted in PeopleAdmin according to the policy on Position Announcements and the Procedure for Filling Position Openings. Timelines set forth by the procedure are expected to be followed, except in the event of an appointed position, as established in Position Announcement policy referenced above.
Human Resources provides direct support to search committees that are convened to fill APT and faculty positions. All members of the search committee are trained in the College’s hiring protocols and are provided resources for maximizing search results. Human Resources also works with search committee chairs to establish an advertising strategy to ensure a strong and diverse candidate pool. Targeted publications, job boards, and online resources are commonly used to advertise positions in addition to the Penn College employment website.

In the event a candidate selected for a position does not meet the minimum qualifications, the supervisor is expected to provide a rationale for an exception and a basis for the exception that speaks to the ways that the selected candidate compensates for a shortcoming in one area through a significant strength in another. The rationale is reviewed by the appropriate vice president or the president, depending upon the position level, and must receive approval at the vice president or president level before the recommendation for hire can be approved.

Non-faculty employees who are new to the College begin their employment on a probationary basis for six months. During the probationary period, new employees are oriented to the College and to their respective roles within the organization. Employee performance is monitored informally throughout the period, and a formal summative probationary performance appraisal is conducted at the six month anniversary of the hire. At this point supervisors may recommend regular employment status, termination, or continued probation based on the employee’s performance.

Employees set goals with supervisors; they meet regularly to ensure that the goals are relevant, reasonable, and achievable within resource constraints. Senior administration, deans, directors, and program chairs are assessed periodically by their reports using the IDEA Center’s survey tools. Aggregated results of the most recent IDEA survey are available (Exhibit 4.5).

**LEARNING PATHS AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Numerous professional development opportunities help staff acquire the knowledge, skills, and behaviors needed to be effective members of the College community. In January 2010, the Employee Relations Office was formed; among its principle charges are to “provide a College-wide professional development program that actively supports all employee groups and fosters a highly trained and educated workforce; assist employees and supervisors with employee relations issues; and provide advocacy for employees and supervisors as the center for the College’s ombudsperson.” This office coordinates and supports non-credit professional development offerings for all employees, including adjunct faculty.

In 2011, the Employee Relations Office developed a comprehensive on-boarding plan designed to make new employees feel welcome and adapt to their new work environment; to minimize the time needed to become fully productive; and to aid long-term retention by developing additional knowledge and skills to manage workplace challenges.

While the establishment of the Employee Relations Office was a response to the continued need to develop quality employees, professional development has always been a priority. Numerous and varied opportunities have been offered by individual offices and departments, including Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Instructional Technology, Human Resources, Academic Success Center, Career Services, and Workforce Development and Continuing Education (WDCE). All on-campus sessions are offered at no cost to employees, even when provided through the WDCE. All non-faculty are required to complete a minimum of eight hours of professional development annually. For the faculty, professional development requirements and opportunities vary.

The number of sessions and attendees provided in the chart below reflect the extent to which Penn College employees value and take advantage of professional development opportunities.
In addition to on-campus opportunities, all schools and offices provide funding for faculty and staff attendance at professional conferences and workshops related to their position responsibilities.

### STUDENT GOVERNANCE

Students participate in a variety of activities that provide them with input into the decision-making process. The most directly linked organization is The **Student Government Association** (SGA). SGA serves as the “democratic voice of the Penn College student body,” and provides an avenue for the student body to address concerns and enhance student life in general. Students nominate senators and officers and vote through a well-defined yearly elections process (**Exhibit 4.6** SGA Bylaws and **Exhibit 4.7** Constitution).

Its Bylaws preamble (2009) states that “SGA is dedicated to the philosophy that students must be included in the making of decisions that affect them and do hereby adopt the following bylaws to govern our internal and external affairs.” To that end, one seat is held for an SGA representative on each of the internal governance system’s standing committees as well as on College Council. In addition, each SGA officer regularly meets with a College vice president. SGA representatives are also invited to attend Board of Directors meetings. During 2010-11, students across campus joined SGA leaders to organize a successful fundraising campaign to endow a $35,000 scholarship in memory of student, Tracey Garis.

Most recent accomplishments of SGA include:

- Successfully advocating for changes to the College’s Alcohol Policy
- Creating parking ad-hoc committee
- Advocating for dual degree options (later passed by the Academic Standards & Issues Committee and approved by College Council)
- Creating an ad-hoc committee to improve communication and teamwork between student organizations
- Creating an ad-hoc committee to help build campus community
- Extending hours for the CC Commons dining facility
- Acquiring copy cards for printers on campus
- Acquiring Commuter Lounge printers and computers
- Extending weekend computer lab access
- Holding a Town Hall meeting regarding campus smoking to get student feedback

Other organizations provide opportunities for student input in the decision-making process on campus. The **Residence Hall Association** (RHA) serves as the voice for on-campus students and provides educational, social, and leadership opportunities. In addition, students in off-campus housing are served through the Off-Campus Living and Commuter Services Office and the Off-Campus Housing Organization (**OCHO**), a group serving a parallel function to the RHA. Off-campus students can apply to become Community Assistants. This nationally recognized program is in its fifth year and is known for its creativity.
and impact on students living off campus. The assistants serve as a resource and plan programs and activities for students living off campus.

**SELF-STUDY OUTCOMES**

Compliance to Standards 4 and 5 is inherent in the College’s administrative structure, cooperative approach to decision-making, and support for staff and faculty development. The people charged with realizing Penn College’s mission are qualified, well-organized, and guided by clearly defined roles and responsibilities. Furthermore, Penn College has an active governing Board of Directors that is closely linked to an organizational structure, which supports the College’s mission and values. Under the newly established Employee Relations department, staff development programs sustain and develop the skills and knowledge of administrators, staff, and faculty, and a periodic assessment of administrative effectiveness ensures continuous improvement.

The College believes in participatory decision making and has a well-established internal governance system with campus-wide representation. As noted in Recommendation One, a systematic assessment of this internal governance will enable it to change as the institution and its needs change, and will ensure broad-based participation and processes that allow for timely communication and feedback. Students also provide input in the decision-making process through a variety of activities, committees, and organizations across campus.
Integrity

right: Students enjoy a diverse spectrum of entertaining and informative performances
below: Memorial Garden honors students, faculty and staff
Student-designed handout (front and back shown here) used to promote the My Voice campaign, a campus-wide tool to elicit comments and concerns.
Chapter Five: Integrity

Standard 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is information readily accessible to the Penn College stakeholders?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do students have access to information needed for timely program completion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are processes, policies, and procedures impartial, shared, and consistently applied?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the College foster a climate of respect?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Websites, webpages, portal sites, print publications, safety alerts to mobile phones, catalogs, television programs, radio interviews/announcements, e-mail, on-paper memos, reports in any format—all of the above factor into the information flow, the accuracy, and professionalism of which can itself stand as an indicator of an institution’s character. How the College presents itself helps to establish a climate of respect as it adjusts its communications to varying audiences with respect for their time, need, and interests.

The College complies with Standard 6, as indicated by its commitment to students, employees, and external stakeholders through its conveyance of accurate and accessible information; through its creation, assessment, and revision of its policies and procedures; and through its demonstration of respect and open inquiry.

INFORMATION ACCESS

The office of College Information and Community Relations (CICR) is responsible for official communications as well as for materials used in recruitment and public relations—in both print and electronic formats. That responsibility extends to both design and content. Information Technology Services (ITS) assumes responsibility for the platforms and ensures availability and appropriate use of communication-related devices. The Portal Development and College Documentation Office oversees catalog changes and provides additional editing services as requested. The Office of Assessment, Research, and Planning gathers, validates, and publishes data that grounds the conclusions and inferences used in print and electronic media. Thus, these support areas provide the means by which accurate, appropriate, accessible information is conveyed to audiences. Each of those offices follows its strategic plan; CICR and ITS administrators report directly to the president, which demonstrates the College’s commitment to appropriate communication.

The myPCT Portal and its collection of intranet sites are available to all employees and students, full-time and part-time, providing information, including data, as it is needed. The Assessment, Research and Planning (ARP) site, for example, includes all survey reports, providing data to those working on accreditation reports. Students have access through the Student Information System (SIS) – upon application to the College – to course information, policies, and to Student Activities related information; they may choose to provide access to their parents, via the Parent-Guest access to educational records on SIS.

The following table identifies the standard communications/intended audiences. The College is committed to sharing information necessary and appropriate for audience and purpose. In so doing, it also commits to maintaining confidentiality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Publications/Communications</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>External Stakeholders (including parents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstracts of Middle States reports</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Majors booklet</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors meeting agendas &amp; minutes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Catalog (electronic*)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College website</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course abstracts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime reports</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation, Retention, Licensure pass rates</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One College Avenue magazine (print and electronic)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and procedures</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>As appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position openings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press releases</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program review executive summaries</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety alerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>As appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourcebook</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stall Wall Weekly (news bulletin)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Planner and Guidebook</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and related costs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Distribution of standard publications, reports, and other communications.

*Archived versions are available in electronic format.

**POLICIES, PROCEDURES, INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS**

Student prospects have access to Fast Facts on the College website and also through the Student Consumer Information page, which includes information on financial aid, health and safety, daily crime alerts, student outcomes, etc. In addition, each school’s website includes majors’ pages with the program objectives and an outline of required course work. In the case of selective admissions programs – primarily within the School of Health Sciences – the Admissions Ranking Requirements page alerts
students to the requirements/means by which students gain entrance. In addition, those prospective students gain additional information during all pre-enrollment sessions.

Upon matriculation, students have access to their “profile” (see Exhibit 5.1), containing all required courses and serving as a tracking mechanism for students and their advisers. If a student follows the profile/sequencing of requirements, program completion within two years (for associate’s) and within four years (for bachelors) is possible; however, student preference regarding semester load (14.75 credits has been the average load over the past three years) and the impact of developmental needs affect time-to-completion. The Catalog’s inclusion of all course descriptions provides information on pre-and co-requisites, another element in planning for timely completion of a degree. Finally, the schools identify the number of “seats” required in major and support courses to ensure student access. A review of course offerings from Spring 2010 through Spring 2011 semesters indicates that a sufficient number of required and elective courses were provided and that open seats remained in a number of elective courses. On Graduate, Leaver, and Student Satisfaction surveys, students report satisfaction with the variety of course offerings (76.3%) and rated student scheduling very good to good (83.1%). Exhibit 5.2 includes graduate survey results; Exhibit 5.3 contains Leaver Survey results; and Exhibit 5.4 includes Exit and Student Satisfaction survey results.

Student surveys had identified a need to add a “waiting list” function to online scheduling; implemented Spring 2007, it has been well used and made even more efficient over time. Another student-requested adjustment occurred with the reporting of GPAs: a separate GPA for major courses is included on transcripts (see Exhibit 5.1, which includes a transcript), signaling to employers the level of preparation within the field of study.

The Student Planner and Guidebook – available in both print and electronic formats – provides “what every student needs to know” from campus life to policies to services; the Planner includes websites for additional detail on all topics. An Academic Fairness Policy ensures equitable treatment, while the policy on Retention of Graded Materials and Grade Books, implemented in Spring 2010, ensures accurate responses to grade challenges. The Student Code of Conduct Policy also ensures impartial treatment. All student-related policies and procedures are available in the Policy and Procedure area of the portal. Policies relevant to prospective students and those required by the Department of Education for public access are available through the Student Rights and Responsibilities website.

POLICIES, PROCEDURES, INFORMATION FOR EMPLOYEES

All Policies and Procedures are available to employees via the myPCT portal; AdminWire, a portal messaging system for high priority administrative announcements, provides notices of changes in those policies and procedures to ensure that all employees remain cognizant of processes. Changes occur when data and/or environmental shifts require; a recent example affects use of Social Networking sites and another that amends the Pets on Campus policy to accommodate the use of service animals.

All employees have the opportunity to recommend additions, retirements, and revisions of policy and procedure; the proposed action moves to the employee’s vice president and from there to President’s Council. In the case of full-time faculty, the terms of the Agreement apply as well. In some instances, negotiated items within the Agreement become policy affecting all employees; a prime example is the negotiated benefit for Retiree Hospitalization. It has been institutional practice to extend benefits negotiated with the faculty to all employees, just one indication in support of the College’s recognition as a “Best College to Work For.”

Conversely, as employee benefits outside those negotiated as part of the Agreement are added, those benefits are extended to faculty. A prime example is the Compassion Leave policy. It originated with recognition that some family-related issues can be more humanistically managed than through FMLA options. For example, in the case of a terminally ill family member, the employee/care-giver may apply for
compassion leave after exhausting all accumulated leave. Making use of a “bank” to which all full-time employees contribute, days may be approved with no loss of pay; moreover, there is no requirement of pay back for those days. That policy was initiated by senior administration.

Equal opportunity practices mark the hiring process; the Statement of Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action and the policy governing Position Announcements set the requirements. Moreover, all search committee members receive training on ethical and legal practices related to the interview and hiring processes. While targeted advertising is used to draw applicants from diverse backgrounds, historically, over 90% of those hired have been white. That percentage is not substantially different from the 91.9% white, non-Hispanic population in Lycoming County as reported by the U.S. Census Bureau for 2010.

As a condition of employment, all full-time employees complete a professional development session dealing with harassment in the workplace. All employees must also complete follow-up sessions. Grievance policy and procedures are in place for both students and employees who claim harassment.

Academic inquiry and engagement are safeguarded through the Intellectual Property policy and the academic freedom statements resident in the Agreement, as well as through the work of the Copyright and Fair Use Advisory Group (CFUAG). The policy covering Academic Dishonesty ensures that students follow fair use practices. Library staff provide workshops on the topic.

Feedback received during the self-study process noted that policy and procedures were reviewed on an as-needed basis. As recommended by the Self-Study Steering Committee, administration has adopted a process whereby each policy and procedure will be reviewed no less than every five years.

THE CLIMATE OF RESPECT

Penn College’s commitment to use assessment to guide and implement changes also is reflected in its response to data drawn from NSSE, FoE surveys, and other sources. The data indicated a need for greater attention to cultural diversity. In Spring, 2011, the College value statement was modified and related goals within the Strategic Plan were implemented. An Assistant Director of Student Activities for Diversity and Cultural Life was hired, a plan to increase students’ exposure to diversity topics was developed, and professional development offerings were created to support awareness of and appreciation for cultural diversity.

The specific policies governing harassment and standard practice/activities further demonstrate the institutional commitment to valuing and respecting difference. Among those practices/activities are the following:

- The cultural diversity elective – required special-designated course – in all baccalaureate majors
- Creation of the Ombuds Program to assist full- and part-time employees
- The Cultural Life Committee in Student Affairs, which aims to expand activities and events focused on diverse values
- Student organizations, for example, the Multicultural Society, the PC Alliance, American Sign Language Club, and United Campus Ministries
- “A Day On” in recognition of Martin Luther King, involving a variety of social service activities within the community and related on-campus programming
- Exposure to diversity as a topic in FYE 101, a required course for all students
- Disability Services’ full spectrum of services to students with disabilities, including, among others, orientation activities
SELF-STUDY OUTCOMES

The College complies with the standard on integrity and creates an environment supportive of academic growth and intellectual freedom. The management of information itself is an indication of the climate of respect; all employees have access to the policies and procedures that govern institutional practices. All students have access to information that affects and facilitates the achievement of their goals. Moreover, protocols exist for the regular review and revision of policies and procedures.

As the student-designed graphic, shown on the divider page preceding this chapter demonstrates, the College’s value of “diversity, inclusiveness, tolerance, and civility” is reflected in its commitment to heed all voices.
right: Modern classrooms benefit student learning
below: Dedicated and experienced faculty provide personal attention

Faculty
## Fall 2011 School Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business and Computer Technologies</th>
<th>Construction and Design Technologies</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Hospitality</th>
<th>Industrial and Engineering Technologies</th>
<th>Integrated Studies</th>
<th>Natural Resources Management</th>
<th>Transportation Technologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Associate Degree Majors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bachelor's Degree Majors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students (FTE)</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Six: Faculty

Standard 10

Are full and part-time faculty appropriately prepared and qualified for their positions?
Are the procedures for the hiring and review of all individuals carefully articulated, equitable, and implemented?
Who is responsible for the design, maintenance, and updating of the educational curricula?
Does the College support professional growth?

In addition to answering the questions noted above, the study group gathered evidence of the faculty’s support for the institution’s mission and its commitment to teaching and learning. The review of pertinent policies and procedures found them to be appropriate and helpful. Moreover, the College aggressively seeks qualified faculty, supports their development consistent with teaching as the primary role, and provides an environment that supports the commitment to student learning.

FACULTY DEMOGRAPHICS

Quality faculty, who include counselors and librarians at Penn College, promote the pursuit of learning, scholarly standards, and respect for students, thus reflecting the institution’s mission of student-centered learning. Student-centered courses focus on learner activity instead of passivity. The average class size of 17 students and a faculty student ratio of 1:17.2 foster this instruction. In many of the institution’s academic schools, most of the full- and part-time faculty members are or have been professionals within their respective industries or disciplines, bringing real-world experience into the classroom.

Over the last five years, the largest number of faculty held the rank of assistant professor as viewed in Table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Number of faculty by academic year and rank, according to the Sourcebook 2010-11.

NOTE: Counselors and Librarians are excluded from this table.

The ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor are not attached to the salary system at Penn College. Therefore, the lack of financial impact may, in part, explain why faculty are not motivated to apply in greater numbers for promotion to a higher academic rank. Faculty salary is determined according to the Agreement and is discussed later in the chapter.
The following chart demonstrates the academic preparation of the full-time faculty for the 2010-11 academic year (full-time and part-time Faculty CVs are available in Exhibit 6.1). Seventy-four percent of the full-time faculty hold an advanced degree (master’s or doctorate).

Figure 6.1: Chart showing percent of faculty by level of academic preparation.

The percentage of male faculty, 72%, has remained consistent at the institution. This is representative of the higher number of traditional male programs offered at the College and parallels the predominately male enrollment.

As was noted in the chapter on Standard 6 - Integrity, Penn College makes every effort to attract high quality employees from diverse backgrounds, including individuals from minority ethnic groups. The same diligence is observed when it comes to the selection of high-quality, well-trained faculty. Full-time searches for faculty are conducted on a national basis. Notices of position openings appear on multiple websites likely to be accessed by persons from all ethnic groups, including the Chronicle of Higher Education’s employment postings, Diversejobs.net, and Higheredjobs.com. When posting on Higheredjobs.com, the College utilizes the feature that sends e-mail alerts to diverse candidates who have listed with the website.

As was noted in the previous discussion of employee demographics, however, the percentage of white, non-Hispanic faculty members remains over 90%. While the College has made some headway in attracting persons of color to faculty positions – from 97.2% white and 2.8% persons of color in 2009 to 95.3% white and 7% persons of color in 2010 – recruitment remains a challenge. A number of candidates of color who have been offered positions reported that, while they were impressed with the College and would have considered the offer, when they surveyed the surrounding communities, they did not find themselves represented in either the general population or the cultural life in the area, and thus were reluctant to relocate. Nevertheless, the College intends to continue the initiatives related to diversity and build upon the modest gains made so far.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident alien</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black non-Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the August 2011 all-College meeting, College members were asked to reflect on various issues (see Exhibit 6.2); the activity identified a potential concern with the number of adjunct versus full-time faculty providing instruction. However, the study group’s analysis found that the College supports the schools’ and programs’ goals with appropriate staffing of full- and part-time faculty members. During the 2010-11 academic year, 307 full-time faculty were employed, with 193 approved adjuncts available to teach as needed.

The percentage of credit hours taught by instructor type for the last five years can be viewed at Table 6.3. Exhibit 6.3 details credit hours taught by instructor type for all eight academic schools. There is a strong institutional commitment to limit use of adjuncts to no more than a College-wide average of 25% of credits taught. The evidence clearly demonstrates that the College not only meets, but historically exceeds this pledge, with part-time faculty teaching approximately 23% of the total credit hours over the last five academic years.

### Table 6.2: Faculty by race; data source: 2010-2011 Sourcebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White non-Hispanic</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Faculty by race; data source: 2010-2011 Sourcebook.

During the August 2011 all-College meeting, College members were asked to reflect on various issues (see Exhibit 6.2); the activity identified a potential concern with the number of adjunct versus full-time faculty providing instruction. However, the study group’s analysis found that the College supports the schools’ and programs’ goals with appropriate staffing of full- and part-time faculty members. During the 2010-11 academic year, 307 full-time faculty were employed, with 193 approved adjuncts available to teach as needed.

The percentage of credit hours taught by instructor type for the last five years can be viewed at Table 6.3. Exhibit 6.3 details credit hours taught by instructor type for all eight academic schools. There is a strong institutional commitment to limit use of adjuncts to no more than a College-wide average of 25% of credits taught. The evidence clearly demonstrates that the College not only meets, but historically exceeds this pledge, with part-time faculty teaching approximately 23% of the total credit hours over the last five academic years.

### Table 6.3: Percentage of credit hours by instructor type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Type</th>
<th>FALL PERCENTAGES</th>
<th>SPRING PERCENTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct*</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: Percentage of credit hours by instructor type.

*Adjunct includes part time faculty, full and part time staff members.

### QUALITY INSTRUCTION

Classroom instruction was assessed during the FoE process, and the results of related survey questions suggest that students are more than satisfied with the instruction they receive, regardless of whether the instructor is full- or part-time. The 2008-09 Graduate Survey Instructional Ratings Table reveals a mean score of 4.07 (on a 5.0 Likert scale) for instructional quality. The graduates’ level of satisfaction further implies that instructors are appropriately prepared and qualified.

Penn College Student Course Evaluation & Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness instrument (found in an appendix to the Faculty Development/Evaluation Plan) uses the following point scale: A(4) = Strongly Agree, B(3) = Agree, C(2) = Disagree, D(1) = strongly disagree, and E = not applicable. Analysis of the compiled Fall 2010 evaluations showed that in all 34 categories, except one, 90% or higher of the students
responded Strongly Agree and Agree. The student evaluations confirm strong teaching effectiveness. Table 6.4 shows a sample of the responses from the student evaluations. Based on the data represented, students in the fall semester, on average, overwhelmingly rated their instructors favorably.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Item</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#12. Professor Knows Course Subject Area</td>
<td>3.635 3.662 3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13 Professor Is Well-Prepared for Course</td>
<td>3.539 3.598 3.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22 Professor Encourages Student Ideas</td>
<td>3.452 3.482 3.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24 Professor’s Methods Encourage Learning</td>
<td>3.403 3.423 3.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28 Professor’s Sessions Help Understanding</td>
<td>3.614 3.552 3.560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4: Student evaluations Fall 2010 summary.

The College recognizes excellence in teaching with annual awards to both full- and part-time faculty: the Master Teacher and Excellence in Teaching Awards, and the Part-Time Excellence in Teaching Award. The criteria for the awards are comprehensive and encompass the competencies, supporting skills, and attributes of distinguished teaching and service to students. Since 1982, 87 awards have been conferred; 38 of the recipients were still teaching at the College in the Spring 2011 semester (Exhibit 6.4 memo from Senior Vice President on Distinguished Teaching Awards).

**HIRING, PERFORMANCE REVIEW, AND RETENTION**

**Finding Qualified faculty**

To ensure that faculty are qualified when hired and that they maintain that standard of excellence, the institution follows a regular hiring and review process. Processes and standards such as job descriptions, hiring policies and procedures, and search committees ensure that individuals are appropriately prepared and qualified for the positions they hold.

A position begins with a job description developed by the hiring supervisor. The job description sets the position’s minimum and desired qualifications and specific roles and responsibilities (see Exhibit 6.5 – Sample Job Description). A search committee is established by the hiring supervisor with members who must complete mandatory training on a fair and equitable hiring process. Through the People Admin portal site, search committee members gain access to the application materials provided by applicants.

Searches for full-time faculty members are generally conducted on a national basis, and advertised position openings include media outlets accessed by diverse populations. During the selection process, the applicants’ curricula vitas are screened by the committee members, and candidates for interviews are selected. Phone interviews further refine the candidate pool, and after reference checks, eligible candidates are invited to campus for interview. During the onsite interview, the candidate meets with the search committee, school administration, department faculty, and, frequently, students. All candidates present a sample lesson. An offer of employment is conditioned upon a successfully completed background check.

Presidential approval is required to hire full-time faculty, and the academic school deans approve additions to adjunct pools. Full-time faculty members are typically hired on a probationary term for a three-year period. Probationary faculty members who successfully complete the faculty evaluation/development process within the designated periods are granted non-probationary status. As stated in the Faculty Agreement (Exhibit 6.6), the most important task of faculty is teaching.
Salaries for full-time faculty are negotiated in accordance with the Agreement and are not related to academic rank. As the Agreement detail notes, faculty salaries are determined by a matrix of education and work experience, both internal and external to the College. This salary system ensures equitable pay based on education and experience, and once hired, faculty may increase their salaries by acquiring additional experience or education. Advancement on the educational axis of the matrix is accomplished in “units” that are accrued with academic credits or by completing advanced degrees. Academic credits may be acquired by taking credit classes at Penn College or other institutions, or by attending technical or educational workshops or classes, which are equated to academic credits on a 32:1 hour ratio, or by a 16:1 ratio for specific areas of development, such as advisement and assessment.

According to the 2009-10 Sourcebook, the average full-time faculty salary was $70,679. The maximum full-time teaching load is 15 credit hours or 20 contact hours in any semester, and 30 credit hours or 40 contact hours in an academic year. Faculty who opt to exceed the maximum outlined in the Agreement are paid on an overload rate, which is equal to the adjunct per-credit rate. Experience, a component of the full-time salary system, is not reflected in the part-time salary. The Joint College-Association Salary Committee comprises three members appointed by the Association and three members appointed by the College. The amicable relationship between PCEA and the administration indicates that faculty perceive the salary system as fair and equitable.

Conditions of employment for new faculty are specified in the position offer from the president. Conditions of employment specify requirements that the candidate must complete within the probationary period; these may include such things as attending industry training, completing advanced degrees, enrolling in or auditing Penn College courses, attending new faculty orientation, and completing Education Theory and Practice courses (PSD100 and 101). These courses include content in learning taxonomy, learning styles, assessment, creation of syllabi, and practical application; the PSD courses are intended especially for new faculty who have minimal teaching experience (Exhibit 6.7 PSD100 & PSD101 SYLLABI). Although these courses are non-credit, faculty receive credit on the pay scale at a 16:1 ratio.

Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined through job descriptions and reinforced in the Agreement Between Pennsylvania College of Technology and Penn College Education Association (Agreement). All faculty have access to an electronic handbook on the portal, which provides useful information in regard to instructional, administrative and professional responsibilities, protocol, and policies and procedures. Penn College has the right to terminate the employment of both probationary and non-probationary faculty. The terms for the dismissal, as well as the procedures, are clearly outlined in the Agreement, which applies to full-time teaching faculty, counselors, and librarians.

As discussed in Chapter Four, all non-faculty staff with responsibility for educational programming or services undergo annual performance review. Job descriptions are reviewed as part of the evaluation process. Supervisors complete the annual appraisal with the employee. The Human Resources office monitors the appraisal process for completeness and timeline compliance (see Performance Appraisals Policy).

Faculty Professional Development

The College recognizes the importance of professional development for faculty and staff, as evidenced by its emphasis within the faculty evaluation process and its inclusion in the criteria for academic promotion. Internally, the College offers professional development sessions throughout the calendar year, and faculty are also afforded the opportunity to complete classes offered through Workforce Development & Continuing Education (WDCE). Data over the last five years shows that an average of 200 Professional Development Training (PDT) courses were offered annually with approximately 2,000 registrants, including faculty (Exhibit 6.8 Noncredit Professional Development Course List). A January 2010 faculty survey revealed that 78% of the respondents attended off-campus professional development activities,
while 51% attended on-campus activities (Exhibit 6.9 January 2010 Faculty Survey). Additionally, the College supports professional development days each year specifically for part-time faculty.

The Faculty Evaluation/Development Plan (Exhibit 6.10) is a detailed document that provides for regular performance reviews of all probationary and non-probationary full-time faculty, counselors, and librarians. Deans evaluate probationary faculty every semester; the evaluation includes not only student evaluations in all courses taught by the faculty member, but also announced and unannounced observations in the classroom. Every three years, all non-probationary faculty participate in this full formal evaluation. In the interim years, student evaluations are administered in at least one course per semester. The faculty member and his/her supervisor meet to review student evaluations, instructional practices, and the faculty member’s developmental needs. Part of the formal process includes the completion of the Synthesis of Faculty Performance form, documenting a review of instruction, related activities in the program, scholarship, service, and other professional activities. The synthesis formally articulates a professional development plan agreeable to the dean and the faculty member.

After the initial year of appointment, part-time faculty members participate in a formal review with their supervisors. The same course evaluation tool and process, with the exception of the synthesis, is used by students for both part-time and full-time faculty.

**College Support for Professional Development**

The Agreement between the College and the Association stipulates funding for a number of professional development opportunities for faculty, including tuition reimbursement, travel, retraining and upgrading, and sabbaticals. Relevant data for 2010 follows.

Expenditures related to faculty professional development benefits:

- Penn College tuition waivers -- $71,000
- Penn State tuition reduction -- $45,000
- Tuition reimbursement -- $63,000
- Other professional development activities - $166,123

Faculty participation in professional development activities:

- Credit classes – 60 faculty, totaling 420 credit hours
- Noncredit classes – 288 faculty

Established by the Agreement, the College allocation for retraining/upgrading is $50,000 each year, with grant amounts ranging from $500 to $3,000 in any one year. Additional monies earmarked for professional development are set aside each academic year in each school budget. Conversely, when budgets tighten, those monies are often the first line item to be reduced, making it more difficult for faculty and/or staff to attend professional conferences or to take advantage of other professional development opportunities. However, based on the Agreement, faculty members who are authorized to attend meetings or conferences shall receive some reimbursement (see page 71 in the Agreement). In most instances, that minimum amount is significantly higher, dependent on number of requests and available allocation.

Formalized Training Experiences are requests for professional development that are specifically required to maintain industry sponsorship of a major, maintain accreditation of a program of study, or to maintain currency of instruction in a program, as determined by the College. Faculty make these requests to the respective deans on an annual basis for approval for the next academic year. If approved, this non-credit experience is equated to credit equivalents using 16 hours of sessions attended equal to 1 credit, instead
of the usual 32 hours for 1 credit equivalent. Examples of formalized training include certification of
dental hygienists to administer local anesthesia or industry seminars.

The College’s Office of Instructional Technology (OIT) offers professional development training on
technology tools, applications, and course design to a primary audience of faculty. The data summary in
Table 6.5 illustrates data from 2006 through 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Sessions Offered</th>
<th># of Lecture Hours</th>
<th># of Faculty Registered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>113.75</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>90.25</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>103.25</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5: Office of Instructional Technology professional development summary.

The greatest number of faculty attended sessions offered by OIT during 2008. The College’s conversion
from WebCT to ANGEL in August 2007 significantly contributed to higher numbers during that period. The
data does not indicate which faculty attended multiple sessions. The decrease in 2010 attendance could,
in part, be attributed to the development of OIT Tutorials (https://oit.pct.edu), which became available in
Summer 2009. As more faculty became aware of these options, there was less need for them to attend
face-to-face sessions.

