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Introduction

On June 27, 2013, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education accepted Lebanon Valley College’s March 2013 Monitoring Report, acknowledged the visiting team report submitted by the Commission’s representatives, removed our warning, and reaffirmed accreditation. The Commission declared that Lebanon Valley College was in compliance with accreditation standards 7 (institutional assessment) and 14 (assessment of student learning). Nevertheless, the Commission requested a monitoring report in April 2015 that demonstrates the following: (1) data are collected, managed, and archived by the Office of Institutional Research; (2) assessment plans and results are shared and discussed by appropriate constituencies in a timely manner; (3) assessment processes have sufficient simplicity, practicality, and ownership to be sustainable; and (4) assessment results are used to renew strategic planning, to support benchmarking and resource allocation, and to achieve documented improvements in all programs.

Institutional Transformation

Lebanon Valley College finds itself in a transformative period. The institution has undertaken this transformation because of current pressures in higher education. This process was initiated after the Middle States Commission placed the College on warning in the summer of 2012. It convinced us that the College needed to be proactive about meeting the challenges of higher education in the 21st century. The leadership of the College’s Board of Trustees and President Lewis Evitts Thayne has set in motion many programs and actions to depart from the status quo and undertake exciting new initiatives and programs that will transform the institution and sustain it for years to come.

Overview of the College

Lebanon Valley College (LVC) is a private, co-educational college founded in 1866 by local private citizens who resided in and around Annville, Pennsylvania. All of the founders were members of the United Brethren Church but none of them was a college graduate. At its origin, the College was coeducational and guided by the principle that “education, to be effective, must be thorough and practical” (General Curricular and First Annual Catalogue, 1866–1867). The College’s current mission, revised in 2014 through a strategic planning process that involved input from all segments of our community, reads:

Lebanon Valley College delivers a transformative education built on the liberal arts. We develop students who think critically and creatively across boundaries, who solve complex problems, who communicate effectively, and who value differences among human beings. Our graduates are empowered to pursue a life of learning, citizenship, and success.

LVC offers thirty-six academic majors, five baccalaureate degrees, three part-time master’s degree programs, one full-time master’s degree program in athletic training, and a full-time doctoral program in physical therapy. This list includes new academic programs in athletic training and exercise science that begin in the fall of 2015. Last fall, the College enrolled 1,683 full- and part-time undergraduates and 218 graduate students. Seventy-nine percent of full-time undergraduate students reside in the College’s 27 residential units. The College retained 85% of the 2013 cohort after the first year, and 72% of the 2010 cohort completed their baccalaureate degrees in four years. There are 106 full-time faculty members, 90% of whom have a doctorate or terminal degree in their field.
Lebanon Valley College has been accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education since 1922. The College is approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and the following programs have been granted specialized accreditation: the Doctor of Physical Therapy degree program by the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education; accounting, business, and economics programs by the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs; music programs by the National Association of Schools of Music; and chemistry programs by the American Chemical Society.

**Enhancements since March 2013**

The faculty of the College has led the way in achieving several positive steps forward. They have embarked on ambitious and comprehensive revisions to the general education curriculum, the first such significant changes in more than two decades. These revisions will promote learning opportunities across the curriculum taught by full-time faculty who will mentor students within and beyond the classroom. An educational technologist has been added to the staff to assist faculty in developing the most effective and advanced classroom teaching methods. The faculty continues to look for ways to enhance and improve academic offerings. Since the March 2013 *Monitoring Report*, faculty have been involved, in addition to general education, in the curricular redesign of computer science, music recording technology, and psychology. Planning for a new major in finance is underway. A new academic program in exercise science and an entry-level master’s-degree program in athletic training will start this fall; both have attracted a robust number of applications for the next entering class.

The College has committed to develop world-ready students through various efforts, including internationalizing its campus community. Last year, the College commissioned two agents for international student recruitment. President Thayne himself visited China in 2014 to establish relationships with schools in Tianjin and Beijing. The Study Abroad Office was expanded and renamed the Center for Global Education, and an Assistant Director position was created to recruit international students and develop infrastructure to support them once they enroll.

The College utilized a bequest in excess of $1 million from an alumnus and his wife to create the Lebegern Learning Commons in the lower level of the Mund Campus Center at the start of the 2014 academic year. This innovative, student-learning space offers cutting-edge technology for use around the clock. Lebegern Learning Commons makes it possible to centralize academic support and enrichment services to provide a convenient communal space for active, engaged learning. Lebegern allows for synergy among offices providing important student support: disability services, peer tutoring, the writing center, global education, and career development. Lebegern also offers a comfortable commuter center for students who do not reside on campus, accessible meeting spaces, practice facilities for the Wig and Buckle Theater Company, and areas for the digital communications and music recording technology academic programs.

The College has undertaken several steps to improve the effectiveness of our admission and scholarship programs. The College introduced Early Decision and the Common Application for the first time this past fall. In an effort to better shape incoming classes in an increasingly competitive marketplace, the College utilized the services of a third-party firm to analyze its current scholarship program. This analysis will suggest future improvements to help families meet the financials requirements of affording the high quality, valuable college education that we provide to all our students. This year, the College admitted its most diverse class in history. It has also adopted an inclusive excellence model as an aspiration for the institution’s future.
The College remains committed to improving its physical plant and facilities as well those it utilizes in off-campus locations. This winter, the College received a $1.6 million sustainable-development grant from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania’s Going Greener Program to construct a new LEED-certified welcome and admission center on Main Street in Annville. The College has added a continuing-education presence at the Dixon University Center in Harrisburg while closing a location no longer needed at Lancaster General Hospital.

In 2013–2014, the College began to develop a new a strategic blueprint to guide its future. A steering committee composed of representatives from throughout the campus community worked in tandem with E4 Exchange Strategic Consultancy of Lancaster to coordinate the process. All segments of the campus community contributed ideas, input, and feedback. A website was created where all members of the community could access a deep reservoir of information about higher education in general and Lebanon Valley College in particular. This archive included a myriad of statistical studies and consumer research conducted with prospective students. A written plan emerged that defines the institution’s mission, purpose, values, strategic imperatives, value proposition, and overarching success indicators.

Perhaps most important of all, the document articulates four strategic focus areas of concentration from now through 2020:

- Graduating World-Ready Students;
- Delivering Educational Excellence and Engaged Learning;
- Developing Inclusive Excellence and High Performance; and
- Achieving Sustainability.

The faculty and staff endorsed the plan. The Board of Trustees then approved the plan in February 2015. Task forces for each strategic focus area have been appointed to develop implementation plans that will begin in summer 2015. This planning process, combined with current challenges in higher education, caused us to examine and assess what we do now that we need to keep doing, what we need to do that we are not doing at present, and what we are doing now that we need to stop doing because this activity is no longer relevant to those we serve.

This blueprint for an envisioned future will guide the institution through the challenges of the next several years and strengthen the College’s position to increase enrollment, maximize revenue, and enhance the quality of its educational offerings. It will promote institutional renewal and further the transformation underway at our institution.

**New Personnel Serving the College since March 2013**

President Thayne continues to enhance the quality of our leadership team through adding experienced and talented individuals who are committed to fulfilling the College’s mission of providing a first-rate, high-quality education to all our students. These steps have fostered a cohesive and enthusiastic team that seeks to instill a high-performance culture throughout the institution. Since the submission of the March 2013 Monitoring Report to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, several noteworthy, positive leadership changes have occurred within the College’s senior leadership:

- In July 2013, President Thayne appointed Steven O’Day as Special Assistant to the President. Mr. O’Day chaired the strategic planning campus committee and serves as interim Vice President for Advancement until our national search is completed.
• In September 2013, President Thayne appointed Karen Feather, who ran the Washington office of a U.S. Representative for more than two decades, as the Executive Assistant to the President and Secretary of the College.

• Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration Tom Maher served the College well during 2013–2014 during which an extensive national search led to the hiring of Shawn Curtin to fill permanently this leadership position.

• In May 2014, the Vice President for Enrollment Management left the College and an experienced interim replacement currently manages our enrollment office and its operation. A national search launched in December 2014 to hire an experienced leader in enrollment management by July 2015.

• In September 2013, the College hired Jessica Ickes as our full-time Director of Institutional Research. She replaced the previous director who left the College in June 2013.

• Under the direction of new Associate Dean Greg Buckley, Graduate Studies and Continuing Education was renamed “Graduate & Professional Studies (GPS).” GPS’s mission has shifted its focus to meet the 21st century educational needs of adult and part-time students through undergraduate, graduate, and non-credit professional development opportunities. As a result, new directors for the Master in Business Administration program, the Master in Science Education program, and the Office of Professional Education were hired. GPS has coordinated campus-wide efforts to reenergize or enter into consortia agreements with community colleges.

**Context for this Monitoring Report**

This *Monitoring Report* provides evidence that Lebanon Valley College has instituted and continues to develop effective, useful, and sustainable assessment processes that have resulted in or are currently informing improvements in programs, services, and curriculum. Further, these assessment processes are themselves assessed regularly and continue to be refined to ensure usefulness and sustainability.
Requirement 1: Data are collected, managed, and archived by the Office of Institutional Research

The April 2013 visiting team report recommended that the College “enhance support of the vital Institutional Research function, and look to IR for best practices in data collection, data management, and data presentation.” Notable progress in institutional research practices has been made since the April 2013 team visit, resulting in a wealth of information pertaining to admissions, campus climate, retention, alumni, current students, and faculty. Research findings have been made accessible to appropriate stakeholders and are used to inform discussions, planning initiatives, resources, marketing, and curricular improvements. Institutional Research (IR) has also contributed to strengthening the College’s efforts to assess institutional and educational effectiveness.

In September 2013, a new director of Institutional Research joined the College, bringing to the position a breadth of experience in institutional research, assessment, and accreditation. In her initial year at the College, the director worked to improve data standards, implement census and standardized reporting, increase transparency and data driven decision-making, and establish an infrastructure based on best practices. In addition, she articulated a departmental mission consonant with the institutional mission that guides the work of the IR office:

The mission of the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) is to support the advancement of the mission at Lebanon Valley College by providing unbiased information to be used in college-wide decision-making, institutional effectiveness activities, assessment practices, and strategic planning processes. The office responds to internal and external requests for data to ensure the accuracy and consistency of reported College data.

The Office of Institutional Research is guided by the Association of Institutional Research’s Code of Ethics and Professional Practice.

Data Collection and Management

To achieve the mission of Institutional Research, the director requested and was immediately given access to all appropriate data within the institutional data system, including admissions, enrollment, retention, financial aid, and course-level data. Once this access was provided, the Director of Institutional Research collaborated closely with the Office of Information Technology to build custom tables in the data system that combine selected data into meaningful data “views” for standard reporting.

Through this process, the Director of Institutional Research, the Registrar, and Information Technology identified a need for broader campus discussion of data standards and definitions. This led to the formation of the “Information Systems User-group and Data Standards Committee” that is comprised of appointed representatives from each College division, including representatives from Information Technology, Institutional Research, the Registrar’s Office, Graduate and Professional Studies, Marketing and Communications, Advancement, Student Affairs, Admissions, and Financial Aid. Other constituents are invited to join the committee as needed. The committee began meeting monthly in September 2014 and identified a list of initial data items, definitions, processes, and policies to review.

In addition to supporting the collection and management of institutional data from the College’s information system, the Director of IR serves as the primary administrator of TracDat, the College’s
assessment management system. In this role, the Director of IR collaborates closely with the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs (ADAA), the Associate Dean of Student Affairs (ADSA), and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) to ensure that the system is used to collect and archive assessment data and reports in academic and administrative departments and divisions. This system serves as the central repository for assessment information, but has the potential to be a place where all stakeholders can access the full range of assessment reports.

The Director of IR is also the primary administrator of Qualtrics, a campus-wide survey tool purchased in spring 2014 at the recommendation of the Directors of Institutional Research and Information Technology. Qualtrics serves as a survey data collection system and a central repository for raw survey results and instruments. This particular system was selected not only to collect survey data, but also to improve the security of survey data and extend survey research capability to interested students and faculty.

To support the systematic collection of survey data, the Director of IR also proposed a multi-year survey schedule that was endorsed by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. To gain an understanding of the scope of survey needs on campus, the Office of Institutional Research first reviewed the existing survey schedule and implemented a survey prioritization process. In April 2014, administrative departments that planned to administer a survey in academic year 2014–2015 were asked to identify the following: type of and purpose for surveys and targeted audience. This process was beneficial in identifying survey overlap, streamlining survey data collection, and minimizing the potential for survey fatigue. For example, a number of offices were able to consolidate small surveys into a bi-annual comprehensive student satisfaction survey.

The survey schedule includes a rotation of survey instruments that ensures data are collected in a way that allows for longitudinal analyses to be conducted. For example, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) will be administered to first-year students and seniors at the end of second semester every three years. This will allow for longitudinal analyses of the same students over time and enable the College to gather data on perceived growth over time.

This type of survey schedule encourages survey data to be collected systematically and purposefully. A copy of the survey schedule can be found in Appendix 1.1.

Archiving

When evaluating the Institutional Research infrastructure, the director determined that an urgent need existed at the College to establish standard reporting data files at appropriate census dates. Historically, College administrative offices independently created reporting data files that were typically not shared with or archived in the Office of Institutional Research. The offices of Institutional Research, Information Technology, the Registrar, Financial Aid, and Human Resources met on a number of occasions to establish the needed data fields for each census data file and to discuss data standards for those files. The Office of Information Technology prepared data tables in the system that captures or “snapshots” the data in each of these tables daily. These data files are archived and are available to query as needed. Additionally, the data are archived in the data system and by IR on the relevant census
dates beginning in fall 2014. These data tables and files have been created for admissions, retention, enrollment, and financial aid and are forthcoming for human resources.

The need for improved archiving at the College extended beyond the creation of census reporting files as well. As noted previously, the College adopted two technological tools, TracDat and Qualtrics, to support the archiving of assessment data and survey research instruments and data. Thus far, these tools have met the College’s need in these areas, and they will be evaluated regularly to identify additional needs and maximize functionality.

Transparency

In addition to the need for the implementation of robust data collection, management, and archiving, the College sought to expand access to College data more broadly both internally and externally to support data-driven decision-making. The College’s senior leadership unanimously endorsed a guiding principle of campus-wide access and transparency to data as appropriate, and the President appointed the Director of IR to the College’s senior leadership team. In order to ensure that research and assessment results were accessible to all stakeholders, the Director of IR created a comprehensive website for internal and external constituents, and a dissemination plan for College survey data. A complete listing of reports can be accessed at www.lvc.edu/institutionalresearch. Data sharing will be discussed in greater detail under “Requirement 2” of this monitoring report.

Summary and Next Steps

• Significant progress has been made in the area of institutional research at the College in the last eighteen months, including improvements in the systematic collection, management, and archiving of institutional data, assessment results, and survey research.
• The College will continue to archive institutional data; these resources will develop over time as data continue to be stored and archived.
• Information Technology is currently in the process of developing the appropriate census and reporting data file for Human Resources. That work is scheduled for completion in spring 2015.
Requirement 2: Assessment plans and results are shared and discussed by appropriate constituencies in a timely manner

The April 2013 Visiting Team report noted that Lebanon Valley College is making “great progress in achieving a culture of assessment,” but needs to improve processes for sharing assessment findings with key stakeholders.

Through websites, annual reports, and presentations, assessment results are now shared with internal and external audiences. Those who are primarily responsible for assessment have dissemination plans for sharing findings and facilitating discussions. Deliberate efforts are made to ensure that appropriate stakeholders have access to assessment results and institutional data sources.

Sharing Institutional Data and Institutional Assessment Results

Since the March 2013 monitoring report and April 2013 team visit, considerable improvements have been made in institutional research, including how institutional data and assessment results are shared. The Director of Institutional Research posts institutional data reports, survey summaries, and the College’s Factbook on the department’s website, making them accessible to internal and external audiences. Academic departmental data and specific survey results (HERI Faculty Survey and the Campus Climate Survey) are accessible on the IR website to an internal audience.

A Google Analytics report shows that people are viewing the resources and data available on the IR website. Two months after the website was launched, it had 1,683 page views. In the first quarter, this figure rose to 2,390 views, indicating that this website is an appropriate place to share assessment findings. Usage continues to be tracked using Google Analytics.

In addition to the IR website, the director has given frequent presentations to the College’s senior leadership team, Student Affairs and Academic Affairs administrators, College committees, College faculty, Board of Trustees sub-committees, and student groups. Table 1 indicates with whom key institutional survey data have been shared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Survey Data</th>
<th>Shared With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate Survey</td>
<td>Committee on Inclusive Excellence; senior leadership team and participants at the senior leadership retreat (August 2014); Student Affairs administrators; Student Government; College faculty and staff; online accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRP</td>
<td>Student Affairs administrators; selected data points in assessment presentations; online accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>Academic departments; senior leadership team; Board of Trustees sub-committee on Academic and Student Affairs; Academic Affairs Council; Student Affairs administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Survey Data</td>
<td>Shared With</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>College faculty; Academic Affairs Council; senior leadership team; Student Affairs administrators; online accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni &amp; Graduating Senior Surveys</td>
<td>Senior leadership team; Academic Affairs Council; faculty; online accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERI Faculty Survey</td>
<td>Senior leadership team; College faculty; online accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>Senior leadership team; members of the Academic Affairs Council; Student Affairs staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National trends impacting higher education</td>
<td>Senior leadership team; senior leadership retreat (expanded group); Board of Trustees sub-committee on Academic and Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure that sharing results from institutional surveys is systematic and deliberate, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee approved an institutional dissemination plan in September 2014. This plan can be found in Appendix 2.1. Further, to guard against a misuse of surveys and maximize the use of data, requests made to the Director of IR for a college-wide survey must include a clear dissemination plan.

The College has also emphasized sharing institutional data to support planning, decision-making, and program-level assessments. The Director of Institutional Research and the College Registrar have provided research and assessment results to the faculty task force on load reconfiguration, including, but not limited to, load models at peer institutions, faculty load and composition analysis, departmental load summary reports and planning reports, NSSE and CIRP data points, and retention/degree completion analysis. These two administrators have also furnished data and assessment results to academic departments, particularly those preparing for program reviews. Specific information includes alumni survey results, departmental enrollment trends, grade distribution reports, degree-completion rates, and student participation in high-impact experiences. The Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning shares and discusses analyses of IDEA data at chairs’ meetings, focusing primarily on teaching effectiveness of adjunct faculty and common teaching methodologies at LVC. Providing faculty groups with institutional data and survey results not only informs careful planning and decision-making, but also demonstrates administrative support of faculty assessment processes.

