INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN

SUBMITTED TO THE

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

JUNE 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

THE FIVE EVALUATIVE QUESTIONS

1. **How is the plan linked to the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution?**

   Indiana State University's mission and goals are based on three fundamental values, namely access, affordability, and success. The University has long sought to be an inclusive academic community, providing an affordable opportunity to students with a wide range of academic abilities and educational backgrounds, ethnic and cultural heritage, family experience and economic means, physical and learning differences, mobile and place-bound circumstances, and career and life expectations. The University is dedicated to assisting students achieve their goals through personal attention, a supportive environment, and essential academic and personal services. Students and faculty are encouraged to excel in all they do by meeting rigorous, professional, and academic standards. The goals and strategies of the University's 1994 Strategic Plan (see Appendix H) are intended to enhance these values. The commitment to a comprehensive student outcomes assessment plan is the cornerstone of putting students at the center of everything we do. The assessment program is characterized by self-definition and self-examination. This will lead to strengthening academic programs and what happens for ISU students.

   The present institutional mission approved by the Board of Trustees and confirmed by the Commission for Higher Education enunciates the functions, responsibilities, roles, and scope appropriate for the university of the 21st century. Refinement, clarification, and a shift of emphasis of the mission statement is ongoing as a result of the 1994 Strategic Planning process and the adoption of a comprehensive and systematic student outcomes assessment plan.

   The University has identified the following eight strategic goals to guide its continued development:

   - ✓ Enhancement of Undergraduate Education
   - ✓ Extension of Advanced Knowledge
   - ✓ Service to New Clienteles
   - ✓ Expansion of Knowledge
   - ✓ Transfer of Knowledge and Expertise to Society
   - ✓ Enhancement and Advocacy of Multicultural and International Values
   - ✓ Promotion of an Interdisciplinary Culture
   - ✓ Enhancement of Intellectual and Creative Expression in West Central Indiana

   Assessment is linked directly to the strategic goals as one of eight academic initiatives identified to begin implementation of the goals. A plan to assess student outcomes will offer faculty a reliable data base for their utilization as they seek to improve the educational experience. It will provide a data base to identify program strengths as well as areas for needed growth and development.

   The plan will allow targeted analysis of the success of non-traditional students. The emphasis on assessment at four developmental stages will allow formative feedback to students and faculty throughout the academic program and identify new opportunities for growth and development.

   A fundamental guiding principle and characteristic of the assessment plan is that it involves representatives from both inside and outside the educational community. Alumni and employers will be actively involved in providing information to assess student learning outcomes and the quality of the academic programs. Alumni and employers will be asked to serve on academic program advisory committees. This enhanced interaction will expand opportunities for a variety of partnerships with various

agencies, institutions, and organizations. This interaction should expand co-op and internship opportunities for students in their major fields and increase the understanding between the University and work environments and thus exert a positive influence on education and society.

A goal of the recently developed interdisciplinary General Education program (1989) is to broaden the horizons of students by providing them access to the diversity of cultures and experiences that define American society and the contemporary world. The assessment plan for General Education will provide information on the success of attaining this General Education goal and the strategic goal of the University.

The assessment plan will provide information on the success of programs in preparing students for life-long learning. It will provide data on the perspective of the larger community as to whether the University functions as a symbol and active agent responsible for developing knowledge as a cultural and value system of west central Indiana.

2. **What is the institution's evidence that faculty have participated in the development of the institution's plan and that the plan is institution-wide in conceptualization and scope?**

In the early 1990s, many faculty became increasingly aware of the role of assessment in higher education and its contributions to improving student learning and academic programs. In an effort to establish a structure to promote more universal faculty involvement, a core of faculty were supported to attend regional and national conferences on assessment in higher education. These faculty advised the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs on strategies for faculty involvement and the development of a comprehensive assessment plan. They recommended the appointment of an Administrative Fellow in the Office of the Provost from the faculty ranks to coordinate the assessment effort and the establishment of an Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC) to develop and recommend the principles, policies, and practices appropriate for university and program assessment activities.

In the summer of 1994, an Administrative Fellow was appointed for the purpose of providing leadership and coordination of the university assessment efforts. After consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Deans' Council, the Provost appointed a 13-person Assessment Advisory Committee. The committee is comprised of nine (9) faculty members from each of the Schools and the College, the Coordinator of General Education, an undergraduate and graduate student, and professional staff from Alumni Affairs and Student Affairs. The General Education Assessment Committee was formed in the Spring of 1993. It is a four-person subcommittee of General Education Council chaired by the Coordinator of General Education.

The #1 principle of the "guiding principles" document (see Appendix A) is that the primary responsibility for developing, implementing, and evaluating student outcomes assessment plans rest with the faculty. The "guiding principles" document was approved by the following faculty committees: Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee, Graduate Council, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, and the University Faculty Senate.

The General Education assessment plan was developed by the General Education Assessment Committee (a faculty group), and approved by the following faculty groups: General Education Council, Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, and the University Faculty Senate.

The academic program assessment plans were developed by program faculty. They were reviewed by the respective Chairpersons and Deans, and the AAC to ensure that the plans followed the "guiding principles" and contained the appropriate components.

The AAC, comprised predominantly of faculty members developed the conceptual framework for assessment at ISU, produced a resource manual on assessment for campus use, and conducted workshops

to assist faculty. Faculty from all of the departments have had access to the resource manual and many have attended the workshops. The next scheduled workshop, in the summer of 1995, will focus on faculty sharing activities and concerns in relation to assessment methodology.

The AAC has synthesized an institution-wide program using the academic program plans and the General Education plan. The ultimate goal of the University plan is to improve student learning and the quality of programs.

3.   **How does the plan demonstrate the likelihood that the assessment program will lead to institutional improvement when it is implemented?**

The plan generates data which will inform an ongoing discussion about the quality of academic programs at Indiana State University. Analysis of student learning data will lead to changes in programs and more targeted analysis of other academic issues. The institution believes implementation of our assessment plan will help us to become a better institution in the future. The plan will foster greater discussion about the issue of program quality than ever before. Improvements in the University will come from the open discussion of quality.

In General Education, an annual assessment report will be prepared and made available to the University at large. The report will identify areas of success as well as areas of concern. Report #1 (General Education Program - Review and Assessment) has already provided impetus for program improvement. It is the General Education Council's responsibility to recommend appropriate action to address concerns.

The plan emphasizes local control and responsibility by academic program faculty. This decentralization of control encourages activity at the program level and maximizes the role of the faculty in the assessment program. This is reflected by the following "guiding principle":

> #7   Each program will develop its own unique assessment plan within the framework of the "guiding principles."

Discussion of assessment results will occur at the program level. Since the programs are responsible for assessment, they will receive assessment information first hand and link to targeted program improvements. The assessment results will be incorporated into appropriate levels of planning so that any weaknesses identified through assessment can be addressed and the strengths revealed can be maintained. Program committees will prepare annual or bi-annual assessment reports that will be shared with all program faculty. When either program or student learning weaknesses are identified, it will be the responsibility of the program faculty to identify the source of the difficulty and to determine ways to address it. Many programs will develop a five-year composite assessment report that will be provided for the University program review process.

Systematic assessment by program faculty will likely alter the following features of programs: mission and goals; description of degree and programs; identification of unique program features; course sequencing; integration/culminating experiences; and course offerings.

4.   **Is the timeline for the assessment program appropriate? Realistic?**

The General Education Council began work on assessment in the Spring of 1993. Between September 1993 and January 1995, a multiple measure program of assessment with emphasis on inputs and processes was initiated. This resulted in the submission of preliminary Report #1 (General Education Program - Review and Assessment) to the Council and the Provost. The document was also distributed to the Faculty Senate and all campus departments. The Council is reviewing recommendations for program improvements during the Spring 1995 semester.

The General Education plan for the assessment of student outcomes was approved in the spring of 1995. The protocols for the pilot portfolio and interview program are presently being developed. The pilot will be conducted during the 1995-96 academic year. Analysis of the pilot results will be conducted in the summer of 1996. Full implementation of the student outcomes assessment plan will occur during the 1996-97 academic year.

Individual academic programs will pilot their assessment tools and methods during the 1995-96 and 1996-97 academic year. Implementation of most plans will occur during the 1997-98 academic year. The following is a historical and projected timeline for the assessment plan and is realistic in terms of available and anticipated resources.

Date	Action
June 1992	Faculty attend AAHE Assessment Conference
June 1993	Faculty and Administrators attend AAHE Assessment Conference
September 1993	Provost establishes General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC)
Sep. 1993-Jan. 1995	GEAC devises multiple measure assessment with emphasis on inputs and processes
June 1994	Faculty and Administrators attend AAHE Assessment Conference
August 1994	Administrative Fellow for Assessment is appointed in Office of the Provost & VP for Academic Affairs
October 1994	Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC) appointed for the University
December 1994	Dr. Karen Maitland Schilling visits ISU as consultant
December 1994	Campus adopts Guiding Principles for Student Outcomes Assessment Plan
January 1995	GEAC - Submits Preliminary Report #1 (General Education - Program Review & Assessment). Focus is on input and process assessment
January 1995	AAC distributes resource manual on assessment to all academic departments
February 1995	AAC conducts assessment workshop for academic programs
March 1995	Academic programs and General Education Council submit drafts of assessment plans for review and synthesis
April 1995	Campus review of the University's Student Outcomes Assessment Plan
June 1995	AAC conducts summer workshop
September 1995-June 1996	Academic programs and General Education pilot assessment methodology
1996-97 Academic Year (AY)	Implementation of assessment plan by academic programs and General Education
1997-98 AY	Evaluation of the University's assessment plan by Assessment Advisory Committee
1997-98 AY	Establishment of an Office of Assessment under the Provost

5.   **What is the evidence that the plan provides for appropriate administration of the assessment program?**

The plan is presently administered by the Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC) consisting of nine faculty members from the College and each of the Schools, an undergraduate and graduate student, and professional staff representing Alumni and Student Affairs. The Director of Institutional Research serves as an ex-officio member. An Administrative Fellow in the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; and the Chair of the Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate co-chair the committee. The committee is advisory to the Provost.

The AAC has recommended to the Provost the establishment of an Office of Assessment (OA) and the continuance of the Assessment Advisory Committee to administer the assessment program. This recommendation is currently under review.

The Office of Assessment (OA) would consist of a coordinator who would report to the Office of the Provost and Vice president for Academic Affairs. The OA would function in a service model assisting faculty and students with assessment activities. The OA would:

1.   Assist the individual programs in preparing, executing, and improving their assessment plans;
2.   Assist the General Education Council in coordinating its own assessments with those of individual units;
3.   Prepare annual reports to the University regarding assessment activities;
4.   Serve as an advocate for assessment to the University administration;
5.   Maintain a collection of reference materials useful for those assessing learning experiences;
6.   Gather and maintain historical data on the University and its learners; and
7.   Coordinate assessment activities with the Office of Institutional Research, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and the Office of Alumni Affairs.

The AAC would:

1.   Develop and recommend the principles, policies, and practices appropriate to University and program assessment activities;
2.   Develop and maintain the University-wide assessment plan;
3.   Assess University assessment activities at least annually;
4.   Advise the Office of Assessment in the performance of its functions;
5.   Serve as an advocate for needed resources as assessment activities expand and develop;
6.   Conduct a professional assessment workshop annually to assist faculty in moving from assessment data to program improvement;
7.   Assist programs in assessment activities when requested; and
8.   Distribute examples of effective assessment techniques to the University community to help individual programs improve their assessment efforts.

The University is dedicated to educational opportunity, equity, social change, and technological advancement in society. It seeks to provide educational access to all students seeking admission whose demonstrated capabilities suggest that they have the knowledge and skills requisite to earn a university degree, and the University is committed to providing a highly personalized educational environment which both promotes academic excellence and assists admitted students in meeting their educational goals. In an attempt to enhance student performance and success, the University is committed to actively engage in the assessment of student learning.

INTRODUCTION

Indiana State University (ISU), founded in 1865, is a comprehensive state university located in the city of Terre Haute and the Wabash Valley, with an area population of some 140,000. The University enrolls approximately 12,000 undergraduate and graduate students in more than 100 degree programs that extend from the baccalaureate to the doctoral level. ISU includes more than 50 departments and 640 FTE faculty throughout the College of Arts and Sciences and the Schools of Business, Education, Graduate Studies, Health and Human Performance, Nursing, and Technology.

Strategic Goals for the 21st Century

The University has evolved from a normal school into a comprehensive public university. As the institution has evolved, the environment in which it has functioned also has changed. To respond to this change, it was essential for the University to engage in a systematic self-examination and planning activity. With the arrival of President John Moore in 1992, a formal planning process was designed and initiated to help ISU anticipate the future more effectively, and to identify the opportunities, demands, and constraints placed upon the University by various constituencies it serves. By engaging in the planning process, ISU intended to effectively clarify its role and purpose, identify central goals and objectives, establish priorities, initiate new programs, and make decisions about allocation of resources.

The resulting Strategic Plan for the 21st Century (1994 report) identified the following eight (8) strategic goals::

- ✓ Enhancement of Undergraduate Education
- ✓ Extension of Advanced Knowledge
- ✓ Service to the New Clienteles
- ✓ Expansion of Knowledge
- ✓ Transfer of Knowledge and Expertise to Society
- ✓ Enhancement and Advocacy of Multicultural and International Values
- ✓ Promotion of an Interdisciplinary Culture
- ✓ Enhancement of Intellectual and Creative Expression in West Central Indiana

Fourteen (14) academic and support initiatives were identified to begin the implementation of the strategic goals. The development of a systematic and comprehensive student outcomes assessment plan is part of Initiative 7: Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness. As part of its commitment to self-examination, the University has undertaken a program of assessing student academic achievement. Indiana State University's assessment plan has been developed within the context of the eight strategic goals.

Philosophy and Scope of Assessment

Indiana State University is committed to delivering high-quality undergraduate and graduate programs which will prepare students to lead productive lives. Student outcomes assessment at ISU is a systematic process of gathering, interpreting, and using information about student learning for the purpose of improving student learning and the quality of academic programs. The assessment program gives the University an opportunity to demonstrate its strengths as well as to identify areas for growth and development. Activities are undertaken at the University-wide level, as well as at the department and program levels. Faculty, administrators, and students work together to accomplish the purposes of the assessment program. Alumni and community representatives are also involved.

The overall goal of the assessment program is to improve academic programs. This is accomplished by assessing student knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values at four stages of development; entrance; mid-program;

exit; and post-graduation. This information is used by program faculty to identify needed program changes or to target analysis of other areas. Indiana State University's assessment program is based on a set of "guiding principles" (Appendix A) which were reviewed and approved by the campus as a whole. The assessment program possesses the following characteristics:

✓   develops, implements, and evaluates the assessment program with faculty holding primary responsibility;

✓   focusses on academic programs, not individual students or faculty;

✓   reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional;

✓   emphasizes that improvement of student learning is a long-range process;

✓   includes representatives from both inside and outside the educational community;

✓   is comprehensive--i.e., includes all academic programs;

✓   evolves continually and dynamically;

✓   involves the use of multiple measures; and

✓   uses evaluation of assessment data to improve academic programs.