During the January 2011 all-College meeting, each study group presented questions related to their
respective standards. The audience members were encouraged to answer the questions by texting a reply
with their cell phones. When the audience was asked if they knew their school’s or department’s
guidelines for distributing professional development funds, 54.5% of respondents indicated they did not.
Since each school has unique needs and varied guidelines for the distribution of the professional
development funds, the Steering Committee suggested that the school deans review the procedures for
requests with their faculty and staff.

An additional concern with professional development expressed in the January 2011 all-College meeting
was the availability of professional development courses. With the addition of the Employee Relations
office, initiatives have included establishing the Faculty Professional Development Advisory Committee, a
focus group with counselors and librarians, and a focus group with teaching faculty. The faculty focus
group ranked advising as the most-frequently suggested topic and proposed scheduling professional
development during the All College Hour on the third Tuesday of the month; this suggestion was echoed
within the findings from the Foundations of Excellence® (FoE) Professional Development Survey Report.
Employee Relations’ proposal that all school meetings be scheduled on the same day as Convocation or
the all-College meeting has been implemented, thus enabling faculty to attend professional development
sessions on other non-instructional days. To make session content more accessible, recorded sessions
from the Academic Advising Series and the three course series on Critical Thinking were made available
through the portal for viewing at any time. Employees receive equal credit on the salary system for
participation in the recorded sessions.

It is important to note that approximately 80% of faculty respondents (109) in the 2009 Great Places To
Work Survey answered that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their professional/career
development program. Additionally, the survey revealed 83% of participants believed that teaching is
appropriately recognized in evaluation and promotion processes.

Governance’s Promotion and Sabbatical Review Subcommittee conducts a peer review of all academic
rank and sabbatical applications. In August 2010, the institution revised the academic rank and promotion
criteria to more closely reflect the College’s mission (see Academic Rank and Promotion Requirements Policy). Criteria focus on the appropriate degree for rank, record of outstanding performance, significant professional development, and service to the College. Full-time faculty, librarians, and counselors who desire professional advancement may apply for promotion or sabbatical. The Academic Rank and Promotion Requirements Policy is easily accessed on the portal. An informational workshop on the promotion process is voluntary for applicants. Table 6.6 reflects the number of applicants for promotion and sabbatical and the number granted over the last five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Promotions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Sabbaticals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applications Received</td>
<td>Applications Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applications Received</td>
<td>Applications Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: Number of promotions and sabbaticals requested and approved 2006-2010; source: Exhibit 6.11 Memo – Sandra Lakey Chairperson Promotion Committee.

SCHOLARSHIP AND SERVICE

Penn College faculty involvement extends beyond the classroom. Results from the May 2011 Faculty Service and Scholarship Survey (Exhibit 6.12) (response rate of 72% of full-time faculty), indicate that within the last year, half of the respondents engaged in one or more of the following eight areas of College service involvement opportunities:

- Club adviser
- Orientation/Open House volunteer
- Assistance with special events
- Connections sessions
- Scheduled recruitment activities
- Standing College committees
- Middle States workgroups
- Foundation of Excellence® workgroups

Additionally, 62% of the respondents engaged in other related College service committees. Faculty were active in the external community, also, serving on boards of schools, religious, and other community organizations. Approximately 50% of the survey respondents were volunteers in non-profit organizations.

In addition to College and community service, Penn College faculty impact their professions and disciplines through scholarly activity. Last year, almost 30% of survey respondents were conference presenters, 14% held educational leadership positions, and 10% were external accreditation team members and/or accreditation report reviewers. Respondents also authored textbooks and scholarly articles, reviewed scholarly publications, and received professional awards.
OWNERSHIP OF CURRICULA

As stated in the Philosophy section of the Curriculum Manual: “Curriculum development and review at Pennsylvania College of Technology are designed as collegial processes. Curriculum initiatives are the responsibilities of Academic Affairs, and faculty are seen as the “owners” of curriculum.” (Exhibit 6.13 PA College of Technology Curriculum Manual). The College Vision Statement, “Pennsylvania's Premier Technical College,” sets the stage for a core commitment to excellence in an ever-changing and developing environment. To that end, Penn College is highly committed to strategic planning and procedures to ensure currency of curricula, facilities, and equipment to support hands-on learning. Curriculum is proposed through a process defined in the College’s Curriculum Manual and described in the eFaculty Handbook. Faculty and other academically prepared professionals design the curricula and draft the proposals, which are eventually forwarded to the Governance Curriculum Committee. Representatives of that committee include (but are not limited to) an elected faculty representative from each academic school, and a dean (Exhibit 4.4 Governance Structure).

The Program Review process requires all programs to undergo an evaluation every three years (Appendix 5 - Program Review Template). This analysis is data driven and incorporates input from many program stakeholders. The College has demonstrated a strong commitment to seek accreditation when available to support program excellence. Faculty play an essential role in the establishment and self-study review process of program accreditation (Appendix 4 - List of Accredited Programs). Additionally, there is a substantial commitment to incorporate the respective accrediting bodies’ recommendations, as well as those suggested by program advisory boards, into the curriculum. For example, in Early Childhood Education (ECE), Stage X facility improvements were a result of program review and advisory board recommendations (Exhibit 6.14 - ECE Program Review Recommendations).

Additional information on curriculum is available in Chapter Nine.

FACULTY SATISFACTION

Every educational institution needs to retain first-rate faculty. Figure 6.2 illustrates the remarkable retention rate of full-time faculty. Collectively, 115 faculty members have worked at the institution for fifteen years or more. These faculty members bring a wealth of knowledge, experience, and mentoring to new faculty and to the College community.

Although the College has an established grievance process for faculty members (Exhibit 6.15 Grievance Form), no formal grievances have been filed by any faculty members in the last 19.5 years (Exhibit 6.16 PCEA President e-mail). This, together with the College employees’ ratings in the 2009 Great Place to Work Survey, provide strong evidence of Penn College’s positive work place environment.
SELF-STUDY OUTCOMES

The study group determined that the College is in compliance with the Middle States standards focused on faculty. While the College continues its efforts to recruit diverse applicants for faculty positions and adheres to the fair application of its employment procedures in screening, hiring, developing, and evaluating those it employs, the demographic composition of teaching faculty largely reflect the demographics of the student body and the regional population. Faculty members’ credentials – both their education and their experience acquired in business, industry, and academia – support the College’s mission of providing comprehensive, hands-on technical education. The College commitment to creating a community of respect and to providing opportunities for faculty to enhance their skills is reflected in College policies and procedures for evaluation and development of faculty and staff. The faculty’s ownership and maintenance of curriculum makes them a solid partner in the College’s mission of promoting students’ personal growth, social awareness, commitment to diversity, and competence as lifelong learners.
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Standards 8 and 9

How does the College ensure admitted students’ interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission?

How are students introduced to academic expectations and prepared for student life through the College’s admissions and matriculation policies and processes?

How does the College create an environment conducive to student learning?

In what ways does the College provide programs and services to support students’ pursuit of their academic goals?

Penn College offers educational opportunities to anyone who has the interest, desire, and ability to pursue advanced study. Therefore, courses of study are offered at the certificate, associate, and bachelor-degree levels. While the College functions as an open admissions institution, it also simultaneously maintains selective admissions criteria for several majors. The College is keenly aware of both its mission and the demographics of its student body, as reflected in the intentional and comprehensive admissions and academic support systems that have been developed to support students’ educational pursuits. Through this purposeful commitment to creating an appropriate environment where students can achieve their academic goals, the College is compliant with Standards 8 and 9.

ADMISSIONS SUPPORT OF THE COLLEGE’S MISSION

The College’s mission and values explicitly state its commitment to providing comprehensive, hands-on technical education that emphasizes applied, real-world instruction in a student-centered environment. As a College of technology, versus a technical institute, all students, regardless of their level of academic preparation or the level of certificate or degree they pursue, are afforded an educational experience consistent with the stated mission.

Penn College has historically functioned as an open admissions institution, illustrated by both its admissions policy and placement process (see also Exhibit 7.1, Details of the Placement Process). Yet at the same time, all baccalaureate-degree programs and most majors within the School of Health Sciences are restricted to persons who meet certain academic prerequisites, who have attained levels of academic achievement, or who have earned an acceptable score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or American College Testing Program Test (ACT). While the co-existence of an open admission philosophy and program-specific selective requirements may seem incongruent to some, this approach is consistent with the College’s commitment to providing access to higher education for those who demonstrate an ability to be successful.
INFORMATION FOR PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS

Career Day

Held twice a year, Career Day is the premier opportunity for school districts to bring students to Penn College, enabling them to explore technical careers via hands-on activities, demonstrations, facility tours, and discussions with Penn College students and faculty. A typical Career Day schedule includes approximately 50 faculty- and staff-led workshops, scheduled in nearly all campus facilities, especially labs and instructional spaces. This event reaches students who otherwise may never consider visiting Penn College. For example, Fall 2011, Career Day for grades 9-12 brought 800 students and 80 chaperones, representing 20 schools, to campus.

Open House

Open House, held once each semester, provides high school juniors and seniors full access to the campus to meet faculty and school deans; to learn more about Penn College majors; to tour campus and its state-of-the-art labs, classrooms, instructional equipment, residence halls, and library; to interact with current students; and to learn more about student clubs and organizations, athletics, dining services, and campus life. In Spring 2011, 1,182 students registered for Open House, bringing to campus 3,551 students and their guests. In a post-event survey (N=130), 80% of respondents indicated that they were likely to apply, citing the following influencing factors: Academic information about majors- 86%; Job placement after college- 68%; Faculty- 61%; Instructional equipment/facilities- 58%; Campus tour- 45%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FALL OPEN HOUSE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered prospects</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition deposits</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attendance</td>
<td>3752*</td>
<td>4256</td>
<td>4556</td>
<td>3928</td>
<td>3295</td>
<td>3399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPRING OPEN HOUSE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered prospects</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>9191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition deposits</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attendance</td>
<td>3,551</td>
<td>3,898</td>
<td>4,054</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>3,094</td>
<td>2,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Summary of attendance and applications submitted during Open House.

*Two “Senior Visit Days” in the summer of 2011 resulted in fewer students attending the Fall Open House.
Senior Day

Introduced in Summer 2010, the annual Senior Visit Day targets the rising high school senior population. The planning for this initiative was directly linked to the College’s efforts to increase new student enrollment. This year, a total of 160 students participated over the two-day event. Admissions received 57 applications, and initial feedback indicates that families appreciated the personal attention offered during this unique opportunity.

College Website

Website content is designed to be a mechanism through which the institution communicates with the public (versus the portal, which is intended for internal use only); as such, it serves as a primary source of information about academic programs, admissions processes, available support services, financial aid, etc. The Office of College Information and Community Relations (CICR) conducts a regular and systematic review of website content to ensure that information is accurate and up to date; all campus offices that have a Web presence are regularly reminded to review and update information as well. As detailed in the Overview to this report, the College’s website has earned noteworthy recognition for its informative, interactive, and easily navigable design.

The College catalog provides current information on admissions requirements, transfer procedures, detail on majors, and memberships on advisory committees.

Included on each academic school site is an overview of the majors within the school. Each site includes the specific field of work, the required course work, program admissions, potential wage earnings and job prospects, external accreditations, faculty rosters, and other current news about the program.

The College’s Facebook Page, http://www.facebook.com/penncollege, provides another communication stream with students, parents, alumni, and any others interested in the College. It allows for dialog between the College and these groups, and – importantly – dialog within the groups. The College first implemented a Facebook Page on January 6, 2009. Between January 2009 and July 2011, support grew from 500 fans to 5,765 fans. In addition to the growth of the College’s “main” presence on Facebook, other official Pages have been created, including, for example, Career Services, Student Wellness, and The Madigan Library.

The College also has a presence on Twitter, YouTube, and LinkedIn.

Matriculation Committee

In Fall 2006, to create greater collaboration among offices that have significant interaction with students throughout the matriculation process, the Matriculation Committee was formed. This workgroup continues to function today as the Enrollment Management Committee; its goals include coordinating communication about the admissions and matriculation processes and creating a seamless set of activities designed to facilitate students’ (and their parents’) transitions to Penn College.

A recent example of the committee’s work, a matriculation checklist dubbed the “Checklist for Success,” is available to students both in print and on the Student Information System (SIS). The checklist resulted from a year-long examination of the College’s matriculation processes. The matriculation cycle provides an opportunity not only to guide students through the admissions-testing-enrollment process, but also to educate students about academic expectations; campus resources; and College policies, procedures, and processes. The checklist outlines what a student should know about Penn College by the first day of class.
Financial Aid

Recognizing that tuition is a primary concern for most students, the College places a strong emphasis on educating students about the availability of financial aid. During 2010-11, 5,974 (78.9%) Penn College students received some form of financial aid; this was a decrease in the number of students from 6,088 (78.3%) in 2009-10, but an increase in the percentage of students receiving aid. The amount of aid awarded to students totaled $90.7 million, a record high and an increase of more than $1.05 million from the previous year. As indicated by the following chart, financial aid comes from a variety of sources, including College-sponsored scholarships.

In 2010-11, 458 students received 805 scholarship awards totaling roughly $810,000. Sponsorship of these funds were as follows:

- Penn College – $120,656
- Penn College Foundation – $248,712
- Miscellaneous sources (Caterpillar, PHEAA Special Programs, etc.) – $440,625

The average award per student was $1,769, of which $1,006 were, on average, scholarship monies. As of June 30, 2011, the Penn College Foundation had total assets of $7,830,564.

Figure 7.1: Comparison of types of aid over past three years (2008-09 to 2010-11).

Information about financial aid is made available to students on the College’s website; through direct mailings; at presentations during Open House, Pre-Enrollment Advisement sessions, Connections, and Welcome Weekend; and during individual meetings with financial aid counselors. When asked about the degree to which the College communicated with students prior to attending about 1) tuition and living expenses, and 2) financial aid opportunities, respondents to the FoE Student Survey reported a 3.86 and 3.63 respectively (on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 equaling very high).

From the Financial Aid website, students can obtain information about financial aid programs, loans, and scholarships, as well access applicable forms and applications. Information is tailored to specifically address the needs of traditional, nontraditional, and transfer students. Additionally, a Financial Aid Handbook assists students in identifying the various means available to help fund their education.
The Financial Aid Office proactively seeks opportunities to continue educating enrolled students about aid processes and resources. For example, an information session to explain financial aid beyond the first year is held during Parent and Family Weekend. Targeted financial aid correspondence is routinely sent to enrolled students to address individual issues, such as failure to make satisfactory academic progress, incomplete documentation, outstanding loans, and requirements to complete a Web-based exit interview.

**Communications Relating to Selective Admission Requirements**

Admissions information for each major is available on the Admissions Office website. Information is also available on the website for each of the respective programs. While the College retains its open admissions commitment, a number of programs require selectivity. As noted earlier, students wishing to enter Health Sciences’ majors must meet certain academic prerequisites and have attained specific levels of academic achievement. In addition, students enrolling in baccalaureate majors must meet certain placement requirements.

Information and advisement are available to the students through the pre-enrollment sessions and through individual meetings with College faculty and staff.

**PLACEMENT REQUIREMENTS AND PROCESSES**

To ensure that students have the entry-level skills necessary for success in their selected major and college-level course work, comprehensive placement testing has been developed. Appropriate placement of students into first semester course work is determined in a number of ways: new students may complete placement testing, earn SAT scores at a level that will exempt them from parts of the placement test, or transfer courses from another institution that demonstrate baseline skill levels in math, reading, and English.

Details of the placement process are available in Exhibit 7.1 - Details of Placement process. The results of the placement tests and required developmental course work are discussed in detail in Chapter Nine.

**Low Score Testers**

Acceptance to the College is temporarily rescinded for students whose placement test results indicate a weakness below the developmental course level. Low scores are defined as follows: reading at or below the 4.9 grade level, math placement “0,” or English placement “1” (College Admissions Procedure).

The Advisement Center is the main point of contact for low-scoring prospective students. Averaging 2.6% of testers per fall semester (over the last ten years), low scoring students are notified of their status by letter and invited to attend a special advising session to receive additional information and to discuss methods for improving their placement with the goal of future enrollment.

Students have the opportunity to improve their placement in one of two ways. They may remediate weak skills and retake the placement test, thereby earning placement into at least a developmental level. Alternately, they may complete and transfer an approved course from another college. Students may enroll upon successful completion of either process.
Off-site Testing

Students have the option of taking the College’s placement tests at alternative, off-site locations with a proctor. For the Fall 2011 semester, 275 students elected the off-site testing option; this accounted for 13% of the total number of students who completed placement tests.

Pre-enrollment Advising Sessions

When placement test scoring is complete, students and their guests are invited to a pre-enrollment advising session where faculty and staff explain the implications of placement testing scores and further discuss students’ educational plans. First semester course schedules are primarily devised based on placement test scores and curriculum requirements. While attendance at a pre-enrollment advising session is required for only those students whose placement test scores indicate a need for at least one developmental course, a majority of students who complete placement tests return to campus for a pre-enrollment advising session, as shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Placement Testing</th>
<th>Placement Testing and Advising Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>1,306 (68.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>1,431 (75.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>1,377 (75.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>1,248 (75.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2: Four-year longitudinal data of new/transfer student participation in pre-enrollment advising sessions.

SUPPORT FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS

The College has developed comprehensive processes and services to appropriately support all students, regardless of academic preparation.

Developmental Course Work

If placement test results show a need to improve certain skills before attempting course work in their major, students are required to take developmental courses (RDG 001, 111; ENL 001; MTH 004, 005, 006). The majority of Penn College students have at least one developmental requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single Developmental</th>
<th>Double Developmental</th>
<th>Triple Developmental</th>
<th>Non-Developmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>42.22%</td>
<td>13.23%</td>
<td>4.94%</td>
<td>39.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>46.04%</td>
<td>14.45%</td>
<td>4.79%</td>
<td>37.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>46.34%</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
<td>35.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>41.56%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
<td>37.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3: Four-year longitudinal data of new/transfer students with developmental needs.

Deficiencies may prevent enrollment in some majors. In those cases, students may need to change to a related major better suited to their current skills. For example, bachelor-degree applicants required to take MTH 004 may start in a related associate-degree major that will build their skills and allow them to transfer into the bachelor-degree major in a later semester.
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The following policies apply to developmental courses:

- Developmental courses must be scheduled in the first semester.
- Required developmental courses in the same discipline must be scheduled in consecutive semesters.
- Students may not withdraw from developmental courses.
- Students may repeat a developmental course once.

The College awards institutional credit for developmental courses (courses numbered 001-009). The developmental reading course RDG 111 (College Reading, Reasoning, and Study Skills) may be used as an open or general elective. No other developmental course with institutional credit may satisfy a course requirement or elective. However, the grades earned in all developmental courses are included in the student's grade-point average and contribute to "satisfactory academic progress" for financial aid purposes (see Developmental Studies Policy).

Academic performance of students who take developmental course work is discussed in detail in Chapters Nine and Ten.

Developmental Semester/ORN

Students whose placement test results indicate a need for developmental course work in all three areas (math, reading, and English) are placed into the Developmental Semester, which means they are scheduled for developmental courses in math, reading, and English, as well as ORN 001. Students in the developmental semester must earn at least a 2.0 semester GPA; failure to do so results in academic suspension for one semester. A complete review of the Developmental Semester is underway. Further details are discussed in Chapter Nine (See also the Developmental Studies Policy).

TRANSFER STUDENTS AND EXTRA-INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING

Articulation

A number of mechanisms are in place to facilitate a smooth transition for students interested in transferring to Penn College. Transfer-specific information is included on the College’s website to educate and guide students through the transfer process. Penn College has in place more than 60 articulation agreements with two-year schools in Pennsylvania and neighboring states.

Dual Enrollment

Penn College NOW (PC NOW) is a program that allows high school students to earn Penn College credits through dual enrollment. PC NOW classes are taught by approved high school teachers at the student’s home high school or career and technology center. PC NOW offers technical courses that relate to 11 of the College’s majors. Students pay a significantly reduced cost ($20 per credit) and must have scored “advanced” or “proficient” on their PSSA reading test and/or must pass required math placement testing. During 2010-11, 343 high school students took classes through the PC NOW program. Since its beginning in 2006, 32% of high school students who took classes through PC NOW have matriculated as degree-seeking students at the College; indications are that involvement in this program is increasing. Thirty-eight percent of the students who participated in PC NOW during 2010-11 are planning to enroll at Penn College.

In April 2011, PC NOW was awarded accreditation by the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP); it is the first program in Pennsylvania to achieve this distinction.
Support for Transfer Students

The Registrar’s Office staff reviews external transcripts and assigns credit for courses that are approved equivalents to Penn College courses. Students must have earned a grade of C (2.0 on a 4.0 scale) or higher in a course for it to be considered for transfer.

The College maintains a database containing approximately 56,778 courses approved for transfer credit from at least 2,190 institutions. Requests for transfer credit for courses that have not yet been reviewed are forwarded to the Registrar’s Office for evaluation, with involvement of faculty as needed. The College’s Transfer Course Equivalency Search is a Web-based tool that transfer students can use to check for equivalent courses between their originating institution and Penn College. Likewise, current Penn College students consult the system to identify equivalent courses at other institutions, often those close to their permanent homes, in order to continue with course work while on breaks from the College. This database-driven website includes more than 16,000 course equivalencies to institutions nationwide and has had more than 8,200 visits since its implementation in May 2010.

In July 2006, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) began implementation of Article XX-C of the Public institution Code of 1949, which required Pennsylvania community colleges and the 14 Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE) institutions to adopt mandatory equivalency standards for at least 30 credits of common foundation courses. Although not required to do so, Penn College elected to participate in this statewide transfer system beginning December 2008. Students are able to review course equivalencies between Penn College and other participating schools at www.PATRAC.org. In addition to the Transfer Course Equivalency Search mentioned previously, the College has implemented a “synchronizer” that periodically updates all transfer equivalencies to a national database hosted by AcademyOne on their collegetransfer.net site (of which PATRAC is a subset).

Transfer Student Experience

In Fall 2008 and Fall 2009, Penn College admitted 627 and 576 transfer students, respectively. Students who transferred to Penn College and responded to Foundations of Excellence® (FoE) survey questions indicated a high level of satisfaction with the transfer process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree to which...</th>
<th>% of Students that responded High or Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student received unbiased treatment from faculty and staff.</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn College accurately communicated information regarding available academic majors.</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student was able to enroll in the courses they needed for their major.</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student was able to enroll in the courses they needed for their major.</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student received their transcript analysis in a timely manner to enable course selection.</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn College accurately communicated academic expectations for students.</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4. Student views of transfer student issues on the FoE survey.
Credit for Life Experience

Recognition of experiential learning has had a long history at Penn College. The College’s official procedure for Nontraditional Credit: Credit for Work/Life Experience was first formalized in 1983 and then revised in 2002; it governs the College’s process for accepting life experience for academic credit.

To be considered for academic credit, a student must be able to document his/her experience and demonstrate how it aligns with established objectives for a specific course. Variation in the required documentation and evaluation process, however, exists among the schools. This process is summarized on the school/College Web pages and detailed on the College’s internal portal site.

CAREER GUIDANCE

Career Counseling

Applicants who are unsure about their educational goals can avail themselves of a number of resources to explore the College’s program offerings. Many resources are available online (e.g., school websites, College Catalog, etc.), while others involve interaction with staff and faculty. Most notable among these is the career counseling offered by the Counseling Services office. In 2010-11, counselors logged 243 career counseling appointments, during which approximately 175 individual Career Assessment Inventories (CAI) were administered.

In addition to those administered during individual career counseling appointments, CAIs were administered to ORN students, to students in selected courses per instructor request, as well to prospective students (during Open House). Approximately 85 CAIs were administered in group settings. Counseling staff also use the DISCOVER career instrument in group settings; this instrument was administered to approximately 260 students during 2010-11. Counselors meet with students requesting a change in major; in so doing, there is opportunity to ensure the student’s understanding of and preparation for the change.

Undecided Students

Approved as one of six recommendations submitted in the June 2005 Marketing Plan, an “Undecided” major allows applicants to submit an application without having to immediately declare a major. A coordinated career awareness campaign is in place to support “Undecided” students, as are processes to quickly connect these students with appropriate staff. The goal is to assist students with identifying a selected major as soon as possible due to competitive enrollment in some majors, industry-specified core curricula in others, and the limited period of financial aid eligibility.

Per the College Catalog, students who enroll as Undecided should identify a major before scheduling courses for their second semester of enrollment. As of June 7, 2011, approximately 118 undecided students were recorded for Fall 2011 semester. Reflected below are the number of students per semester who completed the semester as Undecided students; note that these numbers do not include those who were effectively advised and declared majors before the end of the semester.
Table 7.5: Number of “Undecided” students per semester, Fall 2009 to Spring 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th># of “Undecided” Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIENTATION TO COLLEGE LIFE AND EXPECTATIONS

Implemented in Summer 2006, Connections is Penn College’s orientation program, designed to help new, transfer, and nontraditional students prepare for college. The primary purpose of the program is to provide students, and their parents, more information about academic expectations and opportunities for cocurricular engagement at Penn College. Connections is regularly assessed against its intended learning outcomes, and the results indicate that Connections makes a significant impact.

Table 7.6: Summer 2010 Connections assessment results summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating in the Connections program helped me better understand (more than I did before the session):</th>
<th>% of Students who responded Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The academic expectations related to my major.</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What a college class will really be like.</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to get help with my classes.</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will happen to me if I don’t do well in my classes.</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to find out about campus activities and how to get involved on campus.</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to interact with people who are different from me.</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What it means to be a responsible member of my living community.</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, when asked about the degree to which the College communicated with students prior to attending about the importance of standards of behavior in an academic community and the importance of ethical conduct, respondents to the FoE Student Survey reported a 3.85 and 3.91 respectively (on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 equaling very high).

ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES

Foundations of Excellence®

As noted in the overview in Chapter One, Penn College participated in Foundations of Excellence® (FoE), a comprehensive, externally guided self-study and improvement process for the students’ first year. This self-study process led to a number of significant initiatives to increase student success by focusing on the issues of first-year students. The self-study and analysis yielded 37 recommendations, including:

A Freshmen Year Experience Course for all new students, including transfers with fewer than 24 credits, was implemented for all majors in Fall 2011. The FYE course provides information and tools necessary for students to become proactive learners and to take personal responsibility for their entire educational experience. Full-time faculty members taught approximately 35% of the sections, well above the national average of 7-12% of full-time faculty teaching FYE.
Reorganization of the Academic Support Services Offices resulted from a comprehensive and systematic evaluation of the services provided and an identified need to expand student support systems. Two action items were specifically identified to fulfill this recommendation:

- Increasing the scope and availability of academic support services
- Replacing the College’s current Early Alert System with an online, comprehensive system

An outline of services now coordinated by the new Academic Success Center, as well as preliminary results after just one year of implementation follows.

- **Study and Enrichment Skills:** In addition to the existing Project Success (a free six-week study skills program), a variety of workshops were created on topics such as note taking, stress management, test taking, and reading textbooks. Students can take advantage of these sessions in multiple formats at convenient times.

**Year One Update:** In 2010-11, the Academic Success Center offered 274 workshops to 801 students, for a total of 3,017 contacts with students, approximately 64% of whom were first year students. On Demand workshops reached the greatest number of unique students (441), while Project Success resulted in the greatest number of student contacts (2,464). Students who complete Project Success have demonstrably higher GPAs and report greater confidence in preparation for academic course work (Exhibit 7.2). The unduplicated headcount of students served in 2010-11 represented 38.4% of the total enrollment. For the current academic year, 38% of the total enrollment has been served in just one semester, through December 2011.

- **Mentoring:** Outreach to students identified as ‘in need’ occurs through various initiatives that fall into three broad categories:

  1) **SupportNET** is an online early-alert referral system that provides faculty and staff an easy way to identify a concern about a student. Academic Success Center staff reach out to students to offer direct assistance or to connect the student with other campus resources.

  2) The Academic Mentoring program is designed to meet each student’s needs and can include multiple sessions over a semester. Mentors are available to help students clarify goals, work on time management skills, and make connections to College resources.

  3) Tailored services are coordinated for special student populations, such as transfer students.

**Year One Update:** In its first two semesters, SupportNET received 774 referrals on 636 students, 65% of whom were in their first year at the College, and 80% of whom had a developmental requirement in at least one subject area. The Academic Success Center was able to establish contact with approximately 79% of the students who were referred, and approximately 50% of the referred students spoke or met with a member of the Academic Success Center to address their academic situations. This compares favorably with the 272 referrals received during 2009-10.

In 2010-11, the Academic Mentoring program received 126 requests or referrals. Of these, 90 students (71%) agreed to a mentoring relationship and were matched with one of seven mentors, though only 77 (61%) followed up with regular meetings with their mentors. While the initial data is encouraging, further data and analysis will continue to assess the impact of these programs.

- **Tutoring/Writing Centers:** The Tutoring Center and the Writing Center provide academic assistance in math, writing, and technical subjects to all students. Services are provided in
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multiple formats: drop-in tutoring, small group tutoring, and individual tutoring (available by appointment). Additionally, online tutoring (SMARTThinking) is available, as is Supplemental Instruction (SI) for key courses.

**Year One Update:** The major changes in tutoring during 2010-11 were the introduction of appointment (one-on-one) tutoring and the opening of the Writing Center. Together, the Tutoring and Writing Centers provided 19,051 hours of tutoring to 1,679 unduplicated students, representing roughly 27% of the student body. Though the number of unduplicated students served rose by only 4% over 2009-10 levels, total contacts rose by 11%, and total hours rose by 21%, with essentially no change in staffing.

Work continues on the recommendations and an update for 2011 is included in Appendix 3.

**ADVICEMENT PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES**

While academic advising initially occurs at Pre-Enrollment Advising sessions, every student is assigned an academic adviser within his or her academic school prior to beginning classes. Academic advising is an expectation of all full-time teaching faculty, per the Agreement. Information about academic advising is currently located on the Advisement Center’s and the Registrar’s websites and portal pages. However, several new initiatives are underway to develop more comprehensive resources.

Students generally report a positive level of satisfaction with their academic advising experiences. From a Spring 2010 survey focused solely on academic advising, 72% of responding students reported that academic advisers are helpful and effective in advising, 69.3% agreed overall that their academic advisers provide them with information about courses required for their majors, and 65.7% agreed overall that their academic advisers provide them with information that helps them schedule classes they need. In the Foundations of Excellence® (FoE) survey, students rated their overall satisfaction with academic advising; 65.1% rated it “high” or “very high.”

Recommendation 7 of the FoE Final Report establishes the need for a more purposeful approach to academic advising and the creation of educational resources for both students and faculty related to the academic advising process. Even prior to FoE, a workgroup of faculty and staff had been assembled to explore ways to strengthen the academic advising process. In a Spring 2009 survey, full-time faculty clearly cited the need for more training and resources (i.e., some type of reference manual) in the area of advising. Furthermore, feedback collected during the all-faculty meeting in January 2010 showed that faculty believe the greatest challenges they face as academic advisers are getting students to attend advising meetings and the need for more information or training.