The College’s senior leadership team, which consists of members from all six divisions, discusses assessment findings from various units in support of institutional goals on a periodic basis. Such findings may be from operational reports in functional areas (e.g. alumni support, enrollment data, analysis of employee benefits), or they may be gleaned from surveys or committee reports (e.g. Task Force on Technology Final Report, Annual Report of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to the College President, results from the Campus Climate survey). Members of the senior leadership team use these findings to brainstorm possible solutions as well as to inform planning decisions and divisional priorities. For example, results from the Campus Climate Survey informed the planning goals of the Committee on Inclusive Excellence and influenced two Strategic Focus Areas in the College’s Envisioned Future Plan. Assessment reports from the six divisions are likewise shared with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and reviewed with respect to usefulness, reliability, and implications for resources.

Institutional assessment data were also shared with E4, the strategic planning consulting team commissioned by the College, and discussed by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC). Data included branding research, market analyses, advancement and alumni program reviews and audit
reports, current market analyses, and institutional survey results. A complete listing of the institutional survey reports shared with the strategic planning consulting team, E4, and the SPSC can be found in Appendix 2.2.

Additionally, the College shares information with external audiences as per HEA requirements and other federal and state compliance mandates. In November 2013, President Thayne appointed a compliance officer at the recommendation of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to ensure that the institution remains in compliance with all regulations. The Executive Assistant to the President and Secretary to the College was named as compliance officer, and she is currently drafting a compliance calendar. The Education Program’s assessments of student learning and program effectiveness are shared with and analyzed by diverse stakeholders, namely alumni and representatives from local school districts, as mandated by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. Departments that have specialized accreditation—chemistry, physical therapy, music, and business—share assessment findings with their respective accrediting agencies through a self-study review process. Likewise, academic and nonacademic departments engage in five-year program reviews, sharing program assessment results with external reviewers, faculty committees, and College divisions.

Finally, as per a suggestion made by the April 2013 visiting team and advocated for by Institutional Research and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, LVC joined the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS), which necessitates sharing data with a variety of stakeholders.

**Sharing Student Learning Assessment Plans and Results**

Student learning assessment plans are generated by members of individual departments. In general, assessment results are analyzed at the departmental level and then shared with and reviewed by the assessment sub-committee of the Committee on Curriculum and Assessment (CCA). The sub-committee, chaired by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA), consists of three faculty members, the Associate Dean of Student Affairs (ADSA), and the Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. All members of each department are invited to participate in the review in order to ensure that conversations about assessment and assessment findings are inclusive and to guard against assessment becoming the responsibility of one individual (e.g. the department chair) operating in isolation of other faculty. Further, all faculty members receive a summary of the comments made during the review. In 2013–2014, 17 out of 18 department chairs (94.4%) reported discussing these comments with members of the department.

The assessment sub-committee provides bi-annual progress reports to the Committee on Curriculum and Assessment and a yearly report to the full faculty at the close of the academic year. These reports, which focus on departmental compliance and the quality of assessment practices, are an opportunity to share with faculty a review of the College’s assessment processes.

The assessment plan for General Education is developed by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Director of Curriculum and members of the General Education Advisory Committee. The plan is shared specifically with faculty who participate in these assessments, and it is posted on the Institutional Effectiveness website under “Student Learning Assessment” ([www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness](http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness)). Results from the assessments of student learning in general education are analyzed by the General Education Advisory Committee each semester, disseminated to the faculty-at-large at faculty meetings and brown bag lunch presentations, and are accessible to all faculty members on the Institutional Effectiveness website.
Student learning assessments are also required from administrative offices responsible for student learning, including Advisement and Student Success, the College Library, Center for Disability Resources, Global Education, the Writing Center, Career Development, Counseling, Multicultural Affairs, Leadership Institute, Residential Life, and Spiritual Life and Community Service. Assessment plans and results in Academic Affairs are initially reviewed by the ADAA. They are then reviewed by the assessment sub-committee on a two-year cycle and, when appropriate, analyzed at the divisional level with respect to planning priorities. In Student Affairs, assessment results are reviewed by the ADSA and members of the Student Affairs Assessment Committee (SAAC). The Student Affairs division has made some component of assessment (e.g., shared findings, processes, TracDat training) the focus of the three division-wide retreats held annually, and most recently, a Student Affairs Assessment Newsletter has been created to highlight divisional assessment findings and share them with a larger audience.

Outcomes data are also posted on the websites of academic departments or through social media venues. For some departments, these findings focus primarily on alumni stories and student/faculty accomplishments. Philosophy and religion, for instance, keep graduates and prospective students informed of student/faculty accomplishments through a departmental blog called BRAINSTORMS. Other departments, such as chemistry, publish the results of assessment testing. Marketing and Communications continues to work closely with academic departments to ensure that assessment results are accessible to external audiences, particularly prospective students and their parents.

Reports on assessment plans, results, and processes are also given twice annually to the Board of Trustees sub-committee on Academic and Student Affairs. Board members are kept apprised of where students’ performance is strong, where the College may need to dedicate resources and make modifications, how effectively academic departments are assessing student learning, and what percent of departments are in compliance with assessment requirements.

Program review protocols for academic and non-academic departments were implemented in 2014–2015. These protocols require departments to describe how assessment results are shared with stakeholders, including students, advisory boards, community partners, and departmental faculty. Program reviews, therefore, will become another vehicle for identifying how broadly assessment findings are disseminated.

Summary and Next Steps

- Considerable progress has been made since the March 2013 Monitoring Report at sharing assessment findings with diverse audiences through various means.
- Faculty and administrators have improved access to current institutional data sources that may then be used to inform planning decisions and other analyses.
- The College’s most valued stakeholder, our students, has been included in the dissemination of institutional survey findings. However, a more deliberate plan to include them in the process in the future needs to occur. The Committee on Curriculum and Assessment is currently discussing the possibility of including students on the assessment sub-committee.
- Institutional data and assessment findings will continue to be shared with and be available to constituents, and other opportunities for sharing and discussing results will be pursued.
- A more concerted and collaborative effort between those primarily responsible for assessment and the Enrollment Division may result in better sharing of outcomes data with prospective students.
• Academic Affairs/academic departments should collaborate further with Marketing and Communications to ensure greater consistency in how individual programs report outcomes data. The Chemistry Department is a model for other academic departments.
Requirement 3: Assessment processes have sufficient simplicity, practicality, and ownership to be sustainable

The April 2013 visiting team report recommended that the assessment plans in General Education and academic departments be simplified to “create a meaningful and sustainable process.” The team further voiced skepticism with the “template-driven documentation” being used at the College and suggested that administrative divisions consider an alternative reporting method.

Since then, the College has made progress toward establishing assessment processes that are practical, useful, and sustainable. An institutional effectiveness plan was fully implemented, and assessment processes for academic and administrative departments were modified with an aim toward greater simplicity, practicality, and ownership. Resources continue to be dedicated to improving assessment practices: assessment workshops for faculty and staff are regularly scheduled; the College invested in software to manage departmental assessments; and personnel resources and grant funding have been provided to support assessment practices.

Communicating Expectations to Ensure Quality, Ownership, and Sustainability

At its organizational meetings in April and May 2013, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) prepared a preliminary outline of a revised Institutional Effectiveness Plan. This revised plan was presented to President Thayne in December 2013, approved by senior leadership in January 2014, and modified in June 2014 to reflect updates to the College’s assessment processes. The plan articulates requirements and expectations related to assessment, including an assessment calendar, the review process for annual reports, budget allocation procedures, dissemination of institutional research findings, and recommendations pertaining to compliance. The Institutional Effectiveness Plan clearly states that assessments of student learning must be reported annually by all undergraduate and graduate programs, including general education. The plan further stipulates that all administrative departments are required to complete annual assessment reports. This plan is accessible to internal and external audiences via the Institutional Effectiveness website (www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness). A copy can be found in Appendix 3.1.

The processes used to review assessment reports were modified in order to enhance communication regarding effective assessment practices and emphasize ownership and accountability. Administrative reports in Academic Affairs are reviewed annually by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA) and scored using the rubric designed by the IEC in 2013–2014 to measure assessment processes at the departmental and divisional levels. (See Appendix 3.2.) The ADAA then meets one-on-one with each director to discuss his/her assessment processes and provide feedback on the contents of either the plan or report. Departmental reports in Student Affairs are reviewed on an annual basis by the Student Affairs Assessment Committee (SAAC) and scored using the IEC rubric.

As previously noted, annual assessment reports of student learning, generated by academic departments and administrative units responsible for student learning, are reviewed by a sub-committee of the Committee on Curriculum and Assessment. In an effort to communicate expectations more clearly and improve faculty understanding of what constitutes effective assessment, the Fulcher and Russell “Assessment Progress Template Evaluation Rubric” that had been used for administrative purposes in previous years was modified by the assessment sub-committee in Spring 2014 and shared with all faculty and directors. (See Appendix 3.3.) Rather than provide departments/directors solely with written feedback, as was practiced in previous years, directors and faculty representatives met face-to-face with the assessment sub-committee to discuss their annual reports on student learning assessments. Following each meeting, the sub-committee provided departments with a copy of a scored
rubric, indicating how effective their practices are, and providing a summary of the sub-committee’s comments and recommendations. Each review focuses on the quality of assessment processes as well as their practicality and sustainability.

As of March 1, 2015, 77% of the departments scheduled for an annual review met with the assessment sub-committee. Each department was well represented at its review, with full or nearly 100% of departmental faculty attending the reviews for chemistry, music, physical therapy, biochemistry & molecular biology, psychobiology, and Academic and Student Affairs operations. A survey of assessment processes revealed that 75% of those who participated in the face-to-face meeting with the assessment sub-committee found the review helpful, while 19% were neutral. In contrast, 67% of faculty in 2013–2014 reported that the assessment review process was helpful.

Average ratings on the rubric used to score assessment reports suggest that student learning assessment practices in academic departments range from good to exemplary. Departments are especially strong in articulating goals and measureable objectives and reporting, analyzing, and interpreting results. Ongoing faculty development is provided by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in developing action plans based on assessment results. While 35% of departments reviewed in 2014–2015 earned an “Exemplary” rating in using results to inform action plans, there are inconsistencies when it comes to documenting how assessment results are being used. (These results are on par with those from 2013–2014.)

Feedback from the assessment sub-committee addressed not only the effectiveness of assessment practices and the quality of departmental reports, but also on the efficiency and sustainability of assessment processes. Since April 2013, improvements have been made that resulted in simplified and more sustainable practices in a number of departments. For instance, the Psychology and Business Administration Departments implemented the use of standardized instruments, and all departments identified transition points where student learning will be assessed. A number of departments—physics, English, history, languages, and mathematical sciences—revised their learning goals and objectives, articulating learning outcomes with greater clarity and reducing the number of objectives.

Two specific recommendations made repeatedly by the assessment sub-committee with respect to efficiency and sustainability were for departments to make better use of current, existing data sources (e.g. IDEA survey data, alumni and graduating senior survey results) and to use one measure to assess multiple objectives. In art & art history, for example, the faculty designed a departmental rubric that might be used to measure majors’ artistic skills and development, problem-solving abilities, and communication skills. At present, it is being used only to assess artistic expression.

Face-to-face meetings with the assessment sub-committee provided faculty with clearer direction about meaningful assessment practices. Qualitative feedback solicited after the 2014–2015 reviews suggest this is the case. One faculty member noted, “We valued the opportunity to talk directly about the report and the chance to get ‘real time’ feedback from an external group that has the perspective of effective and sustainable assessment,” and another described the meeting as “extremely helpful . . . a collaborative process, a discussion with peers/colleagues.” This outcome will be assessed through the review process in 2015–2016.

Using a similar process, the IEC reviewed divisional reports, scoring each by a rubric that articulates expectations for exemplary practices. (Appendix 3.2) While the IEC’s primary purpose is to assess how planning priorities and resource allocations are informed by assessment findings, the reviews provided an opportunity to provide feedback on assessment processes and communicate to vice presidents what is required for good assessment. In October and November 2014, the IEC met with each
Simplifying Processes to Ensure Sustainability

The two main suggestions the April 2013 visiting team had regarding practical, sustainable processes—simplifying General Education assessments and eliminating the various reporting templates used by administrative departments/divisions—were implemented in 2013–2014.

General Education

In 2012–2013, in preparation for the March 2013 Monitoring Report and the April 2013 team visit, the College’s Assessment Committee and General Education Advisory Committee implemented a comprehensive assessment plan where all learning objectives were assessed in introductory-level, intermediate-level, and capstone-level courses using the AAC&U value rubrics. In addition, summative assessments were completed for first-year writing courses and intercultural diversity classes. In the Student Affairs Division, administrative units assessed how well students were developing learning outcomes related to intellectual and practical skills and personal and social responsibility.

Faculty and administrators realized, and the April 2013 visiting team affirmed, that such a comprehensive approach to assessing student learning in general education could not be sustained. Therefore, in summer 2013, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA), in consultation with the Director of Curriculum and members of the General Education Advisory Committee, drafted a three-year assessment plan, spanning 2013–2014 through 2015–2016. This plan includes assessing all learning objectives on a three-year cycle, using direct measures and current, existing data sources, such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Graduating Senior Survey, and the 1-Year and 5-Year Out Alumni Surveys. The AAC&U value rubrics have been customized by faculty and are being used to
assess student learning in the various areas of the general education curriculum. The completed assessment plan for 2013–2014 can be found in Appendix 3.4. The assessment plans for 2014–2015 and 2015–2016 are in Appendix 3.5. These plans can also be accessed on the Institutional Effectiveness website under “Student Learning Assessment.”

Results from the 2013–2014 and Fall 2014 assessments of student learning in general education indicate specific areas in quantitative reasoning, oral communication, written communication, critical thinking, information literacy, and intercultural competence where LVC students achieve milestones and those areas where their performances do not achieve the desired outcome. For example, assessments of both written and oral communication suggest that students’ skills are strong when organizing materials, adhering to conventions, and establishing a thesis or central message, but they are less successful in presenting evidence or providing supporting materials. Direct and indirect evidence of student learning in intercultural competence demonstrates that students successfully develop knowledge of cultures other than their own, but are less likely to be open to or curious about other cultures.

Assessments were additionally planned in order to answer questions about student learning and the general education curriculum that remained unanswered due to a lack of systematic assessments in previous years. For example, the College lacked evidence that Writing Process courses were, in fact, developing students’ writing abilities beyond first-year writing courses. Therefore, in fall 2013, an assessment of student writing in Writing Process courses was completed. A cross-sectional analysis indicated that students in Writing Process courses outperform those in ENG 111/FSY 100 with the greatest gains measured in writing conventions, syntax, and mechanics, and smaller gains noted in providing evidence to support a thesis.

Similarly, to date there had been no assessment of Disciplinary Perspectives (DSP) courses. Therefore, the College lacked evidence as to whether or not students were able to analyze a complex issue by integrating diverse disciplines. In 2014–2015, DSP courses participated in an assessment not only of student learning, but of the courses themselves. Results from the Fall 2014 semester suggest some problems with the current DSP course offerings. Specifically, the findings indicates that not all DSP courses are assessing the learning goals related to drawing connections between and among disciplinary perspectives, and showing how different perspectives may complement or challenge one another. The analysis of results reveals that students are strongest in disciplinary knowledge, but are not achieving the benchmark in making integrative connections and achieving a balance between disciplines. This assessment will continue into the Spring 2015 semester; the findings are being used to inform revisions to the general education curriculum, as outlined in Table 1 under “Requirement 4” of this Monitoring Report.

The assessments of student learning in general education courses are either course-embedded or completed by a team of faculty at the close of each semester who earn a nominal stipend for this additional work in assessment. They are facilitated by the ADAA, and the cycle ensures that assessments are equitably spread out among disciplines and faculty. Where possible, and depending on budget support, standardized assessments are used to measure student learning in general education. For example, in the Spring 2015 semester, the HEDS Research Practices Survey (RPS)—used to measure information literacy—is currently being administered to seniors. In Spring 2016, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) will be administered in Intercultural Diversity courses. There are obvious benefits to using standardized instruments, one of which is that they do not increase the workload of faculty.
To date, well-structured and focused assessments, administrative support, and use of standardized instruments when possible have resulted in a sustainable and practical process to assess general education, a process that has yielded meaningful results about student learning and the curriculum.

Reporting Mechanisms

The reporting templates described by users and the April 2013 visiting team as cumbersome and confusing were eliminated in 2013–2014 following the full implementation of TracDat, a comprehensive, web-based planning and assessment management tool. Effective Fall 2014, all academic and administrative departments were required to use TracDat for their assessment plans and reports and upload all artifacts—survey instruments and results, rubrics, test outlines, and course syllabi—into the system.

TracDat has provided the College with a tool to manage a sustainable assessment reporting process in all departments and allows each unit a common method to align objectives to divisional goals, institutional student learning goals, and Presidential priorities. In addition, using TracDat reduces the clerical burden on faculty and administrators that was associated with assessment reporting, since the system retains goals, objectives, and assessment methods, and various reports can be generated from user inputs, including customized reports that may be needed for specific administrative purposes. The ability to generate reports has also improved consistency, which was problematic prior to its installation.

Faculty and administrators benefitted from regularly scheduled TracDat training in 2013–2014 and Fall 2014. Training included individual meetings, phone consults, group workshops, and drop-in tutorials. Eighty-one percent of the administrative staff that participated in TracDat training agreed/strongly agreed that the training was clear. To supplement training efforts—and enhance the efficiency of staff development—the Director of IR developed instructional videos that highlight key functionality and answer frequently asked questions. These can be accessed under “Resources” on the IR website. In September 2014, 93% of administrators stated the TracDat system videos were helpful to them as they worked on reporting assessment plans and results.

Prior to the implementation and use of TracDat, assessment reports varied in quality from department to department, and some reports were poorly organized, bulky, and difficult to read. Reviewing reports in TracDat has allowed readers (e.g. members of the assessment sub-committee and IEC) to access supporting documents easily by clicking links, as opposed to shuffling through dozens of pages, some of which were poorly marked. Such ease enables reviewers to pay better attention to alignment, data analyses, validity of measures, and summaries of results than was possible with the confusing templates used in previous years. It will also be easier to track whether or not departments are assessing all learning objectives in a three-year cycle and allow for consistency in reports from year-to-year.

The effectiveness of the TracDat system is assessed regularly by the Director of Institutional Research, who serves as the system’s administrator. After consulting with various users, she continually reconfigures the system to ensure maximum functionality at the department/division level as well as the institutional level.