DEVELOPMENTAL
STEPS OF THE PLAN

Some ISU programs have been successful at assessing student learning in academic programs for many years. However, an effort to increase faculty involvement and to establish a systematic and comprehensive assessment plan for the entire university began in 1992. During the academic years of 1992 and 1993, four administrators and eight faculty representing the General Education Council, the College and the Schools were funded by the Office of the Provost to attend regional and national conferences on assessment in higher education. These individuals formed a core of expertise to advise the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs on strategies for increasing faculty involvement and developing a comprehensive assessment plan. This group recommended the appointment of an Administrative Fellow from the faculty ranks to coordinate the assessment efforts and the establishment of an Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC) to develop and recommend the principles, policies, and practices appropriate for university and program assessment activities.

Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC)

In the summer of 1994, Professor David R. Hopkins was appointed as an Administrative Fellow in the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for the purpose of providing leadership and coordination of the University assessment efforts. In the fall of 1994, after consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Deans' Council, the Provost appointed a 13 person Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC) (Appendix B). The committee is comprised of 9 faculty members from each of the Schools and the College, the Coordinator of General Education, an undergraduate and graduate student, and professional staff representatives from Alumni Affairs and Student Affairs. The Director of Institutional Research serves as an ex-officio member. Professors David R. Hopkins, Administrative Fellow, and Tom Sawyer, Chair of the Faculty Senate Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee, were appointed as co-chairs of the committee. The committee was given the following six charges for the 1994-95 academic year:

✓   Develop the link between the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution and student outcomes assessment;

✓   Develop the principles that should guide the development of program and institution-wide assessment plans;

✓   Identify and recommend appropriate action concerning issues pertaining to assessment;

✓   Develop a conceptual framework for student outcomes assessment to provide guidance to program plan development;

✓   Provide assistance to programs in the development of student outcomes assessment plans; and

✓   Oversee the development of a comprehensive student outcomes assessment planning document to be submitted by the Provost to the North Central Association.

Guiding Principles for Student Outcomes Assessment

The AAC proposed fourteen (14) general principles and four (4) additional principles specifically for graduate programs to guide the development and implementation of student outcomes assessment plans for the General Education and undergraduate and graduate majors. The principles were widely disseminated and discussed on campus. The "guiding principles" document (Appendix A) was approved in the fall of 1994 by the Deans' Council, Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee, Graduate Council, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, and the University Faculty Senate. The following principles concerning structure and methodology form the foundation of the assessment plan:

STRUCTURE

1.   The primary responsibility for developing, implementing, and evaluating student outcomes assessment plans rests with the faculty.

2.   The focus of student outcomes should be on programs rather than on individual faculty.

3.   The assessment of student learning is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional.

4.   The focus of student outcomes assessment should be on academic programs rather than individual students.

5.   Improvement of student learning is a long-range process.

6.   Student outcomes assessment fosters greater improvement when representatives from both inside and outside the educational community are involved.

7.   Each program will develop its own unique assessment plan within the framework of the "guiding principles."

METHODOLOGY

8.   The assessment of student learning begins with educational values.

9.   Student outcomes assessment plans can only sample intended outcomes.

10.   The student outcomes assessment program should be dynamic and evolving.

11.   Student outcomes assessment results should be used for comparisons between current and previous performance of a program rather than among university programs.

12.   Assessment of student learning should be based on the use of multiple measures.

13.   Student outcomes assessment should address standards of performance related to improvement.

14.   Student outcomes assessment data should be evaluated and used.

Supplementary Guiding Principles for Graduate Student
Outcomes Assessment

15. Since research/creativity is one of the distinguishing characteristics of graduation, measures of graduate student learning should include an evaluation in this area.
16. Professional graduate programs (MBA, MPA, MSA, etc.), which by definition are designed to prepare professional practitioners, should include student learning measures of the students' abilities to apply advanced knowledge to the problems addressed by the profession.
17. Training at the graduate level prepares students for professional participation in their fields of study. Graduate student outcomes assessment should include measures of professional association, participation, and/or endorsement, as appropriate.
18. Graduate student outcomes assessment should address student recognition of the professional ethics of the discipline.

Resource Manual and Campus Workshops for Academic Departments

The AAC developed a resource manual (Appendix C) on student outcomes assessment for academic programs. The purpose of the manual was to answer basic questions about assessment, provide a conceptual framework for assessment, and provide a model for the assessment plans of the individual academic programs. Each department liaison received a copy of the manual in early January 1995. The manual contained the following: A) Introduction to Assessment in Higher Education, B) Definition of Terms, C) Guiding Principles for Student Outcomes Assessment, D) Developmental Steps for an Assessment Plan, E) A Model for the Assessment Plan, F) An Example of the Model, and G) Supplementary Materials and Suggested Readings.

Dr. Karen Maitland Schilling, from Miami (Ohio) University, was brought to campus in December of 1994 as a consultant to share her assessment expertise with the General Education Council and its Assessment Committee, the AAC, and representatives from academic programs.

The AAC provided an assessment workshop in February 1995 as a follow-up to the distribution of the resource manuals to all departments. An intensive summer workshop is planned for the summer of 1995 for all department representatives to aid in the continued development of assessment tools and methods, data analysis techniques, and links to program improvement.

Student Outcome Assessment
Plan in the Major
↓
Academic Program
↓
Development
↓
Implementation
↓
Review
↓
Evaluation
↓
Academic Program Faculty
↓
Reviewed by Chair
↓
Reviewed by Dean
↓
Reviewed by Assessment
Advisory Committee

Faculty Development of the Plan

The AAC identified the required six components of an assessment plan model: 1) mission of program; 2) intended student outcome statements; 3) tools and methods; 4) timeframe for implementation; 5) projected analysis of results; and 6) program for improvement. A discussion of the model and an example of an academic program model was provided to all academic programs via the resource manual and a campus workshop. The General Education Council and all undergraduate and graduate major programs were requested to

submit draft #1 of their student outcomes assessment plans by March 3, 1995, that followed the "guiding principles" and contained the six components.

The academic program faculty have the primary responsibility for developing, implementing, revising, and evaluating student outcomes assessment plans. The plans were reviewed by the department chairperson and appropriate dean, and the Assessment Advisory Committee to ensure that the plans contained the six components and followed the guiding principles approved by the University Faculty Senate. The plans are meant to be dynamic in nature. The end product of assessment will be the modification of the academic programs by the academic program faculty to better prepare students for their future lives. If consensual concerns arise within the academic program faculty, relating to the assessment plan, a procedure has been established to address these concerns (see Appendix D).

Unlike the academic programs, which are the responsibility of the specific program faculty, the General Education Program is a University-wide faculty responsibility. The student assessment plan for the General Education Program will be developed, implemented, revised, and evaluated by the General Education Council. The General Education Plan was approved by CAAC, the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate, and the University Faculty Senate.

All proposed academic program plans and the General Education plan were reviewed and approved by the appropriate individuals and bodies during April 1995. The procedures used by the AAC to review and make suggestions on plans are presented in Appendix E.

The AAC also worked closely with the Offices of Institutional Research and Alumni Affairs in the development of the Freshman Profile, Department Profile, Graduating Senior Survey, and the Alumni Survey. These will be discussed in the next section.

Student Outcome Assessment
Plan for General Education
↓
GEAC
↓
General Education Council
↓
CAAC
↓
Executive Committee
University Faculty Senate
↓
University Faculty Senate

THE ASSESSMENT PLAN

The University Assessment Plan flows from the institution's mission and strategic goals, is characterized by faculty ownership and responsibility, and has institution-wide support. The following summarizes the plan for the components of General Education, undergraduate, and graduate majors, and supporting university-wide assessment initiatives.

Assessment in General Education - The assessment of student outcomes for the General Education Program at Indiana State University is a continuation of the ongoing assessment program initiated in the fall of 1993. On January 18, 1995, the General Education Assessment Committee, GEAC, submitted *Report #1_General Education Program_Review and Assessment* to the General Education Council and the Provost. The report describes the approach, methods, first results, and, based on the results, implications for program improvement. The emphasis of the assessment was more on inputs and processes than on outcomes.

I.   Mission

The mission of the General Education Program at Indiana State University is reflected in the program description in the *Undergraduate Catalog 1994-1996*: "The General Education Program at Indiana State University provides an essential foundation and broad academic base for students in all curricula, both liberal arts and professional. It also encourages each student's development as a rounded human being, an informed citizen, and an individual capable of functioning effectively in an evolving society." (p. 69)

The General Education Program which went into effect for all students entering in the fall of 1989 comprises approximately 40% of their undergraduate program. It is divided into Basic Studies (11-17 credit hours) and Liberal Studies (36 credit hours). The Basic Studies component includes writing, speaking, mathematics, and physical activities. The Liberal Studies component requires the completion of a minimum number of credit hours in each of five areas.

II. Intended Student Outcomes

The first nine intended student outcomes identified below are based directly on the nine goals established for the Liberal Studies component, which incorporate the Basic Studies goals of enhancing students' abilities in English composition, communication, mathematics and physical education. Two additional outcomes relate to the structure and impact of the overall General Education Program.

As a result of their enrollment in the General Education Program, students should be able to demonstrate:

- increasing capacities for independent thinking, critical analysis, and reasoned inquiry,
- increasing abilities in writing, speaking, reading and listening,
- increasing capacities for making informed judgments, and responsible choices, and
- increasing preparation to meet the challenges of their post-collegiate lives, including participatory citizenship, the value of lifelong learning, and the ability to adapt to change.

As a result of study in the five Core Areas of Liberal Studies students should be able to demonstrate:

- increased scientific and mathematical literacy, analytic competency, and ability to examine phenomena and to interpret data in a manner consistent with the principles, methods and theories of science. *Area A: Scientific and Analytic Studies,*
- increased knowledge of the nature of humankind, including origins, processes, and systems. *Area B: Human Origin, Process and System Studies,*
- development of a critical awareness of the aesthetic and cultural dimensions of the literary, fine, and performing arts. *Area C: Literary and Artistic Studies,*
- development of a perspective on history that enables them to understand the complexities of the past and enhances their understanding of the changes within human society over time. *Area D: Historical Studies,* and
- a broadening of the horizons by which they regard the diversity of cultures and experiences that define American society and the contemporary world. *Area E: Multi-Cultural Studies.*

In addition, for the following two outcomes which relate to the effectiveness of the program's overall structure, students should be able to demonstrate:

- the contribution of the Basic Studies component of their program to their total University experience, including the Liberal Studies component, and
- an understanding of the place and value of a general education program in a university education.

III. Assessment Methods

The responsibility for the assessment of the General Education Program is within the General Education Council, a faculty committee representative of the University. For Basic Studies, this responsibility is shared with the faculty in the departments with primary responsiblity for providing instruction in this area. The General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) referred to earlier, is a committee of the Council which develops assessment plans for Council approval. GEAC implements the assessment and reports its findings to the Council for their review and action.

The methods which will be used to assess student outcomes for General Education must reflect the nature of the student who attends Indiana State University. From that perspective, student development and student heterogeneity are central considerations which influence the form of any plan. Our students arrive with a variety of backgrounds, aptitudes, and expectations. The approach to assessment is to use methods which allow us to measure change over time, that is, development. The specific methods indicated below allow this.

A. Student Portfolios

Student portfolios have become used increasingly as a method for assessing general education outcomes. The General Education Council, through GEAC, intends to establish a portfolio program, for a representative sample of students, which will allow assessment of their accumulating course work and experiences in the General Education Program, both Basic Studies and Liberal Studies. The representative, stratified, random sample will be designed to approximate student demographics and still maintain adequate samples for reviewing the General Education program from the perspectives of students in the different schools and the College. GEAC recognizes from the outset that once students begin to participate, they are "special." However, GEAC assumes that the portfolio will still provide a representative reflection of what students are

learning and the paths to that learning. The contents of the portfolio will be reviewed specifically in terms of the outcomes previously stated.

Coincident with their enrollment at ISU, selected students will be recruited for participation in the portfolio assessment process with the expectation that they will continue in the assessment program throughout their stay at Indiana State University. Depending on the resources available, students will be offered a modest incentive such as a bookstore voucher each year for their participation . They will be informed of the scope of and purposes and expectations for participation, including the once-a-semester (twice-a-semester submissions may be used) obligation to submit materials and participation in annual interviews. The Office of General Education will serve as the contact and collection site for all of the portfolio activities. Faculty from across the campus and the General Education Council will be recruited to review, analyze, and interpret portfolios and to conduct interviews.

To begin the project, the preference is toward over-inclusion of information on student performance. The portfolio will contain for each Basic Studies and Liberal Studies course:

1. Syllabi and all materials distributed in the course,
2. Tables of contents for assigned texts,
3. Student developed materials related to their course experiences _ for example, a sample of photocopies of text pages with student annotations,
4. All assignments receiving teacher feedback including developmental aspects of assignments,
5. Graded exams, if possible,
6. Other materials reflecting activities consistent with the purposes of General Education _ for example, co-curricular activities sponsored through General , Education in Action or in conjunction with the First Year Experience or the University 101 course, and
7. A reflective essay prepared at the end of each semester in which students describe their sense of development as a consequence of their experiences in General Education courses during the semester.

B. Questionnaires

GEAC has developed and administered to students enrolled in the required upper-level writing course a questionnaire intended to assess their perceptions of the General Education Program. The questionnaire is a viable way to determine students perceptions of their experiences and to examine a sampling of indicators of their values vis-a-vis the general education outcomes. The structure of the General Education Program, with a required upper level writing course in which students can enroll only after completing 62 hours, allows the collection of data from representative samples of students at a relatively propitious time in their program.

GEAC is also developing a question module to be made available to individual instructors to supplement established class-based questionnaires. The module will allow individual instructors and departments to determine the extent to which the experiences within individual Liberal Studies classes are affecting students perceptions of the General Education outcomes.

In addition, the University already uses questionnaires and is developing additional ones to obtain information about students' backgrounds, expectations, and experiences from entry to alumni status. These instruments will include questions relevant to general education assessment.

C. Individual Interviews

1. Portfolio participants

A part of the student portfolio procedure will be to conduct annual interviews with student participants. The purpose of the interviews will be to help to understand the materials in the portfolio and the students' perceptions of their experiences, and to provide the students with additional guidance in their portfolio development. Questions such as the reasons for course selection and a student's sense of what a general education program is will also be discussed.

2. Other students

In addition to the students who develop and maintain portfolios, a small sample of other students will be interviewed either individually or in focus groups in order to determine their experiences in and perceptions of the General Education Program. This process will help to validate the portfolio process. Especially during the development of the portfolio base, it will provide information on the General Education Program for a cross section of students at different levels.