An Academic Advising Purpose Statement acknowledging academic advising as an institutional priority was created. This also establishes, for the first time, a common definition of effective advising and clearly articulated responsibilities of both advisers and advisees.

In response to these assessments the following initiatives have been completed:

- Use of a Scheduling Access Number (SAN) that requires students to meet with their advisers
- A professional development series for faculty
- The creation of an award to recognize excellence in academic advising
- The creation of an electronic handbook for faculty (a student version is in development)
- Expanded information about the academic advising process in Advising Sessions, Connections, and FYE 101
In Fall 2011, the College initiated use of MAP-Works, an online retention management tool that helps promote student success by identifying at-risk students early in the academic year and providing tools to coordinate and manage intervention efforts. The program uses demographic, academic, and survey data to predict academic and retention risks, allowing the College to more efficiently intervene with specific students about specific issues prior to those issues developing into problems. In addition to the reporting, tracking, and communication tools provided for faculty and staff, the program provides students with a customized report that helps them gain a better understanding of their strengths and weaknesses in areas essential to their persistence and academic success in college.

**OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES FOR STUDENTS**

**Military Friendly Designation**

In 2011, Penn College was named a Military Friendly School by G.I. Jobs for the second consecutive year. The designation is reserved for the top 15% of colleges and universities that illustrate both a commitment and proactive approach to embracing America’s veterans as students. Veterans’ services are primarily coordinated through the coordinator of veterans affairs, located in the Financial Aid Office. Chief among the services offered are free assistance with submitting applications for Veterans Affairs Educational Benefits, mentorship during the matriculation process, and ongoing support with navigating the VA processes. In Fall 2011, Penn College enrolled 323 students who were certified as veterans through the VA, an increase from 316 the year before.

**Career Services**

Career Services’ mission is to make available the information and tools necessary for successful career development and advancement at all stages of students’ careers. The department’s mission is fulfilled through the array of services offered, including cover letter, resume, and portfolio support; on-campus recruiting; career fairs; mock interviews; job search coaching; and an online job posting system for full-time, part-time, and internship opportunities. Career Services support is available to all students and all alumni, at no additional cost.

Career Services staff regularly visit classrooms at the invitation of faculty, and encourage faculty to integrate career awareness, career development, job seeking, and job keeping activities into their syllabi. Throughout 2010-11, Career Services staff presented to 74 classes, through which they impacted 1,326 students. In addition, 1,103 students were served through individual appointments with Career Services staff. Career Services serves as an intermediary between prospective employers and students and alumni, posting job vacancies, scheduling on-campus interviews, sponsoring events, and promoting off-campus job fairs.

In an effort to ensure effective service to all stakeholders, Career Services engages in regular assessment activities. For example, to evaluate the effectiveness of the mock interview model in supporting student competence in interview settings, students are asked to evaluate their perceptions of their interview skills using an established rubric that matches the rubric that is used by the mock interviewer. At the close of the mock interview, the student has the opportunity to compare his or her own pre-assessment with that of the reviewer. This provides an additional opportunity for insight, discussion, and learning. The office has tracked these pre- and post-assessments and found statistically significant gains in students’ interview skills following the mock interview process. Similarly, employers regularly use provided rubrics to score student resumes; Career Services uses the completed rubrics to ensure that the work done with students reflects the priorities and preferences of the hiring employers.
Counseling Services

Penn College’s Counseling Services’ mission is inspired by the values of life-long learning and the development of the whole person in order to maximize the potential for student success. The primary function of the counseling staff is to promote psychological well-being that enriches personal, academic, and career growth and development. Specifically the office

- provides psychological services in a safe, supportive, and confidential environment;
- participates in the campus community through outreach and responsive consultation; and
- teaches strategies whereby students can gain insight, solve problems, make decisions, change behavior, resolve conflict, and accept responsibility.

In 2010-11, Counseling Services conducted several assessment activities, one of which was designed to examine the effectiveness of personal counseling. Specifically, the goal was to determine the extent to which personal counseling helped students “feel better.” To do so, the level of student-reported symptoms, as measured by the Outcome Rating Scale (ORS), was used to assess effectiveness of therapeutic interventions. The results were collapsed into two groups: students who met for three or fewer sessions, and those who attended four or more sessions. As expected, fewer appointments resulted in fewer gains across all dimensions. This information has informed counselors’ planning to provide more targeted services to students who demonstrate a need for treatment or to suggest alternative options for students who are not benefiting from or engaged in treatment.

Disability Services

The Disability Services Office coordinates accommodations for students with documented disabilities. Disability Services’ primary purpose is to provide reasonable academic accommodations and to ensure access to programs and activities that promote a supportive learning environment, while enabling students to achieve their educational objectives. Based upon the history of the student’s disability, current documentation, and the nature of the request, Disability Services staff identify appropriate accommodations and services, which may include adaptive equipment, assistive technology, books in alternate format, testing accommodations, note-taker assistance, and Sign Language interpreters.

The office serves as an educational resource for both students with disabilities and the greater campus community primarily through educational programming and professional development on disability-related issues, including workshops designed to clarify rights and responsibilities of both students and the College, sessions on the differences between high school and college for students and their parents, and on-going professional development for faculty and staff. Handbooks for both students and parents (see “Resources” in Exhibit 7.3) have been created as a complementary educational resource under the Resources section of the Disability Services public website.

Disability Services also leads a work group that addresses issues of accessibility in information technology and media. This cross-functional group makes recommendations for supporting universal accessibility of media and information technologies, including those used in instruction, marketing, campus information, and communication.

In an effort to ensure effective service to all stakeholders, Disability Services engages in regular assessment activities. For example, to evaluate the effectiveness of their professional development sessions focusing on supporting students with Asperger’s syndrome in the classroom, the staff conducted a brief pre-/post-test assessment that measured both learning outcomes and confidence gains as a result of the session. The results indicated statically significant gains in both areas (see Exhibit 7.4 - Student Affairs 2010-2013 Strategic Plan, 2011 Update Report). Each semester, the office also examines GPA and retention among students who use their counseling accommodations and make regular appointments with Disability Services for support. This data demonstrates that qualifying
students who regularly engage with Disability Services are more likely to be retained and also carry a higher GPA than qualified students who do not interact with the office on a regular basis.

**College Health Services**

Recognizing that maintaining good health is important to academic success, College Health Services promotes individual and campus-wide health and wellness education, prevention programs, and assistance to individuals with acute and chronic illnesses, injuries, or health issues. The department offers emergency treatment, assessment of acute illnesses, allergy injections, immunizations, physicals, over-the-counter and prescription medications, phlebotomy and laboratory services, and health and wellness screenings.

The Impaired Student Recovery Area (ISRA) represents collaboration among College Health Services, College Police, and Residence Life. The ISRA provides a safe location for significantly intoxicated students who are considered be a safety or health risk to themselves or others due to intoxication. The ISRA is not a punishment, nor does a visit to this facility result in a College judicial sanction; it is a medical observation area to ensure the safety of Penn College students. Certified Emergency Medical Technicians (EMTs) provide oversight of the ISRA and care to the students who utilize this service.

The Health Survey results (ACHA-NCHA completed Spring 2011) led to a number of additional health-related activities. Spring 2012 semester, for example, will include Healthy Weight Week and Sexual Responsibility Week. During those weeks, programs and activities will focus on related topics, as appropriate, based on the survey results. Healthy Wildcats is a student organization assisting staff with health-related programming.

**Children’s Learning Center**

The mission of the Children’s Learning Center at Penn College is four-fold:

- Offer a service that facilitates students’ access to the College experience and serves employees.
- Function as a model early care and education program.
- Provide exemplary developmentally appropriate early care and education.
- Provide a demonstration and observation site for students enrolled in specific majors, thereby extending the educational experiences of students.

The center enrolls approximately 60 children during the fall and spring semesters (fewer in the summer). It has enjoyed full enrollment, with a waiting list, for at least the past eight years. Priority in admission is given to students, then to employees, then to alumni and the community at large. Children of students consistently make up 50% to 60% of the enrollment. To best meet the needs of students, the center offers both part-time and full-time schedules and allows for summers off, holding a place for children of students who will return in the fall to continue their course work. In addition, the College offers generous discounts in the cost of care (partially funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education) to low-income students who qualify for Pell grants.

The center is licensed annually as a child care center by the PA Department of Public Welfare. It participates in the Pennsylvania voluntary quality rating system, Keystone STARS, and has maintained the highest rating (4-star) since the STARS system was implemented. The center is also accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and by the Middle States Commission on Elementary Education. The current five-year accreditation by NAEYC expires in November 2012 and the seven-year Middle States accreditation expires in May 2014. Center group sizes, staff/child ratios, and teacher qualifications consistently meet or exceed the standards of the accrediting bodies.
Maintaining the certifications and accreditations listed above requires an ongoing commitment to continuous quality improvement. This is documented by required annual reports, as well as by annual staff and family surveys, results of assessment visits conducted by DPW and Keystone STARS staff, and by the reports of accreditation assessors. The center relies on the input of College faculty (primarily but not exclusively the faculty of the Early Childhood Education degree program) and on the networking of the staff and director to ensure continuing best practices in the field. In conformity with Keystone STARS requirements, enrolled children are assessed three times annually using an online checklist for the Work Sampling System and Ounce. All teachers are required to document a minimum of 24 hours annually of approved professional development, and the director is required to have 30 hours.

In 2010-11, the center recorded over 300 visits by Penn College students for purposes of completing course assignments. Early Childhood Education students make up the largest group, as they visit to complete various assignments relating to courses in that curriculum. However, almost as many visits are made by students enrolled in Health Sciences majors. Several student activities groups have completed service projects for the center. In addition, outside visitors in the past year have included high school child development classes, representatives of community agencies, and staff of other area early childhood education programs.

**College Police**

The Penn College Police Department supports the College’s mission by providing a safe learning environment, maintaining civility in the community, and making students aware of how behavior outside the classroom can impede learning and success.

Penn College Police provide general police services to the campus community and the surrounding neighborhoods. The department includes fifteen police officers, and six security officers. The men and woman of the department investigate reported crimes and respond to calls for service. They also deter crime through visible, proactive patrols and community outreach. Additionally, the officers provide mutual aid to the other departments (the Williamsport Bureau of Police, the Pennsylvania State Police, and other law enforcement departments within Lycoming County), with whom they share information and investigate crimes.

Each year, the department assesses overall crime and calls for service in order to alter work schedules and patrol techniques to provide appropriate coverage. For example, tracking of off-campus crimes led to the addition of two police officers for neighborhood patrols off campus. In the following two years (2005-06 and 2006-07), major crime was reduced by 42%, and it has remained low each year since that time. Recent data analysis and reviews of best practices led to staffing some of the residence hall substations with security personnel rather than police officers (2010-11). This permitted the officers to move about the complex and interact with the students. Although a change in criminal activity or calls for service within the complex was not noted, criminal activity and damage in the area immediately outside the complex was reduced by 18%.

The department continually assesses enforcement efforts related to students’ alcohol misuse. Analysis of these trends indicates that the department’s increased enforcement activity has resulted in an overall reduction in alcohol-related contacts by 38% over the last four years. The trends also indicate that many of those contacts involved first-time offenders. In response, the College implemented a “Second Chance” program, which offers students an opportunity to participate in an educational program in lieu of criminal citation. Assessment data in the first year of the program (2010-11) indicated successful completion by 80% of those placed in the program and less than 1% recidivism.

College Police also serve an important educational role in safety and security programming. Information about the role and services of College Police is presented throughout the matriculation process and throughout the academic year in targeted programs such as safe partying, personal safety, and crime prevention.
The department is responsible for managing the College’s compliance with the Communities Act Amendments of 1989 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. This information is readily available on the Police website. Also available to the College community via the Portal are the Daily Activity, Crime and Fire Log, and a new Police Activity Blotter (one of the most popular Portal sites), which gives additional information about key incidents that occur on and around campus.

One of the College’s most proactive efforts with regard to safety and security is the campus text alert system, PCT Alerts. This messaging system was designed to alert the campus community to situations that may require immediate attention. It is an opt-in system that allows students and employees to receive text, e-mail, and phone messages. Though originally designed to notify individuals about snow closing and individual class cancellations, it was quickly expanded after the Virginia Tech tragedy to include security-related issues and crisis situations.

**EXTRACURRICULAR AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAMS**

The Wildcat Athletics program, the Student Activities Office, the Residence Life Office and other areas offer students extracurricular and cocurricular opportunities that are designed to make the spirit of the academic mission statement a reality in the lives of Penn College students as demonstrated in the following sections.

**Wildcat Athletics**

Penn College Wildcat athletics features 13 intercollegiate sports, including men’s and women’s archery, basketball, cross country, golf, soccer, and tennis. Other sports include men’s baseball and wrestling, and women’s softball and volleyball. Teams are not affiliated with the NCAA; they compete in the Penn State University Athletic Conference (PSUAC) and the United States Collegiate Athletic Associate (USCAA) in all sports, except Archery, which competes in United States Collegiate Archery (USCA). The Athletics department is funded by the Student Activity Fee, as are all aspects of the Student Activities Office.

Penn College student-athletes do not receive any scholarships, nor do they receive any preferential treatment (except for priority scheduling during their sports’ seasons, a privilege granted to several other student groups on campus, including students with disabilities and Presidential Ambassadors). Student-athletes are required to maintain a 2.0 GPA to remain eligible to compete, which is a higher standard than that required by the NCAA. First-year students who compete in intercollegiate athletics are required to complete study hours either in the library or in the Tutoring or Writing Centers. These standards have consistently resulted in Penn College student-athletes excelling above their peers in academic achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Spring 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male student-athletes</td>
<td>2.953</td>
<td>2.907</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td>2.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All males</td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>2.841</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>2.847</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>2.854</td>
<td>2.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female student-athletes</td>
<td>3.054</td>
<td>3.012</td>
<td>2.969</td>
<td>2.948</td>
<td>3.007</td>
<td>2.913</td>
<td>3.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All females</td>
<td>2.964</td>
<td>3.023</td>
<td>2.946</td>
<td>2.992</td>
<td>2.955</td>
<td>2.981</td>
<td>2.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All student-athletes</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.985</td>
<td>2.974</td>
<td>2.902</td>
<td>2.861</td>
<td>2.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>2.907</td>
<td>2.840</td>
<td>2.898</td>
<td>2.845</td>
<td>2.900</td>
<td>2.491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.7: Comparison of GPAs for student-athletes and non-student athletes (male, female, and combined).
Also notable is the level at which the College’s student-athletes excel on the fields and courts while meeting the standards mentioned above. College teams regularly end their seasons at the top of both the conference and national association. See Exhibit 7.5 for more details.

**Intramural Athletics**

Penn College has 30 intramural sports teams with over 1,000 students, faculty, and staff participating. These include archery, golf, various versions of basketball and football, and newer activities such as inline skating and dodge-ball. A Residence Hall Intramural Cup Competition for on-campus residential students promotes athletic competitions among the various residence halls.

Strong intramural sports can evolve to extramural teams. Extramural activities are sanctioned competitions between Penn College and other colleges or community leagues, teams, and tournaments. Offerings depend upon the availability of teams and leagues to compete, and include the following:

- Basketball – Intramural league or tournament champions represent Penn College.
- Flag Football – Intramural league or tournament champions represent Penn College.
- Inline Hockey – Participants are chosen through sign-ups and/or open tryouts.

**Student Activities**

As an integral part of the Division of Student Affairs, the Student Activities Office applies a holistic approach to its work, focusing on the following:

- Cocurricular learning
- Effective transitions into and through collegiate life
- Productive use of leisure time
- Opportunities for developing healthy relationships
- Exposure to and education on diversity and multiculturalism
- Leadership and group development through a wide range of programs and services

Data from the Foundations of Excellence® (FoE) student survey indicates that students respond positively to questions about student life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Area</th>
<th>Percent of Positive Responses (moderate to very high agreement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College effectively communicates the importance of out-of-class activities.</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities are available for involvement in out-of-class activities that are of interest to students.</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have a sense of belonging at Penn College.</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ social needs being met.</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.8: Key FoE survey results relating to extracurricular activities and social interaction.

In the same survey, for questions relating to how well the College increased students’ understanding about the benefits of attending college, students most often reported favorably, as indicated in the following table:
Table 7.9: FoE survey results relating to benefits of attending College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Area</th>
<th>Percent of Positive Responses (moderate to very high agreement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College increases knowledge for personal growth.</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College prepares students to be involved members of their communities.</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College prepares students to contribute to the betterment of society.</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Functionally, the Student Activities Office is a conglomeration of areas that work collaboratively and seamlessly. These areas include Leadership Development, Greek Life, Student Organizations, Programming, Community Services, and Diversity & Cultural Life.

**Leadership Development** supports the College’s mission of “creating and sustaining excellence in a student-centered environment that promotes personal growth, social awareness, a shared commitment to diversity, and lifelong learning, all of which help prepare our graduates for success.” The program provides opportunities for students to explore leadership theory, to develop a personal philosophy on leadership, and to gain skills that are integral to the holistic student learning experience. Penn College’s leadership program has four components (first semester, first year, second year, and third year), each with its own learning outcomes. As discussed more fully in the section on Greek Life below, NSSE data indicates that students involved in leadership development are more engaged in virtually all areas of their collegiate experience.

**Greek Life** was initiated at Penn College in 2007. Currently, Penn College has four fraternities (two sororities have disbanded), involving approximately 85 students. Academic eligibility requirements include a 2.25 GPA and 12 completed credits, or passing (P) grades at midterms (for first-semester students). NSSE comparisons show students involved in Greek Life and leadership activities are more engaged in virtually all areas of college life than the student body as a whole (Exhibit 7.6), and GPA data shows that Greek students are earning higher grades than the student body as a whole (Exhibit 7.7).

**Student organizations** – approximately 60 – provide students opportunities to develop strong interpersonal and leadership skills, including how to effectively work within a group setting. Many organizations’ missions are closely aligned with specific academic programs, thereby creating yet another opportunity for students to gain knowledge about and develop skills related to their future professions.

From a survey administered to the 2010-11 student organization presidents and vice presidents (approximately 110 student leaders with a 34% response rate), students reported the two most common reasons they get involved in leadership positions: to contribute to the organization (67.57%) and to gain leadership experience (62.16%). Over 70% of student organization officers responded that learning to effectively work with others was one of the key skills they gained or improved from their officer experience; 68% gained or improved communication skills. Over 91% of reporting officers would repeat the experience again. Areas for improvement indicated that student leaders needed help with recruiting, increasing involvement of members, increasing meetings, and getting information about student activities policies and paperwork. The survey results informed Student Activities plans for the upcoming year (see Exhibit 7.3 Student Affairs 2010-2011 Assessment Report and Student Affairs 2011-2012 Goals).

**Honor societies** are among the student organizations, involving approximately 200 students in the following groups:

- Alpha Chi Honor Society - Recognizes academic excellence and exemplary character among junior and senior college students
• Delta Mu Delta Honor Society – International honor society in business administration
• Phi Theta Kappa – Recognizes scholarship, leadership, service, and fellowship among associate-degree students
• Gamma Epsilon Tau – Honor society in graphic communications
• National Residence Hall Honorary (NRHH) – Recognizes the top 1% of leaders in on-campus housing

**Event planning and programming**, one of the most active areas within Student Activities is supported in this effort by the Wildcat Events Board (WEB). WEB is a student programming organization that plays an influential role in selecting and planning events for the entire student community. Programs range from events purely social in nature, such as dances, comedians, and musicians to those more curricular in nature, including a lecture series and educational awareness weeks on topics such women’s history, alcohol, and sexual responsibility.

**Community service** programs range from local one-day events (such as the United Way Day of Caring, the MLK Day of Service, and internally developed “Civility Saturdays”) to large scale, multi-day events in other areas of the country (such as Alternative Spring Break and Alternative Winter Break trips).

The most developed of these initiatives is the Alternative Spring Break (ASB) experience. Since the first trip was offered in 2006, the program has evolved significantly, including the formulation of a mission, a vision, a set of learning outcomes, and an assessment plan. The ASB program promotes civic engagement, personal growth, social awareness, service, and lifelong learning in a student-centered environment. Through opportunities for reflection and service, alternative breaks are conducted in a student-centered environment focused on cultivating an appreciation of differences, creating active citizens, and community building.

**Diversity and cultural life** issues have been a high priority for the Student Activities Office for several years; however, efforts in this area were significantly increased in 2010-11 following assessment activities through FoE, NSSE, a Residential Life survey, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Department in the School of Integrated Studies. Efforts in this area have largely been facilitated by the Student Activities Office and Cultural Life Committee, which includes staff, faculty, and students. The Cultural Life Committee is charged with

• creating campus-wide partnerships;
• promoting and encouraging the celebration of diversity;
• supporting inclusiveness regardless of color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, ethnic, or national origin;
• supporting the Penn College and Williamsport communities in their efforts to increase cultural awareness; and
• promoting cultural life and multiculturalism through educational programming, including high-profile events.

Student Activities has expanded efforts in the area of diversity and cultural life, including the following:

• Increased collaboration between Student Activities and Academic Affairs to improve attendance at diversity-related events
• A series of high-profile, diversity-related events
• A newly created position to coordinate campus-wide diversity initiatives and enhance College support of students from historically marginalized populations
Residence Life provides high-quality living environments for Penn College students. Started in 1997 with one 320-student residence hall, Residence Life now includes eight residence halls with a capacity of 1,710 beds. Annually, approximately 1,000 spaces are reserved for new, first-year students. Residence Life strives to create, foster, and develop environments that support the academic and social development of Penn College students by

- providing safe, clean, and secure living environments geared toward academic success;
- developing inclusive communities that celebrate diversity;
- promoting socially just environments in the College’s residential communities;
- offering programs and opportunities that meet the developmental needs of students; and
- designing communities that encourage active engagement.

Collaborative relationships with numerous campus offices allow for academic integration in the residence halls, and social support/development for students. For instance, a College counselor serves as a liaison with each residence hall area for support, outreach, and programming opportunities. Also, the Academic Success Center provides programs on academic success within the residence halls.

Residence Life regularly uses a variety of assessment efforts to help fulfill its mission and meet student needs. Staff uses institutional data from the NSSE, the FoE process, and other sources to inform their practices. They also participate in Educational Benchmarking, Inc.’s (EBI’s) Resident Assessment Survey (see Exhibit 8.9), which is endorsed by the Association of College and University Housing Officers - International (ACUHO-I) and the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) professional standards. The EBI survey provides insight into resident satisfaction with student staff, programming, facilities, services, and climate in the residence halls. In addition, selected learning outcomes are measured, such as personal interactions, diverse interactions, managing time, studying, and personal growth.

The 2008 NSSE and initial feedback through the FoE process showed lower than desired engagement levels for first-year students. With the opening of Dauphin Hall in 2010 and the ability to house first-year students together, Residence Life could target programming to better meet first-year students’ needs.

Data from the 2010-11 Resident Assessment Survey (Exhibit 8.9) regarding this new model indicated very positive results, most notably in the following areas:

- Satisfaction with “Student Staff (RAs)”
- Satisfaction with “Safety and Security”
- Satisfaction with “Facilities”
- Student perceptions of “Sense of Community” and “Room/Floor Environment”

The survey identified additional needs, including the following, which are being addressed:

- Promoting personal interactions
- Learning outcomes such as time management, study skills, and problem solving

One of the most significant new programs, implemented in Fall 2010, is the creation of living-learning communities in the new first-year residential area. The four living-learning areas included Leadership, Health Sciences, Automotive, and Hospitality. Each living-learning community received support from Residence Life as well as support from the associated academic area or office. Although the program is new and still being developed, initial feedback indicates that students in the living-learning communities with the highest activity/participation rates, posted higher GPAs, retention rates, and student satisfaction as compared to other on-campus students not living in one of these communities. The following average semester GPAs demonstrate the comparison more specifically:
Health Sciences

- Living-learning members in Fall 2010 – 2.47
- Non-members in Fall 2010 – 2.68
- Living-learning members in Spring 2011 – 2.76
- Non-members in Spring 2011 – 2.47

Automotive

- Living-learning members in Fall 2010 – 2.8
- Non-members in Fall 2010 – 2.71
- Living-learning members in Spring 2011 – 2.95
- Non-members in Spring 2011 – 2.33

The fall to spring retention rate was 95.5% within the Health Sciences living-learning community and 100% in the Automotive living-learning community. This initiative is being expanded both in terms of the number of living-learning communities and the programmatic offerings for participating students.

**Cocurricular activities** include both service and competitive events tied directly to curricula:

- Plastics majors designing and building replacement light fixtures for the Peter Herdic Transportation Museum’s Pullman railcar
- Student Chapter members of the Society of Manufacturing Engineers (SME) designing, building, and competing in the annual Baja Buggy competition
- Dental Hygiene’s, “Sealant Saturday” for children in the greater Williamsport area
- Physician Assistant and Emergency Medical Services/Paramedic Technician students’ support of the Little League World Series
- School of Natural Resources Management’s student participation in Earth Day Activities for local children
- Horticulture students’ landscaping work with the YWCA and Boy Scouts
- Student members of the Penn College Construction Association (PCCA) assisting Habitat for Humanity in the construction of several area homes in recent years

In addition, a number of student organizations have direct ties to industry and professional organizations, including for example, Society of Manufacturing Engineers (SME), Central Susquehanna Association for the Education of Young Children (CSAEYC), and the American Institute of Architects (AIA).

**STUDENT RECORDS MAINTENANCE AND CONFIDENTIALITY**

Penn College informs students of their rights under the *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)*, as explained by College Policy and Procedure. Dissemination of this information begins during the placement testing process and continues throughout the time that the student is enrolled. The Advisement Center provides information related to FERPA during the parent presentation that occurs while students take placement tests and during Connections in the *Parents as Partners* session, the *Home Away from Home* parent session, and the *Online Resources* student session.
The College goes beyond federal mandates to notify students of their rights under FERPA on an annual basis. The Registrar’s Office coordinates delivery of student e-mail notifications each semester and houses FERPA information on its public website.

Students can give parents/guests different levels of access to academic and non-academic information in the Student Information System (SIS). The level of access (Basic, Full and Complete) determines the type of information parents or guests may access. Faculty and staff designated to have a ‘need to know’ can use the Employee Information System (EIS) to verify the individuals to whom a student has granted access and at what level. This user-friendly resource is extremely helpful for those who regularly receive calls from third parties, usually parents.

**STUDENT COMPLAINTS AND GRIEVANCES**

Penn College has established reasonable procedures for equitably addressing student complaints and grievances.

In December 2010, the College approved the [Academic Fairness Policy and Procedure](#), to codify a long-standing practice of ensuring students’ protection against improper/unfair academic evaluation or treatment. Students who feel that a College faculty member has infringed upon their rights to fairness or verbal expression have the right to submit a complaint/appeal via the Academic Fairness Complaint Procedure. Records of student complaints that are remedied at the dean level are maintained in the school offices; records of student complaints remedied at the final level of appeal are maintained in Academic Affairs.

Student complaints and grievances resulting from harassment and/or discrimination based on a protected class are addressed in the [Student Sexual Harassment Policy](#). That policy and procedure, as well as a new policy and procedure on student harassment and/or discrimination based on protected classification, are currently under review and development. This process is guided by the College’s Coordinator of Title VI, IX and Section 504 (who is also the Assistant Director of Counseling Services). All records of student grievances are maintained in the Counseling Services office.

**SELF-STUDY OUTCOMES**

Penn College’s mission guides the framework for admitting, educating, and serving students’ diverse needs and interests. Ongoing efforts to align programs and services with student needs demonstrate the institution’s commitment to appropriately and effectively support students’ educational pursuits. The College’s approach is proactive and intentional. The Foundations of Excellence® self-study, re-envisioned Academic Success Center, and implementation of FYE 101 are examples of this. Yet, administrators and staff are mindful of the need to balance support with the expectation that students take responsibility for their actions, both in and out of the classroom. The scope and quality of support offered to students provide the resources students need to be successful at Penn College.
Institutional Assessment

right: Students experience applied, real-world training
below: The College proudly displays a great achievement
Pennsylvania College of Technology is among the “top 10” best public, four-year colleges in the north region of the United States, according to the latest rankings of America’s Best Colleges by U.S. News Media Group. Penn College ranked 10th among public colleges and 36th among all “best regional colleges (north)” in the 2012 rankings published by U.S. News & World Report.
Chapter Eight: Institutional Assessment

Standard 7

As an institutional community, how well are we collectively doing what we say we are doing?

Are we fulfilling our mission and achieving our goals?

Do we use the assessment results to improve programs and services?

These key questions from Characteristics of Excellence informed the work of the Instruction and Outcomes Study Group. This group, which was already working as an existing campus committee, Quality through Assessment (QTA), undertook the self-study assignment of Standards 7, 11, 12, and 14 and collaborated with the Student Admissions and Support Study Group on Standard 13. QTA – identified as the assessment oversight group in 2006 – grew from the realization that while the then-existing part-time assessment coordinator working with a large assessment committee did create awareness of and commitment to assessment, a lack of significant institutional oversight remained. QTA, through its blend of faculty, senior-level administrators, assessment staff, deans, and department directors, and through its direct reporting to the president, provides that institutional oversight and has yielded a clearer process. Assuming responsibility for the four standards fits QTA’s intended functions.

As noted in Characteristics of Excellence, the self-study may demonstrate compliance with the institutional assessment standard by drawing “conclusions about the institution’s overall achievement of its key goals” (25). Moreover, Characteristics notes that institutions “may create a bridge between two separate sets of documents, one for... student learning and one for the aspects of institutional effectiveness” (27 & 65). Such is the approach taken in this self-study. This chapter focuses on institutional effectiveness; the assessment of student learning is reported in a subsequent chapter. Thus the self-study follows the organizational principle of the College’s assessment handbook, moving from a macro-to-micro approach.

The College defines assessment as an open process encompassing the following principles:

- It is mission-focused, at both the institutional and programmatic levels.
- It is systematic, iterative, collaborative, documented, and adaptable.
- It applies multiple measures, qualitative and quantitative, direct and indirect.
- It identifies strengths and areas that warrant improvement.
- It informs planning and decision-making for the purpose of ascertaining learning and development, thereby improving programs, services, functions, performance, and the overall value of the educational experience. (The Penn College Plan and Process)

Penn College has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards. The results of that process demonstrate the College compliance with Standard 7.

The effectiveness of the institution is the sum of all those parts; the assessment thereof is detailed within The Penn College Plan and Process 2010-2013, the assessment handbook (Exhibit 8.1).

The Penn College Plan and Process clarifies the symbiotic relationship between institutional effectiveness and student learning in the chart on the following page (Figure 8.2). In addition, unit plans include action on the plans’ outcomes (Exhibit 8.2 includes a sampling of current plans). The assessment schedule is in sync with the budget development cycle, thereby tying planning, assessing, and budgeting into a unified
whole. Ultimately, the “Annual Assessment Report” required of the various units provides an accounting of that unit’s assessments and resulting actions (Exhibit 8.3 includes a sampling of the 2010-11 reports). QTA and the office of Assessment, Research, and Planning (ARP) function as the reviewers/overseers of the assessment activity, while the vice presidents ensure the completion of annual assessments at the cost center/department level. An annual comprehensive report goes to President’s Council and to the Board of Directors; key pieces are added to the College website.