In September 2014, administrative personnel responsible for assessment were surveyed in order to solicit user feedback about the system. On average, the responses were positive. However, respondents indicated a lack of comfort using TracDat, and disagreed that TracDat was an efficient way to manage their assessments. The novelty of the system probably accounts for the lack of confidence
among users. It is anticipated that as users become more accustomed to the system, their degree of comfort and understanding of expectations will increase.

**Resources to Sustain Assessment**

In addition to TracDat, the College purchased Qualtrics Research Suite software, which has resulted in greater efficiency when assessing student satisfaction, program-level effectiveness, student teachers, interns, and internships. Since Qualtrics has a built-in reporting tool as well as full data export capability, this tool reduces the administrative time previously spent on such assessments; enhances ownership of survey data and results; and decreases the amount of time between survey administration and results, making it possible to respond more quickly to assessment findings and implement improvements. The more efficient the processes are, the more likely they are to be sustained. Hence, the purchase and use of Qualtrics is a significant contribution to the College’s efforts to ensure sustainable assessment processes.

Financial and human resources have been dedicated to sustain and strengthen assessment efforts as well. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee has a moderate budget that enables the College to fund assessment-related needs that may arise during the academic year or were unanticipated as operational costs when the budget was submitted. In 2014–2015, these funds were used for membership in HEDS, the purchase of the Research Practices Survey, and registration for a conference on TracDat.

The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs also has funds budgeted for assessment purposes. Monies are reserved for academic departments that use standardized instruments to assess student learning. For instance, Major Field Tests are administered in the Chemistry Department and, more recently, the Psychology Department, and the Business, Accounting, and Economics Department implemented the Peregrine Assessment of Common Professional Components in 2013–2014 to assess student learning at various transition points. Funding is also available to provide stipends to faculty members who participate in large-scale assessments of student learning in general education.

The President’s Innovation Fund, introduced in 2012–2013, includes Program Enhancement Funding to improve programs and/or initiatives based on assessment results. In 2013–2014, Program Enhancement Funds were awarded to improve the summer research experience for science majors, study the utility of e-portfolios in an interdisciplinary major, and re-imagine/re-invent the computer science curriculum. Course Enhancement Grants are available through the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) and have been used to revise currently existing courses based on assessment findings.

Fiscal and human resources are available to provide faculty and staff development in matters related to assessment. The Associate Deans of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and the Director of IR, representing the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, have provided training and individual consultation to faculty and administrators, ranging from help with using TracDat to articulating goals and objectives to designing instruments to measure outcomes. The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) has organized faculty share sessions on assessment. In 2013–2014, these sessions focused primarily on assessing student learning in general education courses. In 2014–2015, faculty share sessions addressed sustainable assessment practices, deriving appropriate action plans based on assessment findings, assessing the affective domain, and using institutional data sources.

Administrative support continues to be available to all who are responsible for assessment. The Director of IR has shared relevant data sources and conducted statistical analyses for those departments requiring such information, and the ADAA and ADSA have assisted with data collection and methods
used to assess learning outcomes and program objectives. However, comments solicited from faculty and administrators on surveys pertaining to their assessment needs indicate that further administrative support is required, and findings from the HERI Faculty Survey show that faculty satisfaction with administrative/clerical support decreased by 26% over the last six years. We currently aim to provide remedial support to personnel who continue to struggle with assessment, but the College’s vision and efforts must focus on moving forward, creating adequate infrastructures, and advancing a culture of assessment in the interest of institutional renewal.

**Summary and Next Steps**

- The College’s investment in software, personnel, and financial resources, combined with an Institutional Effectiveness Plan that clearly articulates expectations and requirements regarding assessment practices, have contributed toward ensuring that assessment processes are ongoing and sustainable.
- A rigorous, collegial review process, particularly by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the assessment sub-committee of the Committee on Curriculum and Assessment, demonstrates that assessment is an institutional value and enables improved communication of requirements, expectations, and best practices. Assessment processes will continue to be evaluated on an annual basis and, where warranted, modified in the interest of practicality, simplicity, and ownership.
- Academic Affairs will appoint a small committee to review administrative reports in order to be consistent with other assessment review processes at the College.
- The Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the assessment sub-committee observed that in instances where turnover occurs, assessment has suffered. Ownership of assessment processes requires that when a new person is hired for a position, he/she assumes immediate responsibility for assessing a unit’s operational goals. This responsibility will be better communicated to future hires and included in a revised Institutional Effectiveness Plan.
- The College will continue to provide remediation to departments that practice ineffective assessment, but, in keeping with the strategic focus of a high performance culture, those who are practicing exemplary assessment will be appropriately rewarded.
- Organizational realignment within divisions may be required to sustain quality assessment practices, especially since the training and staff development needs have increased.
- Analyses of assessment processes will continue to be used to inform faculty and staff development.
Requirement 4: Assessment results are used to renew strategic planning, to support benchmarking and resource allocation, and to achieve documented improvements in all programs, services, and processes.

The March 2012 visiting team report required that Lebanon Valley College develop institution-wide, systematic, organized, and documented assessment processes that are used to inform strategic planning, resource allocation, and decision-making at all levels of the institution. While significant progress was made to do just that, the April 2013 visiting team likewise recommended that the College continue to use data intentionally to inform its strategic plan, benchmarking, and resource allocations. Improved processes, improved means of sharing data, an improved Office of Institutional Research, an expanded leadership team, and continued institutional support for assessment—these have contributed to the College’s ability to utilize research and assessment findings in meaningful ways to inform institutional renewal. Noteworthy improvements in programs, processes, and services include, but are not limited to, a proposed General Education revision, new academic programs, curricular revisions on a number of majors, and enrollment initiatives. A new strategic plan will be implemented in 2015–2016. An assessment process has already been articulated as part of its implementation, and strong assessment practices will indicate how well the College is achieving its strategic priorities.

**Strategic Planning**

The April 2013 visiting team report recommended that “The institution should move as quickly as possible toward its next strategic planning process using the data that it has gathered to date to inform that process.” In December 2013, the College partnered with E4 Strategic Consultancy of Lancaster, Pennsylvania to develop a participatory planning process and formulate a strategic blueprint for its envisioned future.

The goals of the strategic planning process were to strengthen the institution in its current market and expand those markets geographically and demographically. As noted on the “Envisioned Future” website, “Key issues that must be examined in the planning process include: learning goals and curriculum revision, student course load, faculty teaching load, financial aid policy, institutional identity, plan implementation, and becoming a high-performing organization” ([www.lvc.edu/envisionedfuture/CampusCommunity/index.aspx](http://www.lvc.edu/envisionedfuture/CampusCommunity/index.aspx)). (This is not a public page; please use the following to access: User Name = mstates and Password = mstates15.)

In January 2014, President Thayne appointed a Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC), consisting of faculty, director-level administrators, staff, and Trustees. This diverse group of stakeholders ensured that the planning process was inclusive and collaborative. The SPSC, in conjunction with E4, coordinated the process, reported progress, and shared information with various constituents.

From February to August 2014, E4 and the SPSC worked to revise the College’s mission and articulate a core purpose, core values, a value proposition, and strategic focus areas. At the request of E4, current, existing research completed by LVC’s Office of Institutional Research was uploaded to a shared site, and selected research was made available through the “Envisioned Future” website. (See Appendix 2.2) The three-person team from E4 familiarized themselves with this material. E4 and the SPSC then participated in an informal environmental scanning process and a review of non-LVC specific external research that focused on the future of higher education, the 21st century students, and the market needs for graduates. This external research, comprised of articles from *The Chronicle of Higher Education, Time Magazine*, and the *Wall Street Journal*, informed the newly revised mission and the recently formulated value proposition and strategic focus areas.

E4 also conducted a focus group for faculty and surveyed faculty, staff, and students. Faculty members were surveyed regarding the proposed mission statement; staff were surveyed about the institution and its students; and students were asked about their experience at LVC. These survey results, and the institutional data used during strategic planning, can be accessed by our internal users.
audience at [www.lvc.edu/envisionedfuture/campuscommunity/research-and-surveys.aspx](http://www.lvc.edu/envisionedfuture/campuscommunity/research-and-surveys.aspx). (This is not a public page; please use the following to access: User Name = mstates and Password = mstates15.) The articulated core values and core purpose, shaped by the President’s vision for a competitive 21st century college, were generated by E4 as consultants and vetted by the SPSC. In August and September 2014, the value proposition was tested by Maguire Associates, who solicited the opinions of prospective students on the central ideas in the value proposition statement. As indicated in a PowerPoint presentation given by E4 in September 2014, “Overall, the value proposition statements received positive ratings . . . Students reacted most positively to the value proposition statement focused on demonstrating skills and abilities as well as building a professional network” and they “[R]ated real world and solving real world problems highest in terms of importance.”

In September 2014, the SPSC, completed its primary work, and small task forces consisting of members of the steering committee and the College’s senior leadership team were appointed to review the strategic focus areas, establish strategic indicators, and suggest revisions. A draft was then brought forward for review through a series of open forums and lunch meetings. An electronic survey was also made available to gather input. After compiling the feedback, members of the College’s leadership team refined the draft. This draft was reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees in December 2014, and in February 2015, a final draft of the strategic plan was brought to the full Board for their endorsement. The strategic plan—the College’s envisioned future—calls for the following institutional initiatives:

- Common learning experience for all students
- Internationalization of the curriculum and the student body
- Outcomes focused on world readiness
- Resolution of faculty roles and responsibilities
- Diversification of revenue streams
- Incorporation of inclusive excellence as a model for recruitment and programming
- Implementation of a strategic marketing and enrollment program
- Planning and execution of a comprehensive fundraising campaign

As noted in President Thayne’s January 28 email to the College community, “[W]e have a strategic plan that will make Lebanon Valley College a visibly stronger institution, more attractive to students, and even more successful in our graduate outcomes. In short, we expect to advance our mission and to derive a competitive advantage from the implementation of the plan.” A copy of this strategic plan can be found in Appendix 4.1. The plan is password protected via the following link: [www.lvc.edu/envisionedfuture/CampusCommunity](http://www.lvc.edu/envisionedfuture/CampusCommunity). (This is not a public page; please use the following to access: User Name = mstates and Password = mstates15.)

The College is currently positioned to implement the goals of its Envisioned Future. Task forces have been created to operationalize the initiatives—i.e. identify action steps and articulate targets or strategic indicators. Comparative and benchmark data will be provided to each task force to develop each initiative and identify success indicators. The use of comparative and benchmark data will help ensure that goals are significantly challenging and reasonably attainable, and will encourage the College to view its success internally and in the context of institutions like itself. A smaller group of individuals consisting of the Director of Information Technology, the Director of Institutional Research, and the Director of Financial Planning and Analysis will assemble the work of the task forces into three organizational templates: priorities, measurement/assessment of initiatives, and resources needed for successful implementation.

**The Budget Process and Resource Allocations**

As part of its review of annual assessment reports, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) inquired of each division head how he/she made resource and planning decisions. As noted in the Fall 2014 Report to the College President, Presidential priorities influenced each division’s decision-
making for the 2014–2015 academic year. These priorities focused on improving enrollment, enhancing academic offerings, increasing revenue sources, strengthening philanthropic efforts, and creating a more diverse and inclusive campus. Institutional and/or divisional assessment findings informed resource requests that aligned with these Presidential priorities. For example, findings from the Campus Climate survey, combined with the retention rates of ALANA students and recommendations from a consultant’s report, resulted in a reallocation of resources to fund an assistant director position in the Office of Multicultural Affairs. The decision to add intercollegiate Division III women’s ice hockey and return the men’s ice hockey program to Division III competition was informed by an external review, a review of benchmark institutions, potential enrollment projections, and Title IX requirements.

In 2013–2014, an interim Vice President for Finance and Administration was hired in July 2014, and has already done much to articulate a budget process, keep stakeholders informed of this process, and communicate how resources are allocated and why. As chair of the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC), he has clarified this committee’s purpose: “The Planning and Resource Allocation Committee provides a transparent process linking institutional planning and assessment to budget development and resource allocation.” The committee consists of representatives from all areas of the College, including senior leadership, mid-management administrators, and faculty. In an effort to ensure transparency and keep all constituents, especially faculty, informed of the budget development process, a PRAC website was created and can be accessed through the College’s portal.

In summary, revenue assumptions are based on preliminary enrollment and financial aid forecasts, using historical data for the College and its peers. The development of expense and capital budgets is the responsibility of each budget manager. Any budget requests for new initiatives must align with the institution’s strategic priorities and/or result from well-documented assessment findings. Departmental budgets are then submitted to the respective Vice President, who is responsible for determining priorities and presenting new initiatives to PRAC. These initiatives are prioritized based on institutional priorities. In 2014–2015, these priorities were established by the College President. Moving forward, the priorities will be determined by the College’s strategic plan.

Capital improvements are informed by a facilities condition assessment report completed by a third party as well as the needs indicated by Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and other departments. The College budgets planned maintenance and capital improvements at the level of annual depreciation.

All new initiative requests and planned maintenance/capital improvements are reviewed and discussed by PRAC, and requests that do not align with institutional priorities or are not informed by reliable assessment findings are eliminated. Vice Presidents, budget managers, and the College President prioritize new initiatives. All final decisions are made by the President. The campus community is kept informed of budget priorities and decisions through campus update meetings, communications by PRAC members to their constituent groups (e.g. Faculty Steering Committee representatives report to the faculty-at-large), email communications, and postings on the PRAC website.

Historically, the College has prepared only an annual budget. Efforts are underway to develop a five-year forecast. This will allow the College to understand the financial implications of implementing its strategic plan over multiple years and thus permit better informed decision-making. In December 2014, the Finance and Administration division was reorganized and a Director of Financial Planning and Analysis position was created. This person will lead the efforts to develop a five-year enrollment, financial aid, new initiatives, and capital expense budgets.

**Using Data and Benchmarking to Inform Decision-making**

The April 2013 visiting team report additionally recommended that the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC) “should identify and discuss the yearly ways by which each division uses data and benchmarking to inform decision-making.” The College has made significant strides in
improving the use of comparative data and benchmarking to inform decision-making. In addition to utilizing better existing sources of comparative and benchmarking data, such as data from the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Pennsylvania (AICUP), IPEDS, NCES, and survey comparison groups, the College has joined the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS). These affiliations have provided the College with ample and robust peer comparative data to use in institutional decision-making. These data are shared broadly on campus, and, when appropriate, survey comparison group data are included on the Institutional Research website. Additionally, a peer comparison report of key IPEDS data is published annually, shared with the campus, and posted on the Institutional Research website.

Comparative benchmarking data are being used in various ways at the College. At the departmental and divisional levels, individual offices are using comparative and benchmark data as part of their assessment processes, particularly when establishing goals and targets in their assessment plans. Using these existing data sources as part of departmental assessment processes is encouraged through the review process as well. As noted previously, comparative and benchmark data were utilized throughout the strategic planning process, especially when determining success indicators.

As the use of comparative and benchmarking data has increased, questions have arisen about how our peer/benchmarking group was selected, how regularly this choice is evaluated and refreshed, and whether or not the College should have more than one peer group. Documentation suggests that the current peer/benchmarking group was established at least a decade ago and focused on regional liberal arts colleges of similar academic profile, size, and resources. The group also includes three aspirational institutions of a more selective academic profile and significantly greater financial resources. There has not been a plan for regularly assessing whether or not this peer/benchmarking group remains an appropriate choice. Therefore, the College determined that the peer/benchmarking group(s) will be reviewed every five years as part of the strategic planning process. This review, initiated in February 2015, will be conducted by a committee chaired by the Director of Institutional Research and consisting of three faculty members and three administrators. The process will utilize the IPEDS data center to gather comparative metrics as well as a review of mission, program make-up, and other non-quantitative factors as recommended by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES).

**Using Assessment Findings to Improve Programs, Services, and Processes**

Systematic assessments and well-planned institutional research have yielded findings that are used at the College to inform change, whether at the course or program level or at the institutional level. Two prime examples in Academic Affairs are the development of a master’s program in athletic training, an undergraduate major in exercise science, and a revised General Education curriculum. The former was in response to assessment findings that indicated limited career options for graduates in health sciences who did not succeed in completing the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) program. Funded by a President’s Innovation Grant, physical therapy faculty conducted a feasibility study and then hired a consultant to develop alternatives to the DPT beyond the health sciences major. A proposal for a new academic program in athletic training and exercise science was developed and approved by the College faculty in 2013–2014.

Direct and indirect assessments of student learning in General Education, completed in 2012–2013 and 2013–2014, consistently revealed that Lebanon Valley College does an effective job developing students’ abilities in communication and critical thinking, but is less effective achieving desired outcomes in quantitative reasoning, technology, problem-solving, and intercultural competence. Further, the current curriculum has an objective related to ethical reasoning, but there are no required opportunities for students to achieve this learning outcome. Consequently, in 2013–2014, the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC), under the direction of a recently appointed Director of Curriculum, began its work to redesign the general education curriculum. Informed by assessment results and institutional research, and guided by the resources provided by AAC&U, GEAC members
The overarching curriculum goals state that graduates from LVC will:

- Demonstrate superior abilities in communication, problem-solving, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and intercultural competence;
- Use different “paths of inquiry” to be able to integrate diverse perspectives;
- Articulate why their education matters.

While the academic major may be the centerpiece of a students’ educational experience, surveys of employers consistently reveal the value of the liberal arts in shaping tomorrow’s workforce. The GEAC advanced the message that general education should be a holistic experience, not a cafeteria-style curriculum where components are the province of a single department or program.

The proposed model brought to the AAC&U institute on general education was remarkably similar in shape, structure, and content as the “Problem-Centered Inquiry” model adapted by AAC&U in 2013. LVC’s model includes a common first-year experience, courses from discrete disciplines organized around a common motif (“Cluster courses”), courses focused on developing those skills that assessment results indicate LVC students are not adequately developing (“Signature courses”), a capstone course emphasizing integration and reflection, and two high impact learning opportunities. The revised curriculum allows for clearly defined transition points where the faculty will be able to assess student learning. An e-Portfolio will serve as the primary method of assessment.

A draft of the proposed curriculum can be found in Appendix 4.2. Appendix 4.3 shows the alignment of learning goals, objectives, and curricular elements in the proposed curriculum revision. Table 1 delineates how research and assessment findings informed the proposed curriculum model.