D. Continue Other Input and Process Approaches

GEAC has initiated and will continue to develop, conduct, and refine a broad-based assessment program which addresses input and processes. The multiple measures are listed in the table on the following pages. The development of the outcomes assessment program will support the existing efforts and vice versa.

IV. Time frame for Implementation Note (shaded area describes prior work)

Date	Action
June 1992	Coordinator attended AAHE Assessment Conf.
Spring 1993	General Education Council began work on assessment
June 1993	Coordinator and team attended AAHE Assessment Conf.
September 1993	Provost established GEAC

Sept. 1993 - Jan. 1995	Multiple-measure program of assessment with emphasis on inputs and processes initiated: 1. Focus groups of faculty, students, chairpersons, and advisors 2. Questionnaires administered to upper-level students 3. Questionnaires distributed campus-wide 4. Syllabus analysis 5. Course-based enrollment analyses 6. Transcript analysis
December 1994	Karen Maitland Schilling visited ISU as a portfolio assessment consultant. GEAC recommended to the General Education Council the adoption of portfolios as a primary mechanism for general education outcomes assessment. The Council endorsed the recommendation.
January 18, 1995	GEAC submitted *Report #1_General Education Program_Review and Assessment* to Council and Provost. The Provost distributed the report to all deans, department chairs, and the Faculty Senate.

Spring 1995	1. Develop protocol for the pilot portfolio program, and
	 2. Continue ongoing input and process assessment, including:
	    a. Responses to *Report #1_General Education Program_Review and Assessment*, and
	    b. Department-based reviews of Liberal Studies courses.

Summer 1995	1. Recruit 15-20 incoming students and 6-8 continuing students to participate in pilot portfolio program, and 2. Continue protocol development.
Academic year 1995-1996	1. Set assessment objectives and develop indicators, 2. Recruit and train faculty to conduct portfolio reviews and interviews, 3. Faculty conduct first portfolio reviews, 4. Develop and refine methodology, 5. Modify the portfolio implementation based on experiences, 6. Set plan for 1996-1997, including sample size, cost estimates, and identify target assessment objectives, and 7. Conduct interviews and collect General Education Program questionnaire data from a sample of students in the upper-level writing classes. 8. Department with primary responsibility for providing instruction in Basic Studies area and the General Education Council together set assessment objectives, develop indicators, and establish methods for Basic Studies components of the General Education program.
Summer 1996	1. Recruit a sample of possibly 30-40 students for portfolio assessment, 2. For use in the portfolio reviews, develop and test procedures that focus on student development, 3. Analyze results of portfolio reviews, and 4. Prepare first report to General Education Council on outcomes assessment.

Academic year 1996-1997, and beyond	1. Based on their review of the assessment report, the General Education Council and the Coordinator propose changes to improve student learning, 2. Conduct the portfolio program as stated above, 3. Continue to recruit and train faculty participants, 4. Continue to develop and refine the iterative cycle for student outcomes assessment, 5. Assess the efficacy of the portfolio program, and 6. Identify other forms of data that should be collected and analyzed to augment the assessment program.
Summer year 2000	The portfolio process will be reviewed to evaluate its efficiency and its contribution to improvement of the General Education program and to the ongoing improvement of student learning. A break of two years in the portfolio program will be considered.

V. Analysis and Results

The analysis protocols for the portfolios will be developed prior to the first review of portfolios in the fall of 1995. It is envisioned that GEAC will develop a process of reviewing the materials to determine the kind, quantity, and quality of the content and experiences related to the General Education objectives. The process will probably have pairs of faculty review each portfolio from the perspective of one or two of the stated outcomes. Reviewers will first try to identify the indicators in the submitted materials which meet an objective and then will review the students' process of accomplishing the objective. For example, the reviewers addressing the objective "increased capacities for independent thinking, critical analysis, and reasoned inquiry" will examine the syllabi, assignments, exams, etc., to determine the extent to which tasks were presented which would support the objective. The students' work will then be reviewed to determine the process by which they accomplished the task and to assess the quality of their work. More important, as students continue in the program over successive semesters, it will be possible to track their development.

Since it is the General Education Program which is being assessed and not the individual student per se, measures and formats for extracting the relevant data will be developed. One of the questions with regard to an objective will be to try to separate the opportunities to meet the objective and to determine the bases for the students' success, or lack of success, in doing so. For example, if a student is unsuccessful, is it because of a lack of preparation or a lack of effort?

The portfolios will be a rich source of data. Choices will have to be made with regard to the objectives on which to focus. The selection of the objectives will be, in part, a reflection of the other assessment data GEAC is collecting and of the General Education Council's identification of priority issues. At the outset, however, there will be an attempt to review, analyze, and interpret at least some of the portfolios for each of the objectives.

The questionnaire data will complement the portfolio analyses. Since the General Education Program questionnaire will be administered on an annual basis, it will allow comparisons over time of students' perceptions of their experiences in the program. As other questionnaires are developed which provide information from the students at different points in their collegiate and post-collegiate career, the data will become a part of the ongoing assessment process.

VI. Program for Improvement

Each year an assessment report will be prepared and made available to the University at large. The report will identify areas of success as well as areas of concern. *Report #1_General Education Program_Review and Assessment* has already provided impetus for program improvement. It is expected that the student outcomes assessment will augment the ongoing and continuing assessment. When the portfolio analysis identifies either program or student learning weaknesses, it will become the General Education Council and Coordinator's responsibility to identify the source of the difficulty and to determine ways to address it. In some cases it may be a matter of process-for example, advisement if students are taking courses before they are ready. Or, it may be curricular, if, for example, the totality of the multicultural experiences students have had within their program does not seem to meet the expectations for the outcome. In order to improve the General Education Program, the Coordinator and Council will support the faculty who are responsible for the development and delivery of instruction in the General Education Program.

The student outcomes assessment described in this plan will be integrated with the continuing assessment of the General Education Program, which to date has focused more on inputs and processes, already underway. An important component is developing and implementing a process for the review, at the departmental level, of all courses approved for the Liberal Studies component.

Assessment in the Major - The faculty of the individual academic programs have clearly defined the mission and goals of their program. They have identified intended student outcomes for degree programs at the baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral level. The intended outcomes relate to what programs expect students to know, do (skills), and care about (attitudes and values) when they complete their program of study. Examples of intended student outcome statements are presented in Appendix F. The following program specific outcomes appear across the programs:

Undergraduate

1. Demonstrate knowledge in the area of the specific major

2. Demonstrate competence in skills required for the specific major

3. Demonstrate appropriate attitudes and values

Graduate

1. Demonstrate increased levels of all knowledge and skills expected by undergraduates in the major

2. Demonstrate ability to apply advance knowledge to the problems addressed by the profession

3. Demonstrate professional behaviors with respect to the specific major participation in their fields of study

4. Demonstrate the ability to make ethical decision with respect to the major

The program faculty have also identified tools and methods that they intend to use in assessing student learning outcomes. Some tools are already in use, others will need to be found or developed. The types of assessment tools included in the plans are examinations of subject matter as a single activity examination, standardized tests, and locally developed assessments of subject competence. The plans call for performance measures to be used for assessment of the major which include, but are not limited to, a variety of student assignments and projects; recitals; exhibits; juried presentations; seminar presentations; portfolios; exit interviews; surveys of students, alumni, or employers; capstone experiences; practicums, including student teaching and co-op experiences; and oral and comprehensive exams. Most programs intend to assess their students upon entry into the program, at the mid-point of the program, at exit, and a period of time after graduation. A summary of identified assessment tools can be found in Appendix G.

Program faculty have identified their intended time frame for implementation, how data will be collected and analyzed, and how the results will be used for program improvements. The majority of programs will be developing and piloting assessment tools and procedures during the 1995-96 academic year. Implementation of plans will commence during the 1996-97 academic year.

University-wide Assessment Initiatives - The following are University-wide assessment initiatives that provide a variety of information to campus constituencies to help in making decisions on how to improve academic programs:

Graduating Senior Survey - Starting in April 1995, the Office of Institutional Research will mail questionnaires to all Indiana State University seniors who are scheduled to receive a baccalaureate degree in May 1995. The questionnaire will be used to determine if Indiana State met the needs of its graduating seniors in a variety of important areas such as general satisfaction, skills and knowledge attained, campus environment, facilities and services, and their major. Respondents are asked to indicate whether their experiences at the University prepared them or met their needs very well, satisfactorily, or poorly in these areas. An annual summary report will be prepared and distributed to campus constituencies.

Alumni Survey - The ISU Alumni survey is mailed by the Office of Alumni Affairs to a stratified random sample of alumni. It was created to measure satisfaction levels and perceptions of alumni about their ISU experience, and about the ISU faculty, administration, and student activities. The survey was implemented in January 1995. The 1995 administration of the survey will provide the baseline for future comparisons.

Freshman Profile - During the new student advisement and registration program, the Office of Institutional Research administers the Freshman Profile questionnaire. This information is used to annually produce the Freshman Profile report which provides information about demographic and academic characteristics and anticipated college plans of incoming students. This information is widely distributed to the faculty.

Department Profile - The Office of Institutional Research annually prepares unit profiles for all academic departments. The profile delineates five-year trends in class size; majors; FTE majors; credit hours; degrees awarded; descriptions of allocated human and fiscal resources; and summaries of grant and contract activity, scholarship and creative activities, and professional service activities of the department. The information is provided annually to every academic department.

Other University-wide assessment initiatives are also underway which will expand and enrich the assessment process. Some of these include the annual report by the Career Center on student placement and a comprehensive review of campus advisement.

Summary - Indiana State University is proud of its commitment to excellence in education. To attain its goal of becoming a national model for the distinctiveness and quality of its educational experience, it supports a program of assessing student academic achievement. This program gives the University an opportunity to demonstrate its strengths as well as to identify areas for growth and development.

Assessment activities at the institutional and program levels derive from the University's mission statement and eight strategic goals for the 21st century. The assessment plan involves a variety of assessment activities, including standardized testing, evaluation of performance measures, and surveys of various groups. Results of assessment activities are used in planning processes to stimulate program improvements.

APPENDICES

A.   GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR STUDENT
      OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT
B.   ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
C.   RESOURCE MANUAL FOR ACADEMIC
      DEPARTMENTS
D.   CONSENSUS PROCEDURES
E.   REVIEW PROCEDURES BY THE AAC
F.   EXAMPLES OF INTENDED STUDENT
      OUTCOME STATEMENTS
G.   SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS
H.   1994 STRATEGIC PLAN

APPENDIX A
GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR STUDENT OUTCOMES
ASSESSMENT

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Indiana State University is committed to delivering high-quality undergraduate and graduate programs which will prepare students to lead productive lives. Student outcomes assessment is a systematic process of gathering, interpreting, and using information about student learning for the purpose of improving student learning and the quality of our academic programs. Methods must be developed to accomplish the following:

1) articulate the intended student outcomes of each undergraduate and graduate program;
2) gain feedback on each program's progress toward achieving those outcomes; and
3) use the feedback to modify academic programs to ensure that intended outcomes are effectively achieved.

The intent of outcomes assessment is not to impose impediments in the classroom nor to take time away from instruction, but rather offer the faculty a reliable data base for their utilization as they seek to improve the educational process. The following principles, related to structure and methodology, have been identified to guide the development and implementation of student outcomes assessment plans at Indiana State University:

STRUCTURE

1. **The primary responsibility for developing, implementing, and evaluating student outcomes assessment plans rests with the faculty.** Cooperation among faculty, administration, staff, and students is essential to support the assessment process.

2. **The focus of student outcomes should be on programs rather than on individual faculty.** The purpose of gathering data is to evaluate programs rather than to evaluate individual faculty.

3. **The assessment of student learning is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional.** Learning is a complex process. It entails various dimensions, not only what students know but what they can do with what they know; it further involves individual values and attitudes that affect both academic success and performance beyond the classroom. Therefore, the assessment plan should endeavor to measure the multidimensional aspects in an academic program.

4. **The focus of student outcomes assessment should be on academic programs rather than individual students.** Student outcomes assessment is concerned with using the collective results of individual students and determining what those results imply about the quality of individual academic programs.

5. **Improvement of student learning is a long-range process.** The goal of each program should be to establish and implement systems for ongoing student outcomes assessment. The academic community should monitor progress toward intended outcomes in a spirit of continuous improvement. Programs should gather post graduation feedback from alumni and employers to identify program strengths and challenges.

6. **Student outcomes assessment fosters wider improvement when representatives from inside and outside the educational community are involved.** Student learning is a campus-wide responsibility and assessment is a way of enacting that responsibility. Thus, while assessment

efforts may start small, the aim over time is to involve people from across the educational community, the local community, and ultimately the State of Indiana. Faculty play an especially important role, but assessment cannot be fully addressed without participation by some combination of students, student-affairs educators, librarians, administrators, alumni, and employers. Assessment is not a task for small groups of experts but a collaborative activity; its aim must be wider, emphasizing attention to student learning by all parties who have a stake in its improvement.

7. **Each program will develop its own unique assessment plan within the framework of the document.** Each major program will develop its own assessment plan. Student outcomes assessment should be decentralized and, when appropriate, discipline-specific. Clear statements of intended student outcomes developed by the faculty are to be the basis for assessment. Decentralization encourages activity at the program level and maximizes the role of the faculty in the assessment program.

METHODOLOGY

8. **The assessment of student learning begins with educational values.** Student outcomes assessment is not an end in itself but a vehicle for educational improvement. Its effective practice begins with a vision of the kinds of learning we most value for students in general education and major programs and helps them lead productive lives.

9. **Student outcomes assessment plans can only sample intended outcomes.** Outcomes should be prioritized based on such criteria as currency, cost effectiveness, and important educational outcomes for each student completing an academic program. The sample of outcomes should include issues which represent current concerns within the discipline and program.

10. **The student outcomes assessment program should be dynamic and evolving.** Assessment at the program level should allow for refinement in the plan as faculty evaluate the results of their activities. Those involved with assessment should meet regularly to plan activities, study results, develop approaches for sharing results, and evaluate the assessment activity.

11. **Student outcomes assessment results should be used for comparisons between current and previous performance of a program rather than between university programs.** In a comprehensive university, diverse values and criteria in the various disciplines will impact on assessment in different ways. Comparisons among programs on criteria that are not equally emphasized within programs can impede the improvement process.

12. **Assessment of student learning should be based on the use of multiple measures.** There are many valid methods of assessment that include the use of both quantitative and qualitative measures. Assessment should reflect the multidimensional understanding of learning by using a variety of measurement techniques. No one measure is adequately comprehensive to capture the wide range of achievements represented by students' academic experiences. Appropriate measurement instruments include, but are not limited to, standardized tests, surveys, and portfolio techniques. Since learning is not a passive activity it is also appropriate to include measures of student effort.

13. **Student outcomes assessment should address standards of performance related to improvement.** It is appropriate to measure student growth at various stages of the academic program. Student outcomes assessment should be formative as well as summative.