Figure 8.1: Chart demonstrating relationship between institutional effectiveness and student learning; source: *Penn College Plan and Process*. 
THE FOUNDATION OF EFFECTIVENESS: EMPLOYEES

Hiring practices, initial required assessments, and ongoing performance appraisals ensure that all employees maintain the commitment to the College mission, core values, and goals. Exhibit 8.4 includes the collection of appraisal instruments applied within each employee category. For cost center supervisors, the College periodically conducts the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) leadership assessment, by which a supervisor’s direct reports evaluate the supervisor’s performance. That input coupled with two levels of supervisors’ review provides useful information regarding performance, and more importantly, helps to identify continuing professional development options/opportunities. For internal review, the ARP portal site includes summaries of the 2010-11 IDEA survey results by employee group.

As noted elsewhere, faculty performance is reviewed via a different schedule. Exhibit 6.10 includes all the related instruments as well as the Faculty Evaluation/Development Plan handbook. The feedback of students and supervisors provides probationary faculty, the on-cycle non-probationary faculty, and adjuncts with concrete information on performance and areas in need of improvement. The opportunity to benchmark student input against that of other faculty has been especially useful (Exhibit 8.5).

Among the questions asked and statements posed at the January 2011 all-College meeting was My supervisor’s review provides useful suggestions and feedback that help me to satisfy the responsibilities of my position. The 273 unqualified positive responses of the 342 entered suggest that the system is working as intended.

Additional, albeit indirect, feedback comes from other sources, including institutional surveys (Exhibit 8.6 provides a full set of those surveys) and some commercially prepared instruments like NSSE and CIRP; though focused on a service area or on a specific item, the responses include commentary on College staff. For example, information about faculty accessibility and faculty feedback to student work can be gleaned from the responses to NSSE’s Student-Faculty interaction questions. Similarly, the Supportive Campus Environment questions reference administrative personnel; Penn College freshmen and senior responses outscored both the selected peers and the NSSE cohort on the 2010 instrument. (Exhibit 8.7 includes the full set of NSSE data for 2006, 2008, 2010). For all surveys, the results are available on the portal; moreover, significant findings are conveyed to President’s Council members who share feedback within their units.

Penn College was named in the Chronicle of Higher Education 2009 Great Colleges to Work For. The primary basis for this recognition is employee feedback, which demonstrates the positive attitude of faculty/staff. Penn College joined nine other medium sized colleges on the 2009 Honor Roll. Achievement of Honor Roll status rests upon the number of times the College was listed in individual recognition categories. Key categories in which Penn College overwhelmed both its peers-in-size and in the baccalaureate Carnegie classification are the following:

- Job Satisfaction/Support
- Career Development, Research & Scholarship
- Compensation & Benefits
- Facilities & Security
- Policies/ Resources & Efficiency
- Connection to Institution & Pride
- Confidence in Senior Leadership
- Respect & Appreciation (Exhibit 1.4 includes the full summary report)
As significant is the Teaching Environment criterion, which is defined as the balance of teaching, service, and research and appropriate recognition of innovative and high quality teaching. Penn College had significantly higher scores than its peers in size and in its Carnegie class.

Bearing out the Chronicle’s findings is the length of employee service as the following table demonstrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>&lt; 1</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>&gt;25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1: Years of service: full-time employees as of 2010-11.

The strength of the College’s employee base has been affirmed through a variety of surveys, and the College remains committed to maintaining that strength via its extensive performance appraisal mechanisms as well as its robust professional development program.

### ONGOING REVIEW AND SUPPORT

*The Penn College Plan and Process 2010-2013* references the linkage of an organizational unit’s mission, goals, and objectives; the connectivity to planning and budgeting; and the relationship between units. Exhibit 8.2 includes several unit plans from both the academic and non-academic areas. As a separate item, the Marketing Plan (*Exhibit 8.8*) stands as an example of the variety of approaches taken. Given the institution-wide impact of marketing, the outcomes/update report is posted on the portal as information. The initiative-based Strategic Plan serves as the umbrella instrument for all other plans; it also includes an assessment component as detailed in Chapter Three.

The College’s public website includes information on planning and assessment as well as outcomes, but at varying levels. Some units, QTA among them, include annual goals as well as a report on goal accomplishment at year end (*QTA public website*). Academic program websites include the program goals and executive summaries of program reviews. For other units, the outcomes information remains within the unit and/or is shared via the portal. College-wide matters are shared with appropriate constituencies: Board of Directors, Corporate Advisory Board, major advisory committees, accrediting organizations.

Data-driven/evidence-based decision-making remains a key institutional strength, as examples below attest:

- Reconfiguration of counseling and career services resulted from studies by both an external consultant and an internal planning group.
- Changes in purchasing levels/approvals resulted from input of supervisors.
- Revised academic policies, ranging from course repeat policy to academic dismissal, result from review of student performance over time; the most recent example affects the Developmental Semester as reported in later chapters. The change came after careful review of longitudinal data.
- Restructured Human Resources office and creation of Employee Relations area with responsibility for professional development were based on recognized inefficiencies as well as growth in professional development requests/needs (see Exhibit 6.8 for full listing of on-campus activities, years 2008, 2009, 2010). The office has gathered input from all employee groups.
regarding topics, time of day for scheduling sessions, etc. One recent survey of faculty is included in Exhibit 6.8.

- Termination of specific majors comes out of longitudinal internal and external data (see Exhibit 2.3 for a listing, along with the Curriculum Manual detailing the process).

- Decisions to build, renovate, or repurpose facilities come via Site and Facilities Master Plan (Exhibit 1.2) or from other assessments; a recent example is the 2010 relocation of the Children’s Learning Center. The decision to move resulted from NAEYC and MSA accreditation visit feedback noting a concern for facility security.

- Additional revision of the Penn College Mission and creation of a new position, Assistant Director of Student Activities for Diversity and Cultural Life, were outcomes of FoE activity and recommendations as well as from other evidence as referenced in other chapters.

- Additional Learning Communities within student housing for Fall 2011 were the result of the 2010 Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI) survey and a Fall 2010 review of student academic performance (Exhibit 8.9 - EBI results).

- In response to the PRR suggestion to increase benchmarking, additional programmatic accreditations have been pursued; currently, 71 programs have achieved accreditation. Appendix 4 includes a current list of accredited programs.

Institutional support for assessment led to the “Assessment Institute,” a QTA-created professional development program with elementary, intermediate, and experienced tracks for faculty and staff involved in assessment. Each track includes specific topics designed to develop assessment skills/strategies. For faculty, the Institute provides a 16 to 1 valuation for use on the salary system, increasing the “value” of participation and demonstrating the institution’s commitment to assisting those involved in assessment (see Assessment Institute Overview).

The Assessment Plan and Process includes a comprehensive list of Plan Components as a quick snapshot of the various assessment activities related to Institutional Effectiveness.

SELF-STUDY OUTCOMES

Assessment at Penn College has been an evolutionary activity. Over the past 20 years, the approaches and oversight have shifted from part-time assessment directors to committees, to offices, to cost-center supervisors, and back again. Each shift resulted from an assessment of the process in place. As noted previously in this chapter, the need for institutional oversight, in particular, led to the birth of QTA. With each shift, the goal of creating the “culture of assessment” has come closer to reality. The current approach, now in its second year, places shared responsibility on the QTA committee and ARP; the change was made possible by the restructuring of the ARP office and the addition of staff. The handbook (Penn College Plan and Process 2010-2013) and the significant depth and breadth of professional development offerings throughout the year highlight the assessment process and provide assistance with accomplishing authentic assessment. As a visible and collaborative partner in the assessment activities, representative ARP staff work directly with faculty in addition to serving on QTA.

The handbook notes the need to assess the assessment plan and process on a regular basis; that assessment has been completed. In its review, QTA surveyed administrators responsible for assessments within their units, scanned completed assessments, and applied the results of the myriad data-gathering mechanisms related to the self-study process. The results of the review conducted Summer 2011 include the following:
• In a survey of handbook users, 94% agreed or strongly agreed that the handbook helped them better understand the assessment process; 89% noted increased understanding of direct/indirect measures.

• Given that only 47% of Academic Affairs responders found the course template useful, QTA worked toward a revision of that piece.

• A companion “users” manual including content directly related to assessing courses and services will be created for use Fall 2012; the one-page document with links to the appropriate handbook pages will provide a more immediately usable resource.

• Examples of completed templates were added to the handbook and to the manual, further facilitating faculty and staff’s understanding of expectations.

The flow chart on the following page (Figure 8.2) provides a visual of the iterative process in place, demonstrating the means by which institutional assessment is achieved. Compliance with Standard 7 is supported by the results referenced above as well as by the results of the study group’s work. The evidence, and documentation thereof, suggests that the approach to assessment is manageable and effective. In particular, the institution’s addition of staff to the ARP office allows for direct assistance to the schools where the work on student learning outcomes originates.
Figure 8.2: Flowchart illustrating the College’s assessment process.
Educational Offerings and Related Educational Activities
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Workforce Development & Continuing Education Activity

JULY 1, 2010 – JUNE 30, 2011

Noncredit workforce development instruction:

• 6,160 students trained in traditional noncredit courses
• 3,200 students trained in natural gas courses
• 266 students trained in online noncredit courses
• 9,626 total noncredit students trained

Through Pennsylvania’s Guaranteed Free Training program (WEDnetPA), WDCE administered workforce development grants for over 900 companies totaling $8.4 million to train 48,172 employees in FY2010-2011.
Chapter Nine: Educational Offerings & Related Educational Activities
Standards 11 and 13

Do our educational offerings support the College Mission?
Do the educational programs offer appropriate content, rigor, and depth?
Are there clear linkages between the program goals, courses, learning activities?
Do our educational offerings serve the needs of the student population?

These key questions from Characteristics (42) shaped the approach of the study group as it examined not only the curriculum portfolio but also the related areas of for-credit certificate programs, by-distance majors/courses, student work-based learning, developmental courses, library services, and noncredit programming. Responses to the questions shape this chapter, which pulls together the full range of educational offerings, both credit and noncredit. (Other elements within Standard 13 have been added to the chapter focused on Standards 8 and 9.) The research that yielded those responses indicates that Penn College is compliant with the standard regarding Educational Offerings and Related Educational Activities.

EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS: THE MAJORS, THEIR INCEPTION

Penn College’s mission and values drive curricular decisions. Of particular importance are its commitment to provide “comprehensive hands-on technical education at the baccalaureate and associate levels” and the value placed on “Hands-on Education and Business and Industry Partnerships.” The College’s “degrees that work” catchphrase is also evident in the curricular decisions.

Within the eight schools reside 100 majors, two of which are as old as the College in its original incarnation: Machining and Automotive. As much as the mission has remained focused on “technical” education through the decades, so too has the commitment to maintain the majors’ currency and to provide teaching-learning resources that assist in the delivery/student mastery of the program content. As research identifies business/industry improvements, the majors keep pace. The “green” movement, for example has yielded new majors like Building Science and Sustainable Design. The majority of the current majors (e.g., Aviation, Welding, Construction) (Exhibit 9.1 lists the 2011-12 majors) have their roots in the College’s predecessor institutions, Williamsport Technical Institute (WTI) and in Williamsport Area Community College (WACC). For other majors, the “roots” have given way to technological change, as seen in the Advertising Art and Graphic Design majors, which stand on the shoulders of their precursor, Sign Painting.

As the College’s history documents, preparation for employment has consistently been part of the mission as have the business-industry partnerships (see Exhibit 9.2, Were You There: The Evolution of a College Campus). The latter include industry-based majors like the Caterpillar emphasis of Heavy Construction Equipment Technology and the Ford ASSET emphasis of Automotive Technology, as well as the recruitment of industry representatives on the program advisory committees (Exhibit 9.3 includes the handbook for committee members, and a current roster of members may be found on the College’s website). An example of advisory committee engagement is seen in the Automotive Technology Management program goals, which were reviewed and revised with input from industry and academic experts within that program’s advisory committee (Exhibit 9.4).

From inception, majors undergo physical as well as academic upgrades. Buildings give way to new buildings, green space, or parking lots; equipment shrinks in size; new equipment requires differently
configured physical space; enrollment requires additional laboratory space; a new course requires a dedicated computer laboratory; etc. Although this type of evolution is commonplace on every college campus, the sheer number of technical programs at Penn College makes those needs more noteworthy. During the 2002 accreditation site visit, the team asked the same question of multiple groups and individuals, phrasing it differently to ensure that what they came to understand was indeed accurate: if a faculty member demonstrates need for a specific teaching-learning “tool,” the need will somehow be met. The team found the answer to be a consistent “yes” across campus in 2002; the same is true now. When the College’s ability to meet such needs is hampered by internal policies or practices, they too evolve. One example is the purchase of used equipment, which was historically avoided due to a concern about its longevity; the purchasing rule now requires that the equipment’s “shelf life” is reasonable. Thus, the Forestry program was finally able to purchase a logging truck, which had been prohibitively priced as a new item.

Exhibit 9.5 provides the equipment inventory list for one program cluster: Machining/Manufacturing. The listing includes year of purchase and cost as a means of providing a glimpse of the scope of instructional equipment supporting the academic programs; in this instance, instructional equipment has a total value of $4,268,883.18. In addition, 43 computers ($67,731 value) support the program, running software at a cost of $47,590. Thus for this program area, the College provides $4,384,204.18 in laboratory instructional support.

Decisions about instructional equipment – either to upgrade, add, or replace – come from the faculty, often with advisory committee recommendation:

- Curriculum proposals (new and significant revisions) include equipment lists; rationales, tying equipment to instructional needs are included.
- Major Equipment List (MEL) system maintains the intended purchase list, allowing acquisition as budget or grant funds become available.
- Assessments are included as part of program reviews, and program accreditation identify needs.
- Workstation reviews (assessment of lab adequacy) conducted in accord with the PCEA Agreement can identify needs.

Program faculty identify relevant software and arrange for availability in labs; they also provide the rationale for upgrades and additions. Advisory committee recommendations as well as industry standards determine need; the intent of upgrades is to ensure students’ employability, a significant intended outcome.

Table 9.1 translates annual equipment additions into dollars and cents, by funding source and year. Two variants warrant explanation: the 2008-09 grant funding downturn reflects an internal programming error; a change in the funding source had occurred, but was not accurately reflected in the computer system. In 2009-10, the significant increase in College-funded equipment reflects the needs connected to the Stage X building program, including the creation of new labs and the retrofitting of existing labs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Funded</td>
<td>$456,337.87</td>
<td>$517,993.89</td>
<td>$328,687.87</td>
<td>$410,072.74</td>
<td>$398,226.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funded</td>
<td>359,432.25</td>
<td>442,367.44</td>
<td>94,081.92</td>
<td>424,041.19</td>
<td>368,004.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>228,820.01</td>
<td>409,966.27</td>
<td>485,298.28</td>
<td>566,662.04</td>
<td>286,875.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Additions</td>
<td>$1,044,590.13</td>
<td>$1,370,327.60</td>
<td>$908,068.07</td>
<td>$1,400,775.97</td>
<td>$1,053,106.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1: Instructional equipment funding by type and year.
Student access to computers remains at a 3 to 1 (students to computer) ratio. Four primary open labs exist in three buildings, with a total of 143 computers available. In addition, the library reference area holds 40 desktop computers, and 30 laptops are available for student use within the library. Discipline-specific software is installed on these computers (e.g., AutoCAD) to allow students access outside of class/lab hours.

In addition, approximately 1,038 student-use computers are available in 54 program-focused computer labs across campus; another 265 computers are integrated into the technical labs and shop areas; and 22 mobile computer carts, with 267 laptop computers, are available for use in classrooms.

Information Technology Services (ITS) maintains the budget for computer hardware/software; it has established a four-to-five year replacement cycle for the 1,833 computers for instruction and student use (replacing 400-500 computers annually) at an annual cost of $450,000 to $500,000. ITS also oversees software purchases/costs for academic applications; the annual cost for licenses is approximately $300,000. The ITS portal site not only identifies the open and program labs, but also identifies the software available in those labs. ITS provides help desk services for students and staff, providing computer and network-related assistance to support both traditional and distance/online courses.

Need and budget determine hardware replacement. Employee computers, for example, are replaced on a five-to-six year cycle. Computer labs are on a four-year replacement cycle; high-end labs (e.g., labs supporting the Civil Engineering and Manufacturing programs) will have a shorter replacement cycle. They require CPU-intensive software necessary to provide industry-standard learning opportunities.

The process by which a new curriculum is introduced is simplified for Penn College because state agency approval is not among the requirements. However, internal processes for developing and reviewing new curriculum are appropriately thorough. The Curriculum Manual (Exhibit 6.13) specifies the required research and detail on all aspects of a new major, including academics, facilities, equipment, and staffing as well as thorough needs assessments and fiscal analysis. The levels of review, culminating with the approval of the president, ensure that program duplication is avoided and that legitimate need for the addition exists. Significant curriculum revisions require similarly intensive work. The Curriculum Manual includes all pertinent information for the faculty and for the reviewers. Exhibit 9.6 includes the proposal for a recently approved new major – A.A.S. in Renewable Energy Technologies. Every proposal for a new and revised major requires an explanation of its “Relationship to College Mission/Philosophy/Goals.”

RANGE OF AVAILABLE CREDENTIALS

Baccalaureate and associate-degree majors account for the majority of enrollment (43.8% and 50.4%, respectively, in Spring 2011); in addition to these two credentials, Penn College offers 13 certificates in special fields of study and 9 competency credentials. The former require minimal general education: a course in communications and one in mathematics, both of which are at a lower level than college-transfer-level work. The competency credentials are designed to be completed in one semester. Both the certificates and the competency credentials derive from the existing majors and provide an avenue for gaining employment or sitting for certification examinations. Examples include:

- The Financial Planning competency credential includes six courses; upon their completion, students are eligible to sit for the Certified Financial Planner certification.
- The Early Childhood Director credential provides a distance learning option for early-age educators who lead a program or aim to direct a program.
- The Paramedic Technician certificate can be completed in four semesters, enabling completers to sit for the Emergency Medical Technician examination required for certification as an EMT-Paramedic.
The Nurse-Health Care Paralegal Studies certificate requires an earned associate’s or bachelor’s degree in nursing or in some other health sciences field. Completers are positioned to function in legal-related offices/services requiring medical expertise.

Enrollment in certificates and competency credentials remains light; for Spring 2011, 2.8% of the total enrollment was in certificate majors; 16 students were enrolled in competency credentials.

**PROGRAM REVIEWS**

The program review process requires the faculty to demonstrate the program’s “centrality to mission” and to apply data to the assessment of the major or cluster of majors. As with institutional assessment, the approach to and the reporting of program reviews have evolved. Portfolio reviews, the precursor to program reviews, had existed for the chief purpose of examining the fiscal impact of a major or cluster of majors. Program reviews, focusing on non-fiscal matters, were added as companion pieces; thereafter, program reviews encompassed both fiscal and academic impacts and underwent a series of designs. The current approach (revised in July 2010 and re-revised in November 2011) is provided, as an outline in Appendix 5. Exhibit 9.7, includes a sampling of completed program reviews from 2010-11 as well as a collection of reports specifying the actions taken as a result of 2009-10 program reviews. (The exhibit also includes a sampling of program reviews that followed earlier formats and guidelines.) The current approach includes fiscal information that often translates to budgeting for staff, facility improvements, equipment, and/or software. Among the proposed program changes from the 2009-2010 reviews are the following:

- Curriculum in the Automated Manufacturing/Machine Tool Technology majors is being updated; for example, the topic of Six Sigma will be added in automated manufacturing courses. The Six Sigma quality plan will add another employability layer for graduates; as the number of Six Sigma certifications continues to grow, grads will be positioned to gain the certification. The curriculum is scheduled for Summer 2012 revision to incorporate Six Sigma in one or more courses; the school budget will provide curriculum development funds for that project.

- The Physical Fitness Specialist major will seek Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Programs (CAAHAP) recognition; work on the self-study will continue in 2011-12. Data to determine the major’s readiness to satisfy CAAHAP’s requirements for accreditation is being collected and analyzed by the faculty who are using both historic data and current student/graduate performance data in their assessment.

- The review of Business Administration: Small Business and Entrepreneurship Concentration led to the elimination of that concentration (approved by Curriculum Committee Sept. 2010); declining enrollment as well as limited job opportunities led to that decision. In its stead, a Small Business minor was developed to serve a number of majors.

The program review schedule permits changes/needs to be considered for the subsequent year’s planning activities and budget development; the **Penn College Plan and Process** provides a visual of that timing, shown in the following chart:
As part of the formalized Program Review, the program’s goals are re-examined and are affirmed or revised. The “coherence” template connects the major courses with the program’s goals and provides a means of checking rigor and depth; it also notes a major course’s support for one or more of the goals of the core curriculum. The role of advisory committees in the program review lends objectivity to the process; as noted earlier, the Automotive Technology Management materials demonstrate the level of involvement.

As the number of accredited programs has continued to grow (currently at 71), the number of accrediting bodies has also grown (currently 36). Program accreditation decisions are determined by school administrators with faculty; in all instances, the choice of accrediting agency includes a review of the “fit” with the major. For example, rather than ABET accreditation, HVAC faculty chose Partnership for Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Accreditation (PAHRA) because of its relationship to program-specific goals. PAHRA also provides an industry-based assessment piece, a competency exam required for all students at the end of their second year of study. The nationally normed test results have yielded curriculum adjustments, equipment allocations, and staff development. Appendix 4 includes the list of accredited programs. Accredited majors complete specific, provost-identified sections of the Program Review in addition to their self-studies.

The Assessment, Research, and Planning Office’s (ARP) role in program reviews has been formalized, and an ARP staff member works directly with the school personnel completing the review. That assistance includes data mining and analysis assistance as well as the creation of single-use surveys when data is not immediately available. Moreover, that office is the official repository for all program accreditation materials, thus ensuring maintenance of the files over time as well as the ability to schedule the work involved.
As a matter of standard practice, student learning outcomes are included within course abstracts (the official documentation of an approved course; see Curriculum Manual) as well as faculty syllabi. The portal provides school/faculty access to syllabi. Students may view syllabi on the Student Information System and in ANGEL. The chapter detailing the institution’s response to Standards 12 and 14 contains more detailed information on the assessment connected to courses.

**DISTANCE (ONLINE) MAJORS AND COURSES**

Whether delivered face-to-face, online, or a combination thereof (hybrid), the major and courses are the same in description, outcomes, rigor, and faculty preparation; moreover, the faculty undergo the same level of evaluation. Such was the decision when distance offerings were explored in 1996. The first major chosen for online delivery – Technology Management baccalaureate – represented a second commitment: to serve students who have earned an associate’s degree in a technology field. The nine majors currently available via distance education are identical to face-to-face majors. The courses available in a distance format also serve students in traditionally delivered majors/courses by offering an alternative to time spent on campus, which is especially attractive for employed nontraditional students.

Current data on distance course work (2010-11 enrollments) includes:

- 220 courses are approved for distance delivery.
- Nine majors:
  - Technology Management (B.S.)
  - Applied Health Studies (B.S.)
  - Automotive Technology Management (B.S.)
  - Dental Hygiene (B.S.)
  - Gaming and Simulation (B.S.)
  - Health Information Management (B.S.)
  - Nursing (B.S.)
  - Web Design and Multimedia (B.S.)
  - Web and Interactive Media (B.S.)
- Six hybrid courses support both face-to-face and distance majors:
  - ABM 310 & 450 (Automotive)
  - IAS 311 (Information Security)
  - CIT 220 (Civil Engineering)
  - AVC 496 (Aviation)
  - MGT 315 (Business)
- Online course offerings numbered 60 in Fall 2009; 74 in Spring 2010; 53 in Summer 2010.
- Beginning in 2001, 186 students have graduated from by-distance majors.

The Office of Instructional Technology assists faculty with all technology-related needs and is responsible for ensuring that the online services are appropriate. The current 50 to 1 (faculty to instructional support personnel) ratio allows for that service; the staff assist faculty with the creation of instructional materials as well as respond to concerns about the technology. Instructional Technology also oversees the use of ANGEL, including providing the necessary faculty development.
• Number of courses using ANGEL: Fall 2009 - 576; Spring 2010 - 600; Summer 2010 – 91, Fall 2010 – 867, Spring 2011 – 822, Summer 2011 – 109, Fall 2011 – 873.

• Approximately 30 professional development ANGEL sessions are offered every academic year.

A review of grades and completion rates indicates no appreciable difference in student performance between distance courses and the same face-to-face courses. Moreover, comparing the two delivery methods, distance courses resulted in more A’s and a larger percentage of completers (see Exhibit 9.8 for supporting data). Faculty note the enrollment of nontraditional (by age) students as one reason for the grade difference and completion rate, which mirrors student performance (traditional versus nontraditional) found in face-to-face classes.

In short, distance and face-to-face differ only in their delivery systems; requirements of the major, syllabi, course outcomes, pre-and co-requisites, and assessments are the same. Moreover, students are made aware of the regulations regarding financial aid for distance course work when they consult with their faculty advisers and when they use online scheduling.

The ANGEL system utilizes username and password authentication through a secure server to verify student identity and ensure system integrity. Faculty use Turnitin and other methods to identify and address academic dishonesty.

A Distance Taskforce was re-convened Spring 2011 to consider the recently-drafted MSA Guidelines. The Taskforce, comprising faculty and staff working with the associate vice president for instruction, identified areas for further review. The self-study group deemed the areas to be reviewed significant enough to warrant a recommendation.

Recommendation Two

While Penn College is in compliance with the Distance Education Programs: Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education (Online Learning) document, a number of related areas have been identified as appropriate for additional study/implementation. Retaining the current Distance Learning Taskforce through the next academic year will allow the continuing focus on these areas:

• Developing a formal philosophy and purpose that encompasses course-level and programmatic approaches to developing, offering, and supporting distance learning at Penn College.

• Publishing a current and effective Distance Learning Guidelines handbook for faculty and administration reference.

• Creating a presence on the website and student portal site to support effective communications about distance learning courses, programs, support services, and contact information.

• Providing focused professional development for faculty and administrators, on both pedagogical and technical matters, which allows accurate assessment of all aspects of distance learning and web-supplemented courses.

• Evaluating and implementing necessary technical support for students and faculty.

STUDENT WORK-BASED EXPERIENCES

Penn College, being strongly focused on workplace skills and career outcomes, considers work-based learning opportunities to be an important component of its academic programs. The experiences are
variously named: internship, clinical, field experience, and practicum, and are managed within the program areas (within this self-study internship is used for all work-based experiences). The designated internship coordinator is a faculty member within the program and is responsible for establishing working relationships between students and employers, developing objectives, and assessing student learning outcomes. While there is not a College-wide requirement within every major, nearly one third of majors require some form of credit-bearing, work-based learning. An equal number of majors include internships as electives within the majors. While there are differences among those experiences, standard College-wide requirements include the following:

- An abstract for every work-based “course”
- Direct faculty involvement in site approval
- Faculty involvement in assessment of student performance
- Compliance with requirements of external accrediting agencies (e.g., Students in the School of Hospitality may participate only in internships supervised by individuals certified by the American Culinary Federation. Similarly, clinical preceptors for Health Science students must hold professional certification.)

The Academic Affairs portal site includes documentation and informational materials for use by the faculty. School portal sites provide resources to students.

Although wide-ranging approaches/differences exist among the work-based experiences available to students, one constant beyond the requirements listed above is faculty involvement:

- Aviation faculty provide on-site training to mentors; the training site is expected to pay the interns.
- The Physical Fitness Specialist program faculty produced an “Employer Guidelines” publication that specifies the responsibilities of all parties and provides assessment templates in addition to a “student Responsibilities” manual (Exhibit 9.9).
- The Applied Human Services internship assessment requires that the faculty, agency/site supervisor, and student meet to assess the experience; the program manual details the process.

Thus, this component of the instructional program is folded into the majors in much the same manner as are distance courses; the work-based experience is ultimately a course, with the same expectations in terms of oversight, outcomes, and assessment as standard classroom courses.

Exhibit 9.10 includes a full listing of required internships, ranging from accreditation-driven requirements as exist in the Health Science majors to industry-driven majors as exist in the Automotive Technology/Ford ASSET major and the Heavy Construction majors. The internships also differ in scope; some require as many as 400 hours (Horticulture) or 560 hours (Applied Human Services), or as few as 240 hours (Diesel Technology). In addition, others require a related seminar, as is the case with Early Childhood Education. Others require regular activity logs and/or “virtual roundtables” whereby students share their experiences with each other and with the faculty via ANGEL or through conference calls.

**INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCES**

The International Programs Office oversees study abroad opportunities and supports international students on campus. For Fall 2011, 66 international students are registered; that number represents continued growth that began after 2008-09’s census of 28 international students. The students must supply financial guarantees and supporting documents in line with federal law and must also demonstrate English language proficiency. Beyond the standard campus tutoring services, international students have access to ESL assistance. Official agreements for groups of students exist with ARAMCO and the King...
Abdullah Scholarship program. The former involves students in the Paramedic major; the latter enrolls students in the College’s HVAC major.

The College offers ten study-abroad opportunities; descriptions and requirements are available on the [International Programs portal site](#). The opportunities include semester-long exchanges with German, Austrian, and Australian colleges. In addition, short-term programs give students the opportunity to travel abroad for one to two weeks while earning course credit. Examples include a Cultural Diversity elective (Japan) and an Art elective (Italy).

**DEVELOPMENTAL SEMESTER/DEVELOPMENTAL COURSES**

Penn College has established entry-level academic standards for acceptance into the College as well as into programs of study. Students whose **placement test** results indicate under-preparedness for college-level work in the basic skills of English, reading, and math are placed into the appropriate course; if there is reason to suspect the accuracy of the placement, students have the opportunity to petition for a re-test. Chapter Seven includes detail regarding placement, transfer credit, and credit for prior learning. Chapter Ten discusses student performance in developmental courses.

The developmental courses, with one exception, do not function as electives but fall outside of the courses required for degree completion; the grades earned, however, do factor into GPA computation. RDG 111 (College Reading, Reasoning and Study Skills) is different from the other developmental courses. Students do test into the course if their Nelson Denney results indicate reading grade levels below 10.7; however, the course is also selected by students who choose to “brush up” on their learning readiness. The chart below provides results of placement testing for the 2010-11 academic year applicants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Placement</th>
<th># of Students (1,820 tested)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Math: 004, 005, 006</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Reading: 001,111</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental English</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2: Developmental placement of 2010-11 enrollees.

*Of 1,992 enrollees (including transfers), 172 were exempt from testing.

While the majority indicated a need for developmental placement in only one area, others had multiple developmental needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Level of Development</th>
<th># of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single developmental</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double developmental</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple developmental</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.3: Breakdown of single and multiple deficiencies for 2010-11 enrollees.

This data indicates that approximately 64% of entering students require some level of developmental course work – a reality replicated across many college campuses. That percentage has increased over the past ten years; in 2001, 51.09% of enrolled students required at least one developmental course. A second indicator of student under-preparedness is Penn College applicants’ SAT scores, which fall below both the national and state mean (64% of Fall 2010 enrollees submitted SAT scores). The institutional
response to the need for developmental education is met through significant student support (see Chapter Seven, focused on Standards 8 and 9) as well as through the developmental courses.