### Table 1: Aligning Assessment Results with Proposed Curricular Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research/Assessment Findings</th>
<th>Proposed Curricular Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention and degree-completion rates remain below the desired target, especially for particular groups of students (e.g. ALANA, male athletes)</td>
<td>First-year companion courses address issues related to academic adjustment and retention, including time management, major/career exploration, and identifying individual strengths and weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning assessments indicate LVC is effective at developing writing and critical thinking; we want to build on our strengths</td>
<td>FYE I and FYE II offer students a common first-year experience designed to foster a sense of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment findings in information literacy are inconsistent and inconclusive; we need a more intentional plan of how we will develop these abilities</td>
<td>FYE I and FYE II begin to develop students’ writing, critical thinking, and information literacy abilities; these competencies will be further developed in the general education curriculum, namely in “cluster courses” and the capstone experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Campus Climate Survey indicates certain groups do not feel integrated into the larger community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The withdrawing students’ survey suggests that poor grades/not successfully adjusting to academic demands are the reason students leave the institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence indicates that first semester success is a predictor of retention and timely degree completion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Assessment Findings</td>
<td>Proposed Curricular Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AAC&amp;U research into attributes employers desire in college graduates reveals that having both field-specific knowledge and skills, and a broad range of skills and knowledge is most important for long-term career success (2013, “It Takes More than a Major”).</td>
<td>• Curriculum is structured so that competencies are developed throughout and assessed at various transition points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research indicates students learn better when actively engaged in experiential learning opportunities</td>
<td>• Reflection is integrated throughout the curriculum, giving students the opportunities to articulate what they know, value, and are able to do as well as synthesize what they have learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment findings indicate that the application and integration of knowledge may occur in the academic major, but it is not happening successfully in general education</td>
<td>• Signature courses focus on developing specific competencies, particularly those that the current curriculum is failing to develop in undergraduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of students completing high-impact experiences each year consistently falls short of the College’s target set in the 2009 Strategic Plan</td>
<td>• Cluster courses and capstone course will provide students with the opportunity to integrate diverse perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Campus Climate Survey shows ALANA and LGTB students have less satisfactory and less integrated experiences at LVC</td>
<td>• Two required high-impact experiences (HIEs) will ensure that all students are benefitting from experiential learning opportunities and that HIEs are accessible to all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct and indirect assessments of student learning indicate we are not achieving desired outcome in inter-cultural competence</td>
<td>• Specific, required signature courses will emphasize intercultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alumni surveys (1-year and 5-years out) show that the majority of graduates do not report LVC as contributing significantly to their growth in understanding a multicultural or global society</td>
<td>• Proficiency in a language other than English will be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AAC&amp;U research into attributes employers desire in college graduates suggests that all students should have experience solving problems with people of different views (2013, “It Takes More than a Major”)</td>
<td>• Each set of cluster courses is required to address intercultural competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific, required signature courses will emphasize problem-solving and quantitative reasoning abilities</td>
<td>• Specific HIEs will expose students to persons of different cultures (e.g. community engaged learning, service learning trips, study abroad)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of this writing, the GEAC has developed an action plan, a communication plan, proposed a First-Year Experience course, developed criteria and learning outcomes for cluster and signature courses, worked with Information Technology on e-Portfolio options, and developed the capstone course for general education. The faculty approved the First-Year Experience course in February 2015 and likewise approved changing the committee from an advisory committee consisting of appointed members to an elected committee of the faculty. The target date for faculty approval of the entire model is April 2015.
### Additional Improvements Based on Assessment Results

In addition to these two prime examples of curricular improvements, the College has made several modifications to and improvements of its programs and services based on assessment data and aligned with Presidential priorities. Table 2 reports on the *major* institutional improvements since 2013–2014 that were informed by various assessments ranging from institutional surveys to external consultant reviews to enrollment trends to student learning results.

Table 2: Institutional Improvements Resulting from Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Action Plans/Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Direct and indirect assessments of student learning</td>
<td>• Findings from direct and indirect assessments consistently reveal that our educational experience has been less effective than desired in developing intercultural competence and global knowledge</td>
<td>• Revision of the General Education curriculum so that intercultural competence is immersed in the course offerings and assessed at various transition points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Graduating Seniors Survey and Alumni One-Year/Five-Year Out Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expansion of study abroad to a Center for Global Education whose mission is the internationalization of the campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic credentials of first-year students</td>
<td>• The high school GPAs and SAT scores of approximately 30 first-year students, correlated with attrition rates at the College, marked these students as potentially high-risk.</td>
<td>• Hire a Director of International Education (<em>new position</em>) to provide support for international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct assessments of first-year students’ writings</td>
<td>• 15 first-year students would benefit from ESL instruction</td>
<td>• Visiting scholar, Shao-Feng Tang (Tina) from Guangdong Province, China, will arrive mid-February 2015 to work with Center for Global Studies on recruitment and retention of Chinese students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• COL 101, a 1-credit course to assist with academic adjustments, was offered in Fall 2014 for students identified as being at risk. (Course is typically offered in spring semester for second semester first-year students.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 sections of intensive and individualized ESL instruction offered in Fall 2014, in conjunction with additional writing and content learning support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• implementation of a testing policy to support ESL learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ENG 112 course offered (Spring 2015) to support needs of ESL students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Method</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Action Plans/Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retention and degree-completion rates</td>
<td>• Male athletes have lower 4- and 6-year graduation rates compared to other sub-populations and the College’s overall rate&lt;br&gt;• Survey findings indicate that a major reason students withdraw is because they lost scholarship funds&lt;br&gt;• First-to-second year retention, while improving, still falls short of institution’s 90% benchmark&lt;br&gt;• Retention rates vary widely among majors; business and biology have had lower retention rates than the College’s overall average rate&lt;br&gt;• Students in the bottom quintile of three examined cohort groups with regard to high school rank and SAT scores were less likely to be retained; students in the top quintile were most likely to be retained&lt;br&gt;• Students who performed poorly at mid-term and at end of year were least likely to be retained</td>
<td>• Mandatory study halls for first-year athletes staffed by tutors&lt;br&gt;• Writing tutors available in residence halls to assist first-year students with their writing processes&lt;br&gt;• Mid-term “interventions” with faculty advisors for students with GPAs &lt;2.3&lt;br&gt;• Change in SAP requirement to make it more consistent with requirements at peer institutions&lt;br&gt;• Centralized support services in the newly opened Lebegern Learning Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Withdrawing student survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feasibility study</td>
<td>• Programs like athletic training/exercise science will help the College attract students and sustain healthy enrollments&lt;br&gt;• The College has expertise in the PT faculty and athletic department to support athletic training/exercise science programs&lt;br&gt;• Options are needed for health science majors, who perceive their degree as “useless” in the job market, who are underemployed in their first year following graduation, and who are not achieving the outcomes of graduates from other programs</td>
<td>• Implement an entry-level master’s program in athletic training with a major in exercise science&lt;br&gt;• Hire a program director (new position) and additional faculty to sustain these programs&lt;br&gt;• Change the health science major to health and exercise science and develop curriculum/learning outcomes&lt;br&gt;• Develop plans for a facility to house and sustain programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• June 2013 external consultant report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reported outcomes of health science majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HERI survey data</td>
<td>• High teaching load reduces faculty time dedicated to research and advising&lt;br&gt;• Compared to peer institutions, LVC is a “lean” institution&lt;br&gt;• High teaching load, combined with other expectations (committee work, publishing demands, and personal responsibilities) contribute to high levels of stress among faculty</td>
<td>• Task Force appointed to study student/faculty load and recommend reconfigurations&lt;br&gt;• Model endorsed by the faculty, March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Qualitative findings from faculty evaluation of VPAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Method</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Action Plans/Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enrollment trends in specific academic majors</td>
<td>• Enrollments steadily declining in computer science major</td>
<td>• Redesign computer science curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attrition rates in certain majors</td>
<td>• Students who attrit from actuarial science major need a viable alternative course of study</td>
<td>• Develop and implement finance major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus groups with diverse constituencies</td>
<td>• Psychobiology program does not reflect current practices in the field</td>
<td>• Create neuroscience major to replace psychobiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current trends in professional fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curriculum review</td>
<td>• A lack of core curriculum for the English major makes it impossible to complete meaningful assessments at various transition points</td>
<td>• Proposed curriculum revision that includes a set of core courses required of all majors, regardless of concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student learning assessments</td>
<td>• Students in certain concentrations feel disenfranchised in the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Graduating Senior Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Qualitative feedback from Leadership Council</td>
<td>• The number of students participating in HIEs falls short of the College’s target established in the 2009 strategic plan</td>
<td>• Potential affiliation for LVC internship opportunities, continuing education partnerships, and research opportunities with Penn State Hershey Medical and Four Diamonds Pediatric Cancer Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Survey data regarding HIEs</td>
<td>• HIEs are not as accessible as best practices recommend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participation rates in HIEs</td>
<td>• Alumni Leadership Council reports students need to be better prepared for world of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enrollment results, forecasted trends, and future prospect numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demographic changes in Northeast, in particular, and private 4-year institutions, in general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Declined acceptance surveys, new student surveys, and national clearinghouse data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enrollment metrics (e.g. number of inquiries, campus visits, unique visits to the College’s website, applications)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The number of traditional college-age students in our market region continues to decline</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Modify recruitment strategies and review the effectiveness of current recruitment materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The College experienced lower yield rates in the last few years</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish realistic benchmarks and enrollment goals to inform budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enrollment goals not met consistently since 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish recruiting relationships overseas and commission the services of an international recruiting consultant to supplement internal expertise and efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Retain services of consultant (3rd Coast Analytics) to examine the effectiveness of the academic and need-based aid program and revise scholarship program, if warranted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Method</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Action Plans/Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Campus Climate Survey</td>
<td>• ALANA and LGTB students, and students with disabilities, are disenfranchised at LVC</td>
<td>• Creation of a permanent committee dedicated to Inclusive Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multicultural Affairs program review and external report</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual symposium on MLK Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology Task Force</td>
<td>• Current infrastructure makes expansion of technology possible</td>
<td>• Implementation of the Campus Climate Hotline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Survey and Audit</td>
<td>• Foundation has been developed for IT to grow as a solutions provider</td>
<td>• Social norming campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial Technology Audit</td>
<td>• Faculty and administration are willing to adopt new technologies; more than 60% of faculty are willing to redesign their course(s) to take advantage of technology</td>
<td>• Expanded new student orientation activities that emphasize the values of Inclusive Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SWOT Analysis/Educause and ECAR Comparison Data</td>
<td>• Reduced costs in enterprise servers, desktops, laptops, and printers is alleviating budgetary burden</td>
<td>• Enhanced student leadership training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hire Assistant Director for Multicultural Affairs (new position created from reallocated resources within the Student Affairs Division.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Renegotiate or revise current contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Purchase specific software, licenses, services, and equipment to support institutional goals and enhance institutional effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted, these are among the *major* institutional improvements made as a result of assessment findings. Improvements to programs and services have also been made at the departmental level. Many of these are operational. For example, the program review and external team report in Public Safety resulted in modified investigative procedures for Title IX complaints, and the program review in Health Services led to the hiring a part-time administrative assistant and health certification for CLIA-waived test administration. In academic departments, assessment results have been used to strengthen assessment processes, inform curriculum modifications and requirements, or improve pedagogical approaches. For instance, results from an information literacy assessment in sociology/criminal justice indicated that students in capstone courses were not demonstrating the expected level of skill. Therefore, the faculty restructured assignments throughout the major, from beginning-level through intermediate through capstone, to ensure that students were developing the information literacy abilities required in the program. Improvements to process, services, and programs are documented in the annual assessment reports completed by each academic and administrative unit.

**Summary and Next Steps**

- Improvements in assessment processes have yielded improved results that have contributed to the College leadership being better informed when engaged in planning decisions. A revised scholarship program, for example, has depended on good institutional research.
• The College has created a strategic plan to guide the institution through the challenges of the next five years. A bold implementation plan that is likewise practical and flexible needs to be developed by various task forces representing diverse stakeholders.

• The College’s budget processes are participatory and transparent; all constituents can access budget information and documents related to the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee through the College’s MyLVC portal.

• The Vice President of Finance and Administration is working to create a five-year budget forecast aligned with the implementation of the strategic plan; this is a shift from the College’s practice of projecting only an annual budget.

• As the College further develops and assesses its assessment processes, it needs to define better where the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee intersect.

• In 2016–2017, the College will assess a number of its current committees with respect to workload, effectiveness, and redundancy of efforts.

• A number of the College’s divisions are engaged in participatory planning at the divisional-level. As per recommendations from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, all divisions should be doing so. While it is understandable that Presidential priorities and strategic goals will influence divisional/departmental objectives, the division’s assessment results must also inform planning goals.
Conclusions

This monitoring report provided a descriptive analysis supported by evidence that Lebanon Valley College has addressed and will continue to address four areas of concern raised by the Middle States Commission of Higher Education: the role of Institutional Research, sharing and discussing assessment results, sustainability of assessment processes, and using assessment findings to inform planning, budgeting and institutional improvements.

We believe we have made tremendous progress in all areas. Under the leadership of a new director, the College’s Institutional Research Office has enhanced its effectiveness and efficiency. Improvements have been made in collecting, managing and archiving institutional data and survey results, and research findings are easily accessible to stakeholders via the Institutional Research website. The research completed by this office informed and continues to inform planning and decision-making at all levels of the institution, particularly in matters related to enrollment, financial aid, academic program reviews, and Student Affairs programming. The office’s collaboration with other operations has improved as well since the April 2013 visiting team report was issued.

Intentional efforts have been made to ensure that assessment findings are shared and discussed by all relevant stakeholders, and the institution remains committed to transparency when it comes to assessment findings. We need to document further the extent to which departments and divisions are actually discussing and analyzing assessment findings as a unit. Reviews of assessment reports by the assessment sub-committee and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee suggest inconsistencies in this regard. Members of a unit might be informed, but effective assessment means including all stakeholders when interpreting and analyzing data. We need to make sure this is happening in all departments and divisions.

We also need to articulate a plan for what assessment results we will share with prospective students and their parents, beyond what is required by federal and state regulations. LVC graduates’ rates of enrollment in graduate and professional schools exceed those of our peer and aspirant schools. This information gem merits sharing, but at present, we have no organized process for selecting and reporting assessment results with prospective students. Some academic departments are better than others at sharing this kind of information. We need to be more consistent as an institution.

Significant and noteworthy improvements have been made in our assessment processes, and we assess these processes on an annual basis with an eye toward ensuring their sustainability and enhancing their usefulness. The College has invested in resources to support sustainable processes, and we have created the necessary infrastructures for assessment. Academic departments have been well supported by administrators, particularly the Director of Institutional Research, the Registrar, and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Our ongoing assessments of assessment processes have indicated where departments and divisions are effective and where their processes are less effective. Action plans have been and will continue to be implemented to strengthen our practices. These plans make good use of current, existing resources, such as the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.

Assessment results and institutional research have informed planning and resource allocation and are used to improve the College, whether these improvements are operational and made at the department-level or strategic and made at the divisional or institutional-level. We need to continue to emphasize the importance of using assessment results to inform improvements, since this “closing of
the loop” is a weakness in our assessment processes. Academic departments need to document better how student learning assessments result in improvements in curriculum, assessment methods, and pedagogies. Administrative divisions need to show how departmental assessment results “roll up” and inform planning and resource allocations. If departments do not see the merits and rewards of doing effective assessment, the motivation to do so will diminish.

Without question, institutions of higher education will confront serious challenges within the next five-to-ten years. Lebanon Valley College enthusiastically endorses its strategic plan that provides a blueprint to achieve its envisioned future through 2020. Assessment is central to this plan and critical to its success. The plan calls for a high-quality, learning-centered, and outcomes-based education delivered within a campus community defined by a high-performing culture. The implementation task forces will identify strategic indicators and develop metrics to measure how well the institution is achieving its mission and strategic goals. Periodic reports will be issued to articulate successes and identify weaknesses and posted on a website accessible to all within our campus community. The implementation of this plan will energize the institution and foster a sense of common purpose in support of defined goals. This energy and commitment will provide added impetus to furthering the positive transformation of the institution already underway since the Middle States warning instituted in the summer of 2012.

As part of its Periodic Review Report (2018), the College will document its continued efforts to strengthen its assessment processes, recognizing that however much we improve, we can always be better at what we do. We consistently aspire to be the best we can be. As noted in the College’s envisioned future document, our culture “is recognized for its . . . deep sense of ownership and accountability for the College’s success.”
# Appendix 1.1—Campus-Wide Survey Schedule

*Updated January 2015*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admits</strong></td>
<td>Survey of Admitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (Admissions)</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Survey (CIRP)—HERI</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td><em>Incoming FTUG FR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Senior Survey</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCSSE</td>
<td><em>Seniors</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td><em>Incoming FTUG FR</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td><em>2nd semester FR and SR</em></td>
<td>X¹</td>
<td>X¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (or SSI)</td>
<td>UG Students</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEDS RPS (Info Literacy)</td>
<td>FY and SR</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEDS RPS (Info Literacy)</td>
<td><em>UG Students</em></td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td>HERI Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Survey</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees</strong></td>
<td><em>National or internal instrument</em></td>
<td>X²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alums</strong></td>
<td>Alum Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum Survey</td>
<td>Alumni 1-year, 5-years, and 10-years out</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not scheduled</strong></td>
<td>AICUP Bacc Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicle Great Colleges to Work For</td>
<td>Faculty/Administrators</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AICUP:** every five years (should have been administered in 09–10, however AICUP postponed for two years for financial reasons)—AICUP will be administering the Bacc. Outcomes survey in spring 2016. At the recommendation of advancement and IR, the College will not be participating in 2016.

¹Fall administration
²Spring administration
*Pilot—seniors only

Note: Governmental regulation may require the College to administer a sexual assault survey as early as 14–15. This will be monitored closely and will be implemented if necessary.
• **Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement**—This survey is run out of IU and is the baseline survey for NSSE. It allows the institution to look at changes in engagement (or expectations for engagement) from orientation (BCSSE) to the end of the first year (NSSE). This survey would be administered every three years, only when the NSSE administration is planned. The survey instrument can be found on the website [http://bcsse.iub.edu/](http://bcsse.iub.edu/) and the cost is reasonable (especially compared to NSSE) at $1 per student if we use an online administration.

• **Alumni Surveys**—These surveys are often developed within the institution and administered each May 1 to alumni who are 1-year, 5-years, and 10-years out. These will not generate comparison data but will provide information about our own alumni. The cost is minimal. The surveys are typically first sent online, and paper surveys are typically only administered to those who do not respond to the web survey.

• **Climate Surveys**—These surveys are designed to assess the campus climate related to diversity. They are typically administered to all students, faculty, and other employees on campus. These can include national or institutionally developed instruments. Additionally, this work, including focus groups, can be provided by a consultant although the costs associated with this are often prohibitive.