14. **Student outcomes assessment data should be evaluated and used.** Program decision makers are encouraged within each assessment report to use assessment as a means to improve the quality of the program.

Collectively, the above principles support the three-prong approach, identified in the introductory paragraph, to student outcomes assessment. Further, these principles form the framework for the development and implementation of student outcomes assessment plans within each academic program. Finally, the assessment plans for the academic programs are to be dynamic allowing for continuous dialogue about student outcomes assessment at Indiana State University.

Supplementary Guiding Principles for Graduate Student
Outcomes Assessment

The Graduate Council of the School of Graduate Studies has identified the following supplementary principles to guide the development and implementation of graduate student outcomes assessment plans:

1. Since research/creativity is one of the distinguishing characteristics of graduation, measures of graduate student learning should include an evaluation in this area.
2. Professional graduate programs (MBA, MPA, MSA, etc.), which by definition are designed to prepare professional practitioners, should include student learning measures of the students' abilities to apply advanced knowledge to the problems addressed by the profession.
3. Training at the graduate level prepares students for professional participation in their fields of study. Graduate student outcomes assessment should include measures of professional association, participation, and/or endorsement, as appropriate.
4. Graduate student outcomes assessment should be address student recognition of the professional ethics of the discipline.

Approval Flow Chart

Approved - Advisory Assessment Committee	13-0-0	11/22/94
Approved - Dean's Council	Consensus	11/28/94
Approved - CAAC	7-1-0	11/30/94
Approved - Graduate Council	Consensus	12/01/94
Approved - Executive Committee (UFS)	7-0-0	12/06/94
Approved - UFS	26-0-0	12/15/94

APPENDIX B
ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Deborah Barnhart, Assistant Professor, Nursing
James W. Chesebro, Chairperson, Communication
Sandy Cline, Assistant Director, Alumni Affairs
Alan Czyzewski, Assistant Professor, Accounting
Jacquelyn Frost, Director, university Planning/Institutional Analysis (Ex-officio)
Robert Goldbort, Assistant Professor, English, Graduate Council
David R. Hopkins, Administrative Fellow, Academic Affairs - Co-Chair
Bob Levy, Professor, Psychology, Coordinator of General Education
Bill McCurry, Chairperson, Aerospace Technology
James Officer, Graduate Student, Public Administration
Bill Osmon, Associate Professor, Counseling
Tasha Roberts-Bolden, Acting Asst. Dean, Student Life
Thomas Sawyer, Professor, Recreation & Sports Management, Chair of CAAC - Co-Chair
Alan Wildman, Undergraduate Student, Vice President, SGA

APPENDIX C
RESOURCE MANUAL FOR ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT IN THE MAJOR

A Resource Manual for
Academic Departments

(Assessment Advisory Committee, 1994)

Contents

Part One

INTRODUCTION

Assessment in higher education has been defined as the systematic process of gathering, interpreting, and using information about student learning (American Association for Higher Education, 1992). Since the mid 1980's, it has become a powerful tool for educational improvement. Perhaps the best way to understand assessment is to view it as a set of questions about student learning: What do our students know? What can they do? Are they learning what we intend? How do we ensure that? How can their experience be improved? These are questions that good teachers have asked for years about students in their classes. Today, programs and institutions are looking beyond individual courses and learning to look at student achievement across courses and examine cumulative effects and learning outcomes.

Approximately 90% of colleges and universities are developing and/or revising assessment plans. Various models exist, but typically three components of assessment are identified: outcome, process, and input.

Student outcomes assessment indicates what and how much of student learning is achieved. Intended student outcomes and appropriate indicators are identified to evaluate student learning in General Education and in the undergraduate and graduate major. In addition, student growth and development are measured.

Process assessment focuses on why results are being achieved. Goals, objectives, and indicators are identified to evaluate the curriculum, instruction, teaching/learning climate, orientation/advisement, faculty development programs and the administrative and service processes. We must evaluate processes in order to improve outcomes.

Input assessment indicates the adequacy of human and nonhuman resources necessary to accomplish process goals and intended student outcomes. Goals, objectives and indicators are identified to evaluate the incoming composition and quality of our students, adequacy of human resources, fiscal and facility resources dedicated to programs, and the university climate in which student learning, growth and development occur.

A comprehensive assessment plan requires attention to student outcomes, processes, and inputs. During the 1994-95 academic year, our initial efforts should focus on student outcomes assessment plans.

The Higher Education Act of 1992 requires that student outcomes assessment be conducted in order for institutions to continue to receive federal financial aid for students. Our accrediting body, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), requires us to submit an assessment plan which identifies how the institution will document student academic

2

achievement. The assessment plan for the General Education Program and major undergraduate and graduate programs is due to NCA by June 30, 1995.

An Assessment Advisory Committee has been appointed by the Provost to provide guidance for the student outcomes assessment planning process. The committee is comprised of the following representatives:

Deborah Barnhart, Assistant Professor, Nursing
James W. Chesebro, Chairperson, Communication
Sandy Cline, Assistant Director, Alumni Affairs
Alan Czyzewski, Assistant Professor, Accounting
Jacquelyn Frost, Director, University Planning/Institutional Analysis
Robert Goldbort, Assistant Professor, English, Graduate Council
David R. Hopkins, Administrative Fellow, Academic Affairs - Co-chair
Bob Levy, Coordinator, General Education
Bill McCurry, Chairperson, Aerospace Technology
James Officer, Graduate Student, Public Administration
Bill Osmon, Associate Professor, Counseling
Tasha Roberts-Bolden, Acting Asst. Dean, Student Life
Thomas Sawyer, Professor, Recreation & Sports Management, Chair of CAAC - Co-chair
Alan Wildman, Undergraduate Student, Vice President, SGA

The committee has been given the following six (6) charges for the 1994-95 academic year:

● Develop a statement of purpose and the link between the mission, goals and objectives of the institution and student outcomes assessment.

● Develop the principles that should guide the development of program and institution-wide assessment plans.

● Identify and recommend appropriate action concerning issues pertaining to assessment.

● Develop a conceptual framework for student outcomes assessment to provide guidance to program plan development.

● Provide resource assistance for programs in the development of student outcomes assessment plans.

● Oversee the development of the comprehensive student outcomes assessment planning document to be submitted by the Provost to the North Central Association (Initial draft by March 1, 1995; final plan by May 1, 1995). (see timetable in Appendix A)

The task before us at Indiana State University is to develop a student outcomes assessment plan that is linked to our mission, goal and objectives; is cooperatively developed and driven by faculty and administration; and will lead to program and institutional improvement when implemented. Assessment must be valued, not just for the data collected, but for the systematic process of gathering, interpreting and using information to improve what happens for our students.

The purpose of the resource manual is to provide a brief explanation to assist programs in the development of student outcomes assessment plans in the major. It is intended to answer basic questions about assessment, and provide a suggested model for assessment plans. The Assessment Advisory Committee stands ready to assist programs in the development of plans. For clarification or further assistance, please contact:

David R. Hopkins (ext. 8271) or Tom Sawyer (ext. 2189)
Email: pmdrh@scifac.indstate.edu / Email: pmsawyr@scifac.indstate.edu
Co-Chairs
Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC)

1994-95 Timetable

Guiding Principles for Student Outcomes Assessment approved by Faculty Senate	December 15, 1994
Resource Manual Distributed to Departments	January 11, 1995
Programs Provide Draft #1 of Student Outcomes Assessment Plans to Deans	March 3, 1995
Assessment Advisory Committee Provides Helpful Reviews of Plans and Return to Deans and Programs	March 7-31, 1995
Final Draft of Program Student Outcomes Assessment Plan to Deans	May 1, 1995
Assessment Advisory Committee includes examples of program plans in appendices of NCA report	June 1, 1995

Part Two

DEFINITIONS FOR ASSESSMENT

The following define commonly used terms related to assessment:

A. **Inputs:** Human and nonhuman resources -- staffing, fiscal resources, student preparation, and college/school climate.

B. **Processes:** The process goals and objectives specify the intended processes by which outcome goals/objectives will be met. They indicate what is offered to accomplish the stated mission -- advising, orientation, services, instruction, course offerings, faculty/instructional development program, and other activities that are developed to produce the desired learning outcomes. Improving the quality of results greatly depends on improving the quality of processes.

C. **Outcomes:** Desired or intended achievements that will result from the processes; results including student knowledge, skills and values, referred to as student outcomes or learning outcomes.

Thus, there are three types of assessment/evaluation:

Outcomes assessment- indicates what and how much of student learning is achieved
Process assessment- why results are being achieved
Input assessment- resources necessary to accomplish process and outcome goals

D. **Goal:** A broad statement of the ultimate intended results desired; more general than an objective; a general statement typically describing a more conceptual and less directly measurable product.

E. **Objective:** A statement indicating how the goal will be carried out; lends specificity and concreteness to broad general goals statement; should be stated in assessable terms.

F. **Indicator:** A criterion or measure used to indicate the degree to which a goal/objective has been achieved; refers to both quantitative and qualitative measures.

   1. Input indicator - provides evidence of the level of resources that have been furnished to support the processes.

5

2. Process indicator - shows what intended processes are actually offered and in what form(s); may indicate to what extent students/faculty/staff/ administration have participated in those processes.

3. Outcome indicator - demonstrates that the intended results have been achieved; only learning outcome indicators provide evidence that learning or growth has actually occurred; may be either quantitative or qualitative.

G.   Evaluation: Uses information gained from input, process, and outcome assessments to make judgements of relative value.

H.   Value-Added: Denotes educational gains attributable to having spent time at the University.

Part Three

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
GUIDING PRINCIPLES
FOR
STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Indiana State University is committed to delivering high-quality undergraduate and graduate programs which will prepare students to lead productive lives. Student outcomes assessment is a systematic process of gathering, interpreting, and using information about student learning for the purpose of improving student learning and the quality of academic programs. Methods must be developed to accomplish the following:

1) articulate the intended student outcomes of each undergraduate and graduate program;
2) gain feedback on each program's progress toward achieving those outcomes; and
3) use this information, as necessary, to modify academic programs to ensure that intended outcomes are achieved.

The intent of outcomes assessment is not to impose impediments in the classroom nor to take time away from instruction, but rather offer the faculty a reliable data base for their utilization as they seek to improve the educational process. The following principles, related to structure and methodology, have been identified to guide the development and implementation of student outcomes assessment plans at Indiana State University:

STRUCTURE

1. **The primary responsibility for developing, implementing, and evaluating student outcomes assessment plans rests with the faculty.** Cooperation among faculty, administration, staff, and students is essential to support the assessment process.

2. **The focus of student outcomes should be on programs rather than on individual faculty.** The purpose of gathering the data is to evaluate programs rather than to evaluate individual faculty members.

3. **The assessment of student learning is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional.** Learning is a complex process. It entails various dimensions, not only what students know but what they can do with what they know; it further involves student values and attitudes that affect

7

both academic success and performance beyond the classroom. Therefore, the assessment plan should endeavor to measure the multidimensional aspects in an academic program.

4. **The focus of student outcomes assessment should be on academic programs rather than individual students.** Student outcomes assessment is concerned with using the collective results and determining what those results imply about the quality of individual academic programs.

5. **Improvement of student learning is a long-range process.** The goal of each program should be to establish and implement systems for ongoing student outcomes assessment. The academic community should monitor progress toward intended outcomes in a spirit of continuous improvement. Programs should gather post graduation feedback from alumni and employers to identify program strengths and challenges.

6. **Student outcomes assessment fosters greater improvement when representatives from both inside and outside the educational community are involved.** Student learning is a campus-wide responsibility and assessment is a way of addressing that responsibility. Thus, while assessment efforts may start small, the aim over time is to involve individuals from across the educational community, the local community, and ultimately the State of Indiana. Faculty play an especially important role, but assessment cannot be fully addressed without participation by some combination of students, student-affairs personnel, librarians, administrators, alumni, and employers. Assessment is not a task for small groups of experts but a collaborative activity; its aim must be wider, emphasizing attention to student learning by all parties who have a stake in its improvement.

7. **Each program will develop its own unique assessment plan within the framework of the document.** Each major program will develop its own assessment plan. Student outcomes assessment should be decentralized and, when appropriate, discipline-specific. Clear statements of intended student outcomes developed by the faculty are to be the basis for assessment. Decentralization encourages activity at the program level and maximizes the role of the faculty in the assessment program.

METHODOLOGY

8. **The assessment of student learning begins with educational values.** Student outcomes assessment is not an end in itself but a vehicle for educational improvement. Its effective practice begins with a vision of the kinds of learning

8

most valued for students in general education and major programs, and help them lead productive lives.

9. **Student outcomes assessment plans can only sample intended outcomes.** Outcomes should be prioritized based on such criteria as currency, cost effectiveness, and important educational outcomes for each student completing an academic program. The sample of outcomes should include issues which represent current concerns within the discipline and program.

10. **The student outcomes assessment program should be dynamic and evolving.** Assessment at the program level should allow for refinement in the plan as faculty evaluate the results of their activities. Those involved with assessment should meet regularly to plan activities, study results, develop approaches for sharing results, and evaluate the assessment activity.

11. **Student outcomes assessment results should be used for comparisons between current and previous performance of a program rather than among university programs.** In a comprehensive university, diverse values and criteria in the various disciplines will impact on assessment in different ways. Comparisons among programs on criteria that are not equally emphasized within programs can impede the improvement process.

12. **Assessment of student learning should be based on the use of multiple measures.** There are many valid methods of assessment that include the use of both quantitative and qualitative measures. Assessment should reflect the multidimensional understanding of learning by using a variety of measurement techniques. No one measure is adequately comprehensive to capture the wide range of achievements represented by students' academic experiences. Appropriate measurement instruments include, but are not limited to, standardized tests, surveys, and portfolio techniques. Since learning is not a passive activity, it is also appropriate to include measures of student effort.

13. **Student outcomes assessment should address standards of performance related to improvement.** It is appropriate to measure student growth at various stages of the academic program. Student outcomes assessment should be formative as well as summative.

14. **Student outcomes assessment data should be evaluated and used.** Program decision makers are expected within each assessment report to use assessment as a means to improve the quality of the program.

Collectively the above principles support the three-prong approach, identified in the introductory paragraph, to student outcomes assessment. Further, these principles form the

9

framework for the development and implementation of student outcomes assessment plans within each academic program. Finally, the assessment plans for the academic programs are to be dynamic allowing for continuous dialogue about student outcomes assessment at Indiana State University.

Supplementary Guiding Principles for Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment

The Graduate Council has identified the following supplementary principles to guide the development and implementation of graduate student outcomes assessment plans:

1. Since research/creativity is one of the distinguishing characteristics of graduation, measures of graduate student learning should include an evaluation in this area.

2. Professional graduate programs (MBA, MPA, MSA, etc.), which by definition are designed to prepare professional practitioners, should include student learning measures of the students' abilities to apply advanced knowledge to the problems addressed by the profession.