Beginning from their introduction in the early 1970s, developmental courses were maintained within the related academic departments, with department oversight of content and standards. Therefore, Integrated Studies retains oversight responsibility for the three developmental areas of English, reading, and mathematics, as well as responsibility for their assessment. The advantages of this organization are the involvement of content experts in those areas and the assurance that the developmental content supports the college-level course content.

In addition to the developmental courses, the Developmental Semester serves students whose placement tests indicate a need for all three developmental areas. The Developmental Semester was implemented after a study revealed that the attrition of triple developmental students was significantly higher than that of all other entrants. The intent is to focus on the developmental areas to prepare the student for movement into the major of choice. Since the Developmental Semester was first offered in 1996, it has undergone three significant changes as the result of ongoing review that began in 2004:

- While the students were identified with their intended major, seats in the major would not be automatically held; that practice proved to be ineffective especially as the students frequently reconsidered their original choice.
- A 2.0 minimum GPA requirement was added; students who fail to meet that requirement at the conclusion of the developmental semester are not permitted to continue enrollment.
- As the result of the most recent study of the program, students testing into both MTH 004 and RDG 001 are considered low-scorers and are denied enrollment. In addition the ORN course will be revised, and the FYE course added; the changes are to be in place for 2012-13 (Exhibit 9.11).

The Penn College Plan and Process specifies the assessments required of the Developmental Semester as well as of the developmental courses. Specific assessment data on these offerings is included in the chapter on Standards 12 and 14.

**LIBRARY SERVICES**

The past two self-studies included a focus on the library: first, on the need for additional funding to improve holdings and services, and then on the importance of making information literacy a standard part of course work. Both of those recommendations have been accomplished. It is noteworthy that the 2010 NSSE results note significant improvement in responses to the item, “Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources.” The first-year and senior-year responses to that item are stronger than was the case in the 2006 and 2008 NSSE.

In Fall 2006, the Madigan Library was dedicated; with it came additional space for standard library services as well as student study rooms, computer labs, an eatery, programming space, the Gallery, and the Teachers Learning Center. In 2004 Governance approved the required inclusion of an information literacy-related course outcome in every course abstract. A random sampling of course syllabi showed that that requirement is being met.

The library’s three-year plan (Exhibit 9.12) includes goals for collections, instruction, outreach, and assessment. Moreover, each librarian’s individual goals note the intersection of his/her personal goals with the three-year plan; the managers of the five library areas—acquisitions, circulation, document delivery/mail services, and operations/technology services—connect the goals of those areas to the plan, thereby creating a cohesive operational plan.
In addition, the schools’ curriculum development planning includes specification of significant library needs, ensuring that library budgets provide the necessary curricular support.

Service hours average 110 hours/week; fewer or more hours occur in sync with the academic calendar. In addition, staff is available via e-mail to assist students, thereby ensuring service to the distance students. The library staff also provides the following services to students and faculty:

- Conduct information literacy instructional sessions; in 2010-11, more than 3,900 students were served via 243 sessions.
- Provide training on Turnitin, the anti-plagiarism program.
- Host displays within the library along with forums; 47 such activities occurred in 2010-11.
- Collaborate with local partners (city library, Lycoming College, Historical Society), e.g., the NEA’s Big Read and the National Library of Medicine’s Harry Potter project.
- Serve on regional library and archives groups, including Associated College Libraries of Central PA, Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference, and Pennsylvania Library Association.
- Act as “Embedded Librarians” to work within the schools, meeting with faculty and with students as requested; the outreach is especially valuable to the Earth Science and Aviation Center sites. In addition, the librarians are available within the residence halls and in the Writing and Tutoring Centers.
- Make available library-catalogued materials in program areas, including instructional sites apart from main campus.

The following provides current information on the library’s collection profile; the information is accurate as of August 15, 2011. In the 2010-11 fiscal year, $761,089 was expended on collections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print Volumes</td>
<td>126,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Volumes</td>
<td>13,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back volumes periodicals</td>
<td>7,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm reels</td>
<td>16,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print subscriptions</td>
<td>1,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database subscriptions</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online journal titles</td>
<td>28,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference volumes</td>
<td>13,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Audio books</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-books</td>
<td>17,043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.4: Library collection summary by media type.

Since the prior decennial review, the new library has become not only a service facility but also a destination for the campus and for the area. Table 9.5 documents the “before” and “after” in terms of space and features. The library continues to be a partner in the College’s educational offerings; the increase in activity represents an increase in budget and staffing—an institutional commitment.
Table 9.5: Comparison of facility and usage between previous library space and new Madigan Library.

When coupled with assessments referenced in the Chapter focused on Standards 12 and 14, the data above—in particular the reduced number of library instruction classes—initiated conversation among the library staff about increased outreach to faculty teaching writing-intensive courses and capstone courses, including offering sessions tailored to their needs.

**WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT & CONTINUING EDUCATION**

**Workforce Development & Continuing Education** (WDCE) supports the College’s mission by providing quality training and consulting services to the region’s workforce. A strong tie to credit programming occurs with shared state-of-the-art equipment and the availability of full-time faculty as instructors, as well as contracted employees (in 2010-11, 59 faculty taught noncredit courses). Courses are developed cooperatively to meet the needs of business and industry and the community in rapidly changing technological and organizational environments. In the past ten years, WDCE has directly trained over 75,000 students. It maintains a statewide presence by administering various workforce and economic development programs that annually impact over 45,000 employees in over 1,100 companies. WDCE currently has funds under management exceeding $11,000,000.

Annually, WDCE conducts over 600 classes and trains over 5,000 students. Approximately 50 percent of these students are enrolled in noncredit courses on both main campus and North Campus. Courses are generally taught during evenings, weekends, or when classrooms and labs are not in use by degree-seeking students. Approximately 697 additional courses are available online.

While WDCE courses typically do not carry academic credit, some are transferrable into credit programs. For instance, WDCE offers a four-day class through the Textron Lycoming program that degree-seeking students can also enroll in as a 2-credit elective. Similarly, students who graduate from the noncredit Licensed Practical Nursing (LPN) program and who pass the LPN exam are awarded 13 credits upon entry into either the BS or AAS nursing degrees.
Assessments of the noncredit courses are conducted via an end-of-course evaluation; feedback is used to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructor, textbooks, and to gather new ideas for future and new programs. In long-term programs (e.g., Medical Assisting, Practical Nursing), feedback from end-of-course evaluations are reviewed, as well as performance on national certification exams (e.g., National Council Licensure Examination/NCLEX).

WDCE has approximately 50 full-time employees operating out of six geographically dispersed locations. WDCE administers specialized programs and services, some of which are described in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs/Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **WEDnet**                               | **WEDnet** is Pennsylvania’s largest guaranteed free worker training program. In addition to managing WEDnet, Penn College is also one of 32 colleges and universities that offer this free training. Funding is provided by the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development through its Customized Job Training appropriation. Training opportunities include:  
  - Basic skills training to improve the skill level of employees by introducing basic, entry-level work skills required for success.  
  - Information technology training (intermediate and advanced) to advance the skills of information technology employees. |
| **Lycoming Piston Engine School**         | Penn College has been solely authorized by Lycoming to conduct the Piston Engine Service School. Two courses are designed for Lycoming engine owners, operators, A&P mechanics, instructors, and students, and are conducted at Penn College’s aviation facility. Four "road schools" are also offered each year. These schools have been conducted in many states and countries, including Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Alaska, California, Florida, Indiana, and Minnesota. |
| **Marcellus Shale Education & Training Center (MSETC)** | Marcellus Shale Education & Training Center (MSETC) is a collaboration between Penn College and Penn State Cooperative Extension to supply community and industry resources. MSETC currently offers 22 courses applicable to the oil and gas industry. These courses range from general information, such as Marcellus Shale Development and Production Overview; to specific content areas, such as Rough Terrain Forklift Certification, Commercial Driver (CDL) Training Specific for the Oil and Gas Industry, and Rigging and Hoisting. The most significant of these is the PEC Basic-SafeGulf/SafeLand Orientation. |
| **ShaleNET**                             | **ShaleNET** is a coordinated network of industry, the public workforce system, and training providers, founded by Penn College, Allegheny Conference on Community Development, Pennsylvania Independent Oil and Gas Association, and Westmoreland County Community College. In a three-year period, ShaleNET will serve 69 counties and 15 Workforce Investment areas. It expects to serve 4,500 workers throughout the Marcellus Shale region, conferring 850 natural gas industry-related certificates, providing on-the-job training, and placing 3,000 workers with some natural gas-related training into employment in the industry. |
| Weatherization Training Center (WTC) | The **WTC** offers competency-based training courses for persons employed by or subcontracted to nonprofit agencies and local governments administering home energy conservation assistance under the Weatherization Assistance Program. Since its inception in 1985, more than 8,000 individuals (2,000+ since 2009) have participated in WTC courses and training events. The WTC is funded by the U.S. Department of Energy and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. |
| Plastics Manufacturing Center (PMC) | The Plastics Manufacturing Center (**PMC**) is one of the top plastics technology centers in the nation for research, development, and education related to injection molding, extrusion, blow molding, rotational molding, and thermoforming. The PMC offers members access to industrial-scale process equipment and extensive material testing laboratories (valued at $2 million), training programs, consulting, and student interns and graduates. The PMC also shares equipment and lab space with for-credit programs. This allows student and faculty access to equipment and processes that might not otherwise be available though the academic program alone. |
| Factory Built Housing Center (FBHC) & Modular Housing Training Institute | The Factory Built Housing Center (**FBHC**) serves three primary sectors of factory-built housing: modular, manufactured, and panelized. Through WDCE, the FBHC offers AutoCAD Premier Training, customized job training, and economic development and assessment services for business and industry. The FBHC offers 17 courses in addition to the AutoCAD training. An important entity within the FBHC is the Modular Housing Training Institute, which provides training, education, and research to the modular construction industry. |
| Industrial Modernization Center (IMC) | The **IMC** is an independent, publicly funded economic development organization that receives its primary operating funding through the federal Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) program and through Pennsylvania’s Department of Community & Economic Development (DCED). The IMC is one of seven Industrial Resource Centers (IRCs) operating in Pennsylvania. The IMC’s client base is primarily organizations in the manufacturing sector and the IMC provides support services to help small to mid-size manufacturers with services including information technology, facility management, market development strategies, and performance improvement. |
| Product Innovation Center | The **Product Innovation Center** is a partnership between WDCE and IMC, Inc. to provide product development and consulting expertise in selected technologies. The Product Innovation Center services include new product design and development services, technology transfer services, patent research and support, and rapid prototyping. |
| Autodesk Authorized Training Center | Penn College is also an **Autodesk Authorized Training Center** (ACC) for Autodesk (CAD software). The center offers 26 courses related to Autodesk products. In 2010-11, the center reported training 104 students in Autodesk software and administered 23 certification exams. The ACC also placed or hired eight student interns for project work. |
Teacher Development Center

The Teacher Development Center (TDC) is a consortium of providers with a mission to provide substantive, relevant experiences and services for professional educators or administrators seeking to stay on the cutting edge of new technology, optimize teaching methods, and master support skills. Members are Penn College, Outreach for K-12 at Penn College, the Workforce Development and Continuing Education Office, and the Pennsylvania Housing Resource Center (PHRC).

The TDC also assists school districts in:
- Conducting community and labor market needs assessments
- Assessing teacher professional development needs
- Developing customized courses
- Facilitating strategic planning processes
- Providing National Occupational Competency Testing Institute (NOCTI) testing

Table 9.6: Workforce Development & Continuing Education programs and services.

K-12 OUTREACH

The Outreach for K-12 Office provides services to school districts, educators, and students through relationships with federal, state, and regional funding agencies. The office has secured $1.9 million dollars of funding in the last three years. A sampling of the major accomplishments and activities of the office include:

- Organizing dual enrollment for high school students using two models:
  - Penn College NOW is a concurrent enrollment model of dual enrollment, providing college-level course work within 23 participating high schools. Accredited by the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (the first in the state and only one of 55 colleges in the nation to have this accreditation), Penn College NOW is in its seventh year of implementation.
  - Dual enrollment in which high school students come to the campus as part of their high school day is a much smaller program at Penn College.

- Conducting two Career Days for middle and high school students annually to participate in hands-on activities and learn an appreciation of technical education – approximate attendance is 1,500 per event.

- Providing leadership and management of the partnership between Penn College and the National Center for Welding Education and Training (Weld-Ed) at Lorain County Community College (OH). Through Weld-Ed, the office has provided leadership for the creation of the national core curriculum for welding technicians.

- Managing a dynamic partnership between secondary schools in 13.5 counties and Penn College under Tech Prep (Perkins Title II) funding for over 19 years. From this partnership emerged such initiatives as dual enrollment, career day, college and career readiness conference, and hundreds of articulation agreements based on articulated competencies. The articulation process is now implemented through an online system.
## ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS/OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL SITES

Penn College has multiple sites that Middle States would define as “additional locations” and “other instructional sites.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Locations</th>
<th>Programs/Courses Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earth Science Center</strong> (ESC), Montgomery, PA</td>
<td>All major courses in certificate, associate, and baccalaureate degree programs in Diesel &amp; Heavy Construction Equipment, Diesel Equipment &amp; Power Generation Technology, Forestry, Heavy Equipment Technology, and Landscape/Horticulture Technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aviation Center</strong> (AC), Montoursville, PA</td>
<td>All major courses in certificate, associate, and baccalaureate degree programs in Aviation Technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Campus</strong> Wellsboro, PA</td>
<td>Non-credit workforce development training offered by the WDCE (includes a non-credit Practical Nursing program resulting in eligibility to sit for the National Council Licensure Examination for Practical Nurses).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Instructional Sites</th>
<th>Programs/Courses Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Automotive Technology Center (AATC), Williamsport, PA</td>
<td>Some major courses in certificate, associate, and baccalaureate degree programs in Automotive Technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC NOW (dual enrollment) sites at 25 high school, career and technology centers, and technical institutes</td>
<td>Various for-credit courses in technical majors (see Exhibit 9.13).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.7: Additional locations and instructional sites.

All programs and courses offered at additional locations and other instructional sites meet the same standards as courses on main campus in terms of development, instruction, and assessment. Furthermore, from a budgeting and planning standpoint, the program and course offerings, as well as facility and staffing, are regularly evaluated in the same manner as those on main campus.

Each additional location/instructional site has an equitable and appropriate level of institutional support. At the ESC, AC, and AATC, students have access to faculty and academic advisers who teach at that location, IT resources, tools and equipment, etc. At the ESC and AC, because students may take multiple courses throughout the day, dining services options are also available. The Madigan Library is located on main campus; however the ESC has its own library/resource area, and the AC has its own reading room, both of which contain hard copy and electronic collections related to their respective programs. Because the majority of courses, including all general education courses, are taught on main campus, some services, including on-campus housing and athletics, are offered only on main campus. Most other support resources (including counseling services, career services, disability services, Academic Success Center services and programs, etc.) are primarily provided on main campus. However, these offices often provide embedded programming, including academic success workshops, career fairs, drop-in times for counseling, etc., at these additional sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Locations/Other Instructional Site</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Adviser Offices</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Earth Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Ed Courses</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Courses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services (All have electronic access)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Labs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Technology (computers, VCR/DVD, projector, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>Yes, limited embedded programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services</td>
<td>Yes, limited embedded programs and Career Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Services (accommodations provided, primary office on main campus)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Services/Tutoring</td>
<td>Yes, limited embedded programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus Housing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Services</td>
<td>Yes, dining unit and vending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>Yes, student organization meeting and events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn College Police patrols</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.8: Resources and services at additional locations and instructional sites.
SELF-STUDY OUTCOMES

The College commitment to “degrees that work” is obvious and can be observed in the following ways:

- a tour of instructional spaces
- a review of the curricula
- a survey of the range of noncredit opportunities and services
- an appraisal of instructional standards, such as the average class size of 16

The care taken in designing the academic offerings as well as the support provided to students and faculty maintains standards, as do the ongoing assessments. Students have access to program goals and the curricular requirements before they matriculate. Technological competence is required via the curricula and supported through the 3:1 ratio of students to computers, along with staff support and the industry-standard equipped laboratories. Care is taken to ensure that students have pre-requisite skills for required courses; moreover, students are supported in their course work through mechanisms detailed in the chapter focused on Standards 8 and 9. The noncredit portfolio extends the industry/business relationships while also serving local, regional, and statewide needs. While this chapter encompasses the Fundamental Elements related to Standard 11, it also includes Elements referenced in Standard 13.
General Education and Student Learning Outcomes

right: President Gilmour presents an award
below: Students make professional connections at Career Fair
Goals of the Core Curriculum

**Communication** – Students will critically evaluate written and oral communication and express themselves in professionally appropriate ways.

**Critical Thinking** – Students will apply critical thinking skills across a variety of academic, professional, and technical disciplines.

**Information Literacy** – Students will recognize when research is needed and have the ability to access, critically evaluate, integrate, and responsibly use the information from a variety of sources.

**Citizenship and Cultural Sensitivity** – Students will possess the knowledge and skills needed to engage in responsible, respectful, and ethical behaviors as individuals and as members of groups in personal and professional environments.

**Physical and Mental Fitness** – Students will apply knowledge of how personal and social well being are integrally linked with maintaining physical and mental health.

**Lifelong Learning** – Students will develop the commitment and skills that prepare them for lifelong learning and adapting to continually changing environments.

**Computing Literacy** – Students will use current and emerging information technologies to research, collect, and organize data; analyze the impact of current and emerging information technologies; and secure personal identity and information assets.

**Quantitative Literacy** – Students will demonstrate the ability to think logically and solve problems using quantitative skills.

**Scientific Literacy** – Students will apply scientific concepts, principles, and thought processes within the various disciplines.

**Art Appreciation** – Students will articulate their critical understanding of and respect for aesthetic principles.
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Standards 12 and 14

Do the goals of the core curriculum draw students into new areas of intellectual experience?
Is there assessment of general education outcomes within the...overall plan for assessing student learning?
Are students learning what we want them to know?

To the above three questions from Characteristics of Excellence is added the fourth question:

How do we know?

This question represents the purpose of assessment: to demonstrate that students are in fact learning what the education professionals have deemed appropriate, and that business and industry as well as the economic/social milieu deem necessary. It is that fourth question that has made assessment a challenge, especially as the traditional/indirect methods need to be supplemented with the direct measures.

As the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) has noted in its publication of two surveys (to both of which Penn College contributed), assessment is “undercapitalized.” Penn College has, however, worked to increase support through stipends for faculty working on voluntary accreditations; external and internal professional development (including stipends for faculty presenters); budget support for commercially/industry-prepared assessment mechanisms; additional staff in the office of Assessment, Research, and Planning; and incentives for completion of professional development.

Chapter Eight focused on Institutional Assessment – the macro level of assessment. Chapter Nine then shifted to educational offerings and learning opportunities outside the formal classroom, moving closer to the key chapter that focuses on student learning. As noted earlier, the macro-to-micro approach taken in the assessment plan is paralleled in the structure of this report.

The discussion that follows, along with the appendices and exhibits, demonstrates compliance with the Standards 12 and 14; two recommendations resulted from the study.

GOALS OF THE CORE CURRICULUM: IDENTIFICATION AND OVERSIGHT

The current ten goals of the core curriculum (see the inside of the divider page of this chapter) were adopted in 2009; they replace the six statements adopted in 2000. The revision came as the result of the 2007 Middle States PRR review, through which it became evident that the then-current statements were limiting. Except for the first goal, focused on communication, the statements were cast in language that made assessment difficult. Moreover, the statements neglected the realities of curricular requirements and/or were expressed in abstract terms. Some deficiencies of the previous goal statements include:

- No direct reference to mathematics, a gross omission, given the technical majors
- Limiting language, e.g., restricting computer use to academic needs
- General terms without clarifying or historic detail that might enable assessment
While assessment of that core did occur, it was focused on assessing specific default courses; the need to assume a more “global” approach required revised goals.

QTA initiated the review, working with the former assessment coordinator, then housed in Integrated Studies. The proposed revision and subsequent versions underwent full review by the faculty – through both hearings and electronic comment - and ultimately moved to Academic Standards & Issues and then to College Council for approval. The use of default courses to satisfy most of the core requirements continues; thus, the Catalog lists courses approved to fit the various disciplines (e.g., communication and scientific literacy). Also continued are differing core requirements for associate and baccalaureate levels.

While the core requirements may be satisfied via completion of approved default courses as noted above, curriculum developers may also request core status for courses within their majors and/or delivery of core competence via aggregated major courses. To do so requires additional formal curriculum review and approval. One example of deviation from the default courses occurred in Construction Management; faculty and dean demonstrated that computing literacy pervaded the major courses and proposed that the students in that major could (and did) demonstrate competence without scheduling a computer course. Such discussions/decisions involve the content experts—in this case, faculty in the Information Technology department. A second illustration involves the Electronics and Computer Engineering Department. The course EET 118 had been added following an assessment project that identified a need for an introductory course. Additional assessments, along with a Fall 2010 curriculum change in the Electronics majors, resulted in EET 124, a course satisfying the computer literacy requirement, applying those skills through an introduction to the electronics field.

Embedding core within the curriculum’s major courses can occur in response to an accrediting body or in response to curriculum design:

- The National Auto Technicians Education Foundation (NATEF), the organization accrediting the automotive programs, requires that ethical practice be “an integral part of instruction.” In addition to requiring an ethics course within the baccalaureate major, ethics is integrated within the service courses in both bachelor- and associate-degree majors.
- The Legal Assistant major follows the American Bar Association’s edict that the program goals must show “Consistency with the general principles of ethical legal practice as promulgated by appropriate authorities in the relevant jurisdiction.” The program goal statements include “identify and respond appropriately to legal ethical issues....”
- The design of the baccalaureate degrees requires a writing-intensive course within the major (a writing-across-the-curriculum approach). In support of that requirement, faculty teaching the WRT course complete a certification seminar. The baccalaureate also requires a cultural diversity-approved course. Both WRT and CUL requirements directly relate to two of the core competencies.

In addition to the default courses and the alternative of approved major courses, the “Assessing Program Coherence” template/part of Program Review identifies major courses that reference core competence in whole or part. Thus, information from multiple sources can be synthesized to answer the Characteristics directive that general education skills and knowledge be integrated and assessed.

Responsibility for core rests with the provost as chief academic officer. The deans’ responsibility for the academic programs within their schools includes ensuring that core is addressed during curriculum development. The Curriculum Committee is responsible for applying core expectations to its review of proposals.

The Goals of the Core Curriculum are included within the online Catalog and are printed in the Academic Majors publication (the latter available as Exhibit 9.1). They are also summarized on the divider page preceding this chapter.
STUDENT MASTERY OF THE CORE

As the current assessment plan was being developed, it became apparent that responsibility for assessing core competence also needed to be assigned so as to ensure a concerted, organized approach. As part of the evolution of assessment referenced in an earlier chapter, the original choice of an assessment coordinator in Integrated Studies, with the responsibility for assessing core, was reconsidered because of other changes. First, the change in core itself and then the changes within the office of Assessment, Research, and Planning (ARP) suggested the need for a more effective and efficient approach. The result is a QTA subcommittee, chaired by the assistant vice president for ARP, with faculty representation from each school (as the NILOA report notes, a common approach). The subcommittee began functioning in 2010 by familiarizing the members with the task before them and then setting a calendar for the three-year core assessment cycle (see attachment to Plan and Process); work toward formal assessments began in 2010, with oversight of this subcommittee.

- Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS) was administered electronically in Spring 2011 to a random sample of 219 students who had earned 45 or more credits. The instrument provided benchmarked data.
- Computing literacy was also assessed Spring 2011 via CSC 124 enrollees; among 42 sections, random sampling identified 210 students who completed the assessment. In this instance, the assessment was directly cross-referenced with the 13 course outcomes; faculty identified 75% as the acceptable accomplishment on each outcome.
- In Summer 2010, English department faculty began to develop a rubric for assessing writing skills; that rubric details qualities of papers that demonstrate exemplary-level skills, 4-year level skills, 2-year level skills, and entry-level skills. Thirteen English faculty applied the rubric to 132 papers from writing-intensive courses within baccalaureate majors so as to measure students’ written communication skills.

The results of these three core assessment activities are available as Exhibit 10.1. Key results are summarized below:

- SAILS results
  - Students out-performed the benchmark on the “Documenting Sources” skill set.
  - The “Evaluating Sources” skill set is an area identified for additional attention.
  - Students performed at an equivalent-to-benchmarks level on seven additional skill sets.

- Computing
  - One outcome was not measurable, given the language of the outcome; therefore, only 12 outcomes were measured.
  - Of the 12, five outcomes exceeded the 75% threshold; of the remaining seven, five closely approached the threshold.
  - Strongest outcome: Use presentation tools to present information professionally.
  - Weakest outcome: Create an online professional presence using an electronic portfolio or other technologies to showcase student accomplishments.

- Writing
  - Interpreting this assessment was difficult in that the papers came from WRT (writing-intensive) courses across the baccalaureate majors and represented a range of assignments – some requiring research and others not; however, the same rubric was applied to the “blind” reading.
On all outcomes except one, the papers scored at primarily a second-year college skill level.

On the exception—“Sources and Evidence” outcome—students performed at the first-year level.

Best performance was on the writing to the “occasion or situation,” which scored at the fourth-year level.

Also a result of the assessment activity, the assessment process itself will be refined to provide comparable samples to which the rubric can be applied.

Those results have been shared with the faculty at large through the schools. QTA, the core subcommittee, Deans’ Council, and faculty studied the results in Fall 2011 and began responding to the deficiencies identified by these assessments. The resulting activities include the following:

- **Information Literacy**
  - Librarians are marketing information literacy classes to faculty who teach second, third, fourth-year courses so as to supplement the first-level classes and facilitate student identification and responsible uses of information.
  - Librarians are working with ARP staff to identify assessment tools for their sessions.
  - A LibGuide for students in FYE classes will include an assessment feature.
  - A new tutorial – Creating a Research Strategy – is being developed.

- **Computing Literacy**
  - Three student outcomes in the CSC124 (Information, Technology, and Society) abstract have been revised; three others have been added.
  - Assignments and quizzes have been directly mapped to the outcomes.
  - A common final examination is in use for all sections of CSC124.
  - MyITLab is used to assess learning of productivity tools across all sections.

- **Writing**
  - A professional development session focused on delivering WRT courses involved 28 faculty who reviewed the blind reading assessment and the rubric.
  - Attendees reviewed the intended course outcomes for ENL 111, 121, 201, 301 as a means of recognizing the focus and scope of instruction/learning that students experience in writing-focused general education courses.
  - Session attendees discussed the need to include more writing within major courses as well as the need for additional professional development opportunities on topics related to incorporating writing in the major.

The Summer 2011 Graduating Students’ Exit Survey (response rate of 37.4%) provided the following indirect assessment of the core curriculum; almost 99% of the respondents reported feeling competent or very competent in the following areas:

- Ability to think critically and analytically
- Understanding of computing literacy
- Understanding of information literacy
- Understanding of the rights and responsibilities of a citizen
• Understanding of personal, physical, and mental well-being
• Ability to think logically
• Ability to apply scientific concepts and principles

In addition, 93% reported that faculty in their majors encouraged them to be active learners and to practice ethical behaviors.

So as to complete two assessment cycles and, thereby, generate the data necessary for sound decisions regarding the recommendation below, as well as to serve the data needs of the next PR&R, the core assessment schedule has been adopted. The following core components will be assessed in 2011-12:

• Citizenship and cultural sensitivity
• Critical thinking
• Physical and mental fitness

Recommendation Three

The review of the goals of the core curriculum shall be undertaken by a to-be identified task force, which will use all available goal assessments in completing its task by December 2016. The provost will determine the membership, timeline, and process and will ensure the involvement/assistance of QTA and ARP.

Given the assessments underway and planned, this review – unlike the previous review, which resulted in the changes/core currently in place – will have significant data to apply in the process. The review will also ensure that the goals of the core curriculum reflect institutional and environmental changes and that their assessment has been thorough.

Thus, the “closing of the loop” is actually a two-part activity: use of the performance data to determine student competence as regards the ten core areas and validation of the core itself. Through these activities, a secondary purpose is achieved: review of the approaches taken to assess core. As Characteristics notes: “Assessment is not an event but a process”; in this instance, the process is likely to yield multiple outcomes.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES – INDIRECT EVIDENCE

In addition to the standard grades and retention, graduation, and placement data regularly collected and reported, the indirect evidence of student learning comes through student performance in competitions, in service opportunities, and in securing industry commendations/scholarships.

Associate-and bachelor-degree retention and graduation data for 2007, 2008, and 2009 are presented in the following tables. The percentages of enrollments shown for the three years are close to those of the 2010-11 year (47.7% associate and 41.6% baccalaureate). The graduation rates exclude part-time and transfer students. Most of the baccalaureate majors are 2 + 2 or progressive professional programs; consequently, the population here reported is different from the actual enrollment, given that these numbers represent the IPEDS-defined population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL-TO-FALL RETENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FALL-TO-FALL RETENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Baccalaureate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.1: Fall-to-fall retention rates for first-time, full-time students.

GRADUATION RATES - ASSOCIATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>Associate (3 Yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.2: Graduate rates for first-time, full-time students in associate-degree majors.

GRADUATION RATES - BACCALAUREATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>Baccalaureate (6 Yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.3: Graduate rates for first-time, full-time students in bachelor-degree majors.

As noted above, the IPEDS-defined graduation rate excludes a significant portion of the enrollment. Additional analysis determined the percentage of entrants who leave the College with an earned degree. The credential may be in a different major or may have resulted in a shift from baccalaureate to associate’s degree.

DEGREES AWARDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Freshmen Head Count</th>
<th>%Degrees Awarded in 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.4: Degrees awarded to first-time, full-time students.

The above detail provides a more accurate picture of students’ degree completion, as it accounts for all enrollees.

In the course of data gathering/review for this self-study, it became apparent that the definitions of student status are often misinterpreted; offices responsible for maintaining records and others across
campus have various definitions for the terms to represent different groupings of students, e.g., “New Major” and “Re-enrollee.” The current terms were developed in 2001; since that time, several changes have occurred. Thus in Fall 2011, a Student Classifications and Retention Team began to provide extended definitions of student status terminology.

Additional data regarding student success comes from the annual Graduate Surveys, which post an 84% response rate. The self-reported data provides placement information, which is important in an institution that touts “degrees that work.” Overall placement is defined as full- and part-time employment, continuing education, and military duty. The data represents graduates’ primary status; therefore, full-time employed while a part-time student would be counted as employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.5: Graduate placement rates (unduplicated count).

Penn College continues its efforts to improve retention and graduation rates. The 2009-10 FoE activity was one step in that direction; the addition of a required FYE course was another, as was the decision to restrict the new housing complex, Dauphin Hall, to first-year students. The “re-visioning” of Academic Support Services undertaken in 2010-11 is yet another as reported in Chapter Seven. These initiatives recognize the significance of a successful first year in moving students toward graduation.