**On-going from offices**
- Alumni & Parent Engagement
- Global Education
- Public Safety
- Health Center
- Counseling Services
Appendix 2.1—Campus-Wide Survey Dissemination Plan  
Updated August 2014

The approach to survey dissemination at the College is to make data available to College constituents in order to inform, make data-driven decisions, and encourage transparency. Whenever possible, summary data will be made available to the surveyed population. Relevant data will be shared in assessment and evaluation presentations campus wide (for example—General Education components).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>Dissemination Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of Admitted Students (Admissions)</td>
<td>Internal Survey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>• Survey report sent to Admissions Director &amp; VPEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey report then shared with senior leadership, with particular attention to Marketing &amp; Communications, Student Affairs, and the Academic Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This is an internal document and will not be shared publically on the web.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Survey (CIRP)</td>
<td>Students Incoming FTUG FR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>• Survey presentation and reports shared with senior leadership, with particular attention to Admissions, Student Affairs, and Academics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary level data shared on the IR website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Senior Survey (could use CSS or HEDS)</td>
<td>Student Seniors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>• Survey reports shared with senior leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary-level survey reports shared on IR website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey reports by major shared on IR website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey reports shared with faculty and Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction (or SSI)</strong></td>
<td>UG Students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Survey</td>
<td>Students and Employees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary level survey reports shared with senior leadership, Committee on Inclusive Excellence, and Student Affairs, and at senior leadership retreat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Committee on Inclusive Excellence will develop a dissemination plan to share data with faculty, employees, and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERI Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary level survey reports shared with the VPAA and Dean of the College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary level survey reports shared with the Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary level survey presentation given to faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Steering Committee asked to identify any additional dissemination needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alumni</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey</td>
<td>Alumni 1-year, 5-years, and 10-years out</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>• Survey reports shared with senior leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary level survey reports shared on IR website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey reports by major shared on IR website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey reports shared with faculty and Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2.2—Institutional Data and Survey Results Shared with E4 and the Strategic Planning Steering Committee in Support of the Envisioned Future

- All consultant reports from the last five years
- The most recent LVC Affordability Analysis
- Graduating Senior Survey (2014)
- Common Data Sets from the last three years
- Factbook
- Factsheet
- HERI Faculty Survey (2014)
- NSSE (2010 and 2013)
- Student Satisfaction Inventory (2012)
- Chronicle Great Colleges to Work For (2009)
- Peer Comparison Reports
- Retention and Persistence Report
- Internal reports, such as Average GPA by Department, Departmental Load, Graduates by Academic Major, Trends in Academic Majors, Minors, and Specializations
- All reports posted on the Institutional Research website
Appendix 3.1—Institutional Effectiveness Plan (IEP)

I. Assessment Plans & Reports

Annual Reports

Academic Departments

All undergraduate academic majors (including interdisciplinary ones), general education, and full and part-time graduate programs are required to submit an annual assessment report that documents how well students are achieving learning goals.

Annual assessment reports must include the following:

• Learning objective(s) being assessed
• Assessment strategies and instruments used
  (Multiple measures should be used to assess learning objectives; a minimum of one direct measure and one indirect measure is required)
• Results and an analysis/interpretation of the results
• Targets and/or benchmarks, where appropriate
• Planned improvements or modifications that will be implemented based on the assessment findings, including requests for resources where warranted
• The assessment plan for the current academic year indicating what learning objectives will be assessed and how they will be measured.

Effective June 2014, all academic departments should enter their assessment results and plans in TracDat. Data and all relevant artifacts (e.g. rubrics, test outlines, course syllabi, raw data) are to be uploaded into the department’s TracDat account.

All learning objectives must be assessed within a three-year period!

The submission period for annual assessment reports is from June to October, with a firm deadline of October 1.

The assessment sub-committee of the Committee on Curriculum and Assessment is responsible for reviewing selected assessment reports and providing departments with a copy of the sub-committee’s response and recommendations. This sub-committee has the authority to mandate follow-up reports, revised assessment plans, or action plans.

The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA) chairs the assessment sub-committee and is responsible for determining which reports will be reviewed during a particular academic year, posting assessment reports and sub-committee responses, and submitting a report on assessment practices to the CCA and the VPAA.

Administrative Departments and Divisions

All administrative departments/divisions are required to complete an annual assessment report that demonstrates the following:

• Effectiveness in achieving institutional and department-level mission, goals, and objectives;
• continuous program-level improvements and contributions to institutional renewal;
• commitment to the educational mission of the College; and
• compliance with reaccreditation standards and government mandates.

The following departments are further required to assess clearly articulated student learning goals:
• Academic Advising and Student Success
• Bishop Library (information literacy)
• Disability Services
• Global Education (intercultural competence)
• Writing Center
• Art Gallery
• Career Development
• Counseling Services
• Multicultural Affairs
• Leadership Institute
• Residential Life
• Spiritual Life

Effective June 2014, assessment plans and reports are to be entered in the College’s assessment management system, TracDat. Data and other artifacts (e.g. surveys, rubrics) are to be uploaded into the departmental/divisional account. Department heads are responsible for updating goals, objectives, and assessment methods in their unit’s TracDat account.

The deadline for each annual assessment cycle varies from division to division, as outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Departmental/Divisional Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>Department-level reports, Student Affairs and Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 25</td>
<td>Department-level reports, Advancement, Enrollment, Finance and Administration, Marketing and Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Division-level plans/reports completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10–November 10</td>
<td>IEC reviews divisional reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is responsible for reviewing divisional reports using a rubric that articulates expectations for exemplary practices. (See Appendix 1.) From October 10 through November 10 of each academic year, the IEC will meet individually with division heads to discuss their review and to ascertain the following:

• What are the most critical action plans for the ensuing academic year?
• How are divisional priorities established?
• Does each priority have an assessment plan?
• What are the most important budget implications of the division’s action plan?
• Is there a department within the division that might benefit from an external evaluation in the ensuing academic year?

Results from these reviews will be documented and shared with the respective general officer, PRAC, and the College President.

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee will further recommend to the College’s leadership what content from the annual reports and institutional assessments should be shared on external websites. Special attention will be given to assuring that prospective students have access to information regarding student learning, career placements, retention, and degree-completion rates.
Comprehensive Program Reviews

Academic Departments

All undergraduate academic majors, including interdisciplinary ones, and all full- and part-time graduate programs are required to complete a program review every five (5) years. The program review schedule is determined by the Committee on Curriculum and Assessment (CCA) and approved by the Vice President of Academic Affairs/Dean of the Faculty. Every ten (10) years, departments should arrange for an external review of their program(s).

Departments under the aegis of that a specialized accrediting body (e.g. PDE, CAPTE, NASM, and ACBSP) should arrange with CCA to complete a report that is consistent with the standards of that agency, but that provides the additional information required in this report. These departments will be on the review schedule as determined by the outside agency.

The requirements for the comprehensive program review and a schedule of program reviews (2015/16–2020/21) can be found in Appendix 2.

Administrative Departments

All administrative units in the College’s six divisions are required to complete a program review. Consistent with what is required of academic departments, administrative units must complete an internal program review every five (5) years. A peer/external review is required every ten (10) years. The purpose of these reviews is to facilitate a program-level analysis of programs/services, identify necessary adjustments and develop means for implementing and evaluating proposed changes.

The outline of and requirements for a comprehensive program review for administrative units can be found in Appendix 3. This outline includes a review schedule that must be finalized by the College’s Vice Presidents by August 2014.

II. Planning and Resource Allocation

Planning goals should be derived from strategic planning priorities, Presidential priorities, institutional, divisional and departmental assessments, external trends or best practices, and projected revenues. They should be determined as part of the assessment report, included in the TracDat account, and aligned with divisional and institutional goals.

For 2014–2015: Where and when assessments indicate the need for resources that cannot be delayed a year, the department/division head should contact his/her vice president to consider how current resources may be reallocated.

After 2014–2015: As per the original institutional assessment plan approved by the College’s leadership team in December 2013, where and when assessment results indicate the need for resources that cannot be delayed a year, the department/division head may apply for strategic funding. These funding requests should be made directly to the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC) by October 8 of each year.

PRAC will review strategic budget requests and approve/deny such requests. These decisions will be made by November 15 of each year and communicated to the respective parties.
Operational budgets are due as outlined below:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Departmental goals and budgets submitted to President and division heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Divisional goals and budgets submitted to VP Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>PRAC determines budget priorities with respect to assessment findings, strategic planning priorities, Presidential priorities, external trends, and projected revenues. Makes recommendations for resource allocations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interaction between PRAC and the IEC are illustrated in Appendix 4.

III. Existing Data Sources and Institutional Resources

The IEC is responsible for developing a toolbox for assessment that is easily accessible to department and division heads via a central website. This effort will be coordinated by the Director of Institutional Research and should be completed by March 2014. The Director of Institutional Research will further develop an inventory of resources and, in consultation with appropriate personnel, recommend what research is necessary to demonstrate institutional effectiveness and what might be eliminated.

In order to ensure sustainable and efficient assessment processes, maximum use should be made of existing data sources and institutional resources. These include, but are not limited to, results from NSSE, CIRP, analyses of retention data, and enrollment reports.

The Director of Institutional Research in consultation with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee will plan a five year survey cycle of national instruments. This will completed by January 2014 and will be updated annually each June. Other administrative surveys may be proposed annually as part of a survey prioritization process to occur in the spring for surveys for the following academic year. The Office of Institutional Research will prioritize and approve these survey requests with the IEC when appropriate. The Office of Institutional Research will coordinate common surveys with academic departments when possible. Although College units should make every effort to participate in the survey prioritization process, inevitably, needs for additional surveys may arise outside of the prioritization process. In those cases, requests should be approved by the appropriate division Vice President and the Office of Institutional Research.

IV. Disseminating Information and Data Sources

It is the responsibility of the College to disseminate information and data broadly on campus to promote Institutional Effectiveness. This is an institutional priority and is effective immediately.

**National Surveys**—Results of institutional level national surveys are expected to be shared broadly on campus. These surveys do not have a particular “owner” or “requestor”. It is the responsibility of the Office of Institutional Research to make the results of these surveys available broadly on campus through campus presentations (broad and targeted), reports, and via the website as guided by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Results are shared with relevant senior leadership when appropriate prior to broad campus dissemination. Summary level results from student surveys are shared with students.

**Internal Surveys**—Results of internal surveys that are requested by a particular person, office, group, or division will be provided directly to the requestor. The Office of Institutional Research may suggest additional campus constituents who would be interested in the results. Summary level results from student surveys should be shared with students.
Website—An Institutional Research website serves as a resource to internal and external communities. Survey information including information on the prioritization process, summaries of institutional survey data, and current and historical institutional data (enrollment reports, persistence reports, Common Data Set, Factsheet, the Factbook, benchmarking, institutional dashboards, and graduate outcomes) are available on the IR website.

V. Compliance

Several departments are responsible for maintaining and providing updated information that must be reported to current and prospective students and current employees, as per the Higher Education Act (HEA) Institutional Disclosure Requirements. (See Appendix 5, Appendices A and B from the Report of the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative titled Information Required to be Disclosed Under the Higher Education Act of 1965: Suggestions for Dissemination.)

The Secretary of the College is the appointed compliance officer and is responsible for creating a master calendar that indicates what is required on an annual basis, when it is required, and who is responsible for providing or updating the information. Compliance embraces not only federal regulations, but state mandates as well.
Appendix 1

Rubric for Evaluating Departmental/Divisional Assessment Plans and Reports

Department/Division______________________________________________________

Year_____________

ASSESSMENT PLAN

Mission Statement
A concise statement outlining the purpose of the operation, who it serves, in what ways, and with what results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear and concise</td>
<td>States the operation's purpose and who it serves</td>
<td>Provides a general statement of the program's intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific to the operation; identifies exactly what it does and what makes it unique</td>
<td>Aligned with College (or divisional) mission statements</td>
<td>Identifies the functions performed but not the greater purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies stakeholders</td>
<td>Scope may be limited</td>
<td>Does not identify stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligned with College (and divisional) mission</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fails to demonstrate clear alignment with College (or divisional) mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Outcomes/Objectives
Specific statements that articulate and/or describe the desired quality of key services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observable and measureable</td>
<td>Observable and measureable</td>
<td>Describes a process or indicate an action step rather than an outcome (i.e. language focuses on what operation does)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable number of objectives identified, enough to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable</td>
<td>Encompass the mission of the program</td>
<td>Does not address the breadth of services associated with the operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonant with strategic (and divisional) goals</td>
<td>Appropriate, but language is vague</td>
<td>Incongruent with mission, divisional, and strategic goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too many or too few objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
### Measures
The variety of methods used to evaluate each outcome; the means of gathering evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple measures for some or all objectives</td>
<td>At least one measure per objective</td>
<td>Not all objectives have associated measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct</td>
<td>Direct and indirect measures used</td>
<td>Few or no direct measures used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible—existing data sources used where possible; some measures apply to multiple objectives</td>
<td>Described with sufficient detail</td>
<td>Methodology is questionable or unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful—clear how results might be used for program improvement</td>
<td>Implementation may require further planning</td>
<td>Instruments are vaguely described or insufficiently developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Described with sufficient detail and supported by appropriate documents</td>
<td>Methodology is clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:

### Achievement Targets
Result, target, benchmark, or value that represents success at achieving an objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligned with measures and objectives</td>
<td>Aligned with measures and objectives</td>
<td>Targets not identified for every measure or not aligned with the measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represent a reasonable level of success</td>
<td>Target identified for each measure (when appropriate)</td>
<td>Targets seem too high/too low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific and meaningful, based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards</td>
<td>Specific and measureable</td>
<td>Language is vague or subjective (e.g. “improve,” “satisfactory”), making it difficult to tell if target was met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some targets seem arbitrary</td>
<td>Aligned with process rather than results (e.g. survey response rate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:
ASSESSMENT REPORTS

Findings
A concise summary of the results gathered from a given assessment measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete, concise, and well-organized</td>
<td>Complete and organized</td>
<td>Incomplete or too much information that is not well-organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate data collection and analysis</td>
<td>Aligned with goals/objectives being assessed</td>
<td>Results not clearly aligned with goals/targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides solid evidence regarding whether or not targets were achieved</td>
<td>Indicates whether or not targets/benchmarks were achieved</td>
<td>Questionable conclusions about whether or not goals was achieved and targets met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compares new findings to established trends (if appropriate)</td>
<td>May contain too much detail or stray slightly from what data suggest</td>
<td>Questionable data collection/ analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting documentation (e.g. rubrics, surveys, raw data) included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Action Plans
A statement of how assessment results will be or are being used to inform divisional planning, improvements, and resource requests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned improvements are identified, specific, and directly related to assessment findings. Improvements are program-level ones. Action plans are appropriate given current resources.</td>
<td>Action plans identified, but they remain vague and unspecific. Plans may not be clearly linked to assessment findings.</td>
<td>No action plan identified or implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Appendix 2

Assessment Processes for Academic Departments: Student Learning and Program Review

Annual Assessment Report on Student Learning

All undergraduate academic majors (including interdisciplinary ones), general education, and full- and part-time graduate programs are required to submit an annual assessment report that documents how well students are achieving learning goals.

Annual assessment reports must include the following:

- Learning objective(s) being assessed
- Assessment strategies and instruments used
  (*Multiple measures should be used to assess learning objectives; a minimum of one direct measure and one indirect measure is required*)
- Results and an analysis/interpretation of the results
- Targets and/or benchmarks, where appropriate
- Planned improvements or modifications that will be implemented based on the assessment findings, including requests for resources where warranted
- The assessment plan for the current academic year indicating what learning goals will be assessed and how they will be measured.

Effective June 2014, all academic departments should enter their assessment results and plans in TracDat. Data and all relevant artifacts (e.g. rubrics, test outlines, course syllabi, raw data) are to be uploaded into the department’s TracDat account.

All learning objectives must be assessed within a three-year period!

The submission period for annual assessment reports is from June to October, with a firm deadline of October 1. Reports are to be completed whether the department is scheduled for an annual review or not.

Annual Report Review Process

The assessment sub-committee of the Committee on Curriculum and Assessment is responsible for reviewing selected assessment reports. *Beginning in 2014–2015, a representative sample of the department’s faculty will meet with the sub-committee to review the annual assessment report.* After such a meeting, the sub-committee will provide departments with a copy of the sub-committee’s response and recommendations. This sub-committee has the authority to mandate follow-up reports, revised assessment plans, or action plans.

The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA) chairs the assessment sub-committee and is responsible for determining which reports will be reviewed during a particular academic year, posting assessment reports and sub-committee responses, and submitting a report on assessment practices to the CCA and the VPAA.
Program Reviews of Academic Departments *(replaces the departmental evaluations formerly submitted to the AEPC)*

Required by: All undergraduate academic majors, including interdisciplinary ones; full and part-time graduate programs. *Departments that are accredited by an external agency should arrange with CCA to complete a report that is consistent with the standards of that agency, but that provides the additional information required in this report.*

Completed: Every five (5) years; scheduled determined by the CCA and reviewed by the Vice President of Academic Affairs. External review: Every 10 years.

**Section I. Program Overview**

**A. Program Mission**

1. If warranted, update the program’s mission statement in the department’s TracDat account. The mission statement should adequately reflect the nature and scope of the program.