3. Training at the graduate level prepares students for professional participation in their fields of study. Graduate student outcomes assessment should include measures of professional association, participation, and/or endorsement, as appropriate.

4. Graduate student outcomes assessment should address student recognition of the professional ethics of the discipline.

Approval Flow Chart

Approved - Assessment Advisory Committee	11-0-0	11/22/94
Approved - Dean's Council	Consensus	11/28/94
Approved - CAAC	7-1-0	11/30/94
Approved - Graduate Council	Consensus	12/01/94
Approved - Executive Committee UFS	7-0-0	12/06/94
Approved - UFS	26-0-0	12/15/94

DEVELOPMENTAL STEPS
FOR AN ASSESSMENT PLAN

The following five (5) steps are helpful in establishing a systematic approach to assessment in the major:

1. Describe the degree program's mission.

2. Identify at least 5 intended student outcomes related to the mission of the program.

3. Identify and describe methods for measuring student learning at important stages of the program, in relation to the intended student outcomes.

4. Describe the data to be collected and the methods by which it will be analyzed.

5. Indicate how the results of assessment will be used for the purpose of improving student learning.

SUGGESTED MODEL FOR THE ASSESSMENT PLAN

The following is a suggested model for program plans:

1. Mission of the Program

   Each program has the responsibility for the development of an assessment plan which reflects the program focus. A brief description should be provided that describes the program mission.

2. Intended Student Outcomes

   Statements of intended student outcomes are descriptions of what programs intend for students to know, do, and care about when they have completed their degree programs. Every program needs to have a clear idea of what outcomes are desirable and reasonably obtainable before they can begin assessing outcomes. However, no program has the resources or time to assess all possible aspects of each degree program. It is logical to begin by focusing the program's assessment efforts on those expectations for graduates that have been identified as of primary importance. As a guide, it is suggested that between four and six statements of intended student outcomes be identified for each degree program. Once intended student outcomes are identified by the faculty, the reason for assessment, and many of the questions surrounding it, will become much clearer and less threatening.

   Getting Started on Intended Student Outcomes
   (adapted from Ball State Assessment Workbook)

Before writing or revising intended student outcomes, you might try a few of the following:

☐ Have some open discussion sessions on one of the following topics or something similar:

   ● What important questions do we want to answer about student learning?

   ● Describe the ideal student in your program at various phases throughout your program. Be concrete and focus on those strengths, skills, and values that you feel are the result of, or at least supported and nurtured by, the program experience. Then ask:

   > *What does this student know?*
   > *What can this student do?*
   > *What does this student care about?*

   ● List and briefly describe the program experiences that contribute most to the development of the ideal student.

12

- List the achievements you implicitly expect of graduates in each major field?

- Describe your alumni in terms of such achievements as career accomplishments, lifestyles, citizenship activities, and aesthetic and intellectual involvement.

☐ Collect and review documents that describe your department and its programs:
  - brochures and catalogue descriptions
  - accreditation reports
  - curriculum committee reports
  - mission statements

For more information on Intended Student Outcomes Statements see Appendix D.

3. Assessment Tools and Methods

There are many valid approaches to assessing student outcomes; including the use of both quantitative and qualitative assessment measures. The faculty of each program will identify or create assessment tools and methods appropriate to their specific programs. Effective assessment programs rely on multiple measures to demonstrate that specified student outcomes are being achieved.

Tools

The first step is to determine what tools are already being used in the program. Are they effective and usable for assessment purpose? Are we making the most of existing points of contact with students? Next, consider new tools that may fit the needs of the program.

The following describes the broad range of commonly used assessment tools:

Major Field Achievement Test--The Educational Testing Service (ETS), which produces the GRE series, has developed the MFA from the same knowledge base as the GRE, but for assessment purposes. MFAT examinations are available in the following fields:

Biology	History	Psychology
Chemistry	Literature in English	Sociology
Computer Science	Mathematics	
Economics	Music	
Education	Physics	
Geology	Political Science	

Locally Developed Achievement Tests--Faculty develop an appropriate tool to measure intended outcomes.

13

Surveys--information about students' perceptions, demographics, levels of involvement, perceived competence at various skills, satisfaction, employment or educational status, and employer and alumni opinions. Surveys may be conducted of the following groups:

Entering Students   Alumni
Current Students   Employers
Exiting Seniors

Performance-Based Assessment--is the process of using student activities, rather than test or surveys, to assess skill and knowledge.

A.   Portfolios--collected examples of student work over time (exams, research papers, essays, projects, videotapes, and audio tapes)

B.   Performance Measures--using examples of students' writing, presentations, or projects for assessment (dance, music, speech, art, journalism...)

C.   Assessment-Center Method--simulation of real-life situations in which student performance is evaluated by expert judges.

Example: Prepare a business plan and present it to a panel
of faculty members.

D.   Capstone Course or Internship Evaluation

E.   Others

1.   Transcript Analysis--using data from the student database to examine the course taking or grade patterns of students.

2.   Focus Groups--a form of group interview where a researcher supplies the topics and monitors the discussion. The emphasis is on group interaction to share insights and ideas.

3.   Interviews--gathering information in a focused, one on one conversation.

Methods

While various methods are appropriate, programs should consider assessment methods that measure intended student outcomes at the following 4 stages:

Entrance   -   at time of program declaration
Mid-Program -   after completing a required # of courses
Exit   -   at the end of the program
Alumni   -   after graduation from the institution

14

Sampling: the number of students in a program may prohibit assessment of all students. Representative sampling is an appropriate methodology.

4. Timeframe for Implementation

Each program should identify a realistic timeframe for implementation of the assessment plan. Will you conduct a pilot on your tools and methods, if so when? When will data be collected and results be available?

5. Analysis of Results

Following the collection of data obtained through various assessment techniques and methods, the program should carefully analyze the results. Describe the type of data that will be collected and identify how it will be described and any comparisons that will be made. Results should address each identified intended outcome and any other current and relevant questions that the program wants to answer about student learning. Typically, a written report of results would answer four basic questions:

1) What did we do?
2) Why did we do it?
3) What did we find?
4) How will we use it?

6. Program for Improvement

This is the critical step in the development of any systematic assessment plan for each program. What strategies will you employ to make the link between analysis of results and improvement in the quality of the program and student learning?

Typically, the first step in assuring that results will be used is to share a written report with all program faculty members. Results may be shared at a faculty meeting or a planned retreat. Results may be used to generate discussion among faculty about 1) What does this tell us about our program? 2) What changes may be needed? What further information or targeted analysis is needed? and 3) How can the program use the results to make changes?

EXAMPLE OF A MODEL

The following is an example of a recently developed preliminary assessment plan of a Department of English at a Midwestern state institution. It has been adapted to fit our proposed model. As indicated, there are a variety of ways to measure intended student outcomes. This is only one example deemed appropriate by the faculty of that department.

Department of English
Assessment Plan for Undergraduate Majors

1. ### Mission

The Department of English offers two tracks for English majors: Literature and Language and English Teacher Education. Undergraduate work in English prepares students for teaching, administrative, and writing-related careers in education, business, industry, and government. An English major is also an excellent pre-professional major for students considering graduate or professional studies in the humanities, law, or business.

While the coursework for both major tracks is interwoven, the short-term and long-term needs of those within those tracks are quite different. Our curriculum speaks to this diversity of demand and hones skills fundamental to all tracks and programs: critical thinking, reading, and writing. The primary goal of instruction is to foster these skills, for from such basic skills comes achievement in all disciplines.

2. ### Intended Student Outcomes

Over the course of their careers as English majors, students should be able to:

1. Describe significant literary works in a variety of forms and periods produced by British and American (including minority) writers as well as works in translation by writers from other cultures and periods;

2. Demonstrate knowledge of the theories of grammar and the history and structure of the English Language;

3. Demonstrate rhetorical and creative strategies for producing and responding to written texts;

4. Describe important critical and theoretical approaches to the study of language and literature;

5. Describe diverse theories and practices currently employed in the teaching of writing; *

16

6. Describe current theory and practice in the teaching of literature, including literature for children and adolescents; *

7. Demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend literary texts in any of a variety of genres, periods, or cultural traditions;

8. Demonstrate the ability to write about various kinds of issues and texts, expressing understanding in clear and effective prose;

9. Demonstrate the ability to formulate and express an informed, carefully reasoned position concerning an issue or problem in literature/language studies; and

10. Demonstrate the ability to prepare a workable plan of instruction for use in English classrooms in intermediate and secondary instruction, a plan informed by current pedagogical theory and practice in the field.*

* pertains to English Education majors.

3. ## Assessment Method

Philosophy and Purpose

Assessment is structured to measure improvement of the abilities of writing, reading, and thinking critically during a student's tenure as an English major and to chart the degree to which instruction serves post-graduate needs. The structure of the course work reflects an implied progression in our current curriculum. It is understood that the degree of competency expected at each level will differ from the one following; thus, the full range of learning outcomes would not, then, be in evidence until students approach the exit-level assessment.

Entry level courses refine composition skills, encouraging reflection and expression; second year courses couple writing to a rigorous reading regimen of literary periods and genres, extending the horizons of intellectual experience through contact with the broad parameters of literary expression. Third year courses unite writing, reading, and individual expression through more tightly focused courses with smaller class sizes, promoting dialogue and discussion of specific modes of expression. In the fourth year, through capstone courses, students synthesize writing, reading, and dialogue in the service of critical thinking and individual expression.

The faculty of English, after careful consideration, has adopted a portfolio system for mapping student progress through the program and following graduation. Given the goals of the department, which emphasize the close relationship between knowledge and expression, the portfolio method is the best instrument to assess the success or failure of instruction and curriculum.

17

The oversight of assessment will fall within the domain of the Curriculum Committee, although the actual analysis of assessment portfolios will be conducted collaboratively by the tenured and tenure-track professors as part of departmental service (that is, no "special" committee or sub-committee need be configured), assuring broadly based distribution of labor and input from all professorial ranks. In this way, assessment can be efficiently administered within existing departmental resources yet can involve the majority of the faculty in the process. In turn, wide participation by faculty members should help assure that the results of assessment will continually inform classroom instruction.

The goal of assessment is to provide ongoing, cyclical reviews of the progression of majors through required 'tracks' at three stages to supplement the course-by-course assessment already performed through traditional instruments (grading, student evaluations, peer reviews of instruction); additionally, through post-graduate surveys, a fourth level of assessment will be sought and included in active files (assessment responsibilities end three years following graduation). Portfolios will be maintained in the advising office, and the individual items will be, with obvious exceptions, student-selected, since part of our goal is to empower students and involve them in the process, giving them a stake in the achievement of short-term and long-term objectives.

The English faculty will use assessment as a mechanism for an exacting evaluation of curriculum, of instruction, and of methods in relation to the needs of students, both while in the program and following their departure.

Methodology

Portfolio

A.   Entry Level: When students declare English as a major, portfolios will be established and will include the following materials:

    1.   Material furnished by Admissions Office;

    2.   Enhanced ACT scores will be included but not factor in to portfolio assessment

    3.   Student-selected expository essay written during the inaugural year as an English major (e.g. English 180, 280, 195, etc.);

    4.   Student-selected examination taken during the inaugural semester as an English major (same choices as above, where applicable).

B.   Mid-Level: When students complete eighteen hours in English, the following materials will be added to portfolios (including where possible sophomore literature surveys):

    1.   Student-selected paper written on a literary topic, critical/theoretical approach, pedagogical issue (for those in English Teach Education), or a representative poem/fictional work;

2. Student-selected examination testing knowledge of content taken during the first eighteen hours of course work (cannot duplicate anything submitted at the entry-level);
3. Narrative self-evaluation to assess progress and to critique classroom experience;
4. Results of any quantitative examination.

C. Exit-Level: When students enter their terminal year as English majors, portfolios must be supplemented with the following materials:

1. All materials included at entry and mid-level;
2. Student-selected essay (5-10 pages) written in a 300- or 400-level literature course that displays analytic/critical skills;
3. Student-selected examination taken in a 300- or 400-level course;
4. Terminal essay written to satisfy capstone course requirement (10+ pages) addressing (for example): a) a major problems of literary study; b) rigorous application of at least one theoretical/critical approach, c) pedagogical applications of at least one theoretical/critical approach;
5. Results of any quantitative examination taken for professional placement or subsequent study;
6. Any letter of appointment to a teaching post, for subsequent graduate study, or other employment.

D. Post-Graduation: When students complete the required course of study and move into teaching positions, graduate studies, or professional positions in the work place, the department will track their progress through the following mechanisms, which will be added to the portfolio:

1. Survey questionnaires will be mailed annually (in May) and quantified for the next academic year (September);
2. Student-selected post-graduate writing sample (article, essay, lecture/class notes, news story, etc.);
3. Portfolio assessment will terminate three years following graduation, since other factors, such as additional education or work experience, begin to exert an influence on performance.

4. Timeframe for Implementation

The English program will administer its assessment efforts through broadly based faculty participation. The Curriculum Committee is the appropriate unit in the departmental structure to oversee assessment efforts, since the goals of assessment remain program evaluation, enhancement, and modification in relation to changing student needs and departmental goals; these activities have traditionally fallen within the sphere of the Curriculum Committee. However, the labor assessment requires will be distributed equitably to all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

A. Beginning in the Fall of 1995, advisors will distribute to any student expressing his/her desire to become an English major an assessment packet which identifies the objectives and justifies the methods of assessment, including a description of the portfolio to be assembled;

B. Advisors will begin and maintain portfolios in the Advising Office, when students submit required material;

C. Toward the end of the academic year (April), the Curriculum Committee will collect all portfolios and in consultation with Department Chair, will designate a day for collaborative portfolio assessment to be conducted;

D. Faculty members must complete their evaluations before final examinations and base their evaluation on "Assessment Criteria" distributed in advance;

E. Portfolios will be returned to the Curriculum Committee, which, at its final meeting for that academic year, would identify problem students, check for thorough and even-handed application of assessment procedures;

F. Portfolios will be returned to advisors with recommendations addressing specific student needs and actions in the next academic year;

G. This same procedure will be followed annually, with mid- and exit-level assessment will be added as students progress through the program;

H. In the fourth year of implementation, the chair of the department will distribute a survey questionnaire to all recent graduates and solicit a post-graduate writing sample, collect documents from those who respond, and deliver them to the Curriculum Committee at the beginning of the Fall semester;

I. The Curriculum Committee will prepare a report on post-graduation assessment, and distribute it to appropriate bodies within and without the department.

5. Analysis and Results

Faculty members will evaluate portfolios each spring using holistic scoring on the following characteristics and scoring scale:

General Directions to Evaluators: Read each portfolio holistically and give it a single comprehensive score on a six-point scale ("6" is high and "1" is low). In determining that single score, do not average the pieces but judge the quality of the portfolio as a whole.