Other indirect measures, including student recognition within their fields of study, are regularly identified, supported, and publicized by Penn College. In all instances, the off-campus experiences are monitored and overseen by faculty to ensure consistency with the majors’ goals as well as the safety of the students for both service projects and competitions. In 2004, the College began providing funding for students engaged in major-related competitions. The following are examples of those competitions in which students participate annually. The 2010-11 results are noted below:

- A team of Building Construction students earned first-place honors at the National Association of Home Builders Residential Construction Management competition in Orlando, and a team of Construction Management students finished second overall in the Associated Builders and Contractors competition in San Antonio.
- Three Penn College students earned honors, including one first place, at Professional Landcare Network (PLANET) Student Career Days, which involved 60 colleges in the competition.
- Two Alpha Chi (honor society for baccalaureate students) members presented papers at the Spring 2011 national convention.

The College also encourages and supports service learning; students apply their skills to “real world” situations as they volunteer their time (repeated returns/ongoing requests are indicative of students’ performance in these venues as are the reviews of the attending faculty). The following activities are a sampling of service learning during 2010-11:

- Construction students developed working drawings and specifications, and built two concrete block dugouts for a Little League field.
Forestry students worked with the Forest Service staff on PA game lands to rid woodlands of invasive plant species.

Physician Assistant and Paramedic Technician students volunteered to staff the medical facilities during the International Little League World Series.

Dental Hygiene students hosted and staffed Sealant Saturday.

Accounting and Business students, in concert with Salvation Army, provided tax preparation services through the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program.

Individual student accomplishment, including industry-supported scholarships, is yet another indirect measure. In some instances, student accomplishment has come through competition; in others, accomplishment is the result of industry experience. The following are examples from 2010-11:

- A junior in the Aviation Maintenance Technology major earned a scholarship from the Aircraft Electronics Association on the strength of an essay focused on new technology improving safety.
- Two Baking and Pastry Arts students won Grand Prizes in the California Raisin Board’s “Best Raisin Bread in America” contest.
- Six students earned Skills USA scholarships.

While course grades continue to function as an indirect measure of student learning, they have additional purposes at Penn College:

- All faculty submit mid-term grades, thereby allowing students time to seek/gain assistance from the faculty and/or academic support services. Interventions, including workshops, focus on improving student performance. Moreover, the grades are included on the students’ scheduling profiles, thus alerting faculty advisers of advisees’ who are identified as “at risk.”
- Aggregated grades for multi-section courses identify problem areas that may call for the addition of prerequisite courses. This occurred, for example, when ongoing student completion rates and grades for General Psychology indicated that reading skills were a significant factor in student success, leading to the addition of the reading prerequisite.

Applying Linda Suskie’s listing from Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide (2nd ed.), other indirect evidence of student learning comes through the following:

- Student self-reported responses on institutional and commercially prepared surveys, including the most recent addition to the institutional instruments: Graduating Student Exit Surveys.
- Student feedback via faculty evaluations.
- Student focus groups generally convened near program end, as is the case in Nursing.
- Alumni and employer donations, which indicate recognition of the College’s success as well as the status of alumni in their fields (e.g., the contribution of three Infiniti vehicles, arranged by a 2008 graduate/Nissan employee, and the donation of a vertical injection mold and hot-runner tool from TYCO Electronics, arranged by a 2004 Plastics graduate).

All of these methods are regularly used on campus and/or within programs.

**Developmental Courses**

As self-studies are likely to do, a close review uncovers shifts in the environment that occurred quietly and incrementally, escaping notice. Such is the case with the matter of entering students’ level of under-preparedness. Chapter Nine includes discussion on developmental courses and the Developmental
Semester, as they represent “Educational Offerings.” Chapter Seven covers pre-matriculation placement testing, which determines the need for developmental course work. The focus in this chapter moves to student performance within the developmental courses.

The level of under-preparedness has increased over time. In Fall 2005, 54% of entering students required at least one developmental course; in Fall 2009, that number rose to 65%. For Fall 2011, the percentage of new enrolled students requiring at least one developmental course is 63%. Under-preparedness is further affirmed by the reality that entering students have submitted SAT scores below both the national and state levels. The College’s open admission policy allows entrance for the majority of applicants, and a variety of support mechanisms are in place to fulfill the institution’s ethical imperative to serve those it admits. As reported in other chapters, the Foundations of Excellence® (FoE) activity, the requirement of the FYE course, the ongoing/review/revision of the Developmental Semester, the retooling of academic support, and the use of learning communities provide assistance to students, with ever-increasing ease of access.

However, in spite of these efforts, student performance in developmental courses has been unsatisfactory and has contributed negatively to retention/graduation rates. Mathematics continues to be a trouble spot as indicated by the following data:

- Of the 262 students who entered in 2005 with a MTH 004 requirement, 111 failed to complete the course in one semester.
- Of that 262 cohort, 32.4% earned a credential within six years: 8-B.S., 66-A.A.S., 11-certificate.
- Of the 327 students who entered in 2005 with a MTH 005 requirement, 148 failed to complete the course in one semester.
- Of that cohort, 38.2% earned a credential: 26-B.S., 92-A.A.S., 7-certificate.

Both MTH 004 (mostly arithmetic/pre-algebra) and MTH 005 (Elementary Algebra I) focus on skills students should have acquired in high school course work.

A second trouble spot is the reading deficiency at the 5.0 – 7.9 reading grade level as determined by the Nelson Denney; students scoring at that level must complete RDG 001, Reading Improvement. (Students scoring below 5.0 are denied admission until they have gained the reading skills that will allow a measure of success in college courses.)

- Of the students testing into RDG 001 in Fall 2005, only 32.7% earned a credential.
- Students completing the course in Fall 2008, 2009, 2010 show an average reading grade level of 8.9 after one semester’s work.
- Of the students enrolled in RDG 001 in Fall 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009, 20% scored high enough (above 10.7) on the post-test to bypass RDG 111.

Fall 2005 students testing into College Reading, Reasoning and Study Skills, RDG 111, (reading grade levels of 8.0-10.7) had stronger persistence: 43.4% earned a credential in six years. However, students in both RDG 001 and RDG 111 were handicapped by their entry-level skills, given that the college textbooks are written at a significantly higher reading grade level, requiring longer time on task.

Students testing into ENL 001, the developmental writing course, persist through graduation at a 39.4% level. Of that same cohort, 48.6% of students testing into ENL 111, English Composition I, earn a credential.

The Fall 2011 results of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) provide insight into student expectations and behaviors; the analysis of that data notes entering students’ attitudes and behaviors regarding academic work. While students come to Penn College knowing what they want to achieve, their
academic preparation and understanding of the rigor of college level work negatively affects their performance. The benchmarked results are being shared during the Spring 2012 semester so as to provide a better understanding of the “input” realities affecting both instruction and student services.

**Recommendation Four**

The data indicates that students who enter the College with a developmental need are immediately at academic risk. At the same time, the College has remained true to its commitment to serve a diverse population and maintain open enrollment.

Collectively, the data suggests the need for closer study, to include the following related elements:

- Realistic levels of academic preparation for majors
- Placement methodology/measures
- Pre-matriculation information regarding performance/expectations
- Academic support
- Related academic policies
- Developmental course design
- Summer enrollments in developmental courses (increasing such enrollment might include adoption of a “conditional acceptance” option)
- Assessment of possible correlation between use of institutional resources (including staff) and success of low-scoring students as well as the efficiencies involved

Specifically, this study group recommends that an ad hoc committee apply all the data gathered in the course of the self-study and identify additional data required to gain a clear and accurate picture of the level of under-preparedness of entering students. Additional points of review may include the College’s curriculum portfolio/academic requirements as well as relevant academic policies and current services. To ensure the adequacy of data to support findings/changes, the study should take a three-year approach.

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES – DIRECT EVIDENCE**

The Suskie listing referenced earlier also includes the “Direct (Clear and Compelling) Evidence of What Students Are Learning”; Penn College collects and applies that evidence on a regular basis within the Academic and Student Affairs divisions. A complete listing of direct and indirect measure can be found in the [Plan and Process](#). The information that follows provides examples of the use of that evidence.

Field experience supervisors regularly rate student skills. Field experience itself includes internships, practica, and clinicals. Exhibit 9.10 provides a listing of major-required experiences. In every instance, the preceptor/work-based supervisor evaluates the student performance as does the student; the exhibit includes examples of the instruments used. The majority of sites are reviewed/approved by the faculty to ensure that the student experience allows the application of knowledge and skills. One example of preceptor-student assessments from the Radiography program focused on the outcome of reducing repeat rates for chest radiographs. Over the two-semester practica, students identified reasons for the repeats and then identified strategies for limiting the repeats (a learning activity that demonstrated critical thinking while refining a program-level outcome); the result was a 1.2% reduction in repeats between the two practica. Some field experiences involve project work for area non-profits; one such
project completed by students in a Landscape Design course was developed to demonstrate student proficiency in the outcomes of the course. The eight students collaborated on a design and plant list and then prepared a formal “presentation portfolio” for the agency.

**Scores and pass rates on appropriate licensure/certification exams** are widely used. In some instances, they are required (in Health Sciences majors for example); in others, they are available to students who choose to follow through. Exhibit 10.2 includes a list of the majors with required and optional exams as well as results. When the exams indicate student weaknesses, faculty consider corrective measures. Examples include:

- **Business Administration students’ performance on the Major Field Test, an ETS product, indicated weakness in specific topics. The faculty determined that the curriculum itself was flawed; the resulting curriculum change added both Business Communications and Qualitative Analysis to the required course work.**

- **Automotive Technology students complete tests in eight Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) certification areas. The test analysis provides percentile scores in each of the eight areas, allowing for benchmarking and a means of assessing the curriculum. One change in 2008-09 resulted from a review of content in two engine classes – Engine Performance and Engine Repair. A duplication of work was discovered, disallowing adequate attention to engine performance tasks. The courses were revised, and the Spring 2011 graduates demonstrated significant improvement in that area.**

- **Students graduating from the Collision Repair major completed N3SA exams, which measure all technical skills. Their performance exceeded the national averages. The weakest area was in paint defects and plastic repair. Both topics are being examined to determine how best to raise performance.**

- **The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 608 Certification test completed by students in Diesel Equipment Technology yielded scores exceeding the benchmarks on each of the eight outcomes assessed. Faculty responded by raising the benchmark and revising homework assignments accordingly so as to challenge the students.**

**Rubrics used to evaluate student work**, including papers, projects, assignments, and tests, provides both formative and summative assessment of student learning outcomes. In most instances, the rubric is provided in advance of the assignment so that students can consider the metrics as they complete their work.

**Capstone presentation or thesis** is a requirement in all baccalaureate majors. The capstones include an oral presentation with time, date, and place announced via an invitation to the campus to attend (in addition to the invitations to advisory committee members). During most presentations, attendees are asked to complete an assessment form. While rubrics are used to evaluate student performance, the assessment forms provide even more response to the student presenter. Faculty teaching the capstones have met as a group to ensure that the focus and scope of the capstones, as configured, are maintained.

**Portfolios** are required in the Graphic Design major and include a campus-wide showing. Portfolios – electronic or hard copy - are recommended in other majors not only as an indicator of student learning but also as an employment-seeking tool. Electronic portfolios are created as part of the senior DSG 424 course for students in Computer-aided Product Design; Early Childhood Education students in EDU 256 submit a portfolio that includes elements identified as key assessments. Students in CHM 101 also develop portfolios.

**Score gains between entry and exit** are gathered and used.

- The placement test for reading is the Nelson Denney, which yields a reading grade level for students. Students who test into RDG 001 (reading between 5.0 and 7.9 grade levels) have the
opportunity to earn credit for both RDG 001 and 111 if the post-Nelson Denney indicates a reading grade level of at least 10.7. A review of five years’ data indicates that 20% of RDG 001 students earn credit for RDG 111. In addition, the pre and post scores on that instrument permitted the faculty to determine that the cut-off scores were appropriate. A study of five years’ pre/post test scores indicates that students gain between 1.5 and 1.8 years’ reading grade levels after one semester in a reading course.

- English Department faculty applied a diagnostic writing sample in all Composition I (ENL 111) sections to check the accuracy of the testing-based placement as well as to check the readiness of students who completed ENL 011. In addition to verifying students’ readiness, the faculty gained a baseline of skill levels on the course outcomes and identified areas for focus.

- Faculty in General Psychology initiated an assessment project focused on course outcomes, using pre and post testing in each of the 29 sections offered in the 2010 academic year. Results are being aggregated and disaggregated by section for faculty review.

**Classroom response systems** are used, with support provided via professional development sessions that introduce the strategy to faculty. The sessions have been co-presented by a faculty-user and an Instructional Technology staffer so that attendees get information on the technology as well as on the course-related uses. In Physics courses, the clickers allow the faculty to help students recognize the errors in their thinking (vital in critical thinking and problem-solving) in addition to enabling the faculty to re-present material. The system also is used to tie students’ responses to course outcomes. Currently, 245 “clickers” and 11 receiving units are available for faculty use.

**Student reflections on their values, attitudes, and beliefs** is a strategy in some majors, such as Human Services. The assignment/paper requires integration of the theory that grounds practice. Most of the capstone projects in that major synthesize theory with the internship and with research completed by the student. Early Childhood Education students complete a personal philosophy statement that speaks to five NAEYC standards. Faculty apply a detailed rubric in the assessment of the students’ work and, in so doing, emphasize the importance of national standards for early-age centers and apply an assessment model students learn to use.

Exhibit 10.3 includes examples of the types of direct evidence of student learning referenced in the narrative.

**SELF-STUDY OUTCOMES**

To return to the four questions that introduced this chapter, the study group offers its overall findings:

The goals of the core curriculum do draw students into new areas of intellectual experience. Among support for this finding are the differences between four-year and first-year responses found in the NSSE results. Moreover, when assessment indicates a weakness, appropriate action is taken as the following example demonstrates. As noted in Chapter 8, for example, when several assessments identified cultural sensitivity as an area of weakness, the College—recognizing that students need to be better prepared to function in a more diverse environment than their backgrounds allowed—refined the College values statements, added a staff member in Student Activities, and planned for additional activities focused on diversity.

As dictated by the **Penn College Plan and Process 2010-2013**, assessment of general education outcomes does occur within the overall plan for assessing student learning. The recommendation to review the goals is itself an outcome of the assessments, as is the recommendation related to the developmental program.
Program reviews, including the required assessment of student performance in major courses, ensure that student learning in the major supports the catchphrase, “degrees that work.” In addition, the collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs in the education process demonstrates an institutional commitment to focus resources on the delivery of the mission and values, in particular, the graduation of students who represent the Penn College values.

Learning is taking place; evidence drawn from multiple assessment measures, including both indirect and direct modalities, supports that assertion, as does the faculty’s use of assessment to improve instruction. Moreover, the cyclical nature of the assessments ensures that assessment is in fact a process, not an event.
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### Glossary

**Academic Success Center:** expanded student services, such as online early-alert referral system, mentoring, increased tutoring access, and a writing center

**Adjunct faculty:** teaching faculty who are hired once and then retained on an “on-call” basis to teach a load that is less than that of full-time faculty

**Advanced Automotive Technology Center:** campus three miles west of the main campus, where major courses focused on automotive technology are taught

**Agreement:** the negotiated contract between Penn College and the faculty association (PCEA) in which faculty load, responsibilities, salary and benefits are delineated

**ANGEL:** the learning management system used by the College to deliver distance learning and web-supplemented courses

**APT:** acronym for Administrative, Professional and Technical employee classification and includes upper level administrators, vice presidents, deans, directors, coordinators and individuals who perform technical functions, such as Information Technology Services staff members and lab assistants

**ARP:** the Assessment, Research, and Planning office, which supports institutional effectiveness by providing information needed for assessment, accreditation, planning, policy analyses, and decision making

**AS& I:** the committee (Academic Standards & Issues) within the College governance system charged with reviewing and making recommendations related to instructional methodology and materials, program evaluation, core competencies/courses/credentials, student retention/probation/termination, and academic standards

**Aviation Center:** campus six miles east of the main campus, where major courses focused on aviation technology are taught

**BCT:** one of the eight schools in the College: the School of Business and Computer Technologies

**Casual Part-Time employees:** employees who may fit into any of the three categories listed (APT, Classified or Service) and who work no more than 18 hours per week (or who work as needed)

**CDT:** one of the eight schools in the College: the School of Construction and Design Technologies

**CICR:** College Information and Community Relations Office, which coordinates and presents College messages, materials and visual images, and implements the College’s Marketing Plan
**Classified employees:** employees who typically perform clerical and other related office work.

**College Council:** within the College governance system, a group of elected and appointed members of the College faculty, staff, and students representing each school and division and each employee category; charges include primary administration of the shared governance system; oversight of the standing committees and subcommittees; and recommendations to the College president on matters of policy and procedure.

**College Governance:** “a College-wide mechanism for input into shared planning, decision making, and evaluation through elected and appointed representatives of faculty, staff, and students” (from the mission statement for the governance system).

**Connections:** new student orientation program designed to help students and parents understand both requirements of college study and expectations of college life.

**Continuing employee:** an employee whose position does not have an established end-date.

**Corporate Advisory Board:** composed of 10 members from business, industry, and public service; charged with promoting the active exchange of ideas and information for the mutual benefit of the College and its community.

**Countdown to the Centennial** the series of events and publicity leading up the College’s celebration of 100 years of service; the institution’s history dates back to 1914.

**CUL:** acronym for courses that meet the standards for a cultural diversity focus.

**Curriculum Committee:** the committee within the college governance system whose function is to review and recommend new, revised, and to-be-deleted courses, programs or curricular proposals.

**DataTel:** (also referenced as myColleague) the suite of commercial software applications that support the College’s financial management and reporting, accounts payable, accounts receivable, purchasing, budget management, project accounting, human resources and payroll processes.

**Deans’ Council:** the provost’s leadership team, which includes the deans and the assistant deans for each of the eight schools in the College, as well as the dean of academic services and first year programs, associate vice president for instruction, assistant vice president for academic services, and the assistant vice president for assessment, research and planning.

**Developmental semester:** First-semester program of developmental course work (12 credit maximum) for students whose placement test results indicate a need for remediation in all three test areas (math, English, reading).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Glossary</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance Learning Taskforce:</strong> an ad hoc committee established to review and address needs of distance learning programs and courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double developmental:</strong> refers to students whose placement test results indicate a need for developmental course work in two of the three test areas: math, English, reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dual enrollment:</strong> partnership with regional Pennsylvania high schools, which allows high school students to earn Penn College credits at their high school during the school day; prerequisites and placement requirements, textbooks, syllabi and course content are identical to courses taught on the College campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earth Science Center:</strong> campus 15 miles south of the College’s main campus, where major courses in the School of Natural Resources Management are taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elections and Communications:</strong> the committee within the College governance system whose function is to oversee and conduct annual elections, review and recommend changes to the elections processes, and promote the governance system throughout the College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embedded librarians:</strong> librarians who provide services at specified areas on campus such as residence halls, the Writing Center, and academic school locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Relations Office:</strong> office with responsibility for compliance oversight for equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, Title VII, Title IX, and Section 504/ADA on employment issues; providing a College-wide professional development program; handling disciplinary and employee leave issues; and providing advocacy for employees and supervisors as the center for the College’s ombudsperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Development/Evaluation Plan:</strong> a detailed document that provides for regular performance reviews of all probationary and non-probationary full-time faculty, counselors, and librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fast Facts:</strong> a webpage that provides a brief overview of key facts about the College, including enrollment, tuition and fees, campus size, volumes in the library, grant activity and other data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year Experience Advisory Committee:</strong> A group composed of members from each academic school and student affairs and charged with making recommendations to the Dean of Academic Services and First Year Programs about the content and delivery of the FYE 101 course; their input helps to ensure that the FYE 101 course is up to date and meets the needs of first year students, especially first semester students, within their school or office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FoE®:</strong> Foundations of Excellence, a comprehensive, externally guided self-study and improvement process for colleges and universities focusing on the first year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formalized training experiences:</strong> requests made by faculty for professional development that are specifically required to maintain industry sponsorship of a major, to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maintain accreditation of a program of study, or to maintain currency of instruction in a program, as determined by the College

FYE: acronym for the First Year Experience designed to support students in their first year of college as they adapt to the requirements of higher education study

GCO: the College’s Grants and Contracts Office, which manages applications for and administration and reporting of grants and contracts

Hobson’s: a communication contact management system that alerts prospective students and parents about important College information, including scholarship opportunities related to the students’ programs

HOS: one of the eight schools in the College: the School of Hospitality

HS: one of the eight schools in the College: the School of Health Sciences

IET: one of the eight schools in the College: the School of Industrial and Engineering Technologies

IS: one of the eight schools in the College: the School of Integrated Studies (in which most of the general education faculty and course work are housed)

LMS: learning management system used by the College to deliver distance learning and web-supplemented courses, typically referred to as ANGEL

Long-Range Plan: former planning document employed between 1989 and 2009, replaced by the current Strategic Plan

Lowscore: students whose placement test results indicate a weakness below the developmental course level; acceptance to the College is temporarily rescinded for this population

Marketing Planning Group: work group established by the President to represent departments (Academic Affairs, Admissions/Financial Aid, Career Services/Student Services, College Information and Community Relations, Strategic Planning and Research) that are major contributors to the institution’s marketing and recruitment efforts

Matriculation Work Group: work group established by the President to address issues related to student matriculation

Non-probationary faculty: faculty members who have successfully passed their probationary period and whose supervisory evaluation rotation moves from every semester to every three years

North Campus: campus 60 miles to the north of the main campus where noncredit and workforce development classes are taught
NRM: one of the eight schools in the College: the School of Natural Resources Management

NSSE: National Survey of Student Engagement

OCHO: A student organization representing the concerns of the Off-Campus students attending Penn College and to create a bond between the Off-Campus students, the Williamsport area and the Penn College community.

Office of Institutional Advancement: office responsible for raising support for the College through cash, in-kind contributions, and service and includes the College Foundation and Alumni Affairs

Ombuds Program: program available to all College employees, providing them with an independent, impartial, and confidential process for solving work-related problems and conflicts

Onboarding: a program for new employees that provides extensive orientation to and induction into the College

One College Avenue: the College's magazine, dedicated to sharing the College’s educational development, goals, and achievements with students, alumni, faculty, staff and the community

ORN: course (ORN 001) included in the developmental semester that orients students to college study

PATRAC: database of courses that are either accepted by Penn College from other institutions or that will be accepted by institutions from the College

PC Now: the College’s dual enrollment program (see dual enrollment above) offered in regional high schools that enable high school students to earn College credit

PCEA: the Penn College Education Association, since 1971 the collective bargaining unit for faculty

PDT: Professional Development Training

Pennsylvania College of Technology Foundation: a non-profit, tax exempt organization, established in 1981 whose purpose is to secure financial and other support for the College and which provides student scholarships/financial assistance, solicits funds and promotes the College; resides within the division of Institutional Advancement

PeopleAdmin Position Management System: software system for management of employee positions, including position descriptions, announcements, search processes, hiring, and staff appraisals

Pillar Society: members of this society are individuals who have made a planned gift
to the College

**Plan and Process:** *(The Penn College Plan and Process: 2010-2013)* serves as a record of assessment undertaken by the College and a guide for faculty and staff engaged in assessment activities throughout the institution.

**Planning Review Work Group:** the group charged by the President with the responsibility for reviewing the institution’s approach to long-range planning and recommending approaches to planning that would best meet the needs of the College.

**President’s Council:** the president’s leadership team, consisting of representatives from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Financial Operations, Institutional Advancement, and Information Technology and Business Process Improvement (refer to organizational charts).

**Probationary faculty:** faculty members, typically in the first three years of employment with the College, whose employment is probationary and who are evaluated by students and their supervisors every semester.

**Profile:** a tracking system that lists all of the required courses in the student’s program of study and enables both student and adviser to quickly see progress toward degree completion.

**Program Review:** the every-three-years process through which all degree programs conduct a self-assessment.

**Project Success:** a free multi-week study-skills program that teaches students how to learn more effectively.

**QTA:** Quality Through Assessment Committee, consisting of faculty, staff, and administration from Academic Affairs; Student Affairs; and Assessment Research, and Planning, to support assessment processes that ensure mission-focused academic programs and lead to quality teaching and learning.

**Regular Part-Time:** employees in any of the three classifications (APT, Classified or Service) who work between 20 to 30 hours per week.

**RHA:** Residence Hall Association

**SAILS:** Standard Assessment of Information Literacy Skills

**SAN:** scheduling access number, provided to the student by his or her adviser to enable the student to schedule classes electronically through the student information system (SIS).

**Service Employees:** employees who perform maintenance and custodial, dining services, policing, and other functions.

**SGA:** Student Government Association, a student organization providing “students’ voices to Penn College administration and faculty.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossary Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single developmental:</td>
<td>refers to students whose placement test results indicate a need for developmental course work in one of the three test areas: math, English, reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS:</td>
<td>online system (Student Information System) that enables students to check their application status; view class schedules, grade reports, and financial information; verify their meal plan balances; process class schedules online; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourcebook:</td>
<td>annual profile of the College and its environment that provides five years of historical data: history, administrative structure, enrollment projections and external environmental factors that influence enrollment and College resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage X:</td>
<td>a building and construction initiative that included construction of student housing and instructional space, as well as renovation of existing facilities in response to alternative uses for buildings; funded through bond proceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stall Wall Weekly:</td>
<td>8 ½ by 17-inch bulletin posted each week on the wall of toilet stalls throughout the College for the purpose of providing information about upcoming student activities and deadlines of interest to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan:</td>
<td>current planning process and document (approved in 2009) relies upon goals and strategic initiatives to guide the institution and direct allocation of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS:</td>
<td>acronym for the courses that satisfy the required course work addressing science, technology and society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Committee:</td>
<td>a committee in the college governance system responsible for review of and recommendations about student life, including housing, athletics, extracurricular activities, student government, etc.; student due process and grievance procedures; student recruitment and enrollment, alumni; and institutional development and community relations related to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study groups:</td>
<td>the work groups through which the Self-Study Steering Committee conducted investigation and documentation of the College’s adherence to the Characteristics of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1914 Society:</td>
<td>honor designation for those donors to the Penn College Fund whose annual gift equals or exceeds $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan:</td>
<td><em>The Penn College Plan and Process</em> — a handbook designed to be a central guide and a resource for those who oversee assessment or are responsible for completing assessment projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple developmental:</td>
<td>refers to students whose placement test results indicate a need for developmental course work in all three test areas: math, English, reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>one of the eight schools in the College: the School of Transportation Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACC</td>
<td>Williamsport Area Community College, a predecessor of the Pennsylvania College of Technology (1965-1989), and successor of Williamsport Technical Institute; it offered primarily vocational and technical majors, while providing general education and transferrable academic programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDCE</td>
<td>center for Work Force Development and Continuing Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherization Training Center</td>
<td>established in 1985 in partnership with the PA Department of Community &amp; Economic Development, offering competency based training courses who are employed by or subcontract to nonprofit agencies and local governments that administer home energy conservation assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDnetPA</td>
<td>Workforce and Economic Development Network of Pennsylvania, the state’s largest guaranteed free worker training program to improve the skills and productivity of PA workers; managed by Penn College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRT</td>
<td>acronym for courses whose content and student requirements meet that standards established for writing enriched courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTI</td>
<td>Williamsport Technical Institute, forerunner (1941-1965) of the Pennsylvania College of Technology, provided worker training in support of the defense industry in the years spanning 1941 through 1965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Initiative-Based Strategic Planning: An Overview

Historically, the College employed a planning model that attempted to encompass all aspects of College operation. The philosophy behind this comprehensive approach would have the Plan include initiatives as well as routine campus operations so that nothing would occur on an annual basis that was not accounted for in the Plan. One problem of this approach is the "drift" that occurs between planning and operations. The scope of the comprehensive model focused equally on routine and initiative activities leading to a dilution of higher profile new activities.

In 2007, the president charged a Planning Review Work Group (PRWG) with a review of all planning processes. The group recommended replacement of the comprehensive planning model with an initiative-based Plan. This model commits the College to continuously identify initiatives that would comprise the Strategic Long Range Plan (Plan). Routine operations would continue without reference in the Plan and without the necessity of annual reporting.

The PRWG took the initiative in developing the new approach to planning. At each step, approval was received from College Council, often following extensive opportunities for campus wide input, and by the College’s Board of Directors. As finally approved in 2010, the components of the Plan include:

- Mission
- Vision
- Values
- Strategic Goals
- Strategic Initiatives
- Success Indicators

These are discussed in more detail on the Components of the Plan page.

Components of the Strategic Long Range Plan

All components of the Plan require approval of College Council and the College’s Board of Directors. While drafted annually, the Plan is envisioned as a three-year document. What follows is a brief description and definition for each of the components of the Plan.

**Mission** - The College’s Mission states its purpose and aim, identifies the primary recipients of its services as students, and defines both the nature of those services (baccalaureate and associate degrees) and the standards to which the College aspires in delivering them.

**Vision** - The vision captures the essence of the College’s Mission in both current and aspirational terms.

**Values** - The College’s operating principles comprise its Values, which guide internal
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Strategic Goals - These are specific targets that the College strives to attain in fulfilling its Mission.

Each of the previous planning components is perceived to be more or less permanent. The Penn College Mission, for example, remains relatively unchanged since the College began and bears a strong resemblance to missions of its predecessor institutions, Williamsport Technical Institute and Williamsport Area Community College. The expression of that mission however has changed over time along with the approach to the way in which the College, and indeed, organizations in general, choose to express their missions.

To ensure that Mission, Vision and Values remain current, the planning process calls for a review of these Plan components every five years, sequenced to facilitate accreditation activities.

Strategic Goals by their definition may be relatively long lived within the Plan, for example the provision of hands-on education or fostering a student-centered environment. Goals may also be of shorter duration such as the introduction of the programs and recommendations that were drawn from the Foundations of Excellence process.

Strategic Initiatives - These non-routine operational objectives contribute to the achievement of Strategic Goals in a measurable fashion.

Success Indicators - These are quantifiable or documentable milestones that mark the achievement of a Strategic Initiative. They are crafted to complete the following thought: "During our future assessment, we will consider this initiative achieved if..."

Strategic Initiatives and their Success Indicators are viewed as more transient components of the Plan. On an annual basis, the College set its initiatives which will reside in the Plan until complete. In many cases, this may require more than one year.

The Planning Cycle

The annual planning cycle begins with the College reviewing the results of assessment activities as they have been reported over the course of the year. Normally this process culminates in early fall semester, although the on-going nature of assessment dictates that results are determined and reviewed throughout the year. There are four major sources for assessment results:

- Institution-wide assessments of a cyclical or special undertakings normally reported to the campus community by the office of Assessment, Research and Planning (NSSE, GIC, etc)
- Reports on student outcomes developed through academic program review, course review, or accreditation initiatives undertaken by the schools
- Reports on student outcomes outside the academic area
- Reports on assessment activities undertaken by other College offices

Results such as these are normally reviewed by the Quality Through Assessment Committee (QTA) and compiled in annual assessment reports. These reports ultimately reside in the
office of Assessment, Research and Planning.