2. Using the template provided below, show how the department/program mission supports the institutional mission. *Complete only those boxes that apply! Not every box under “Departmental Mission” needs to be filled in.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LVC MISSION</th>
<th>DEPARTMENTAL MISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values, skills, and knowledge we promise students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable [students] to become people of broad vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable [students] to become capable of making informed decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable [students] to be prepared for a life of service to others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help [students] acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values necessary to live and work in a changing, diverse, and fragile world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate wisdom that is the capacity of judging rightly in matters of life and conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience a lifelong love of learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values, skills, and knowledge we promise to impart to students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaint [students] with humanity’s most significant ideas and accomplishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop [students’] abilities to think logically and communicate effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give [students] practice in precise analysis and effective performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance [students’] sensitivity to and appreciation of differences among human beings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus environment we promise students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community [where] caring and concern for others is a core value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community [that] values strong and nurturing faculty interacting closely with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community [that] encourages individual student development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community [that] affirms the interrelatedness of liberal learning and the ideal of vocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Learning Goals and Objectives

Review the department’s current learning goals and objectives and revise, if warranted. Update these goals and objectives in the unit’s TracDat account and align learning objectives with program learning goals and the learning goals of general education. (“Related Goals” under the “Plan” tab)

Section II. Assessment

A. Curriculum

1. If warranted, update the curriculum map in the department’s TracDat account.

2. Analyze how effectively the curriculum affords sufficient opportunities for students to achieve the goals and objectives. Explain how the curriculum is current, purposeful, and logically sequenced. (This section should be no longer than 1/2 a page)

3. Describe changes made to the curriculum during the review period (e.g. curricular revisions, new courses, deleted courses, change of prerequisites). Identify what drove these changes (i.e., assessment results, best practices, current research). (This section should be no longer than 1/2 a page)

B. High Impact Curricular Experiences

In the template below, indicate the participation rates of majors in departmental high-impact experiences, report how student learning in these experiences was assessed, and summarize the assessment findings. Report only on students in your program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Participation Rates (% of majors)</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY</td>
<td>AY</td>
<td>AY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Participation Rates (% of majors)</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY</td>
<td>AY</td>
<td>AY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Support for Other Programs

1. In the following table, indicate how the program provides support for other academic programs at the College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Supported</th>
<th>Support Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g. Physical Therapy</td>
<td>BIO 111, 112, and 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. In the following table, indicate how the program supports the General Education curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Supported</th>
<th>Support Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L6 requirement</td>
<td>PHL 110, 210, 222, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSP requirement</td>
<td>DSP 335, 340, 356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Does the need to support other programs and/or General Education requirements present any difficulties in achieving the program’s mission and goals? Explain. *(This section should be no longer than 1/2 of a page.)*

D. Student Learning

1. Analyze the assessment findings of student learning in your major that were systematically gathered through direct and indirect methods during the review period. What specific trends are emerging? Where are students successfully achieving learning outcomes? Where are they less successful? *This analysis requires faculty to interpret the data entered into the department’s TracDat account. (This section should be no longer than 3/4 of a page)*

2. Review the department’s TracDat report on the action plans implemented during the review period. Summarize how assessment findings resulted in changes to student learning goals, curriculum, and other aspects of the program. Reflect on the department’s ability to use assessment findings to inform changes. *(This section should be no longer than 3/4 of a page)*

3. Describe how assessment results are shared with stakeholders, including students, advisory boards, and faculty. Indicate systematic efforts—regularly scheduled meetings, departmental newsletters, departmental webpages—used to communicate such information. *(This section should be no longer than 1/4 of a page)*

E. Grading Practices

Analyze the grade distribution reports from the five-year review period. Include all courses offered during this time, including electives and those taught by adjunct faculty. Do the grade distribution reports suggest the possibility of grade inflation/deflation in the program? Explain any “red flags”—e.g. high rates of withdrawals from certain courses, a preponderance of grades in the A to A- range. *(This section should be no longer than 1/2 of a page)*

F. Course Offerings

Review course offerings and enrollment history. Are there any courses with high or low demand? Explain. Are all courses in the curriculum being offered on a regular basis? Are there any patterns that warrant curricular changes? *(This section should be no longer than 3/4 of a page)*
G. Program Renewal

Identify recommendations made in the previous three (3) years by CAC/former AAC or AEPC, external team reviews and/or departmental and institutional self-studies. Indicate whether or not these recommendations were implemented and indicate any results from implementations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Identified</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>How Implemented? (If not implemented, explain.)</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation

1. Analyze admission data and any additional entry-level assessments (e.g. placement tests, diagnostic assessments). Are the students enrolled in the major(s) sufficiently prepared? Describe any initiatives or strategies the program uses to assist underprepared learners. *(This section should be no longer than 1/2 of a page)*

2. Describe strategies for participating in the recruitment and retention of students at the College and in the major. *(This section should be no longer than 1/2 of a page)*

3. Analyze enrollment figures in major. Include second majors, minors, and areas of concentration. Do these figures reflect vitality and sustainability of the program? Explain any fluctuations in the enrollment numbers. *(This section should be no longer than 1/3 of a page)*

4. Given the numbers reported, and assuming the support for the program remains at current levels, what is the optimal number of students for the program? Is the program oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at the optimal level? Explain. Are there specific plans to expand the program? If so, describe how and what justifies such an expansion.

5. Analyze the number of course offered and credit hours generated by the department during the review period. Are the trends increasing or decreasing? What explains any increase or decrease?

6. Analyze the degree-completion rates in the academic major(s) offered by the department. What is the specific target? What will or does the department do to achieve this target?

7. Analyze the results of the alumni survey and, if you know the information, report on what graduates in your program are doing. Does the evidence suggest that you are preparing graduates well? Explain. *(This section should be no longer than 1/2 of a page)*
IV. Faculty

A. Faculty Characteristics

1. List all full-time faculty and instructional staff teaching in the department during the review period in the table below. Include current CVs for all current full-time faculty and instructional staff as an appendix to this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Area of Expertise in Discipline</th>
<th>Commonly Taught Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. List all part-time faculty teaching in the department during the review period in the table below. Further indicate the academic year(s) each individual taught for the department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Area of Expertise in Discipline</th>
<th>Commonly Taught Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Is the number and expertise of the current faculty (full and part-time) sufficient to meet the program's mission, goals, and objectives? Explain. (This section should be no longer than 1/3 of a page)

4. Were there any special circumstances that warranted additional adjunct faculty during the review period (e.g. sabbatical leaves)? Explain. (This section should be no longer than 1/3 of a page)

5. Identify anticipated staffing changes or areas of need and indicate how these will support the program’s mission, goals, and objectives. (This section should be no longer than 1/3 of a page)
B. Teaching Effectiveness

1. Review the departmental summaries from the IDEA surveys administered during the review period. What are the important and essential objectives at the program-level? Analyze how effectively departmental faculty are achieving the important and essential IDEA objectives. (This section should be no longer than 1/2 of a page)

2. What might be inferred from the departmental results from the IDEA survey and peer reviews about the teaching effectiveness of faculty in the department? What are the obvious strengths? Where is there need for improvement? (This section should be no longer than 1/2 of a page)

3. List the most important activities faculty engaged in to enhance their teaching effectiveness. For each faculty member, list accomplishments or participation in on-campus and off-campus workshops (e.g. CETL programs, faculty share sessions, conferences) aimed at improving teaching, enhancing support of student learning, assessment, or improving academic advising. Be selective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Activities to Enhance Teaching: Accomplishments and Participation in On-campus/Off-campus Workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Advisement

1. In the table to follow, indicate the average advising load in your department during the review period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Average Advising Load/Faculty (Majors)</th>
<th>Average Advising Load/Faculty (Minors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. How does the department assess the effectiveness of its academic advising? What are the results of these assessments? *(This section should be no longer than 1/3 of a page)*

D. Scholarship

1. List the scholarship of departmental faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Scholarly Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Engagement in High-Impact Experiences with Students

1. Use the table below to identify faculty members who have engaged in high-impact experiences with students over the course of the review period. Indicate the type(s) of experience and the numbers of students who participated. Estimate what percentage of faculty time on a semester basis was dedicated to high impact learning experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Type of High-Impact Experience</th>
<th># Students Served</th>
<th>% of Faculty Time (semester)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Professional and College Service

1. Use the table below to indicate the professional and college service activities of each full-time faculty member. Include roles and memberships on college committees and service in professional organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Professional and College Service (indicate leadership positions held)</th>
<th>% of Faculty Time (semester)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Program Strengths and Weaknesses

1. What are the program’s strengths and what are the opportunities for continued success and improvement (i.e. program renewal)?

2. What are the program’s weaknesses and what are the threats (internal or external) that impact its effectiveness?

B. Recommendations and Three-Year Action Plan

1. What recommendations does the department have to enhance program effectiveness and improved student learning?

2. Provide a three-year action plan to enhance the program’s effectiveness.

C. Resources

1. Use Table 1 to indicate resources needed, to prioritize these needs, and to provide assessment evidence justifying needed resources.
D. Final Comments

Add any comments, suggestions, or remarks that should be considered by the reviewers of this report. In this section, you might wish to include suggestions for other units (e.g. library, peer tutoring, administration) that would support the department’s efforts to achieve its mission, goals, and objectives.

Schedule for Program Reviews of Academic Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACAD. YEAR</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>MAJOR(S)</th>
<th>EXTERNAL REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015–2017</td>
<td>Art &amp; Art History</td>
<td>Art &amp; Art History</td>
<td>External team visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion/Philosophy</td>
<td>Religion, Philosophy</td>
<td>External team visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Biology, Medical Technology</td>
<td>External team visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>French, German, Spanish</td>
<td>External team visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>ACBSP report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016–2018</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>External team visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History/Politics/Global St.</td>
<td>History, Politics, Global St.</td>
<td>External team visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>Math, ASC and CSC</td>
<td>External team visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business, Accounting &amp; Ecn</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACBSP report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017–2019</td>
<td>Sociology/Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Sociology/Criminal Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychobiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>External Team Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PDE Major Review 17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018–2020</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Chemistry, ACS Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Bio</td>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Bio</td>
<td>External team visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supplemental reports from Business, MBA, and Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019–2021</td>
<td>Digital Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td>External team visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>External team visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAPTE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music/MME</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASM report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supplemental reports from Physical Therapy and Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Non-Academic Program Review Guidelines

In an effort to ensure program-level effectiveness and continuous program improvement, Lebanon Valley College requires all non-academic programs to undertake a program review. An internal program review is required every five (5) years. A peer/external review is required every ten (10) years. The purpose of this review is to facilitate a program-level analysis of programs/services, identify necessary adjustments and develop means for implementing and evaluating proposed changes. The program review provides an opportunity for the specific program to identify areas of strengths and addresses areas in need of improvement. The findings of the program review, when considered in relation to annual assessment findings as documented through TracDat, will help to guide program-level planning and resource requests.

Appendix A identifies the non-academic programs required to complete the reviews. Each vice president will determine the schedule of non-academic program reviews for his/her respective division.

The framework below provides essential elements of the Program Review. The internal program review will consist of Part A. The peer/external review will consist of Parts A through C. Part A should be completed by the program director. This information will be shared with the peer reviewer/external consultant to provide context for the program review. Additional resources (e.g., policies, protocols, marketing materials, etc.) should also be shared with the peer reviewer/external consultant prior to the site visit. The peer reviewer/external consultant will complete Part B following the site visit. This will provide the context for the program director to reflect on the external program review, and to respond and plan accordingly in Part C.

Following the peer/external review, formal documentation should be provided addressing the essential elements as outlined in these Non-Academic Program Review Guidelines. Documentation related to the internal program review as well as the peer/external program review should be collected and deposited in the respective program’s TracDat account. Subsequent program reviews will build on previous program reviews to ensure continuous improvement of programs and services. Dissemination of program review findings and recommendations is the responsibility of the respective program director.

Part A: Internal Program Review Process
Name of the Program:
Date of the internal program review (Semester, Year):
Program Director:
  a. Name
  b. Position Title
  c. Email Address
  d. Phone Extension
I. Program Mission/Goals/Objectives

If warranted, update the program’s mission statement in the department’s TracDat account. The mission statement should adequately reflect the nature and scope of the program. Using the template provided below, show how the department/program mission supports the institutional mission. *Complete only those boxes that apply! Not every box under “Departmental Mission” needs to be completed.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LVC MISSION</th>
<th>DEPARTMENTAL MISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values, skills, and knowledge we promise students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable [students] to become people of broad vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable [students] to become capable of making informed decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable [students] to be prepared for a life of service to others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help [students] acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary to live and work in a changing, diverse and fragile world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate wisdom that is the capacity of judging rightly in matters of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life and conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience a lifelong love of learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values, skills, and knowledge we promise to impart to students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaint [students] with humanity’s most significant ideas and accomplishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop [students’] abilities to think logically and communicate effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give [students] practice in precise analysis and effective performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance [students’] sensitivity to and appreciation of differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>among human beings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus environment we promise students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community [where] caring and concern for others is a core value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community [that] values strong and nurturing faculty interacting closely with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community [that] encourages individual student development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community [that] affirms the interrelatedness of liberal learning and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the ideal of vocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Briefly describe the program to individuals who may be unfamiliar with the program. This should be no longer than 1/2 page.
b. Provide brief history of program, emphasizing the past five years (e.g., changes in leadership, changes in program services, new initiatives, etc.). How have these changes improved the effectiveness and efficiency of the operation? This should be 1 to 2 pages, not to exceed 2 pages.
c. Briefly identify program goals and objectives.
II. Program Profile and Expertise of Staff

In the table below, list program personnel including full-time and part-time. Include organizational chart if applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the number of personnel adequate to achieve the department’s mission and goals? Explain. (This should be 1/2 page.)

III. Program Services

Provide a brief narrative that addresses the following:

- List specific services provided in achieving program goals, as well as equipment and/or technology resources unique to your program. Identify changes in the program since the last program review, highlighting factors suggesting the need for change. (This section should be no longer than half a page).
- Analyze how effectively the program’s programs and services afford sufficient and appropriate opportunities for the program to achieve its goals and objectives. Explain how the programs and services are current and purposeful. (This section should be no longer than a page)

a. In the following table, indicate how the program provides support for other academic and non-academic programs at the College:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Programs Supported</th>
<th>Support Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Program Renewal

Identify recommendations made in the previous three (3) years by the sub-committee of the Committee on Curriculum and Assessment (if applicable), external peer/consultant’s reviews and/or program and institutional self-studies. Indicate whether or not these recommendations were implemented and indicate any results from implementations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Identified</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>How Implemented? (If not implemented, explain.)</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Assessment of Program Effectiveness and Student Learning

Provide a narrative discussing program effectiveness and assessment of student learning (if applicable) highlighting the following points:

a. Briefly describe the assessment process used to measure program success. What measures are utilized in this process? (This section should be no longer than 1/2 page).

b. Analyze the assessment results of your program goals that were systematically gathered through direct and indirect methods during the review period. What specific trends are emerging? Where is the program successfully achieving its goals? Where is it less successful? This analysis requires the program director to interpret the data entered into the program’s TracDat account. *If the program is responsible for assessing student learning, those results should be included in this section as well.* (This section should be no longer than a page)

c. How are assessment results being used to influence decision-making? Review the program’s TracDat report on the action plans implemented during the review period. Summarize how assessment findings resulted in changes to planning goals, resource allocation, and other aspects of the program. Reflect on the program’s ability to use assessment findings to inform changes. (This section should be no longer than a page)

d. Describe how assessment results are shared with stakeholders, including students, advisory boards, staff, and faculty. Indicate systematic efforts—regularly scheduled meetings, departmental newsletters, departmental webpages—used to communicate such information. (This section should be no longer than 1/2 page).

e. Are the current assessment processes accurately measuring the effectiveness of the program? If not, what changes need to be made which may include utilizing additional assessment tools?
VI. Conclusions and Recommendations

a. Program Strengths and Weaknesses
   1. What are the program’s strengths and what are the opportunities for continued success and improvement (i.e. program renewal)?
   2. What are the program’s weaknesses and what are the threats (internal or external) that impact its effectiveness?

b. Recommendations and Three-Year Action Plan
   1. What recommendations does the department have to enhance program effectiveness and improve student learning (if applicable)?
   2. Provide a three-year action plan to enhance the program’s effectiveness.

c. Resources: Use Table 1 (attached) to indicate resources needed, to prioritize these needs, and to provide assessment evidence justifying needed resources.

Part B: External Program Review Findings

The peer reviewer/external consultant should provide the following information as part of the External Program Review Report:

I. External Program Reviewer:

   Date of the external review (Semester, Year):
   External Reviewer Contact Information:
   a. Name
   b. Position Title
   c. Professional Affiliation (College/Association)
   d. Mailing Address
   e. Phone Number
   f. Email Address

II. External Program Review Observations:

   Please provide a narrative addressing the following questions:

   a. Did the internal program review documentation provide the necessary context to complete the program review?
   b. Are the program mission, goals, and objectives appropriate?
   c. Are current staffing levels and reporting structures adequate and appropriate?
   d. Do services, equipment, technology, and other resources help to achieve program goals?
   e. Have previous program review recommendations been addressed appropriately?
   f. Are assessment processes appropriate? Do they contribute to measuring program effectiveness? Do they inform program planning?
   g. Are the internal program review recommendations appropriate for achieving goals?
III. External Program Review Recommendations:

Please provide a prioritized list of recommendations resulting from this program review.

a.
b.
c.
d.
e.

Part C: Program Review Response and Plan

Following review of Part B: External Program Review Findings, the program director should complete this section and present the comprehensive report to the division Vice President.

I. Program Review Response:
Provide a short narrative (no longer than 1 page) responding to the findings and recommendations offered by the peer reviewer/external consultant addressing the following:

a. Briefly address/clarify any factual errors in the external program review findings
b. Provide any comments/feedback related to the process.

II. Proposed Action Plan:
Provide a narrative (no longer than 2 pages) that outlines an action plan addressing the following issues:

a. Provide a detailed plan for addressing the internal program review recommendations and the external program review recommendations.
b. Identify changes to goals, objectives and program services resulting from the external program review.
c. Provide estimated timeframe for implementation (6 months, one year, etc.) and necessary resources that are required.
d. Provide details regarding implementation and assessment of these during the established timeframe.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>External Review</th>
<th>External Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advising &amp; Academic Success</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>2022–2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement (Advancement Service)</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement (Annual Giving)</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement (Development)</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement (Major Gifts)</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni &amp; Parent Engagement</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>2019–2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual and Educational Technologies</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Library</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>2025–2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office (Accounting)</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office (Purchasing)</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office (Student Accounts)</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Excellence in Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2024</td>
<td>2018–2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>2017–2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Resources</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td>2017–2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Services</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Education</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2024</td>
<td>2018–2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate &amp; Professional Studies</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>2024–2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>2022–2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>2018–2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communications</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Comm</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>2020–2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Affairs</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>2016–2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>2016–2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td>2017–2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Life</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>2015–2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Life/Volunteerism</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>2020–2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Center</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>2015–2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities/Leadership</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>2018–2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct/Judicial Affairs</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>2020–2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing &amp; Tutoring Resources</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
<td>2016–2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- **January - April**: PRAC approved budget assumptions and budget
- **Mid November - January**: Expense modeling begins & dept budgets
- **May**: BOT approves budget
- **November**: President articulates strategic priorities informed by annual reports
- **November 1**: Division-level annual reports reviewed
- **Mid/Early October**: Convene and Revenue Projections begin
- **November**: Division-level annual reports reviewed
- **Oct 1**: Division-level Plans/Reports Complete
- **Continue working on current year goals as articulated in plans**
- **Department-level Level reports complete (Adv., Enrollment, Finance)**
- **Assess achievement of goals**
- **June 30**: Department-level reports complete (Student & Academic Affairs)

**IEC Reporting Cycle Begins**

**PRAC Process Begins**
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APPENDIX B

Posting HEA Disclosure Information on Institutional Websites

The disclosures required under the HEA (as amended by the HEOA) include

- information that is required to be posted on an institution's website;
- information that may be posted on website as a means to “make it available”;
- information that may be posted on website, but specified individuals must receive a notice of its availability;
- information that may be posted on website, but also must be distributed to specified individuals; and
- information that is not appropriate for web posting (including information for crime victims about disciplinary hearings and certain information relating to education loans).