Characteristics of Strong Portfolios	Characteristics of Weak Portfolios
• Pieces are substantial and well developed	• Pieces are short, thin, underdeveloped
• Language used creatively and effectively	• Language used uncreatively and ineffectively
• Takes risks that work in style, approach, or subject matter	• No risks--or risks fail
• Shows when appropriate: creates scenes, uses dialogue and internal monologue	• Little or no showing: lots of straight telling and summary
• Assertions and generalizations supported by evidence, examples, details	• Assertions and generalizations unsupported
• Recognizes complexities in issues and positions; makes connections to larger contexts	• Ignores complexities and contexts
• Pieces are at least occasionally moving, touching, powerful	• Pieces do not engage the readers' emotions
• Pieces are unified and focused	• Pieces are disunified and unfocused
• Strong evidence of intelligent, critical thinking	• Little evidence of critical thinking
• Successfully handles varied writing genres	• Unsuccessfully handles varied writing genres
• Aware of the Power and uses of writing	• Unaware of the power and uses of writing

Scoring Scale

6   An **excellent** portfolio: its numerous and significant strengths far outweigh its few weaknesses. Substantial and original in content (both length and development) and/or in style.

5   A **very good** portfolio: its many strengths clearly outweigh its weaknesses. It engages the material and explores issues, but not to the same extent as in a 6 portfolio.

4   A **good** portfolio: its strengths outweigh its weaknesses. Portfolio shows genuine intellectual effort and moments of sharp focus, but suggests strong potential rather than actual achievement.

3   A **fair** portfolio: strengths and weaknesses are about equally balanced. Some pieces may be too brief or underdeveloped, too general or predictable, but the writing is competent.

2   A **below average** portfolio: its weaknesses outweigh its strengths. Usually thin in substance and undistinguished in style but perhaps clear and error free.

1   A **poor** portfolio: its many weaknesses clearly outweigh its strengths. Appears to have been put together with little time or thought.

The Curriculum Committee will collect all scored portfolios and check for thorough and even-handed application of assessment procedures in regard to intended outcomes. A composite portfolio score will be calculated at each stage of analysis.

In the fourth year (1998) of implementation, the Curriculum Committee will analyze the post-graduate survey questionnaire and score collected post-graduate writing samples. Descriptive statistics for each survey question in relation to intended outcomes will be tabulated. A composite portfolio score will be calculated for the post-graduate writing samples.

6.   Program for Improvement

The Curriculum Committee will prepare an annual assessment report for the Fall retreat. The written report will be shared with all faculty members. Recommendations for more targeted analysis or possible changes will be included in the report. A five year composite report will be provided for the University Program Review.

Supplementary Materials

Appendices

A-F

APPENDIX A

STUDENT OUTCOME ASSESSMENT - ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
TIME LINE 1995

Program/Department Assessment Plan (Draft 1)

↓

Dean   (March 3, 1995)

↓

Assessment Advisory Committee   (March 7, 1995)
(For Helpful Feedback)

↓

Dean/Program   (March 31, 1995)

↓

Program/Department Final Plan   (April 4, 1995)

↓

Dean and Assessment Advisory Committee   (May 1, 1995)
(Examples to be included in NCA report)

POSSIBLE RESPONSIBILITIES OF A
DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

The overall responsibilities of each assessment committee includes, but is not limited to:

- setting of goals and objectives for each program;

- selection of a model;

- preliminary plan preparation and approval;

- engagement of consultants (review and recommendations);

- instrument development,

  - pilot testing,
  - determining reliability, and
  - determining validity;

- analysis of data;

- use of resulting information to continue, modify, or reinforce aspects of each academic program to ensure students achievement; and

- program modification.

Learning Over Time: Portfolio Assessment

by Pat Hutchings

A sure route to nowhere is to have assessment come forward as an "add-on" activity unrelated to the regular work of faculty and students. Unfortunately, many of the methods widely in use seem not to catch what the best teachers feel is most important about what they do. But there's good news, too, in the development of methods that *build on* rather than dismiss the daily assignments, course projects and papers, and final exams that are the ongoing work of students and teachers. Over time we've been learning about such methods—among them, portfolios.

During the last year, the AAHE Assessment Forum has gotten

Pat Hutchings is director for Projects on Teaching at AAHE and past director of AAHE's Assessment Forum.

scores of calls about portfolios. Hardly a week goes by when we don't discover some new instance

> **Dundalk Community College, MD**
> Dundalk is exploring the use of portfolios to assess student writing and "softer" goals such as developing an aesthetic sense, leadership skills, and critical thinking.

of their use—in the music department at Kean College, in Spanish at the University of Virginia, in entry-level placement at Miami University (OH). Elsewhere, with funding from Exxon and leadership from Aubrey Forrest at Emporia State University, seven campuses are working together to devise models for portfolio-assisted assessment of general-education outcomes. A number of FIPSE projects on assess-

ment entail portfolios. At our Assessment Conference in Atlanta last year, there were overflow crowds in the sessions on portfolio use. Clearly, people are finding something they need in portfolios.

In response to this interest, the AAHE Assessment Forum has put together a portfolio-users network to exchange ideas and promote good practice. Last fall we sent out a survey to network members, hoping to get a fuller view of how portfolios are being used, who's involved, what purposes are being served and how successfully . . . and to find interesting new examples (see boxes).

What follows are reflections on what we've learned about this development and how it's taking shape.

The Rule Is Variety

If, in this wave of new work, there's an emerging definition of portfolio assessment, it's a collection of student work done over

Beyond that, the rule is variety—and appropriately so. One finds portfolios used for student advising on the one hand, for program evaluation on the other; some portfolios include only written work, others a broader array of "products." Some are kept by students, some by department advisors, some by offices of assessment. And so forth.

Invention and experimentation

> ### Butler University, IN
> The College of Business uses portfolios to assess problem solving, communication styles and abilities, and metacognitive processing. Included are a variety of indicators, scores, student work samples, and student self-evaluation; in a next phase, student work relevant to ethical, global, and interpersonal and intrapersonal development may be added.

are what we need now, but it may also be useful to try to get in view the distinctive features of portfolio assessment. What do you get by adding portfolios to the assessment mix? What problems do they respond to? What are their advantages—and limits? How can they be used to forge better links between assessment and what happens in the classrooms of the best teachers?

Unlike many methods, portfolios tell you not only where the student ends up but how she got there.

Much of the emphasis in the assessment movement has predictably fallen on outcomes—what students know and can do at the end of their studies. Outcomes are, after all, what policy makers care about, and they're also what we're best equipped to learn about, given the methods and instruments at hand.

But knowing about outcomes is not enough. There's little chance that assessment's findings will point the way to improvements unless you know how those outcomes were

(or were not) gotten to. Getting "behind outcomes" is one of the things portfolios are best suited to do. They reveal learning over time.

Consider, for instance, a portfolio of work done by a student over two years of a sociology major—course assignments, research papers, an audiotape of a presentation, materials from a group project. From such a collection, both the department *and* student could learn much about her progress in handling disciplinary frameworks, integrating knowledge, and writing, about her values and dispositions, strengths and weaknesses. And where the student is asked to write a final, self-reflective essay about herself as a sociologist, one might learn as well about her understanding of herself as a learner and how the curriculum and teaching have contributed to her learning.

Portfolios put explicit emphasis on human judgment and meaning making.

Many of assessment's commonly used methods close off rather than invite what's most needed for improvement: conversation and debate. Summary test scores, in par-

> ### Kenyon College, OH
> The history department requires all students to complete a portfolio consisting of two papers written as course assignments, one revised and expanded research paper, and an autobiographical essay where the student reflects on his or her work as a historian. Each portfolio is evaluated by two history department faculty, who also conduct an oral interview of the student.

ticular, look a lot more like answers than like questions that invite consideration. A portfolio, on the other hand, is slower to divulge its meaning; it practically begs for conversation.

> ### San Diego State University, CA
> San Diego State University uses portfolios in a number of programs, including classics, social work, and recreation. The teacher education program will use portfolios with 1,700 students to track students' individual growth as learners, multicultural sensitivity, and insights from early field experience. Exit interviews based on the portfolios will be conducted through core courses.

Who should be part of that conversation? Much depends on purposes, but fruitful things would surely happen around a table that included the student—let's say a psychology major—his departmental advisor, a faculty member from his support area in philosophy, and the director of student services with whom he's been working on a peer-advising project. The portfolio here is an occasion for a conference whose real point is in-depth feedback, then a talking through of next steps. And with a *group* of portfolios on the table, the department can ask larger questions about its own effectiveness.

The power of the portfolio approach to start larger conversations about learning is a key point for two pioneers of portfolios in writing assessment, Peter Elbow and Pat Belanoff. "That the portfolio promotes collaboration and works against isolation," they note, "may in the end be its main advantage" ("Portfolios as a Substitute for Proficiency Examinations," *College Composition and Communication*, October 1986).

Because they prompt (even demand) conversation, portfolios lend themselves to use.

The biggest problem now facing many campus assessors is not what method or instrument to use but what to do with the results once they're in hand. All too often, data

are gathered that no one wants or knows what to do with. Faculty already edgy about assessment can easily dismiss a test score or survey statistic as invalid, based on a bad sample, irrelevant.

But portfolios, because they build on work that students are already doing—work assigned by faculty— are much less likely to be dismissed. Indeed, the method meets real faculty needs. Advising, for instance, might become a more interesting, significant task if the student arrived not only with a form to sign but with a portfolio of work from previous semesters. Those dreaded letters of recommendation requested by past students (whose work has long-since vanished into vague recollection) would be more easily done from a portfolio filed in the department office.

Portfolios are less subject to misuse than apparently simpler, single-score methods.

The American Council on Education's annual *Campus Trends*

> ### Sonoma State University, CA
> Faculty in the Hutchins School of Liberal Studies are designing portfolio requirements to be used with individualized learning plans in the majors. Assessment of the portfolios will occur in capstone courses. The purpose is to aid students' development as self-motivated learners and to improve advising.

survey shows that although campus administrators have become more sanguine about some aspects of assessment (for instance, that appropriate methods and instruments can be found), fears about misuse of data are mounting. So are concerns that standardized tests may "distort the educational process," which have risen from 38 percent of respondents in 1986 to 63 percent in 1989. Portfolios are one

> ### SUNY College at Fredonia, NY
> Portfolios are used as part of a larger assessment of the General College Program. Each student assembles a portfolio, which includes materials from entrance through the senior year and a final self-evaluation. Pedagogical purposes are primary; the intent is to heighten students' consciousness of their own learning processes and to involve them in their learning.

way around this problem. A ranking of institutions based on portfolios? It's hard to imagine how that would happen. The very unwieldiness of portfolios makes them less subject to misuse than many methods.

Of course, there's a flip side here: the challenge is to find ways of turning the rich, learner-centered information you get from portfolios into something with utility and credibility for "other audiences," be they at the institutional level or beyond that. Here there's work to be done; we need more experience from places like The College of William and Mary, where portfolios help satisfy a state mandate.

But promising tactics come to mind with a little thought. One might, for instance, give external credibility a boost by inviting off-campus, external parties—faculty members from other institutions, alums, professionals from the community—to help evaluate portfolios. And putting portfolios forward as part of a larger array of evidence— including more traditional, quantitative indicators—is likely to be more persuasive than asking them to bear the entire weight of public representation.

Most important: portfolios can be educational for students.

Much of what's being done in the name of assessment involves "getting students to give us some data"— filling out a survey, taking a test. The fact that many campuses feel

the need to pass out pizzas and T-shirts to induce cooperation says a lot about the intrinsic value to students of engaging in those methods: it's *real* low.

On the other hand, it's hard to imagine a more powerful activity for a student than going back over her work of several years, to sort and cull and finally select items that somehow represent her learning ... and beyond that to analyze that work for patterns, strengths and weaknesses, implied next steps ... to have a chance to talk with advisors, faculty, and others about what the portfolio means.

Oddly (sadly) in today's concerns about "how to use the results of assessment," the use one rarely hears mentioned is student learning. But where students are active partners in the assembly and analysis of portfolios, they can learn a great deal from the method—about putting the pieces together, making connections, the need for revision, setting goals for the future.

A View of Learning

As with assessment generally, there are plenty of reasons *not* to use portfolios—they're bulky, time-consuming, difficult to make neat sense of, maybe not what the legislature had in mind, and they are in an early, unproven stage of development.

But what's most at stake here are educational *values*. Choosing portfolios is choosing to enact—and communicate to students—a view of learning as involving, personal, connected, and ongoing. ∎

Note

The AAHE Assessment Forum has compiled brief descriptions of portfolio approaches to assessment on twenty-one campuses, some of which appear in boxes throughout this article. For the set of all twenty-one descriptions (including the name of a contact person on each campus) and a mailing list of portfolio network members, write to Elizabeth Francis, Project Assistant, at AAHE in Washington. There is no charge.

Miami University
1994 Scoring Guide for Portfolios

General Directions to Evaluators: Read each portfolio holistically and give it a single comprehensive score on a six-point scale ("6" is high and "1" is low). In determining that single score, do not average the four pieces but judge the quality of the portfolio as a whole. In doing so, give greater weight to the longer and more substantial pieces, and reward variety and creativity.

Characteristics of Strong Portfolios	Characteristics of Weak Portfolios
• Pieces are substantial and well developed	• Pieces are short, thin, undeveloped
• Language used creatively and effectively	• Language used uncreatively and ineffectively
• Takes risks that work in style, approach, or subject matter	• No risks—or risks fail
• Shows when appropriate: creates scenes, uses dialogue and internal monologue	• Little or no showing: lots of straight telling and summary
• Assertions and generalizations supported by evidence, examples, details	• Assertions and generalizations unsupported
• Recognizes complexities in issues and positions; makes connections to larger contexts	• Ignores complexities and contexts
• Pieces are at least occasionally moving, touching, powerful	• Pieces do not engage the readers' emotions
• Pieces are unified and focused	• Pieces are disunified and unfocused
• Strong evidence of intelligent, critical thinking	• Little evidence of critical thinking
• Successfully handles varied writing genres	• Unsuccessfully handles varied writing genres
• Aware of the power and uses of writing	• Unaware of the power and uses of writing

Scoring Scale

6   An excellent portfolio: its numerous and significant strengths far outweigh its few weaknesses. Substantial and original in content (both length and development) and/or in style.

5   A very good portfolio: its many strengths clearly outweigh its weaknesses. It engages the material and explores issues, but not to the same extent as in a 6 portfolio.

4   A good portfolio: its strengths outweigh its weaknesses. Portfolio shows genuine intellectual effort and moments of sharp focus, but suggests strong potential rather than actual achievement.

3   A fair portfolio: strengths and weaknesses are about equally balanced. Some pieces may be too brief or underdeveloped, too general or predictable, but the writing is competent.

2   A below average portfolio: its weaknesses outweigh its strengths. Usually thin in substance and undistinguished in style but perhaps clear and error free.