After the assessment results are reviewed, responding initiatives would be drafted by the assessing department. Normally these would not rise to the level for inclusion in the Plan unless they were deemed to have institutional significance. In such cases, President’s Council drafts those initiatives and oversees their inclusion in the Plan. This body also, in consultation with other members of the College community as appropriate, drafts success indicators against which progress in completing an initiative will be measured. Some form of assessment is frequently involved in this process.

The comprehensive approach to planning jettisoned by the College was perceived weakest in linking the development of initiatives and budgeting. With initiatives based on assessment set in the fall semester, the timeline is ideal for budgetary preparation that normally begins in the last month of the fall semester.

When the budget is prepared, it is reviewed in the spring semester and approved by the Board. At that time, College personnel responsible for achieving them set their annual plans. Thus procedures for implementing the initiative are set in motion with a clear understanding of the expected outcomes.

The planning cycle is represented in diagrammatic form below.
The Planning Process
The process for developing each of the planning components is detailed below. There are certain elements that are inherent in each component. In general, these commonalities are as follows:

- The planning process is bi-cameral. No component is added to the Plan without the approval of College Council and the Board of Directors. In like fashion, all progress reports through completion are reviewed by each body.
- The planning process is transparent so that the results of assessment, the formulation and budgeting of initiatives, and the establishment of operational plans are open to input from all appropriate stakeholders.
- Annual progress reports are made to the College’s Board of Directors and to College Council. Normally these are drafted after the conclusion of the fiscal year.
- A cumulative planning archive is maintained by the office of Assessment, Research and Planning.
Mission, Vision and Values

The review of the College’s Mission, Vision and Values is perceived to be an undertaking of sufficient significance that it could be included in the Plan as a Strategic Initiative. Normally, the decision to review the Mission, Vision and Values is made well in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year. The president determines the choice of mechanisms for the review: e.g. appointment of a task force or referral to Governance. In either case, when finally presented to College Council, that body has the responsibility to ensure that the most inclusive possible forum is given opportunity to provide input.

Ultimately, any change in the Mission, Vision or Values must be approved by College Council. Given the calendar for Council meetings and the mandate to ensure campus wide participation, the Board would review the changes prior to the start of the following fiscal year. Appropriate changes can thereafter be made in the Plan and all College documents, policy statements and electronic locations. While the president makes the decision to undertake Mission, Vision and Values review, coordination of the process is vested with the president’s representative on College Council.

Strategic Goals

The Goals in the College’s Plan are perceived to be of sufficient generality that they are relatively permanent within the Plan, that is, they would persist through multiple annual review cycles. Some, like the provision of hands-on education, rise to the level universal aspiration and longevity. Others, such as the goals addressing Foundations of Excellence or Assessment, can be perceived as more transitory in that it is plausible they disappear from the Plan after several years. Addition of a Goal to the Plan or modification of an existing Goal requires College Council approval. Goals may be initiated by any member of the campus community through Governance action.

Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Initiatives are undertakings implemented to achieve a Strategic Goal. President’s Council reviews the results of assessment in the fall and develops the resulting initiatives in time for budget preparation. These Plan components are reviewed and approved by College Council and the College Board. However, Strategic Initiatives can be approved at any time through the year and can be initiated by any member of the College community through Governance.

Success Indicators

Success indicators are quantifiable results or documentable milestones which measure the outcome of a Strategic Initiative.

A Note of Governance-Initiated Planning Components

The planning process is structured to utilize the College’s Governance System as a vehicle for approval at virtually every step. The role of this body is in fact, if not in practice, much more than review and approval. Governance has over the years been the source of any number of planning initiatives that, when completed, made fundamental and significant innovations or changes to College operations. While initiation of most of the Strategic Goals
or Strategic Initiatives comes through President’s Council, Governance provides a vehicle for any College employee to have input to the Plan and thereby impact the direction of the College.

**Reporting on Planning Progress**

The College makes progress in addressing its goals and initiatives through operations. In the case of administrative personnel, specific annual activities associated with one or more Strategic Initiatives are included in that person’s annual plan of objectives.

The Strategic Plan, which exists solely as an electronic resource on the myPCT Portal, includes all components of the plan, the Planning Manual, and annual progress reports on each strategic initiative as applicable.

The plan is updated annually, normally at the end of the fall semester following collection of the above referenced annual reports and the formulation and approval of any new goals or initiatives. The plan and the annual progress reports are reviewed and approved each year by both College Council and the College’s Board of Directors.

To provide an archive of planning information, the Strategic Planning site includes individual status report pages for the five most recent reporting years. Additionally, a Retired Goals & Initiatives page includes a full listing of all retired goals and their associated initiatives.

Communication of actions regarding the Plan is facilitated by the Planning Action Form, which is initiated by a Governance Committee or Council upon action and circulated to appropriate staff for information. These forms reside in the Office of Assessment, Research and Planning and provide the input for the annual update for all planning documents.

**School and Department Plans**

Academic schools post Mission and Goal statements prominently in their areas as do a number of non-academic departments. Many segments of the College execute plans that integrate multiple campus units. Some examples include Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Advancement, and Information Technology Services.

There are also planning activities that concentrate on specific activities such as the Facilities and Site Master Plan or five-year enrollment and budget projections.

In addition to mission and goal statements, schools and departments formulate plans, normally looking three to five years in the future. The approval mechanisms vary but involve, at the very least, review by the appropriate senior staff member for the area in question. Care is given to ensure that such plans support the Mission of the institution and coordinate with the Strategic Goals and Initiatives in the College’s Plan.
Current Strategic Goals and Initiatives

Extracted from: https://mypct.pct.edu/departments/AssessmentResearchPlanning/StrategicPlanning/Pages/CurrentStrategicGoals.aspx

September 28, 2011

0001 Provide hands-on education, preparing students for careers in an evolving world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Code</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Complete the major academic components of the Stage X building program, including construction, equipment acquisition, and relocation to permanent facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Success Indicators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Facilities have been completed as scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Equipment and furniture have been acquired and staged in the new facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Classes have been held in the new facilities beginning Fall 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Develop and implement targeted credit and non-credit curriculum modifications to support expanding career opportunities in the regional natural gas industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Success Indicators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) At least three Workforce Preparation Classes have been conducted for entry level industry workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) NSF funding has been acquired for credit curriculum development and modification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) At least three Commercial Driver’s License training sessions have been conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Emergency First-Responder training opportunities have been investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) The Renewable Energy Associate Degree Program has been open for enrollment as of Fall 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) The College will participate in activities associated with the ShaleNet grant. (recommended addition).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Systematically review the entire degree portfolio to validate continued offerings, programmatic integrity, and learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Success Indicators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) The program review pilot has been assessed and an annual schedule developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) A standard program review data collection model has been implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Student placement data continues to exceed 90% in direct or related field of major.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 Retrofit academic campus spaces vacated through Stage X construction.

**Success Indicators:**

a) Plans for academic space retrofitted have been finalized.

b) Project priorities have been established.

c) Budgetary impact statements have been developed.

0002 Foster a student-centered environment both inside and outside the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Code</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Implement Stage X building program for Dauphin Hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Success Indicators:**

a) Construction has been completed for Fall 2010 occupancy.

b) Staff have been hired and trained for new facility.

c) Furniture and equipment has been purchased and installed.

d) The facility has been fully operational as of the start of the Fall 2010 semester.

e) Learning communities are well established and resulted in greater connection to campus and student successes.

2.2 Develop, implement, and evaluate new academic advising strategies based on research and best practices.

**Success Indicators:**

a) Portal sites (faculty and student) for advising have been instituted.

b) Ongoing professional development has been initiated for advisers.

c) Students have been surveyed to establish baseline ratings for advising services.

d) Strategies have been adapted to inform students of appropriate expectations of their advisers.

e) 100% of returning students have met with advisers prior to scheduling.

f) The 6-year graduation rate has improved from 49.0% to 54.0% for baccalaureate-degree graduates.

g) The 3-year graduate rate has improved from 30.5% to 35.5% for associate-degree graduates.
h) Fall to spring retention rates for first-time, full-time freshmen have been improved from 77.5% to 82.5%.

i) Fall to fall retention rates for first-time, full-time freshmen have been improved from 59.8% to 64.8%.

2.3 Retrofit non-academic campus spaces vacated through Stage X construction.

**Success Indicators:**

a) Planning for student support space retrofit has been finalized.

b) Project priorities have been established.

c) Budgetary impact statements have been developed.

2.4 Complete the development and implement the operation of a comprehensive program for academic support services that meets the needs of all Penn College students.

**Success Indicators:**

a) The College has, by August 1, 2010, developed a plan for expanded services and implemented same.

   a) *The College has, by academic year 2012, fully implemented all recommendations of the academic success proposal issued in Summer 2010. (recommended revision)*

b) Headcount of students served has increased by 100% over the 2009-10 academic year.

   b) *Unduplicated headcount of students served has increased 25% over the 2009-10 academic year. (recommended revision)*

2.5 Explore NCAA affiliation and provide recommendation to the College outlining a potential timeline, possible level of participation (division level), costs and benefits, and impact on student-athletes.

**Success Indicators:**

a) A campus-wide task force, led by the Director of Athletics, has been named and has begun operations by March 1, 2012.

b) A final report has been submitted to the College for review and/or approval.

2.6 Create a comprehensive campus-wide awareness campaign focusing on sexual assault response and a parallel education campaign focusing on promoting a campus culture of personal respect and personal responsibility.

   a) *A comprehensive campus-wide awareness campaign focusing on sexual assault response is in place by Aug. 15, 2011.*
b) An educational campaign focusing on promoting a campus culture of personal respect and personal responsibility around the issue of sexual assault is in place by May 1, 2012.

0003  Implement approved Foundations of Excellence recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Code</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Identify and charge the Implementation Team to prioritize recommendations and develop an action plan for the Foundations of Excellence Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Success Indicators:**

a) The Team will be named and begin operation by August 1, 2010

| 3.2  | Implement the First Year Experience (FYE) course for all incoming students for the Fall 2011 semester. |

**Success Indicators:**

a) Identify and train the teaching faculty and staff for FYE by August 1, 2011

b) Place the FYE in each program curriculum by the Spring 2011 semester.

| 3.3  | Work toward becoming a more diversity-responsive institution by actively developing culturally sensitive students, faculty and staff. |

**Success Indicators:**

a) Revise the College’s Mission Statement and Core Values to more directly highlight Penn College’s commitment to diversity by January, 2011.

b) Establish a programmatic series of high-profile, diversity-related events beginning in the Spring 2011 semester.

c) Establish a position to coordinate campus-wide diversity initiatives and provide support to students from historically marginalized populations.

d) Increase exposure to issues and concepts of diversity through the curriculum.

* d) Appropriate curriculum changes/additions have been approved to increase student exposure to issues and concepts of diversity. (recommended revision)*

e) Provide on-going professional development activities related to diversity for faculty and staff.

* f) The programmatic series of high-profile, diversity-related events begun in 2010-11 has been formalized. (recommended addition)*

| 3.4  | Provide ongoing professional development activities related to first year issues of concern for faculty and staff. |
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Success Indicators:

a) Implement professional development initiatives as recommended by the Implementation Team.

b) Formal professional development courses, experiences and activities will be in place for faculty and staff at the beginning of the Spring 2011 semester.

c) Professional development initiatives have been expanded or refined as recommended by the First-Year Advisory Committee. (recommended addition)

0004 Serve as a catalyst for community and economic development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Code</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Develop and implement strategies to facilitate the expanding career opportunities in the regional natural gas industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Success Indicators:

a) Two new academic programs associated with green technology have been implemented.

b) Existing academic programs have been reviewed to ensure that appropriate green learning outcomes are included.

4.2 Develop and implement strategies to facilitate the expanding career opportunities in the green industries.

Success Indicators:

a) Two new academic programs associated with green technology have been implemented.

b) Existing academic programs have been reviewed to ensure that appropriate green learning outcomes are included.

0005 Foster relationships with institutional stakeholders to promote Pennsylvania College of Technology and its mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Code</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Expand articulation efforts with targeted colleges and universities in conjunction with expanded Pennsylvania Department of Education efforts related to PATRAC and Prior Learning Assessment (PLA).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Success Indicators:

a) The number of articulation agreements has expanded by 10%.
b) The actual number of transfer students facilitated via articulation agreements has been documented and tracked.

c) Staff and students have increased their use of the course equivalency database by 15%.

d) The entire Student Information System course equivalency database has been integrated with Academy One national databases.

5.2 Evaluate the implementation of the Integrated Marketing Plan in years one and two (2008-09/ 2009-10) for continuing implementation within available resources for years three, four, and five (2010-11 / 2011-12 / 2012-13).

**Success Indicators:**

a) An annual audit has been conducted to capture the highlights of marketing planning activity.

b) The effectiveness of various marketing strategies will have been evaluated on an ongoing basis.

5.3 Establish a strategy for including students, faculty, staff, alumni, retirees, donors, and friends in College-wide celebrations of the 100-year anniversary in 2014.

**Success Indicators:**

a) The “Countdown to Centennial” program has been formalized.

b) Stakeholder involvement has expanded each year as the centennial approaches.

c) Alumni contributors will be doubled the 2009 number by 2014.

d) Publications and online resources have been developed to share the College’s 100 year history.

5.4 Increase business and industry relationships across all academic schools.

**Success Indicators:**

a) Scholarships provided by businesses and industries have increased at least 7 per year.

b) Business and industry equipment and technology contributions have increased 10% per year.

c) Faculty within each school have increased technical and professional development opportunities.

d) Student internship opportunities within each school have increased.

e) Program Advisory Committees in each school have increased participation and broad-based membership.
f) Classroom presentations and demonstrations by business and industry have increased in each school.

5.5 Conduct a campaign to support the College and Penn College Foundation scholarship programs.

Success Indicators:

a) The campaign will have raised $3 million.

0006 Optimize the use of College resources to support the institution’s mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Code</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Implement the new financial system to improve the management of the College’s financial resources through timely and relevant financial reporting which supports the financial decision making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success Indicators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Financial statements have been generated in compliance with the requirements of the annual audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Training for appropriate staff has been provided as part of the implementation strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Measurable objectives and policies to cost-effectively maximize energy efficiency are developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success Indicators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) An energy audit with the intent of developing strategies for ongoing operating efficiencies in terms of energy use has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Implemented a plan to reduce its carbon footprint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) The College employs electronic forms as the preferred mechanism of communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Implement new staffing, programs, and services, through College Health Services, that provide a greater level of health care to both students and employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success Indicators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) New programs and services for both students and employees have begun by August 15, 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) A comprehensive plan for new programs and services have been finalized by July 1, 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Implement and evaluate an Ombuds Program to provide employees and supervisors with alternate modes of problem solving/dispute resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success Indicators:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.5

Implement and evaluate onboarding program to accelerate new employee productivity, efficiency, and engagement, and to promote effective communications/interactions with internal and external clients.

Success Indicators:

a) Pre-arrival resources page on Penn College website is complete by December 2011.

b) Orientation sessions are scheduled for College supervisors on New Employee Learning Path and other components of On-boarding Program during Fall 2011.

c) HR records reflect 95% of employees serviced by the On-boarding Program successfully complete their New Employee Probationary Period.

d) Assessment reflects that 80% of supervisors and employees serviced by the On-boarding Program indicate that they are more productive, efficient, and engaged on the job as a result of the On-boarding Program.

e) Mentoring programs are finalized by December 2011 and implemented during Spring 2012.

f) Focus group responses confirm that mentoring programs are meeting the needs of the various employee groups.

0007  Embrace a culture of assessment and data-driven decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Code</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Finalize and implement the College-wide outcomes assessment plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Success Indicators:

a) Assessment Plan components implemented in Fall 2010.

b) Complete first set of Student Learning Outcomes by Fall 2010.

c) Student Learning Outcome process assessed Spring 2011.
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d) Subcommittee established for the assessment of core goals.

e) The Office of Assessment, Research and Planning established as the central repository for program accreditation/licensure/certifications.

f) Assessment and the related reports, practices, documentation and data are transparent to all institutional stakeholders.

7.2 Develop a data warehouse/data mining system to support campus planning and assessment initiatives.

**Success Indicators:**

a) Data warehouse/data mining system has been created and made available for querying and custom reporting.

b) Data dictionary with data definitions has been completed.

c) Data warehouse(s) have been designed (student, employee, financial) and populated with data from EIS/SIS.

d) Select campus administrative staff have been trained on the tools to access, query, and build custom reports.

7.3 Middle States Commission on Higher Education action on self-study and team visit has affirmed re-accreditation, by June 2012.

**Success Indicators:**

a) Final Design Document has been submitted to Middle States, by April 2010.

b) Draft reports with analysis and recommendations have been completed by study groups, by February 2011.

c) College community has been updated on status of revised draft and given opportunity for last input before final report, by August 2011.

d) Board of Directors has reviewed the final draft of Self-Study, by September 2011.  
*d) Board of Directors has reviewed the Self-Study draft by October 2011. (recommended revision)*

e) Self-Study has been sent to Middle States, by February 2012.

f) Middle States team visit has occurred, by April 2012.

7.4 Fully implement the initiative-based strategic planning process and finalize the appropriate documents in support of this new approach.

**Success Indicators:**

a) Planning Process has been approved by all appropriate College parties.
b) Planning Manual has been revised.

c) The Sourcebook and Cumulative Update documents have been modified to reflect the new process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Code</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8.1             | Expand both outreach and on-campus recruitment activities.  
|                 | **Success Indicators:**                          |
|                 | a) Increase high school visits/college fairs by 10% over a three-year period.  
|                 | b) Add at least one new major recruitment activity for each summer over the next three years.  
|                 | c) Continue to refine Open House in Fall and Spring to increase participation and matriculation.  
| 8.2             | Review new academic program possibilities on a two-year cycle.  
|                 | **Success Indicators:**                          |
|                 | a) Research and report upon programming possibilities by March 1, 2011, and in alternating years thereafter.  
|                 | b) Assess program opportunities and add development mechanisms as part of budget development to begin July 1, 2011.  
| 8.3             | Expand opportunities for transfer students in order to increase enrollment for that group by 10%.  
|                 | **Success Indicators:**                          |
|                 | a) Coordinate secondary and postsecondary articulation agreements and recruitment activities to ensure that both are maximized for transfer enrollment and expand articulation agreements where possible.  
|                 | b) Review existing academic policy to ensure that transfer students are provided with ample opportunity within the College without sacrificing academic and programmatic integrity.  
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Completed Actions:

As the fall 2011 semester draws to a close, the College has completed seventeen of the thirty-seven action items resulting from the FoE Self Study, three of which have been completed since the last update in June. It is important to note, though, that “completion” for most of the FoE action items means that the action plans for implementing necessary programs and events have been completed. The resulting programs and events now become part of our overall approach to the first year and will be monitored and assessed by the appropriate departments. Those action items that require continuing action and/or assessment are identified as “Completed – ongoing” in this report. Those actions items that require no additional action or assessment are indicated as simply “Completed.”

The three action items completed since the last update include providing professional development on assessment, providing assessment materials on the portal, and sharing the learning outcomes of co-curricular activities with the College community. While this may not seem like significant progress in five months, it is important to note that the fall semester witnessed implementation of FYE as a required course for all first-year students. This was a significant effort that was the culmination of six years of planning and assessment and involved the time and attention of more than sixty faculty and staff and more than 1300 students.

Actions in Progress and Proceeding as Expected:

Seventeen of the thirty-seven action items are progressing as expected. Many of the items involve putting finishing touches on or assessing programs and processes begun in 2010-11. Among these are reinforcing our commitment to first year students through regular reiteration of the rationale underlying this commitment, communicating information to faculty and staff about first year students and their issues, and asserting this commitment during our hiring and orientation processes. Formation of the First Year Advisory Committee, their approval of draft plans, and implementation of those plans will bring several open items to completion. Though not yet complete, many of the actions involved in teaching, supporting, and advising our students have witnessed substantial progress since the last update. Most notable among these items are providing a far-reaching professional development series on advising and posting the advising handbook on the portal. Additional items of note include developing a “success portal” as part of the Academic Success Center portal site; and integration of MAP-Works into our early alert system, allowing us to improve data collection, communications, and interventions.

Actions in Progress Warranting Long Term Action:

Since the last update, two items formerly warranting additional or long term attention have changed status to progressing as expected: these include examining the need for reading and writing prerequisites for reading intensive 100-level classes and providing diversity resources for faculty and staff. The remaining three items requiring long term action include the following:

- Develop a general set of core learning outcomes for all first year students – while the College has, indeed, identified learning and behavioral outcomes for the first year, we still need to determine how to manage or where to “house” these goals. Because the first year and its related processes are far longer and more complex than an FYE course, the goals should not be exclusive outcomes of the course. Yet, if the goals are not attached to a course or to the core, the potential exists that they could be overlooked in the development of future programs and courses. It is possible that these outcomes could be incorporated into the core, but to ensure the intentional, thoughtful, and systematic consideration of this, the question should be addressed when the College reevaluates the goals of the core curriculum after assessment of all of the goals is complete as is currently being recommended by the Middle States Steering Committee.
• Integrate a diversity awareness requirement into the associate degree core – the Middle States Self-Study recommends that the goals of the core curriculum be reevaluated after assessment of all of the goals is complete. It is appropriate that, at that time, a cross-disciplinary workgroup consider the incorporation of diversity awareness into the associate degree core.

• Implement the diffusion model (across the curriculum) for diversity - the Middle States Self-Study recommends that the goals of the core curriculum be reevaluated after assessment of all of the goals is complete. It is appropriate that, at that time, a cross-disciplinary workgroup consider the advisability of requiring a diversity component in every course.

Moving Forward:

The First Year Advisory Committee has been assembled. This is a standing committee that will oversee completion of the remaining FoE Final Report recommendations and, more importantly, provide on-going oversight of first year efforts (including maintenance of implemented FoE actions) and assessment of all first-year programs and initiatives. The committee met in early December to begin action on approving and implementing a first year assessment plan, and developing a definition for diversity and a set of desired outcomes the institution can use in providing diversity resources for faculty, staff, and students.
# Foundations of Excellence  
From Implementation to Institutionalization

## Recommendation 1: Foundational Goal Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Lead Unit/Person(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Add a Goal Statement to the College’s Strategic Plan                        | FoE Philosophy Committee    | Completed  
Completed  
Goal statement added to Strategic Plan and approved by College Council in September 2010. |
| Clearly communicate and regularly reinforce the rationale for the goal and the annually approved initiatives | Eugene McAvoy               | In Progress - Proceeding as Expected  
Drafted an Integrated First Year Communication plan that will be approved and regularly updated by the First Year Advisory Committee. The plan includes the use of appropriate communication tools as well as professional development opportunities for faculty and staff – ECD spring 2012. |

## Recommendation 2: Organizational Structure to Support the First Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Lead Unit/Person(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Create an administrative position to provide oversight and alignment of first-year initiatives | Carolyn Strickland          | Completed  
Completed  
Dean of Academic Services and First Year Programs appointed in July 2010. |

## Recommendation 3: Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Lead Unit/Person(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Employ assessment experts to work directly and consistently with all campus entities | Nasrin Fatima               | Completed  
Completed  
Two Outcomes Assessment Specialists hired and assigned responsibility for specific academic schools; assistant vice president for Assessment, Research, and Planning assigned as liaison for non-academic departments – AY 2010-11. |
| Educate faculty and staff about systematic assessment by creating/supporting on- and off-campus professional development opportunities. | Nasrin Fatima Linda Morris | Completed - ongoing  
Completed - ongoing  
Surveyed faculty and deans to identify specific assessment-related needs of faculty and Academic Affairs. Findings summarized in an EoE Professional Development Need Assessment Survey Report and shared with the Faculty Professional Development Advisory Committee at their May 2011 meeting. Incorporated faculty and deans’ feedback into a two-year plan for assessment related professional development activities – AY 2010-11.  
Completed planning for the Assessment Institute, a three-tiered professional development program on assessment that will be offered over a two-year period. Implementation started on November 1, 2011 with the scheduling of a Track One – Introduction to Assessment at Penn College course. Subsequent to the two-year period, the Assessment Institute courses will be rescheduled on a periodic, rotating basis. – fall 2011  
Surveyed APT staff on assessment-related professional development needs. Shared results with Employee Relations. Incorporated feedback into a two-year plan for assessment-related professional development activities – AY 2010-11. |
Facilitate a greater use of assessment by creating an easily accessible site for housing assessment data, improving the timing of the dissemination of information, and providing appropriate context for information

Nasrin Fatima

- Completed - ongoing
  - Completed an item analysis using the AIR (Association for Institutional Research) listed best practice IR offices. Incorporated findings in the ARP portal to best reflect the Penn College mission, vision, goals, and objectives – AY 2010-11.
  - Completed a survey of faculty and staff on the ARP portal. Incorporated findings to improve ARP portal – fall 2011.
  - Based on the item analysis of other institutions and ARP practices, organized items on the ARP portal to best reflect Penn College mission and goals and to make it more user-friendly - ongoing.
  - Completed revision of the ARP portal site to reflect data gathered from both qualitative and quantitative input from deans, assistant deans, faculty, and staff, and to make the ARP portal more user-friendly - ongoing.
  - Identified all publications managed by ARP in nine CollegeWire announcements - ongoing.
  - Posted a schedule of all of the routine publication dates for documents on the ARP portal. Posted all special publications dates on the ARP portal during the fall 2011 - ongoing.
  - ARP Portal Survey Satisfaction Report indicates that 100% of the faculty/staff who visited the ARP Portal site during 2010-2011 agreed/strongly agreed that the ARP Portal site is easy to access and houses a large amount of relevant assessment data. The results also indicate that 98% of the faculty/staff who visited the ARP Portal site are either satisfied or very satisfied with the portal site. The deans and assistant deans also communicated satisfaction with the ARP portal site. Most significantly, the College President provided very positive feedback regarding housing and organization of assessment data in ARP Portal. This is a continuous process. A two-year evaluation plan has been developed and will be implemented accordingly - ongoing.

Strategically plan how information will be regularly analyzed and used to impact the improvement of first-year efforts.

Eugene McAvoy

Nasrin Fatima

- In Progress - Proceeding as Expected
  - Identified “first year” efforts and associated learning outcomes – AY 2010-11.
  - The College will implement a First Year Assessment Plan that will be approved and updated by the First Year Advisory Committee – ECD spring 2012.

---

**Recommendation 4: Professional Development**

Develop a comprehensive, strategic professional development plan on first-year student issues that includes, but is not limited to, these action items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Lead Unit/Person(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and distribute information annually to faculty and staff, highlighting the new student profile, first-year student issues, and resources available to ease students’ transition to college.</td>
<td>Eugene McAvoy</td>
<td>In Progress - Proceeding as Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Identified resources, stakeholders and appropriate means of communicating with them, first year student issues, and means of developing new student profile – AY 2010-11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Drafted an Integrated First Year Communication plan that will be approved and regularly updated by the First Year Advisory Committee. The plan includes the use of appropriate communication tools as well as professional development opportunities for faculty and staff – ECD spring 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand professional development opportunities on first-year student issues for faculty and staff.</td>
<td>Eugene McAvoy</td>
<td>Completed - ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Identified appropriate topics and learning outcomes, and implemented training opportunities FYE instructors, faculty, and staff – AY 2010-11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Drafted Integrated First Year Communication Plan that incorporates first year related professional development requirements and opportunities – AY 201-11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improve the communication of the College’s commitment to the first year with faculty and staff during the hiring and orientation processes (i.e., new staff and faculty orientations, adjunct faculty orientation, FAC 100/FAC 101).

Tom Gregory
Elliott Strickland
Linda Morris

- **In Progress - Proceeding as Expected**
- Added new sessions to PSD100 (formerly FAC 100) to focus on advising and first year related issues – AY 2010-11.
- The College will add a “New Student” section to the Faculty Handbook posted on the portal. Topics for inclusion in this section will be discussed with deans during spring 2012 – ECD summer 2012.
- Employee Relations continued development of an “on-boarding” plan for all new faculty and staff that includes reinforcement of the commitment to the first year – ECD spring 2012.