An institution may choose to include all of the HEA-required disclosures that are appropriate for web posting on the institution’s student consumer information portal page. However, the institution will need to ensure that certain information is also provided directly to specified individuals.

The HEA-required disclosures are listed below in groups by the required method/s of dissemination (including the reference number used to identify each disclosure in Appendix A, Summary of HEA Institutional Disclosure Requirements). Note: Some of the disclosures have more than one required method of dissemination. Certain requirements do not apply to all institutions.

Please note: Institutions should be aware that posting information on a website is sufficient for meeting those HEA requirements that institutions make certain information “available” to the public or others. A number of the HEA disclosure provisions require that institutions deliver information directly to specified individuals, or that it be provided directly upon request. In those cases, posting information on the institution’s website is not sufficient. An institution may choose to post all of the appropriate HEA disclosure information on its website for information management purposes, but it still must ensure that certain information is also provided directly to the specified individuals.

Institutions should also ensure that the information disclosed is accurate. The Department of Education may initiate a fine, or a limitation, suspension, or termination of Title IV HEA eligibility for any substantial misrepresentation made by an institution regarding the nature of its educational program, its financial charges, or the employability of its graduates. (Under HEA Sec. 485(f)(13), this provision also specifically applies to misrepresentation of the number, location, or nature of crimes included in campus crime reports.) For more information, see chapter 6 of volume 2 of the Federal Student Aid Handbook at http://ifap.ed.gov/fsahandbook/attachments/0910FSAHbkVol2Ch6Information.pdf.
I. Information that must be posted on an institution’s website

(6) Consumer Information on College Navigator Website (including student activities offered by the institution, services offered by the institution for individuals with disabilities, career and placement services offered to students during and after enrollment, and policies of the institution related to transfer of credit from other institutions)

(11) Net Price Calculator

(12) Textbook Information (Internet course schedule)

(L-7) Code of Conduct for Education Loans

(L-9) Preferred Lender Arrangements

II. Information that must be made available to the public

(14) Transfer of Credit Policies and Articulation Agreements

(17) Teacher Preparation Program Report

(18) Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention Program

(20) Crime Log

(22) Fire Log

(30) Intercollegiate Athletic Program Participation Rates and Financial Support Data

(L-9) Preferred Lender Arrangements Annual Report

III. Information that must be made available to current students and their families

(L-8) Preferred Lender Lists

IV. Information that must be made available to current and prospective students

Note: These disclosure requirements must be listed and briefly described in the annual notice that must be distributed to all enrolled students (see subject #1 in appendix A). The notice must also include information about subjects #5 Privacy of Student Records – Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), #20–21 Security Report, and #22 Fire Safety Report.

(2) Contact Information for Assistance in Obtaining Institutional or Financial Aid Information

(3) Student Financial Aid Information

(7) Facilities and Services Available to Students with Disabilities

(8) Student Body Diversity

(9) Price of Attendance

(10) Refund Policy, Requirements for Withdrawal and Return of Title IV, HEA Financial Aid

(13) Academic Program (Educational Programs, Instructional Facilities, and Faculty)

[(14) Transfer of Credit Policies and Articulation Agreements]
(15) Institutional and Program Accreditation, Approval, or Licensure
(16) Copyright Infringement Policies and Sanctions (Including Computer Use and File Sharing)
(19) Vaccinations Policies
(24) Retention Rate
(25) Completion/Graduation and Transfer-out Rates (Including Disaggregated Completion/Graduation Rates)
(27) Placement in Employment
(29) Types of Graduate and Professional Education in Which the Institution’s Graduates Enroll
(30) Intercollegiate Athletic Program Participation Rates and Financial Support Data

V. Information that must be made available to prospective students
(28) Job Placement Rates

VI. Information that must be provided to current and prospective students and their families
(L-9) Preferred Lender Arrangements
(L-9) Preferred Lender Arrangements Annual Report

VII. Information that must be provided to current students
(1) Notice of Availability of Institutional and Financial Aid Information
(4) Notice of Federal Student Financial Aid Penalties for Drug Law Violations
(5) Privacy of Student Records – Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
(18) Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention Program
(20) - (21) Security Report or Notice of Security Report
(20) Timely Warnings and Emergency Notifications
(22) Fire Safety Report or Notice of Fire Safety Report
(23) Information for Crime Victims About Disciplinary Hearings
(31) Voter Registration Forms

VIII. Information that must be provided to current employees
(18) Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention Program
(20) - (21) Security Report or Notice of Security Report
(20) Timely Warnings and Emergency Notifications
(22) Fire Safety Report or Notice of Fire Safety Report
(L-7) Code of Conduct for Education Loans (agents with responsibility for private education loans or FFELP loans)
IX. Information that must be provided to prospective students

(20) - (21) Notice of Security Report
(22) Notice of Fire Safety Report
(30) Notice of Intercollegiate Athletic Program Participation Rates and Financial Support Data

X. Information that must be provided to prospective employees

(20) - (21) Notice of Security Report
(22) Notice of Fire Safety Report

XI. Information that must be provided to a prospective student athlete and the student's parents, guidance counselor, and coach

(26) Completion/Graduation and Transfer-out Rates for Students Receiving Athletically Related Student Aid (Including Disaggregated Completion/Graduation Rates)

XII. Information that must be provided to college bookstores

(12) Textbook Information

XIII. Information that must be provided to borrowers or prospective borrowers of education loans

(L-1) State Grant Assistance
(L-2) Student Loan Information Published by Department of Education
(L-3) National Student Loan Data System
(L-4) Entrance Counseling for Student Borrowers
(L-5) Exit Counseling for Student Borrowers
(L-6) Private Education Loan Disclosures (Including Self-Certification Form)
Appendix 3.2—Rubric for Evaluating Departmental/Divisional Assessment Plans and Reports

Department/Division___________________________________________________________

Year____________

ASSESSMENT PLAN

Mission Statement
A concise statement outlining the purpose of the operation, who it serves, in what ways, and with what results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear and concise</td>
<td>States the operation’s purpose and who it serves</td>
<td>Provides a general statement of the program’s intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific to the operation; identifies exactly what it does and what makes it unique</td>
<td>Aligned with College (or divisional) mission statements</td>
<td>Identifies the functions performed but not the greater purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies stakeholders</td>
<td>Scope may be limited</td>
<td>Does not identify stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligned with College (and divisional) mission</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fails to demonstrate clear alignment with College (or divisional) mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Outcomes/Objectives
Specific statements that articulate and/or describe the desired quality of key services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observable and measureable</td>
<td>Observable and measureable</td>
<td>Describes a process or indicate an action step rather than an outcome (i.e. language focuses on what operation does)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable number of objectives identified, enough to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable</td>
<td>Encompass the mission of the program</td>
<td>Does not address the breadth of services associated with the operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonant with strategic (and divisional) goals</td>
<td>Appropriate, but language is vague</td>
<td>Incongruent with mission, divisional, and strategic goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too many or too few objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
**Measures**
The variety of methods used to evaluate each outcome; the means of gathering evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple measures for some or all objectives</td>
<td>At least one measure per objective</td>
<td>Not all objectives have associated measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct</td>
<td>Direct and indirect measures used</td>
<td>Few or no direct measures used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible—existing data sources used where possible; some measures apply to multiple objectives</td>
<td>Described with sufficient detail</td>
<td>Methodology is questionable or unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful—clear how results might be used for program improvement</td>
<td>Implementation may require further planning</td>
<td>Instruments are vaguely described or insufficiently developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Described with sufficient detail and supported by appropriate documents</td>
<td>Methodology is clear and appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Achievement Targets**
Result, target, benchmark, or value that represents success at achieving an objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligned with measures and objectives</td>
<td>Aligned with measures and objectives</td>
<td>Targets not identified for every measure or not aligned with the measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represent a reasonable level of success</td>
<td>Target identified for each measure (when appropriate)</td>
<td>Targets seem too high/too low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific and meaningful, based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards</td>
<td>Specific and measureable</td>
<td>Language is vague or subjective (e.g. “improve,” “satisfactory”), making it difficult to tell if target was met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some targets seem arbitrary</td>
<td>Aligned with process rather than results (e.g. survey response rate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
# ASSESSMENT REPORTS

**Findings**
A concise summary of the results gathered from a given assessment measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete, concise, and well-organized</td>
<td>Complete and organized</td>
<td>Incomplete or too much information that is not well-organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate data collection and analysis</td>
<td>Aligned with goals/objectives being assessed</td>
<td>Results not clearly aligned with goals/targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides solid evidence regarding whether or not targets were achieved</td>
<td>Indicates whether or not targets/benchmarks were achieved</td>
<td>Questionable conclusions about whether or not goals was achieved and targets met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compares new findings to established trends (if appropriate)</td>
<td>May contain too much detail or stray slightly from what data suggest</td>
<td>Questionable data collection/analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting documentation (e.g. rubrics, surveys, raw data) included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Action Plans**
A statement of how assessment results will be or are being used to inform divisional planning, improvements, and resource requests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned improvements are identified, specific, and directly related to assessment findings. Improvements are program-level ones</td>
<td>Action plans identified, but they remain vague and unspecific. Plans may not be clearly linked to assessment findings.</td>
<td>No action plan identified or implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plans are appropriate given current resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
### Appendix 3.3—Rubric for Program Level Assessments of Student Learning

**Department/Major:**

**Assessment Year:**

**Date of Review:**

| Element                                                | Undeveloped                                                                                                                                   | Developing                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Established                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Exemplary                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Learning Goals, Objectives, and Curriculum Maps**   | No goals or objectives stated; no curriculum map aligning courses with learning goals/objectives.                                              | Learning goals and objectives exist, but are imprecise, non-specific, and difficult to measure. Curriculum map not part of TracDat account.                                                               | In general, goals and objectives are clearly defined. While not entirely precise, they at least specify the content, skill, or attitudinal outcome. Objectives are stated in measureable terms. Curriculum map updated in TracDat.                                                                 | Anchored in verbs, the objectives clearly identify the actions, behaviors, dispositions, and ways of thinking or knowing that students should demonstrate. They are well written and measureable. Curriculum map shows ample opportunities for students to achieve learning goals. Map is included in department’s TracDat account. |
| **Methods and Measures**                              | Measures do not align with the learning objectives. Measures might be too general (e.g. a course or an exam).                                  | Most objectives are assessed primarily via indirect measures and/or only one measure is used to assess each objective.                                                                                     | Assessment methods and measures clearly link to the learning objectives they are assessing; most objectives are assessed primarily via direct measures. Rubrics or other instruments have been uploaded into the department’s TracDat account. | Multiple methods and measures that align with the objectives are used to assess student learning. Assessment practices are efficient: more than one objective is assessed by a single, valid measure. Rubrics or other instruments have been uploaded into the department’s TracDat account. |
| **Benchmarks, Targets, and Standards**                | No benchmarks, targets, or standards defining success are indicated.                                                                           | Benchmarks, targets, or standards have been defined, but it is not clear how they were derived.                                                                                                           | Benchmarks, targets, or standards are defined and appropriate for the circumstances (e.g. introductory-level material versus capstone experience).                                                                                                                             | Benchmarks, targets, or standards are identified and appropriate; targets clearly indicate the expected outcomes.                                                                                                           |
| Results | No results presented. Results are summarized, but they are not aligned with the objectives being measured, or they come from only one or two courses/ experiences. Raw data not uploaded in the department’s TracDat account. | Program-level results are presented and they directly relate to the objectives being measured. However, the presentation is difficult to follow or the results are summative and do not identify specific strengths or areas of improvement. Results have not been uploaded into the department’s TracDat account. | Program-level results are clearly presented, and they directly relate to objectives being measured. Results indicate specific strengths and weaknesses; they show where students are performing at or beyond expectation, and where they are performing below expectations. Findings are uploaded into the department’s TracDat account. |
| Analysis and Interpretation of Findings | Either no analysis or interpretation of results is attempted or the interpretation is not related to the objectives being measured. Interpretation of findings is made without respect to the benchmarks, targets, or standards. Interpretations are not supported by the methodology or the results. | Findings are analyzed and logical interpretations are drawn based on assessment results. However, the interpretation may not have involved multiple faculty/staff, and findings are not benchmarked against previous years, if warranted. | Findings are sufficiently analyzed with respect to a target, benchmark, or standard. Interpretations and conclusions are logical and derive from thoughtful analysis. Multiple faculty/staff were involved in the interpretations of results. Findings are compared to past trends, as warranted. |
| Action Plans and Future Assessment Plans | No action plan identified or implemented. No assessment plan included. Action plan identified, but it remains vague and unspecific. Plans may not be clearly linked to assessment findings. Assessment plan does not allow for the assessment of all learning objectives on the three-year cycle. | Planned improvements identified and directly related to assessment findings, but the improvements lack sufficient specificity. Assessment plan indicates assessment of most learning objectives, but does not provide evidence of regular and systematic assessment of student learning. | Planned improvements are identified, specific, and directly related to assessment findings. Improvements are program-level ones. Assessment plan shows evidence of regular, systematic assessment of all learning objectives within a three-year period. |
### Appendix 3.4—General Education Assessment Plan 2013–2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objective Assessed</th>
<th>How Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrate, interpret, and apply knowledge                           | • IDEA Survey  
• NSSE Survey  
• Graduating Seniors Survey  
• One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey  
• Course-embedded assignments scored by rubric in L2, L3, & L5 classes |
| Synthesize knowledge and integrate learning                           | • NSSE Survey  
• Graduating Seniors Survey  
• One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey |
| Communicate effectively in writing and speech                         | • Randomly selected sample from Writing Process courses scored by rubric  
• Randomly selected samples from ENG 112 scored by rubric  
• Course-embedded assignments scored by rubric measuring oral communication skills  
• NSSE Survey  
• IDEA Survey  
• Graduating Seniors Survey  
• One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey |
| Accurately interpret quantitative data and create truthful representation | • Course-embedded assignments scored by rubric  
• NSSE Survey  
• Graduating Seniors Survey  
• One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey |
| Critically analyze and evaluate information, ideas, and artifacts      | • Course-embedded assignments scored by rubric in L3 & L5 classes  
• Randomly selected samples from ENG 112 scored by rubric  
• NSSE Survey  
• IDEA Survey  
• Graduating Seniors Survey  
• One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey |
| Design, evaluate, and implement problem-solving strategies             | • NSSE Survey  
• Graduating Seniors Survey  
• One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey |
| Use information from a variety of credible, authoritative sources      | • Randomly selected samples from ENG 112 scored by rubric  
• IDEA Survey  
• NSSE Survey  
• Graduating Seniors Survey  
• One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey |
| Analyze and evaluate ethical norms and perspectives                   | • NSSE Survey |
| Recognize and negotiate differences and relationships in a multicultural and global society | • NSSE Survey  
• Graduating Senior Survey  
• One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey |
### Appendix 3.5 – General Education Assessment Plans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objective Assessed</th>
<th>How Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrate, interpret, and apply knowledge | - IDEA Survey  
- Graduating Seniors Survey  
- One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey |
| Synthesize knowledge and integrate learning | - Course-embedded assignments scored by rubric in DSP classes (2014–2015)  
- Graduating Seniors Survey  
- One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey |
| Communicate effectively in writing and speech | - IDEA Survey  
- Graduating Seniors Survey  
- One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey  
- Randomly selected samples from ENG 111/FYS 100 scored by rubric (2014–2015)  
- Randomly selected samples from ENG 112 scored by rubric (2014–2015)  
- Randomly selected samples from FYE courses scored by rubric (2015–2016) |
| Accurately interpret quantitative data and create truthful representation | - Graduating Seniors Survey  
- One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey  
- Course-embedded assignments scored by rubric (2015–2016) |
| Critically analyze and evaluate information, ideas, and artifacts | - Graduating Seniors Survey  
- One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey  
- Randomly selected samples from ENG 111/FYS 100 scored by rubric (2014–2015)  
- Randomly selected samples from ENG 112 scored by rubric (2014–2015)  
- Randomly selected samples from FYE courses scored by rubric (2015–2016) |
| Design, evaluate, and implement problem-solving strategies | - Graduating Seniors Survey  
- One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey |
| Use information from a variety of credible, authoritative sources | - Graduating Seniors Survey  
- One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey  
- Randomly selected samples from ENG 112 scored by rubric (2014–2015)  
- Randomly selected samples from FYE courses scored by rubric (2015–2016)  
| Analyze and evaluate ethical norms and perspectives | - Graduating Senior Survey  
- One-Year and Five-Year Out Survey  
- Course-embedded assignments scored by rubric in ID and ASD classes (2015–2016)  
- Pre/post assessment using IDI (Spring 2016) |

**Note:** Unless otherwise indicated, these assessments will be administered during 2014–2015 and 2015–2016.
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Mission
Lebanon Valley College delivers a transformative education built on the liberal arts. We develop students who think critically and creatively across boundaries; who solve complex problems; who communicate effectively; and who value differences among human beings. Our graduates are empowered to pursue a life of learning, citizenship, and success.

Purpose
Empower students for a life of learning, citizenship, and success.

Values
We are student-centered, learning-focused, and outcomes-based.

We believe integrative and immersive learning experiences are essential for personal and professional growth.

We embrace intentionally the differences among human beings.

We believe collaborative relationships among students, faculty, and staff create the best environment for teaching and learning.

We are committed to the pursuit of scholarship between faculty and students.

We are forward thinking. We embrace strategic and informed change.

We are committed to service, sustainability, and civic engagement.

Strategic Imperatives
We must implement a strategic enrollment program that attracts and enrolls high-achieving students, responds to the needs of families, shapes the entering class, and sustains the College.

We must adopt an intentional, informed, and impactful approach in the development of new courses and programs, recruitment of new employees, and implementation of new technologies.
We must develop wider public awareness, greater recognition of value, and more compelling articulation of the benefits of a Lebanon Valley College education.