1   A poor portfolio: its many weaknesses clearly outweigh its strengths. Appears to have been put together with little time or thought.

MIAMI UNIVERSITY
ADVICE FOR 1994 PORTFOLIO READERS

After reading 550 portfolios, we want to give you an idea of how readers react and respond to them. The most important element to consider is what we'll call "the portfolio writing situation." It has two parts: aim and audience.

Aim
(What you want to accomplish in your portfolio)

We know you want to earn college credit for your portfolio. To do so, you need to show mature and insightful thinking and writing. Many of you think you have to please us, but we like to see you write as you yourself--not as the student you think we want you to be. We look for evidence that you think about how you fit into the world, about how issues you write about relate to your personal situation (social, racial, gendered, economic, regional, religious, etc.). We want you to "Take chances. Use humor. Show different sides of yourself."

Audience
(Knowing who we are helps you accomplish your aim)

The readers at Miami are diverse in age, teaching experience, interests, and taste. We range in education from graduate students to tenured professors, and while we're not all English teachers (people from other departments read too), we're all interested in students and student writing. When we score, we develop a set of criteria that seems to best describe the qualities we value in writing.

We are interested in what you think and see how you see these things in relation to broader issues and concerns, and what connections you are making. "Revise pieces with an awareness of a new audience--remember, we all have different reading experiences and are not a part of the classroom where you initially composed the piece."

Six Hints

Keeping your aim and audience in mind will really make a difference in the quality of portfolio. However, sometimes more specific advice can help. Here are six helpful hints.

1.   **Take advantage of the 12 page limit** and develop your pieces fully. The best portfolios are usually 11 or 12 pages long. They offer analysis and discuss the complexity of issues. (Brief portfolios hardly ever get a high score.)

   - "Don't stop writing and revising before exploring the significance and consequences of what you are saying."

- "Choose papers that show an ability develop, support, and sustain a position (no matter which genre you are writing in)--topics that lend themselves to critical thinking and exploration."

2. **Develop with specific detail.** Use lots of details, examples, and illustrations to develop and explain your points.

   - "We almost always prefer concreteness to vagueness."
   - "Don't' *tell* us how your grandma's death taught you to live life to the fullest. *Show* us!"

3. **Don't neglect your reflective letter.** It's an important piece of your portfolio, not just a cover letter. The reflective letter is the place to situate yourself for your readers; it sets the tone of the whole portfolio and creates a first and lasting impression. Think about what reflection involves--not just including details about who you are and how you write but also about how and why your background and environment have affected what you write.

   - "Be specific when you write the letter--specific about who you are and why you wrote these particular pieces."
   - "Many successful letters strike a balance between confidence and humility; many show awareness of strengths and limitations as well as awareness that writing has consequences (beyond getting credit for English at Miami)."

4. When thinking about **Content and Style**, remember your audience and aims. In a lot of ways, writing is nothing more than making a series of decisions--decisions about what to include and what not to include and about how to organize and phrase your ideas. Consider these suggestions when making writing decisions.

   - "When using outside sources, work from your own viewpoint instead of 'collaging' other peoples ideas."
   - "Consider writing papers that negotiate different views rather than papers that try to win an argument."
   - "Include pieces in a variety of styles if possible. Don't be afraid to experiment."
   - "Forget formulas (a good 5 paragraph theme has no greater chance than a good paper with any other structure). Life is too short to cram into 5 paragraphs!"
   - "Remember a good argument (sound reasoning and use of evidence) is more impressive to a college reader than 'academic'-sounding writing."

5. **Revise. Revise. Revise.** Remember that the aims and audience of this writing situation are not exactly the same as your original writing situation. Of course, good revision usually goes far beyond changing words and correcting grammar.

   - "Go over your pieces and 're-see' them for this audience and situation."
   - "Revise your work and think through your revisions. Make sure your pieces make sense to those who don't know the actual event you are writing about."

6.   **Appearance Counts**. Of course content is most important, but after taking the time to do the writing, why not go that extra mile and really polish? After all, your portfolio represents you.

- "**Both** spell check *and* get a trusted person to proofread."
- Give pieces titles, number pages, and use a legible (plain) typeface or font (full portfolios of *italic* or long narrow fonts are difficult to read).
- Use a readable point size: 12 pt. (depending on the font) is best. Anything smaller than 10 pt. is hard to read. Double-spacing is standard, as are 1" margins on all sides of the page.

Types of Learning Outcomes to Consider

Gronlund (1981) provided the following list of types of outcomes. The list delineates may of the major areas in which instructional objectives might be produced. The specific categories were intended to be suggestive, not exclusive.

Knowledge
- terminology
- specific facts
- concepts and principles
- methods and procedures

Understanding
- concepts and principles
- methods and procedures
- written material, graphs, maps, and numerical data
- problem situations

Application
- factual information
- concepts and principles
- methods and procedures
- problem-solving skills

Thinking Skills
- critical thinking
- scientific thinking

General Skills
- laboratory skills
- performance skills
- communications skills
- computational skills
- social skills

Attitudes
- social attitudes
- scientific attitudes

Interests
- personal interests
- educational interests
- vocational interests

Appreciation
- literature, art, and music
- social and scientific achievements

Adjustments
- social adjustments
- emotional adjustments

Bloom's Classification of Cognitive Skills

Bloom's classification of cognitive skills is widely used in instruction planning. The six levels are arranged by level of complexity. Use of this or other classification systems is recommended to safeguard against a tendency to focus on content coverage and to ignore what the students should learn to do with content.

Category	Definition	Related Behaviors
Knowledge	recalling or remembering something without necessarily understanding, using, or changing it	define, describe, identify, label list, match, memorize, point to, recall, select, state
Comprehension	understanding something that has been communicated without necessarily relating it to anything else	alter, account for, annotate, calculate, change, convert, group, explain, generalize, give examples, infer, interpret, paraphrase, predict, review summarize, translate
Application	using a general concept to solve problems in a particular situation; using learned material in new and concrete situations	apply, adopt, collect, construct, demonstrate, discover, illustrate interview, make use of, manipulate, relate, show, solve, use
Analysis	breaking something down into its parts; may focus on identification of parts or analysis of relationships between parts, or recognition of organizational principles	analyze, compare, contrast, diagram, differentiate, dissect, distinguish, identify, illustrate, infer, outline, point out, select, separate, sort, subdivide
Synthesis	creating something new by putting parts of different ideas together to make a whole	blend, build, change, combine, compile, compose, conceive, create, design, formulate, generate, hypothesize, plan, predict, produce, reorder, revise, tell, write
Evaluation	judging the value of material or methods as they might be applied in a particular situation; judging with the use of definite criteria	accept, appraise, assess, arbitrate, award, choose, conclude, criticize, defend, evaluate, grade, judge, prioritize, recommend, referee, reject, select, support

COMMON GOALS OF LIBERAL AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

(The Professional Preparation Project, Stark and Lowther,
University of Michigan)

1. COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE: reading, writing, speaking, and listening

2. CRITICAL THINKING: rational, logical, coherent examination of issues

3. CONTEXTUAL COMPETENCE: understanding of the societal context and capability to adopt multiple perspectives

4. AESTHETIC SENSIBILITY: sensitivity to relationships among arts, the natural environment, and human concerns

5. PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY: a sense of one's place in the world as an individual, a citizen, and a professional

6. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS: understanding and accepting professional ethics as a guide to behavior

7. ADAPTIVE COMPETENCE: anticipation and promotion of change in professional practice

8. LEADERSHIP CAPACITY: the intelligent, humane application of knowledge and skills, and the capacity to contribute as a productive member of the profession

9. SCHOLARLY CONCERN FOR IMPROVEMENT: sense of obligation to participate in the improvement of the profession

10. MOTIVATION FOR CONTINUED LEARNING: exploration and expansion of personal, civic, and professional knowledge throughout a lifetime

APPENDIX F

FOR FURTHER READING

Adelman, Clifford, Ed. Performance and Judgement. Essays on Principles and Practice in the Assessment of College Learning. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1988

Astin, A. W. Assessment for Excellence. American Council on Education/Macmillan: 1991.

Aubrey Forrest. Time Will Tell: Portfolio-Assisted Assessment of General Education. Washington, DC: AAHE Assessment Forum, 1990.

Ballard, Leslie. "Portfolios and Self-Assessment". English Journal. February 1992.

Banta, Trudy. Implementing Outcomes Assessment: Promise and Perils. New Directions for Institutional Research No. 59. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco. 1988.

Banta, Trudy. Making a Difference: Outcomes of a Decade of Assessment in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub. 1993.

Belanoff, Pat & Dickson, Marcia. Portfolios: Process and Product. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1991.

Berk, Ronald A. Performance Assessment Methods and Applications. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore. 1986.

Berk, Robert. (Ed.). Performance Assessment: Methods and Applications. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Converse, Jean M. and Stanley Presser. Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications. 1986.

Cross, K. Patricia and Angelo, Thomas. Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for Faculty. Univ. of Michigan, National Center for Research To Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

Dillman, Donald. Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: Wiley-Interscience Publication, 1978.

Eisner, E. W. The Art of Educational Evaluation: A Personal View. Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press, 1985.

Erwin, T. Dary. Assessing Student Learning and Development. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Erwin, T. D. Assessing Student Learning and Development. Chapter 3. "Establishing Objectives for Outcomes Assessment," pp. 35-51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Pub., 1991.

Ewell, Peter and Lisensky, Robert. Assessing Institutional Effectiveness. Washington DC: Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education, 1988.

Farmer, D. W. Enhancing Student Learning: Emphasizing Essential Competencies in Academic Programs. Wilkes-Barre: King's College, 1988.

Fowler, Floyd J., Jr. and Thomas W. Mangione. Standardized Survey Interviewing. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications, 1990.

Gardiner, Lion F. Planning For Assessment. New Jersey Department of Higher Education, 1989.

Gardiner, L. F. Planning for Assessment--Mission Statements, Goals, and Objectives: A Guide for Colleges and Universities. Trenton, NJ: Office of Learning Assessment, New Jersey Department of Higher Education, 1989.

Greenwood, Addison. National Assessment of College Student Learning: Getting Started, A Summary of the Beginning Activities. U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. 1993.

Gronlund, N. E. Stating Objectives for Classroom Instruction. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1978.

Gronlund, N. E. Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching. 4th ed. New York: Macmillan, 1981.

Halpern, Diane. Student Outcomes Assessment: What Institutions Stand to Gain. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. 1987.

Hutchings, Pat and Reuben, Elaine. "Faculty Voices on Assessment". Change. Washington DC: AAHE, July/August, 1988.

Hutchings, Pat, "Linking Assessment with Teaching". Assessment Update. Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1989.

Jacobi, Maryann, Astin, Alexander and Ayala, Frank. College Student Outcomes Assessment: A Talent Development Perspective. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report # 7. 1987.

Labaw, P.J. Advanced Questionnaire Design. Cambridge, MA: Abt Books, 1980.

Lenning, O. T. Previous Attempts to Structure Educational Outcomes and Outcome-Related Concepts: A Compilation and Review of the Literature. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1977.

Morgan, David L. Focus Groups as Qualitative Research. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications, 1988.

Morris, Lynn Lyons, Carol Taylor Fitz-Gibbon and Marie E. Freeman. How to Communicate Evaluation Findings. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications, 1987.

Nichols, James O. Institutional Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment Implementation on Campus. New York: Agathon Press. 1989.

Portfolios News. Portfolio Assessment Clearing House, Encinitas, CA.

Sapp, Mary M. and M. Lewis Temares. "Learning How to Improve the Quality of Services Using Focus Groups". Paper presented at the 32nd Annual AIR Forum, 1992.

Sims, Serbrenia. Student Outcomes Assessment. New York: Greenwood Press. 1992.

Valeri-Gold, Maria, James R. Olson, Mary P. Deming. "Portfolios: Collaborative Authentic Assessment Opportunities for College Developmental Learners". Journal of Reading, 35:4, December 1991/January 1992.

Wergin, Jan. "Basic Issues and Principles in Classroom Assessment." In J.H. McMillan (ed.), Assessing Students' Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass [New Directions for Teaching and Learning Series (no.34)], 1988.

Wiggins, Grant P. Assessing Student Performance. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco. 1993.

1994 AAHE Conference on Assessment in Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

Audiotapes (available from Assessment Advisory Committee)

1. Common Problems and Successful Solutions in Assessment Implementation

2. Making Effective Use of Assessment Data

3. How Putting Students at the Center Changes Teaching & Learning: New Findings from Harvard

4. General Education Assessment: A Faculty/Student Collaboration

5. Scoring Issues: Portfolios

APPENDIX D
CONSENSUS PROCEDURES

Establishing a Consensus Student Outcomes Assessment Plan

If consensual concerns arise within the academic program faculty relating to the student outcomes assessment plan, the initial step for resolution will be with the program faculty. Only after an unsuccessful attempt to resolve the concern at the program level, will it move forward to the appropriate departmental faculty committee. If the departmental faculty committee fails to resolve the concern the chair will become involved. Upon leaving the department, the Dean will attempt to resolve the concern, failing to do so, the concern will be forwarded to the appropriate college/school faculty committee. If this effort fails, then the last resort for resolution will be the Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee (undergraduate level) or Graduate Council (graduate level) of the Faculty Senate.

Establishing a Consensus
Student Outcome Assessment Plan
Academic Programs

1. Academic Program Faculty

2. Appropriate Departmental Faculty Committee

3. Department Chair

4. Dean

5. Appropriate College/School Faculty Committee

6. Final Appeal = CAAC/Graduate Council

APPENDIX E
REVIEW PROCEDURES BY THE AAC

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHECKLIST FOR ASSESSMENT PLAN PRINCIPLES

The Assessment Advisory Committee reader has carefully reviewed your academic plan and found the following:

Program Title: _____

Department: _____

School/College: _____

Evaluation Matrix

Principle	Meets Expectations	Revision Suggested	Suggested Revision(s) by
1. Primary Responsibility is Faculty			
2. Focus on programs not faculty			
3. Learning as multidimensional			
4. Focus on programs not an individual student			
5. Improvement long-range			
6. Involvement from inside and outside the educational community			
7. Each program will develop own unique assessment plan			

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHECKLIST FOR ASSESSMENT PLAN COMPONENTS

The Assessment Advisory Committee reader has carefully reviewed your academic plan and found the following:

Program Title: _____

Department: _____

School/College: _____

Evaluation Matrix

Component	Meets Expectations	Revision Suggested	Suggested Revision(s) by
1. Mission of Program			
2. Intended Student Outcomes			
3. Assessment Tools and Methods			
4. Timeframe for Implementation			
5. Analysis of Results			
6. Program Improvement			

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHECKLIST FOR ASSESSMENT PLAN CONTENT

The Assessment Advisory Committee reader has carefully reviewed your academic plan and found the following:

Program Title: _____

Department: _____

School/College: _____

Evaluation Matrix

Content Areas	Meets Expectations	Revision Suggested	Suggested Revision(s) by
1. Is the mission consistent with the guiding principles?			
2. Does the assessment plan clearly establish the appropriate structure for the assessment plan?			
3. Does the assessment plan articulate the intended student outcomes of the program?			
4. Does the assessment plan gain appropriate feedback on the program's progress toward achieving student outcomes?			