### Recommendation 5: Learning

Develop, assess, and report learning outcomes for all first-year curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities, including a general set of core learning outcomes for all first-year students. This includes, but is not limited to, these action items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Lead Unit/Person(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Develop a general set of core learning outcomes for all first year students. | Eugene McAvoy | - **In Progress - Long Term Action**
| | | - Compiled a detailed list of learning and behavioral outcomes critical to first year student success and various mechanisms for accomplishing these goals – AY 2010-11.
| | | - The First Year Advisory Committee will revise, gain approval for, and communicate first year learning goals using appropriate communication mechanisms – ECD spring 2012.
| | | - This task will also be addressed in conjunction with a Middle States recommendation to address the general education core. ECD – AY 2015-16. |
| Investigate standardizing the assessment and reporting of curricular learning outcomes. | Paul Starkey | - **Completed - ongoing**
| | | - Investigation completed – AY 2010-11. As identified in “The Penn College Plan and Process,” assessment strategies and their reporting mechanisms will remain flexible to accommodate the differing needs and goals of various campus entities. The schedule for reporting and providing those reports, however, will be standardized as noted in the Plan.
| | | - The Core Curriculum Sub-committee of QTA has been formed to develop a College-wide approach to assessing learning outcomes in the Core Curriculum. Assessment of all core goals will be completed during AY 2012-13.
| | | - FYE 101 will undergo a modified program review in AY 2014-15.
| | | - Inclusion of the results of outcomes assessment and corresponding recommendations for teaching and the curriculum have been added to the reporting format of both Program Review documents and departmental 3-Year Plans. |
| Share learning outcomes for co-curricular activities college wide. | Jennifer McLean | - **Completed - ongoing**
| | | - Learning outcomes will be regularly shared, along with approved first year learning outcomes, using appropriate communication mechanisms (College Wire announcements and FoE portal site).
| | | - Learning outcomes for key Student Affairs events were shared with Academic Affairs in August for fall 2011. Learning outcomes for spring 2012 will be shared with Academic Affairs before the end of the fall semester. |
| Modify the existing student course evaluation tool to provide faculty the means to use assessment to identify effective instructional methodologies. | Tom Gregory | - **In Progress - Proceeding as Expected**
| | | - Discussed this item for the Middle States Self Study Report. In lieu of a recommendation from the Self Study, the Associate Vice President for Instruction presented this item to Dean’s Council for discussion - summer 2011.
| | | - The College will examine the current evaluation tools and delivery formats at Deans’ Council – ECD spring 2012. |
Provide professional development for faculty who teach first-year students on effective teaching strategies for that population of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eugene McAvoy</th>
<th>Completed - ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Identified appropriate topics and learning outcomes, and implemented training opportunities for FYE instructors, faculty, and staff – AY 2010-11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drafted Integrated First Year Communication Plan that incorporates first year related professional development requirements and opportunities – AY 201-11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Instituted the FYE Professional Development Plan that is open to all faculty and staff – AY 2010-11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Held the inaugural First Year Institute to which all faculty and staff were invited – summer 2011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communicate instructional methods to first-year students via course syllabi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tom Gregory</th>
<th>Completed - ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Modified the syllabus template in the Curriculum Manual and on the portal site to include methods of instruction among the recommended areas to be addressed – AY 2010-11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incorporated additional discussion about methods and syllabi into PSD 100 (formerly FAC100) – AY 2010-11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incorporated into first year professional development the addition to the template and desirability of informing students about methodologies – fall 2011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examine the need for reading and writing prerequisites or corequisites for 100-level classes that have intensive reading requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cliff Coppersmith</th>
<th>In Progress – Proceeding as Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Initial examination of student success rates in “reading intensive” courses suggests other factors may be present. The College will examine additional data and discuss with faculty to determine whether or not a faculty committee should be formed to clarify, study, and develop further recommendations on this item – ECD spring 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 6: First-Year Experience Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Lead Unit/Person(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement the approved, mandatory, one-credit first-year experience course for all new Penn College students.</td>
<td>Eugene McAvoy</td>
<td>Completed - ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incorporated the FYE requirement into existing curricula – spring 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implemented policies and procedures to effect the requirement – fall 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Created and implemented an FYE Professional Development Plan – fall 2010.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Completed development/revision of necessary course support materials – summer 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 7: Academic Advising

Develop a more purposeful, intrusive approach to academic advising and create related educational resources and training, for students and faculty. This includes, but is not limited to, these action items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Lead Unit/Person(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add components to Advising Sessions, Connections, and the FYE course to educate students about academic advising, and their role in the process.</td>
<td>Carolyn Strickland</td>
<td>In Progress - Proceeding as Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Modified and expanded the Connections Classroom Expectations session and FYE content related to academic advising – summer 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Now that baseline resources/programs have been established, all based on the suggestions of faculty and students, the College will form an Advisory Committee to provide oversight on future expansion and maintenance of academic advising related initiatives – ECD spring 2012.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The College will complete a thorough review of the content related to academic advising presented during the major matriculation events and FYE, and make recommendations to provide a more consistent, purposeful message about academic advising to new students – ECD spring 2012.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Progress Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a comprehensive professional development plan on academic advising tailored to meet the varying levels of faculty experience, which may include an annually required professional development session.</td>
<td><strong>Carolyn Strickland</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>In Progress - Proceeding as Expected</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Piloted an academic advising professional development series for faculty and staff during the spring 2011 semester. The series included sessions on the role of advising; preparing for advising; using advising tools effectively; and academic policies, procedures, and campus processes that impact academic advising.&lt;br&gt;- A comprehensive professional development plan has been developed and is being offered throughout the fall 2011 semester. The series includes:&lt;br&gt;  o Professional development offered to new faculty during their orientation and at two of the FAC 100 sessions.&lt;br&gt;  o Professional development for adjunct faculty offered at pre-semester professional development days for adjuncts.&lt;br&gt;  o Professional development for all full-time faculty offered on the August Professional Development Day.&lt;br&gt;  o A professional development series for all faculty offered on a weekly basis throughout the fall semester.&lt;br&gt;- On-going assessment of the sessions offered during fall 2011 is being used to craft the spring 2012 series.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase adviser-student interactions through initiatives such as formally introducing new students to their advisers and requiring meetings at strategic points throughout the semester, i.e., during the first several weeks of the semester and at midterm for those with D or F grades.</td>
<td><strong>Carolyn Strickland</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>In Progress - Proceeding as Expected</strong>&lt;br&gt;- In collaboration with Dean’s Council, the College has identified ideas about how to increase adviser-student interactions and possible ways to take advantage of existing programs – AY 2010-11.&lt;br&gt;- The College will explore ways to incorporate interactions between advisers and students into existing events. The Academic Advising Advisory Committee will review Dean’s Council suggestions and offer their ideas in order to recommend a cyclical calendar of events; Academic Affairs will facilitate implementation/execution of the approved events – ECD spring 2012.&lt;br&gt;- An Excellence in Academic Advising Award was created and will be awarded for the first time in May 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create academic advising resources for both students and advisers.</td>
<td><strong>Carolyn Strickland</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>In Progress - Proceeding as Expected</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Posted the faculty Academic Advising Resource Manual to the portal. Offered several sessions of “Walk through the New (on-line) Manual” professional development sessions – August 2011.&lt;br&gt;- Completed draft of an academic advising portal site for students. Work is in progress to create a portal site for the student version of the manual – ECD spring 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defer assigning advisees to new faculty for one semester, where possible.</td>
<td><strong>Carolyn Strickland</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>In Progress - Proceeding as Expected</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Collected from Dean’s Council information about how/when faculty are assigned advisees – AY 2010-11.&lt;br&gt;- The College will form an ad hoc group to explore this issue and make recommendations to the Provost. ECD for group formation spring 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct an evaluation of the entire academic advising model, from enrollment through graduation, including exploring the value of professional advisers.</td>
<td><strong>Paul Starkey</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>In Progress - Proceeding as Expected</strong>&lt;br&gt;- While the College has not explored the advisability or viability of using professional academic advisors, the Academic Advising Workgroup has conducted a vigorous review of the existing academic advising model and has initiated improvements as detailed above. Full implementation of the workgroup's recommendations is in progress and includes extensive professional development opportunities for faculty. All new faculty have been involved in these offerings. Deans’ Council has recommended additional means of exposing faculty to best practices in advising. A review of the current advising model will include current assessments of the recommendations of the Workgroup.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 8: Diversity**

Foster a greater institutional focus on all aspects of diversity and multiculturalism, by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Lead Unit/Person(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revising the College’s Mission Statement and Core Values to more directly highlight Penn College’s commitment to diversity.</td>
<td>Elliott Strickland</td>
<td>Complete&lt;br&gt;Proposed changes to the Mission and Core Values were approved – spring 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further integrating issues and concepts of diversity into the curriculum and co-curriculum by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Lead Unit/Person(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing diversity training for FYE instructors.</td>
<td>Eugene McAvoy</td>
<td>Complete - ongoing&lt;br&gt;Incorporated “Teaching Diversity” as one of six core sessions of the FYE Professional Development series that more than 70 current or potential FYE instructors have attended – fall 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating a diversity awareness requirement into the associate-degree core.</td>
<td>Tom Gregory</td>
<td>In Progress - Long Term Action&lt;br&gt;This task will be addressed in conjunction with a Middle States recommendation to address the general education core. ECD – AY 2015-16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the Diffusion Model (across the curriculum) for diversity, adding a diversity component analogous to the “information literacy” component.</td>
<td>Tom Gregory</td>
<td>In Progress - Long Term Action&lt;br&gt;This task will be addressed in conjunction with a Middle States recommendation to address the general education core. ECD – AY 2015-16.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increasing collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to improve attendance at diversity-related events. | Elliott Strickland<br>Paul Starkey | Complete - ongoing<br>Formed a liaison committee to discuss co-curricular programming – fall 2010.<br>Initiated the practice of deans making regular presentations to the Student Affairs Division meetings regarding programming in the respective schools and Student Affairs personnel making regular presentations to Deans Council on their respective areas – fall 2010. |

Encouraging faculty to develop diversity-related curricula, international experiences, etc. | Paul Starkey | In Progress - Proceeding as Expected<br>Through their respective deans, faculty were informed of international learning opportunities – AY 2010-11.<br>Contacts with a number of international organizations have been made with visits by delegations from Saudi Arabia and Nigeria. These opportunities involve potential international students enrolling at Penn College and have little potential for domestic students to travel abroad – AY 2010-11.<br>The institution is currently assessing the Core Curriculum. This assessment, which includes Cultural Diversity, addresses both the institution’s effectiveness in delivering the current Core (short term) as well as the appropriateness of the core in relation to the mission of the College (long term as a result of the Middle States Self Study). The CUL designator is a particular focus of both short term and long term assessment efforts – ECD summer 2012 for diversity effectiveness and AY 2015-16 for the appropriateness of the core. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Establishing a programmatic series of high-profile, diversity-related events. | Kim Cassel        | Completed – ongoing                                                  | • Sponsored approximately two dozen diversity related events that were attended by hundreds of students. Additionally, for several of these events, the presenters also offered professional development for faculty that was attended by approximately 300 faculty and staff.  
• The Cultural Life Committee was reassigned to Student Activities in fall 2011 to correspond with the creation of the Assistant Director of Diversity position in that area. Co-curricular programming is planned and executed through the efforts of this group - ongoing. |
| Increasing the exposure to world cultures, world religions, political perspectives, and socio-economic issues through international programming. | Shanin Dougherty  | In Progress - Proceeding as Expected                                 | • Participated in the Cultural Life Committee to suggest new student activities which will focus on diversity and, potentially, international concerns – fall 2010.  
• Attended Deans Council meeting to explain how to propose a new study abroad program – fall 2010.  
• During academic year 2011-12, the College will introduce one new, internationally focused event on campus. |
| Establishing a position to coordinate campus-wide diversity initiatives and provide support to students from historically marginalized populations. | Elliott Strickland | Completed                                                            | • Hired new Assistant Director for Diversity and Multicultural Awareness – summer 2011                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Providing resources and training on diversity for faculty and staff. | Tom Gregory, Elliott Strickland, Linda Morris | In Progress – Proceeding as Expected                                 | • Employee Relations and Student Activities collaborated to offer a number of professional development opportunities. One model that proved successful is having guest speakers who are scheduled to present or perform for students provide a professional development workshop during their stay – AY 2010-11.  
• Began exploring commercially available professional development options. This exploration was reportedly impeded by the lack of an institutional definition of diversity and clear set of expectations to be accomplished by diversity-related professional development. Additionally, this approach has been affected by budget considerations – AY 2010-11.  
• The First Year Advisory Committee will recommend to the Provost a definition of diversity and the desired outcomes for diversity-related professional development and resources – ECD spring 2012.  
• Employee Relations continued development of an “on-boarding” plan for all new faculty and staff that includes reinforcement of the commitment to diversity – ECD spring 2012. |
## Recommendation 9: Student Support Services

Expand student support systems by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Lead Unit/Person(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Increasing the scope and availability of academic support services, including tutoring, workshops on study and life skills, and peer coaching. | Kim Bolig | **Complete - ongoing**
| Added SupportNET, mentoring, a Writing Center, appointment tutoring, and additional Study and Enrichment Programming (On Demand workshops) to the existing menu of ASC services and expanded tutoring into the Madigan Library – AY 2010-11. | | |
| Created and implemented a three-year strategic plan to guide expansion and outcomes assessment – AY 2010-11. | | |
| During academic year 2011-12, the ASC will integrate MAP Works with SupportNET, conduct mentor recruiting and training, conduct and assess summer programming, $^3$ and conduct and assess the fall study skills mini-conference – ECD summer 2012. | | |
| Developing an academic success portal site for students, containing information about academic expectations, available resources, and co-curricular opportunities. | Kim Bolig | **In Progress - Proceeding as Expected**
| Expanded the Academic Success Center portal to include more information and expanded services for academic success. This expansion included the development of a “success” content area. | | |
| Used student focus groups and a review of best practices to identify four primary areas of student interest that will shape content additions to the portal: campus culture, high school vs. college, financial literacy, and social responsibility – fall 2011. | | |
| Used student focus groups and a review of best practices to identify five secondary areas of student interest that will shape content additions to the portal: study skills and learning; college case scenarios; time management, calendar, and procrastination; classroom etiquette, and coping with homesickness – fall 2011. | | |
| Created content pages for college readiness, high school vs. college, classroom etiquette, learning styles, time management and procrastination, reading strategies, academic mentoring, and study skills. Content additions for the “success” portal will be placed in the “WIN IT” (What I Need Is This) area – ECD spring 2012. | | |
| Completion timeline: | | |
| Additional portal page development and marketing – spring 2012. | | |
| Success portal development and updating – ongoing. | | |
| Success portal evaluation and revision– summer 2012. | | |
| Replacing the College’s current Early Alert System with an online, comprehensive system that provides greater accessibility and more developed tracking and notification abilities. | Eugene McAvoy | **In Progress - Proceeding as Expected**
| In fall 2010, implemented the SupportNET online alert system. Almost 800 referrals in AY 2010-11 approximately quadrupled the number of alerts received in any previous year. AY 2011-12 use has so far doubled over last year. | | |
| Introduced MAP-Works to supplement SupportNET for first year students, to help target interventions, and to better ensure communication and coordination among campus personnel involved in student interventions – fall 2011. | | |
| Developed a MAP-Works roll out plan to phase-in use of the program – fall 2011. | | |
| Provided professional development to familiarize potential users with the program – fall 2011. | | |
| The College will develop an online user’s manual to assist faculty and staff in using the program – ECD spring 2012. | | |
| The College will develop and implement strategies to encourage expanded use of MAP-Works, especially by academic advisers – ECD spring 2012. | | |
| The College will assess MAP-Works’ results to determine the most effective use of the program – ECD Fall 2012. | | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Original Date Earned</th>
<th>Date(s) Reaffirmed</th>
<th>Expiration</th>
<th>Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation</th>
<th>Date of Next Periodic Review Report</th>
<th>Deadline for Next Self Study</th>
<th>Date of Next Site Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania College of Technology</td>
<td>Middle State Commission on Higher Education</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/1/07</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Apr-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Business & Computer Technologies

### Accounting BS (BSA, BAA) and AAS (BA)
- **Accreditation**: Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP)¹
- **Original Date Earned**: 2006
- **Date(s) Reaffirmed**: 2009
- **Expiration**: 2011
- **Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation**: 2/09/11
- **Deadline for Next Self Study**: 2011 Spring
- **Date of Next Site Visit**: Discontinued

### Business Administration Banking & Finance Concentration (B BF) Concentration
- **Accreditation**: Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP)¹
- **Original Date Earned**: 2001
- **Date(s) Reaffirmed**: Discontinued
- **Expiration**: 10/22/07
- **Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation**: Spring 2010
- **Deadline for Next Self Study**: Discontinued

### Business Administration Human Resource Management Concentration (BBH)
- **Accreditation**: Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP)¹
- **Original Date Earned**: 2001
- **Date(s) Reaffirmed**: Discontinued
- **Expiration**: 10/22/07
- **Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation**: Spring 2010
- **Deadline for Next Self Study**: Discontinued

### Business Administration Management Concentration (BBM)
- **Accreditation**: Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP)¹
- **Original Date Earned**: 2001
- **Date(s) Reaffirmed**: Discontinued
- **Expiration**: 10/22/07
- **Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation**: Spring 2010
- **Deadline for Next Self Study**: Discontinued

### Business Administration Marketing Concentration (BBK)
- **Accreditation**: Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP)¹
- **Original Date Earned**: 2001
- **Date(s) Reaffirmed**: Discontinued
- **Expiration**: 10/22/07
- **Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation**: Spring 2010
- **Deadline for Next Self Study**: Discontinued

### Business Management (BM)
- **Accreditation**: Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP)¹
- **Original Date Earned**: 2001
- **Date(s) Reaffirmed**: Discontinued
- **Expiration**: 10/22/07
- **Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation**: Spring 2010
- **Deadline for Next Self Study**: Discontinued

### Legal Assistant/Paralegal AAS (LA)
- **Approved by the American Bar Association**: 1994
- **Date(s) Reaffirmed**: 2/12/07
- **Expiration**: 2010
- **Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation**: 2/14/08
- **Deadline for Next Self Study**: 2013
- **Date of Next Site Visit**: 2014

### Legal Assistant/Paralegal Studies BS (BLA)
- **Approved by the American Bar Association**: 1994
- **Date(s) Reaffirmed**: 2/12/07

### Nurse-Health Care Paralegal Studies (LX)
- **Approved by the American Bar Association**: 1994
- **Date(s) Reaffirmed**: 2/12/07

### Information Assurance & Security (BIS)
- **Coursework has been certified by the National Security Agency to meet the requirements of the NSTISSI 4011 INFOSEC curriculum**: 2008
- **Date(s) Reaffirmed**: 2013
- **Expiration**: December 2012

---

¹ Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs
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## Pennsylvania College of Technology

**Program Accreditations/Certifications/Recognitions/Endorsements**

**As of January 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction and Design Technologies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Construction Technology (CB)</strong></td>
<td>Endorsement: Pennsylvania Builders Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Construction Technology and Management (BRM) (BRC) (BRN) (BRA)</strong></td>
<td>Endorsement: Pennsylvania Builders Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Builder (RB)</strong></td>
<td>Endorsement: Pennsylvania Builders Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Management (BCM)</strong></td>
<td>Accreditation: American Council for Construction Education (ACCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/08</td>
<td>7/30/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heating, Ventilation &amp; Air Conditioning Technology (HP) (HV)</strong></td>
<td>Endorsement: Air Conditioning Contractors of America (ACCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8/03</td>
<td>8/8/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heating, Ventilation &amp; Air Conditioning Design Technology (BHD)</strong></td>
<td>Endorsement: Air Conditioning Contractors of America (ACCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8/03</td>
<td>8/8/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Health Sciences

| **Dental Hygiene** | Accreditation: The Dental Hygiene major is accredited by the Commission on Dental Accreditation. ¹ ² The Commission is a specialized accrediting body recognized by the United States Department of Education. The Commission on Dental Accreditation can be contacted at (312) 440-4653 or at 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, IL 60611-2678. The Commission's web address is: http://www.ada.org/117.aspx |

### Nursing - baccalaureate (BSN) (BGN) Nursing - associate (NR) Practical Nursing (NU) Health Arts: Practical Nursing Emphasis (HN)

| Accreditation: National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC); Approved by the Pennsylvania Board of Nursing. For further information, contact the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission at 3343 Peachtree Rd. NE, Suite 850, Atlanta GA 30326; 404-975-5000. |
| 2003 | 2003 | Fall 2007 | Fall 2015 | Fall 2015 |

### Occupational Therapy Assistant (OC)

| Accreditation: Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE)¹² |

### Emergency Medical Services (ER) and Paramedic Technician (PE)

| Accreditation: Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) (www.caahep.org) upon the recommendation of the Committee on Accreditation of Educational Programs for the Emergency Medical Services Professions (CoAEMSP)¹¹ |
| 1979 | 01/21/2010 | 01/2015 | 2015 |

| PA Department of Health, Bureau of Emergency Medical Services |

### Physical Fitness Specialist (FS)

| Recognized by the National Strength and Conditioning Association (NSCA) |
| 06/2007 | 8/25/10 | 05/2013 | 2015 |
### Pennsylvania College of Technology

#### Program Accreditations/Certifications/Recognitions/Endorsements

**As of January 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Accreditation:</th>
<th>Original date earned</th>
<th>Date(s) reaffirmed</th>
<th>Expiration</th>
<th>Date of next review/reaffirmation</th>
<th>Date of next periodic review report</th>
<th>Deadline for next self study</th>
<th>Date of next site visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radiography (RD)</strong></td>
<td>Accreditation: Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRC-ERT)²</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>01/2010</td>
<td>awarded 8 additional years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surgical Technology (SG)</strong></td>
<td>Accreditation: The Penn College Surgical Technology major is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP)¹ (<a href="http://www.caahep.org">www.caahep.org</a>) upon the recommendation of Accreditation Review Council on Education in Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting (<a href="http://www.arcstsa.org">www.arcstsa.org</a>); Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs, 1361 Park Street, Clearwater, FL 33756, (727) 210-2350</td>
<td>05/2006</td>
<td>05/21/2010</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial and Engineering Technologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Engineering Technology BS (BCT)</strong></td>
<td>Accreditation: Accredited by the Technology Accreditation Commission of ABET ¹, 111 Market Place, Suite 1050, Baltimore, MD 21202-4012</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8/2007</td>
<td>9/30/2013</td>
<td>summer 2012</td>
<td>summer 2012</td>
<td>summer 2012</td>
<td>summer 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Engineering Technology AAS (CT)</strong></td>
<td>Accreditation: Accredited by the Technology Accreditation Commission of ABET ¹, 111 Market Place, Suite 1050, Baltimore, MD 21202-4012</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>8/2007</td>
<td>9/30/2013</td>
<td>summer 2012</td>
<td>summer 2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer-Aided Drafting Technology (CD)</strong></td>
<td>Endorsement: American Design Drafting Association (ADDA)</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7/31/2007</td>
<td>8/31/2008</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing Engineering Technology (BAF)</strong></td>
<td>Accreditation: National Institute of Metalworking Skills (NIMS)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5/2/2008</td>
<td>5/1/2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5/2/2012</td>
<td>5/1/2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plastics &amp; Polymer Engineering Technology (BPS)</strong></td>
<td>Accreditation: Accredited by the Technology Accreditation Commission of ABET ¹, 111 Market Place, Suite 1050, Baltimore, MD 21202-4012</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8/13/2007</td>
<td>9/30/2013</td>
<td>summer 2012</td>
<td>summer 2012</td>
<td>summer 2012</td>
<td>summer 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant (ARC-PA)

² Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRC-ERT)

Appendix 4
## Pennsylvania College of Technology

### Program Accreditations/Certifications/Recognitions/Endorsements

**As of January 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Original Date Earned</th>
<th>Date(s) Reaffirmed</th>
<th>Expiration</th>
<th>Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation</th>
<th>Date of Next Periodic Review Report</th>
<th>Deadline for Next Self Study</th>
<th>Date of Next Site Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Integrated Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Original Date Earned</th>
<th>Date(s) Reaffirmed</th>
<th>Expiration</th>
<th>Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation</th>
<th>Date of Next Periodic Review Report</th>
<th>Deadline for Next Self Study</th>
<th>Date of Next Site Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Natural Resources Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Original Date Earned</th>
<th>Date(s) Reaffirmed</th>
<th>Expiration</th>
<th>Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation</th>
<th>Date of Next Periodic Review Report</th>
<th>Deadline for Next Self Study</th>
<th>Date of Next Site Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Technology (DD)</td>
<td>National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation (NATEF)</td>
<td>6/7/04</td>
<td>March 09</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Technology (FR)</td>
<td>Society of American Foresters¹</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>yearly report</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Original Date Earned</th>
<th>Date(s) Reaffirmed</th>
<th>Expiration</th>
<th>Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation</th>
<th>Date of Next Periodic Review Report</th>
<th>Deadline for Next Self Study</th>
<th>Date of Next Site Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Program Accreditations/Certifications/Recognitions/Endorsements

As of January 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date Earned</th>
<th>Date(s) Reaffirmed</th>
<th>Expiration</th>
<th>Date of Next Review/Reaffirmation</th>
<th>Date of Next Periodic Review Report</th>
<th>Deadline for Next Self Study</th>
<th>Date of Next Site Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Maintenance Technician (AC)</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Technology (AD)</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Learning Center</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>11/30/07</td>
<td>11/30/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring Center</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn College NOW</td>
<td>Apr-11</td>
<td>May-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Recognized by Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)
²Approved by the U.S. Secretary of Education

*Candidate Status
PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

Academic Program Review
Revised November 2011
Process Outline

Program review is a fundamental step in maintaining curricular integrity, relevance, current information and functions as a key component of the assessment of institutional effectiveness and student learning. An ideal model for program review is both effective and efficient, while serving as a benchmark allowing program comparison, motivation for currency and establishing aspirational goals and even models. Providing both quantitative and qualitative data, program review is also key in the allocation of institutional resources.

The Penn College Program Review Model embraces Dickeson’s 1999 ten criteria for setting academic priorities. (Dickeson1, 1999) Each program will be reviewed on a 3-year cycle. If the cycle coincides with external program accreditation, a modified format will be established between the Dean and Provost, and a review will be completed. Given the program to be reviewed, it will be the Dean’s decision to add an outside of program reviewer to the committee or not. This decision may be influenced by collaborative course offerings within the degree, program design, or concentration of general education within the degree requirements.

The review document (excluding attachments) should not exceed 15 pages in length and must include recommendations with an action plan. Please note that the program review document should reflect summary information and decisions made based on this information. Explicit and extensive corroborating information can and should be included in appendices.

Faculty and advisory committees must have a role in program review. Three years of data should be examined. The final document is forwarded to Provost for review by AA team (Associate VP, Assistant VP, and Provost). Results are forwarded to the President for information. Approval resides with the Provost. Transparency is important to the review process and to facilitate that campus and external awareness the Program Review process will be posted on the Penn College website.

*Data will be automatically provided by ARP per program review schedule.

FORMAT

1. **History, Development, Expectations (1 page)**
   - Program origin/design/current status
   - Rationale for program
   - Who does the program serve?

   **Data Sources**
   - Curriculum documents
   - Institutional strategic plan
   - Advisory committee

2. **Program Goals**
   - Demonstrate each goal is achieved in curriculum sequence
   - Verify core requirements are met
   - References to the Assessment Plan and Student Learning Outcomes should be noted in this section.
     - Program goals—how are they assessed?
     - Course outcomes—for all courses including General Education

3. **External Demand (1 page)**
   - Employer need – Program Advisory Board input must be noted.
   - Competition
   - National, state, local data
   - Popular media – fad; helping or hurting; emerging technologies

   **Data Sources**
   - Program Advisory Board Minutes
   - Other colleges—competition—web search
   - Work Force Investment Board—high demand occupations
   - Labor data (Occupational Handbook)
   - Popular media
   - National/regional job postings

4. **Internal Demand (less than 1 page format)**
   - Service to others
   - Contributions to WDCE
   - Minors for baccalaureate students

   **Data Sources**
   - GIC (current)
   - Sourcebook
   - Inside/outside credit hours
5. **Quality of Inputs/Processes (3-5 pages)**
   - Numbers—faculty, staff, degrees, % offered by full-time faculty, % by part-time
   - Faculty preparation/ongoing education, training and development
   - Personnel needs
   - Student preparation—overall quality
   * Test results—placement, SAT, NSSE
   - Facilities and technology
   - Accreditations—what agencies accredit; it not accredited, what are limitations?

**Data Sources**
- Fast Facts
- GIC
- Human Resources
- Sourcebook
- AS400 query—future—data warehouse
- Advisory committee input

6. **Quality of Outcomes (3-4 pages)**
   - Intentional learning outcomes are systematically measured
   * Retention; fall to spring; fall to fall
   * Graduation rate
   - Employability of graduate
   - Certifications, licensure, examination results
   - Employer feedback
   - Actual vs. unintended outcomes
   - Graduate school, transfer success
   - Significant student achievements
   - Student participation in related co-curricular activities/clubs
   * GPA’s; # dean’s list; # probation; etc.

**Data Sources**
- Graduate survey
- Assessment plan
- GIC
- Sourcebook
- Fast Facts
- Employer survey
- Alumni survey
- Career Services data
- School/program data
7. **Size, Scope & Productivity (1 page)**
   * Numbers students (head count/FTE)—trends
   * Credit hours (inside/outside)
   * Degrees granted—breadth, depth (scope)
   ● Accreditation
   * Productivity
     o Credit hours per faculty—overload history, trends
     o Class size
     o % capacity of course sections
     o Breakdown lecture/lab

   **Data Sources**
   □ GIC (current)
   □ Sourcebook

8. **Revenue & other Resources Generated (1 page)**
   ● Enrollment
   ● Grants
   ● Donations
   ● Service—what do we do for the college and community?
   ● Unique potential

   **Data Sources**
   □ GIC (current)
   □ Grants and contracts data
   □ Institutional Advancement data
   □ School data (annual reports)

9. **Costs (1 page)**
   * Cost analysis (ARP model) must include lab fees
   ● Needs—what investment is necessary? Technology, staffing, space/facilities

   **Data Sources**
   □ Cost model (ARP office)
   □ School data
10. **Impact, Justification & Overall Essentiality (1 page)**
   - Centrality to mission
   - External community asset role
   - Value to College; tangible and intangible

**Data Sources**
- School data
- Strategic Vision & Plan

11. **The Future—Opportunities and Recommendations (2-3 pages)**
   - This is the summary narrative and recommendations that should clearly define the future of the program. The overall SWOT for the program may be reviewed in this section or may be incorporated throughout the document.

**IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE**

Ideally this is a spring activity to allow for completion in time to facilitate program planning and curricular revisions. Overall the work can be initiated by the Dean at any time as long as completed by April of each year.

Program review results should be incorporated into the schools’ three-year strategic plans connecting resource allocation, planning and data driven decision making.
Addendum 1

There are certain elements or sections that should be in place for each program review document as outlined below. These are to be added to the document prior to submission to the Provost.

1. Executive Summary—to include an overview of the study and recommendations as appropriate. Executive Summaries will be posted to the web as a measure of our transparency via assessment.

2. Recommendations—any recommendations should be clearly summarized at the conclusion of the document and where appropriate timelines, assessment measures and responsible individuals.

3. Cover memo from the school Dean—a transmittal if you will with any additional information that would enhance the overall report.

4. ARP Data will be provided annually by September 15 to the School Dean.

5. Cost Data will be provided annually by November 1 to the School Dean.
Academic Calendar
Fall 2011 – Spring 2012

AUGUST
1 Fall Tuition Due
4 Summer Classes End
6 Commencement
8 Drop/Add, Late Registration
9 Summer Grades Due
11 Convocation
Non-Instructional Faculty Workday
12 Staff Development
Non-Instructional Faculty Workday
13 – 14 Welcome Weekend
15 CLASSES BEGIN

SEPTEMBER
5 Labor Day (NO CLASSES)

OCTOBER
7 1st 8-Week Classes End
   Mid-Terms Due
11 1st 8-Week Final Grades Due
14 – 16 Fall Break (NO CLASSES)
17 – 28 Spring 2012 Scheduling Advising Period
23 Fall Open House
31 – Nov. 4 Spring Scheduling for Current Students

NOVEMBER
1 – 4 Spring Scheduling for Current Students
11 Last Day for “W”
23 – 28 Thanksgiving Vacation (NO CLASSES)

DECEMBER
2 16-Week Classes End
5 – 9 FINALS WEEK (8-Week Classes Continue)
9 2nd 8-Week Classes End
   END OF SEMESTER (Dec. 10 for Saturday Classes)
12 Spring 2012 Tuition Due
12 – 15 Staff Development
   Non-Instructional Faculty Workdays
13 Final Grades Due
17 Commencement
17 – Jan. 1 COLLEGE CLOSED

JANUARY
2 College Reopens
4 Drop/Add, Late Registration
4 – 6 Staff Development
   Non-Instructional Faculty Workdays
9 CLASSES BEGIN

MARCH
2 1st 8-week Classes End
   Mid-Terms Due
4 – 11 Spring Break (NO CLASSES)
12 – 23 Fall 2012 Scheduling Advising Period
13 1st 8-Week Grades Due
24 Spring Open House
   Non-Instructional Faculty Workday
26 – 30 Scheduling for Current Students

APRIL
6 – 9 Easter Break (NO CLASSES)
13 Last Day for “W”
27 16-Week Classes End
30 – May 4 FINALS WEEK (8-Week Classes Continue)

MAY
1 – 4 FINALS WEEK (8-Week Classes Continue)
4 END OF SEMESTER (May 5 for Saturday Classes)
7 Minimester Begins
7 – 10 Staff Development
   Non-Instructional Faculty Workdays
8 Final Grades Due
11 & 12 Commencement
12 1st Summer Session Begins
   Non-Instructional Faculty Workday

JUNE
19 2nd Summer Session Begins

FALL 2011
Instructional Days 74 + 5 Finals
Non-Instructional Days 6
Total Fall 2011 = 85

SPRING 2012
Instructional Days 73 + 5 Finals
Non-Instructional Days 9
Total Spring 2012 = 87

2011/12 SUMMARY
Total Instructional Days 157
Total Non-Instructional 15
Total Faculty Days = 172