We must establish a culture of courage and confidence and a sense of urgency for strategic change within a community committed to personal and civic responsibility.

Value Proposition

Engaged students learn. We engage students in real world experiences, creative problem solving, and collaborative relationships that immerse them in diverse perspectives and cultures. Engaged students learn at a deeper level, know how to demonstrate their value to others, and will rise above a crowded field of peers.

Overarching Success Indicators

Our commitment to being student-centered and delivering educational excellence will result in:

- 90% Retention Rate: 80% Completion Rate
- Enrollment of 1,800 Traditional Students, 100 International Students, and 1,000 Adult Students
- A $75+ Million Comprehensive Campaign
- Establishment of Nationally Recognized Centers of Demonstrated Excellence
Strategic Focus Areas

A. Graduating World-Ready Students

Vision: Lebanon Valley College graduates have the learning experiences, skills, knowledge, and competencies needed to compete, collaborate, and contribute in a local and a global environment.

Strategic Priorities

1) Build a World-Ready Success Model through a commitment to inclusive excellence, international student enrollment, globalized curricular and co-curricular offerings, and experiential learning.
   • International students recruited and retained
   • Globalized curriculum and co-curriculum
   • Faculty-led study away/abroad programs
   • Faculty participation in international learning and service learning
   • Expanded availability of and participation in high-impact and experiential education

2) Launch an Initiative for Graduate Success by developing an innovative model for career development that includes new technological support and data for advising and tracking, alumni engagement and networking, and enhanced integration of campus support mechanisms.
   • Pathway model for career development
   • E-portfolio program implemented for every student
   • Expanded role of technology in student success

Success Indicators

1.1 All students experience intercultural learning and global engagement through curricular and co-curricular offerings.

1.2 Forty percent (40%) of students report an international or study-away, high-impact experience.

2.1 All graduates build an e-portfolio to effectively market skills and abilities.

2.2 Eighty percent (80%) of graduates have participated successfully in internships, clinical experiences, research programs, or practicums.

2.3 Establish 15 high profile, impactful, and structured partnerships that enhance student learning experience and graduate success.

2.4 Ninety percent (90%) of our graduates indicate their LVC education has prepared them for a global environment.
Vision: Lebanon Valley College provides transformative learning experiences that are immersive, collaborative, integrative, inclusive, and globally oriented.

Strategic Priorities

1) Create Centers of Demonstrated Excellence that are interdisciplinary, collaborative, research-project oriented, and nationally recognized.
   • Faculty excel in innovative teaching
   • Digital learning incorporated and leveraged
   • Emphasis on experiential learning
   • New interdisciplinary partnerships established across curricular and co-curricular
   • External partnerships created to expand resources for students and research
   • Validation by professional associations or external agencies

2) Reimagine the Common Learning Experience in order to provide students with the skills, competencies, and attributes necessary for success after graduation.
   • A dynamic first-year student experience bridging curricular and co-curricular experiences
   • A campus environment that facilitates learning
   • Experiential learning across the total student experience
   • Communications, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills developed
   • Capstone experiences incorporate collaborative research

3) Enhance educational quality.
   • Development and support of an innovative faculty
   • Development and support of an innovative staff
   • Mastery of new skills to graduate world-ready students
   • Integration of pedagogical best practices

Success Indicators

1.1 Three Centers of Demonstrated Excellence have been implemented with desired outcomes.

2.1 New Common Learning Experience has been implemented with successful outcomes.

2.2 All students participate in multiple high-impact experiences.

2.3 85% of first year experience students report integration of scholarly engagement, innovative teaching, and real-world experiences in their learnings.

3.1 LVC designs and develops curricular and co-curricular programming in innovative ways.
Developing Inclusive Excellence and High Performance

**Vision:** Lebanon Valley College faculty, staff, and students strive for excellence, support innovation, embrace diversity and inclusiveness, commit to service, and respect a healthy work-life balance. The culture is recognized for its commitment to personal and professional development and its deep sense of ownership and accountability for the College’s success.

**Strategic Priorities**

1) **Develop and Support a High-Performing Culture.**
   - Full faculty and staff engagement in LVC’s Envisioned Future
   - Inclusive excellence practices aligned with high-performance expectations
   - A campus-wide culture of appreciation recognizing performance
   - Development of a leadership mindset throughout the College
   - Informed risk-taking, timely decision-making, flexibility, and agility
   - Standards of excellence throughout all divisions, departments, and programs

2) **Develop and Support High-Performing Individuals and Teams.**
   - Intentional programs and practices to increase diversity of faculty and staff
   - High performance metrics for all College constituents
   - National recruitment of diverse, high-performing talent
   - Mission-driven, market-competitive total compensation program
   - Programs to increase employee talent development, satisfaction, and engagement

**Success Indicators**

1.1 Ninety percent (90%) of faculty and staff report that they value strategic thinking, embrace change, and engage in inclusive excellence.

1.2 LVC high performers feel recognized and appreciated.

1.3 Standards of excellence are established in curricular and co-curricular offerings.

2.1 All divisions of the college meet 80% of their goals and metrics for assessment.

2.2 Underrepresented faculty and staff are increased to 15% or more.

2.3 In defined areas of comparison among our peer group, LVC scores above the median in all categories and leads in several.
Achieving Sustainability

Vision: Lebanon Valley College will develop a diverse and multi-dimensional resource base to support a transformative educational experience built on the liberal arts and of benefit to all its students.

Strategic Priorities

1) Develop and Implement a Strategic Enrollment Management Plan.
   - A new financial aid strategy
   - Increased use of data and predictive analytics
   - Integrated recruitment, retention, and marketing plan
   - Impactful relationships with secondary schools, community colleges, corporations, and other organizations
   - Increased retention and recruitment leverage with intercollegiate athletic programs

2) Build a Robust and Innovative Culture of Philanthropy.
   - A comprehensive fundraising campaign
   - An army of leadership supporters and advocates

3) Develop a Global Network of Influence and Support.
   - Robust, connected database of alumni, parents, and friends
   - Partnerships developed for growth and global reach
   - Network access and flexible management system

4) Maximize College Physical and Financial Resources.
   - Operations and plant utilization efficiencies
   - Program return, endowment performance, and campus utilization maximized
   - Diverse Revenue Model
     o Residential model expanded
     o Accelerated degree programs
     o Traditional and digital summer offerings
     o Professional studies offerings
     o Auxiliary revenue options

5) Develop and implement an Enterprise Risk Management Program.

Success Indicators

1.1 LVC consistently meets or exceeds its enrollment goals and net revenue targets.

2.1 Resources are available to launch new programs, implement new technologies, and invest in high-performing talent.
2.2 LVC total gift income is in the top 50% percentile among its peers.

3.1 Metrics achieved for student and graduate participation in and utilization of global network.

4.1 LVC endowment return and endowment growth are in top 50% among its peers.

4.2 Non-traditional revenue increases to 15% of total revenue.

5.1 Risk management systems are in place for strategic, financial, operational, compliance, and reputation risk.
Appendix 4.2—The Lebanon Valley Experience—A Proposed Model for General Education

The proposed revision of LVC’s General Education program contains six primary components, described below.

**First-Year Experience (8 Credits):**
The first-year experience (FYE) at LVC introduces students to the best of the College. Through participation in small, seminar-style courses, the FYE will promote intensive intellectual questioning, and develop a foundation in core competencies *(see Appendix A)* essential to meet the rigorous curricular demands of our College. The intimate size of these classes (recommended sizes: FYE 111 = 16, FYE 112 = 18) will facilitate the development of meaningful relationships between faculty and students in a small community setting; such relationships are vital to the retention of students.

The goal of the first-year experience is to develop many of the proposed core competencies at an introductory level, with a primary focus on written communication and a secondary focus on critical reading. Additionally, the experience should help students with the transition to college, both in terms of skills and creating a sense of community starting in the first-semester class.

To meet these goals, students will enroll in a 4-credit first-year experience class during each semester of the freshman year (FYE 111 and 112). These courses will be theme-based, and will include an academic component that meets for 3 hours per week focusing on the development of competencies such as writing, information literacy, and critical reading, and a 1-hour per week companion component focusing on the successful emotional and intellectual transition to college. Living arrangements and programming in the residence halls will be designed to coordinate with each first-year seminar. We will attempt, as much as possible, to keep the same cohort of students together for both semesters, enhancing their sense of community. Furthermore, the FYE will introduce students to the structure of LVC’s General Education program, articulating the value of the liberal arts while helping students begin to chart a course for the subsequent 3 years. Topics such as portfolios and high impact experiences will be also be introduced.

**Clusters (Generally Sophomore Year—10 Credits)**
The primary goal of the cluster requirement is to develop students’ ability to integrate information from a variety of perspectives. To this end, students will complete a cluster of courses organized around a single theme. A cluster will consist of three courses that are planned collaboratively by three faculty members such that the combination of the three courses addresses all of the core competencies. The three courses must focus (one each) on how people know the world through:

- Scientific Inquiry *(Path of Inquiry in the Natural Sciences)*
- Aesthetic sensibilities and the interpretation of texts *(Path of Inquiry in the Humanities)*
- Evaluation of human behavior and social structures *(Path of Inquiry in the Social Sciences)*

Definitions for each path of inquiry are shown in *Appendix B*. Each fall, two courses in the cluster are offered. Each spring, the third course will be offered along a one-credit integration project course that brings together the ideas of the cluster. Examples of potential cluster themes and courses can be seen in *Appendix C*. Students will request clusters in a manner similar to the way first-year seminars are currently requested.
The course requires that students approach their work in thoughtful stages, including:

**Signature Courses (19 Credits)**
The signature courses are individual classes designed to develop particular competencies. Courses approved for this part of the general education program must have a significant focus on developing the designated competencies. These courses can be taken at any time and can be designed to overlap with major courses. Each student must complete:

(i) A 200 or higher level language and cultural immersion course that develops intercultural competence. This course includes a work in a foreign language that will be included in the student’s portfolio (4 credits).
(ii) An additional course focusing on intercultural competence (minimum 3 credits).
(iii) A course about problem solving using quantitative reasoning (minimum 3 credits).
(iv) A course that develops critical analysis skills with results expressed through writing (minimum 3 credits).

Each student must complete an additional 6 credits of signature courses. The particular types of signature courses taken by each student will be determined in consultation with his or her advisor. These additional courses will be picked to develop the competencies where the student is weakest, based on language placement exams, the student's transcript, and/or conversations with the student. Students whose language experience and placement score requires them to start below the 200-level or who begin a new language at LVC may count a 102 or 115 language course as one of their signature courses (see description of 115 course below). A 101 language course cannot count as a signature course.

**Examples:**
Students whose language experience and placement score puts them in a 200 level language course will take two additional signature courses from options (ii–iv) above in their areas of weakness. Students whose language experience and placement score puts them in a 102 or 115 language course will take the 102 or 115 language course and one additional signature course from options (ii–iv) above in an area of weakness (note that 115 is a new bridge language course for students with a background that is too strong for 101 but not strong enough to start at the 200 level). Students whose language experience and placement score puts them in the 101 language course and students who begin study in a new language at LVC will take 101 and 102 language courses but only receive general education credit for the 102 language course; they will still need to take one additional signature course from options (ii–iv) above in an area of weakness.

**General Education Capstone (3 credits)**
The capstone course occurs during students’ third or fourth year, either concurrent with or after the spring cluster courses. The class begins with a reflection by students on their LVC experience and an examination of their portfolios. The second part of the course culminates in a paper of at least 15 pages in which the student investigates a topic through the lens of at least three disciplines. The course addresses the value and process of interdisciplinary work. Based on the reflections in the first part of the course, students are encouraged to choose a topic building out of their clustered coursework and/or high-impact experiences, but are not required to do so. The experience encourages students to reflect on their classes and apply ethical reasoning, global citizenship, and personal, and social responsibility to the issue they have chosen. A course like this also requires students to recognize the interdisciplinary value of their high-impact liberal arts education.

The course requires that students approach their work in thoughtful stages, including:
• A one-page proposal explaining how the project will synthesize previous experiences.
• An annotated bibliography of research and sources.
• At least two drafts of the final project workshopped in class.
• An oral presentation to the class.

**Portfolio Requirement**

All students will be required to maintain an electronic portfolio containing documents representative of the student’s entire LVC experience—that is, from major and non-major courses, and from both curricular and co-curricular experiences. The General education Program will provide the primary framework for this portfolio, though it may also be used in the major. Students will submit artifacts to the portfolio as part of specific assignments in the FYE classes, in the cluster integration course, in some signature courses, and in the capstone course. In addition, students will critically reflect on these assignments, and receive feedback from the course instructor on the reflection. Note that all portfolio assignments will be integrated into GE classes; in all cases, the class instructor is responsible for verifying portfolio submissions and grading submissions as appropriate. In no case will the student’s advisor be responsible for verifying or grading portfolio artifacts.

Students will also maintain a record and critically reflect on their co-curricular and high impact learning experiences as they relate to the development of their core competencies and career goals. By reviewing the artifacts submitted at different stages of the General Education Program, the student will be able to see the progress made in developing vital skills essential for success after graduation. These portfolios will be an essential tool to assist with our assessment of the General Education Program. Materials from student portfolios may also be a valuable resource for students as they embark on job searches or apply to graduate programs.

**High-Impact Experiences (2 experiences)**

As the final component of the general education requirements, students must complete two High-Impact Experiences (HIEs) during their time at LVC. For each of these HIEs, the student must complete a reflective essay about the experience. These reflections, along with possibly some artifact from the experience, are included in the student’s portfolio. A grade is not assigned to the reflective essay when it is submitted to the student’s portfolio; instead, the essay will be assessed and graded as part of the general education capstone course. Some HIEs will occur as part of courses, and the reflective essay could then be a graded part of such a course. The faculty has already approved definitions and criteria for High Impact Experiences.
Appendix A. Proposed General Education Competencies

Institutional Student Learning Goals:
Students will be able to:
1. Apply and integrate their knowledge.
2. Enhance their intellectual and practical skills.
3. Develop intercultural literacy and competence.

General Education Competencies/Goals:

Written and Oral Communication:
Students will be able to communicate clearly and effectively for different audiences and purposes. They will effectively integrate diverse perspectives, and will demonstrate academic honesty in their communications.

Critical Reading and Analysis (Includes Information Literacy)
Students will be able to read critically and distinguish among authors’ theses, main ideas, supporting evidence, and rebuttals. When faced with new problems, students will comprehensively explore issues and ideas before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion. Students will be able to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information.

Quantitative Reasoning
Students will be able to reason about and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of contexts. They will read, understand, and create arguments supported by quantitative evidence and clearly communicate those arguments. These arguments will involve a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).

Intercultural Competence
Students will develop the set of cognitive, linguistic, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts.

Problem Solving
Students will be able to design, evaluate, and implement a strategy to answer an open-ended question or achieve a desired goal.

Integration
Students will have an understanding and a disposition for learning across the curriculum and co-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

Definitions adopted from VALUE rubrics.
Appendix B. Definitions for Paths of Inquiry

Paths of Inquiry

PATH OF INQUIRY in the NATURAL SCIENCES: In the natural sciences, the natural world is investigated using the hypothetical-experimental method. Courses utilizing this path of inquiry should teach, in a hands-on environment, the following:

1) Methods for gathering reproducible data via controlled experimentation.
2) Techniques for analyzing experimental data in a theoretical framework.
3) Reflection on the advantages and limitations of scientific methodologies.

PATH OF INQUIRY in the HUMANITIES: Human endeavors, including art, music, literature, and philosophical and religious texts are crucial expressions of the human experience. Courses utilizing this path of inquiry should teach, using the appropriate manners of interpretation, the following:

1) Methods for interpreting the human experience as expressed in creative and intellectual works.
2) Techniques for integrating the interpretation of creative and intellectual works into a broader understanding of the world.
3) Reflection on the perspective that interpreting creative and intellectual works gives to one's own life.

PATH OF INQUIRY in the SOCIAL SCIENCES: Human knowledge must be understood within the appropriate historical, social, and cultural contexts. Courses utilizing this path of inquiry should teach, using the appropriate analytical and conceptual tools, the following:

1) Methods for examining human society by analyzing the role of history, culture, power structures, norms, or customs in its organization.
2) Techniques for analyzing data about the complex systems that influence human behavior.
3) Reflection on the way in which knowledge shapes human behavior and can create social change.

Adapted from Hiram College’s core curriculum - http://www.hiram.edu/new-student/academic-course-scheduling/2016-graduation-requirements
Appendix C. Possible Themes for Cluster Courses

**CLUSTER COURSES**

Possible Themes
- Inequality
- Stewardship
- Environment/Sustainability
- Globalization
- Colloquium Theme
- Aesthetics
- Technology and Innovation
- Citizenship
- Health and Disease
- War and Peace
- Race and Ethnicity
- Gender and Sexuality
- The Mind
- Search for Meaning
- Anxiety
- Social Change

**Sample Clusters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER AND SEXUALITY</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women in Art</td>
<td>Genes and Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>Women, Crime, and Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Gender</td>
<td>Psychology of Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Women in the Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Writers</td>
<td>Psychology of Men/Masculinity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Philosophy</td>
<td>Science of Women’s Bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature and Art</td>
<td>Environmental Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and Ecology</td>
<td>Minerals and World Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Popular Environmental Trends and Public Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Ethics</td>
<td>Severe Weather</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous and Systems Perspective on Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Poets</td>
<td>Climate Change and Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Philosophy/Theology</td>
<td>Water Issues and Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideas for specific courses were taken from clustered courses at other colleges and universities, particularly Portland State. They are intended as samples only, not recommendations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Curricular Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students will apply and integrate their knowledge. | Students will develop the habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion. | First-year experience  
Cluster courses  
Integrative project  
Signature courses  
High impact learning opportunities  
Capstone course |
| Students will enhance their intellectual and practical skills. | Students will develop and express ideas in writing and make purposeful oral presentations to increase knowledge, foster understanding, or promote change in the listeners’ attitudes, beliefs, or behaviors. | First-year experience  
Cluster courses  
Integrative project  
Signature courses  
High impact learning opportunities  
Capstone course |
| Students will know when there is a need for information, be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information. | Students will be able to reason about and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of contexts. They will read, understand, and create arguments supported by quantitative evidence and clearly communicate those arguments. These arguments will involve a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate). | First-year experience  
Cluster courses  
Integrative project  
Signature courses  
High impact learning opportunities  
Capstone course |
| Students will develop intercultural literacy and competence. | Students will develop the cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts. | First-year experience  
Cluster courses  
Signature courses  
High impact learning opportunities  
Portfolio reflections |