APPENDIX F
EXAMPLES OF INTENDED STUDENT OUTCOME STATEMENTS

INTENDED STUDENT OUTCOME STATEMENTS
(EXAMPLES)

General Education   (Statements are found on p. 13)

Communication Studies

Articulate the range of theories of communication for linking messages with audience motivations, needs, and lifestyle objectives.

Journalism

Demonstrate an intellectual depth to understand and write about issues affecting modern society:
1. burgeoning impact of science and technology on society
2. increasingly complicated developments in gender roles and ethnic relations
3. effects of societal and cultural norms on media operations
4. changing roles of political and other traditional institutions within society
5. newly emerging position of the United States in a global economy and the post-Cold War Era

Radio-Television-Film

Understand and identify ethical and professional constraints/conflicts under which RTF operates.

Physical Education

Demonstrate a knowledge of the structure and function of the human body to assure an understanding of the foundations of human movement.

Adult Fitness (Graduate)

Demonstrate appropriate techniques for health appraisal and use of fitness evaluations in developing exercise prescriptions for normal and special populations.

Environmental Health

Demonstrate the ability to follow the regulation to collect and analyze environmental samples, record data, and interpret results.

Recreation and Sport Management

Demonstrate the ability to prepare a workable applied strategic plan for use in either leisure, recreation management, sport management, and therapeutic recreation.

<u>Elementary and Early Childhood Education</u>

> The novice teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking/problem solving and performance skills.

<u>School Psychology (Graduate)</u>

> Demonstrate research skills needed to conduct research and to understand, interpret, and apply research findings to practical and theoretical problems.

<u>Speech-Language Pathology</u>

> Demonstrate ability to define clinical problems, formulate hypotheses, and accomplish systematic analyses and interpretation of data for solutions.

<u>Special Education</u>

> Demonstrate the ability to participate in team conferences (teachers, support staff, administrators, and parents).

<u>Technology Education</u>

> Demonstrate an ability to monitor and assess technological developments in terms of their impact socially, culturally, and environmentally.

<u>Aerospace Administration</u>

> Given a hypothetical airport directorate, the student will be able to:
> 1. develop an airport public image survey instrument
> 2. be able to conduct a security survey of an airport
> 3. assist in the determination of terminal area and airport access planning
> 4. develop airline scheduling information

<u>Physics</u>

> Demonstrate an understanding of and ability to apply Lagrangian mechanics, Maxwell's Equations, and Schrödinger's Equation.

<u>Africana Studies</u>

> Demonstrate familiarity with the experiences of African Americans in the U.S. during the antebellum, reconstruction, post reconstruction, and urban eras in regard to culture and social institutions, citing significant contributions of major scholars and leaders from both the Africana and larger societies.

APPENDIX G
SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS

SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS AND METHODS

The following is a summary of the identified tools and methods used to assess student learning in General Education and the undergraduate and graduate major programs:

Portfolios
Senior Project
Modification of the writing component of the ACT Program's College
        Outcome Measures Project
Entrance Interview
Mid-Program Interview
Exit Interview
Capstone Course (includes performance simulation evaluation)
Comprehensive Examination (locally developed)
Alumni Survey
Employer Survey
Internship Evaluation
NTE Analysis
Registered Environmental Health Specialist Exam (REHS)
NATA-BOC Certification Exam
NAIT Certification Exam
Co-op Evaluation
Placement Records
FAA Certification Exam (Performance Appraisal)
Focus Groups
Senior Survey
Transcript Analysis
Oral Exams
Juried Presentations
Recitals
Exhibits

APPENDIX H
ISU 1994 STRATEGIC PLAN

STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE 21ST CENTURY
1994 Report

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE 21ST CENTURY
1994 Report

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

YEAR ONE: DEVELOPMENT OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

INTRODUCTION

As Indiana State University has evolved from a normal school into a comprehensive public service university, the environment in which it has functioned also has changed. To respond to this change, it is essential for the University to engage in systematic planning activities. A formal planning process is designed to assist an institution in distinguishing between "doing the right thing" (i.e., establishing strategic directions) and "doing things right" (i.e., implementing facilitating initiatives and organizational change). The process helps to anticipate the future more effectively and to identify the opportunities, demands, and constraints placed upon the University by the various constituencies it serves. By engaging in the planning process, Indiana State intends to effectively clarify its role and purpose, identify central goals and objectives, establish priorities, initiate new programs, and make decisions about the allocation of resources.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

The term "strategic planning" frequently includes a wide range of planning concepts. For this report, however, strategic planning has limited meaning and focus to differentiate it from other activities referred to as operational planning or resource allocation. Strategic planning is the process by which Indiana State University will address major strategic issues and decisions that shape its long-term development and that identify significant relationships with the various external constituent groups it serves and their representatives.

PLANNING PRINCIPLES

Several principles have guided the planning process. In order to be effective, the plan must be broader in scope than a simple compilation of the plans of individual units of the institution. The strategic goals and initiatives must be achievable within a realistic time frame. In an era of diminishing public funding, resource allocation and reallocation must encourage efficiencies and economies which produce both short- and long-term financial advantage to the University. Competitive and marketable advantages must reflect the strengths and distinctiveness of the institution. In addition, results of the plan must be measurable and regularly reported to the University community and to public agencies and the citizens of the state.

For an institution to realize its greatest potential, planning must become an integral part of its management culture. Line administrators must assume primary responsibility for planning activities in their respective units. Consistent with existing University administrative and governance structures, vice presidents, deans, department chairpersons, and representatives of all campus constituencies will play essential, campus-wide roles in the development and implementation of the plan. Faculty, students, staff, alumni, and institutional supporters will contribute diverse ideas, values, and interests. Widespread dissemination of the completed plan and extensive discussion of it in a variety of forms will promote a vital dialogue which will expand and enhance its support. Planning also will be incorporated in routine University operation, influencing personnel, performance, and budget decisions. Pro-active leadership, consensus building, and broad-based ownership are vital elements in successful strategic planning.

3

PLANNING COMPONENTS

$\mathcal{A}$t a public university such as Indiana State, the Board of Trustees has the responsibility for ensuring that planning is a continuous process which results in an acceptable institutional plan of action. Directed by the trustees to prepare such a plan, the President assumes primary responsibility for its preparation, its review by the trustees, and its implementation.

President John Moore brought to Indiana State University significant experience with higher education planning. In the months before his arrival on campus in the summer of 1992, he invited key faculty members, administrators, and staff to share their views of the relative strengths and distinctiveness of the University. Upon assuming office, he set in motion a planning process which has produced this report.

The President began the planning process by establishing the President's Planning and Resources Council (PPARC) as an advisory body on the University's strategic and operational planning processes. Members include the President of the University (chair), the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (vice chair), the vice presidents, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Chair of the Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee, the Chair of the Administrative Affairs Committee, the Chair or the Graduate Council, the Chair of the Economic Benefits Committee, the President of the Student Government Association, and the Chair of the Office Personnel Council. The Director of Planning and Institutional Analysis serves as staff to the council. The PPARC has had an active role in the series of planning meetings that were held on campus during January and February, 1993.

Subsequently, the President established a Division of University Planning and Institutional Analysis in the Office of the Vice President for Planning and Budgets to provide staff support for the planning process, conduct relevant analytical studies, format data, and assist with the conduct of the planning process in general.

To introduce the planning process, the President held a Strategic Planning Conference on January 16, 1993, in which more than 75 individuals representing faculty government, school and college academic administration,

students, alumni, community leaders, and elected officials participated. The Commissioner of the Indiana Commission for Higher Education was also in attendance. Conference participants were presented materials which contained demographic, political, economic, and comparative data about or related to the University; identified significant societal trends and needs which the University should consider in the planning process; suggested strategic directions for the institution based on its strengths and societal needs; and described what they wished the University to be known and admired for. A number of the strategic goals and academic initiatives which appear in a later section of this report emerged from this day-long conference.

Three additional planning forums held in February 1993 included a wider representation of campus constituencies in discussions of important environmental and institutional factors central to the identification of long-term strategic goals. Activities similar to those of the planning conference were utilized by the planning forums to elicit ideas and suggestions. During the same period, the Schools, the College, and all administrative units were asked to develop strategic plans appropriate to their needs and governance systems and present the plans to the President in early March.

The first draft of the report was distributed to the campus in April for analysis and recommendations, many of which were incorporated in a second draft presented to the Board of Trustees for discussion and distributed to the campus in July. During the fall, 1993 semester, the President discussed the second draft with the Alumni Council, senior university administrators, the Office Personnel Council; some 50 community leaders of West Central Indiana; the Indiana Commission for Higher Education; the ISU Foundation Executive Committee; leaders of student government; PPARC; and academic department chairpersons, deans, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in an academic summit. Many of the comments and suggestions on the second draft which came out of these meetings have been incorporated in this 1994 strategic planning report.

This report is organized into six parts. Part One is an overview of the development of the plan during Year One.

Part Two is a discussion of important and environmental trends which may affect the higher education community. These international, national, state, and regional trends play a role in the creation of significant societal needs to which Indiana State University can respond.

Part Three summarizes the challenges which have faced the nation's universities during the past half century. Expected to respond in creative and appropriate ways to the needs of society, public universities have embarked on a path that has led to dramatic increases in enrollments and generated high expectations for economic, social, and scientific research.

Part Four outlines how Indiana State has responded to these societal expectations and presents a context for understanding how it is positioned to respond to new challenges as a "progressive public university."

Part Five presents strategic goals which rest upon defined planning assumptions, established institutional values, and strategic decision criteria. The strategic goals are:

• **Enhancement of Undergraduate Education.** ISU will be a "benchmark university" that is known and admired for its teaching excellence and as an exemplar, a national model for the distinctiveness and quality of its undergraduate educational experience.

• **Extension of Advanced Knowledge.** ISU will be a distinguished institution for graduate study by carefully selecting advanced program offerings that respond to demonstrated societal needs, are innovative in approach, and reflect a commitment to excellence.

• **Service to New Clienteles.** ISU will be recognized as an "opportunity university" that brings education to new life-time learning clienteles both on and off campus.

• **Expansion of Knowledge.** ISU will be recognized for the value it places on scholarship and for the support it gives to faculty and students in the pursuit of new knowledge.

• **Transfer of Knowledge and Expertise to Society.** ISU will be nationally known among progressive public universities for its contributions through the development of "public service partnerships" with a particular focus on the quality of life in Indiana.

• **Enhancement and Advocacy of Multicultural and International Values.** ISU will be recognized for its commitment to equal educational opportunity, its ethnic and cultural diversity, and its international perspective.

• **Promotion of an Interdisciplinary Culture.** ISU will be a national model for interdisciplinary instruction, research, and public service.

• **Enhancement of intellectual and creative expression in West Central Indiana.** ISU will be known for fostering intellectual and creative activities within the University and in partnership with the larger community.

Accompanying each of these directions are implementation strategies which can enhance the University's comparative and competitive advantages.

Part Six describes the process for implementation of the plan during Year Two. It summarizes the criteria for establishing priorities among the many proposals in response to the strategic goals. It identifies the following fourteen academic and support initiatives which the Provost, the deans, and the vice presidents have responsibility to develop or implement in 1994:

• Revision of University Statements of Mission and Vision: President and Provost

• Development of the Academic Master Plan: Provost

• Enrollment Planning and Management: Provost

• Enhancement of Undergraduate Education: Provost

• Faculty and Staff Development: Provost

• Academic Resources Development: Provost

• Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness: Provost and Vice President for Planning and Budgets

• Consolidation of Campus Computing and Information Services: Provost

• Revision of School/College Strategic Plans: deans and Provost

• Institutional Marketing and Image Promotion: Vice President for University Advancement

• Institutional Resource Development: Vice Presidents for Business Affairs, University Advancement, and Planning and Budgets

• Student Life and Residential Life Plan: Vice President for Student Affairs

- Facilities Master Plan Revision: Vice President for Business Affairs
- Improvement of the Effectiveness and Efficiency of University Operations: Vice President for Business Affairs

Part Six also relates the strategic planning process to the development of the biennial budget requests and establishes the timelines for biennial review and evaluation of the strategic plan during even-numbered years.

ENVIRONMENTAL TRENDS AND HIGHER EDUCATION

⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯

Strategic planning rests upon analysis of the points of interaction between the University and the external environments in which it functions. Such planning must take into account changing global, national, and state trends; societal needs; public policy decisions; the plans of other universities in the state and region; and institutional strengths and weaknesses. An understanding of environmental conditions provides a realistic context for the formulation of internal goals and strategies.

Identifying the trends which will affect higher education in the 21st century is a task which challenges university leaders and public policy makers. Societal change has become so rapid that what seems inevitable today is sometimes eclipsed by unforeseen developments tomorrow. Political instability, economic fluctuation, environmental crises, technological innovation, demographic shifts, new threats to public health, and the steady expansion of knowledge offer challenges to those who seek to anticipate and prepare for the needs of society. As a result, caution is prudent in forecasting the future, and care should be taken to avoid overemphasizing present customs and practices. Nonetheless, understanding the nature and implications of current trends is essential to those who have the responsibility of addressing the needs of society. Elected public officials and university leaders alike are obliged to examine the present and plan for the future and to work to incorporate in their institutions the values of adaptability and flexibility as well as appreciation of tradition and stability.

Among the many identifiable trends which will influence the nation and higher education in the coming decade, the following seem most significant for strategic planning at Indiana State University:

The Emergence of a Global Society

Population growth in the next generation will occur primarily in the developing nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The population of the United States will grow more slowly and constitute a smaller percentage of the world's total. The internationalizing of technology and the work force is accelerating as markets become increasingly global and advances in communication erode national and cultural boundaries. The impact of population growth, increasing demands for natural resources, rising standards of living, and an expanding industrial technology will present ever-greater challenges to the world environment. American involvement in global politics and economic development will demand greater understanding of other cultures. American higher education also will attract an increasing number of students from nations around the world seeking knowledge, skills, and training.

For Indiana State University, these trends suggest that the undergraduate curriculum must incorporate an understanding of global economies, politics, environment, and cultures; that students must gain an appreciation of cultural diversity and of the changing relationship of the United States with other nations; and that the campus environment will reflect the influence of greater numbers of students from other nations seeking degrees. In short, the University's graduates must be prepared to live in a global society and work in a global economy.

The Changing Demographics of the American Population

Although the national birthrate will not increase in the foreseeable future, the makeup of the population will continue to change. African-Americans will constitute a larger percentage of the American people, and Hispanics

will become the largest ethnic group in the nation within the next two decades. The average age of the population will continue to rise. Dual-career and single-parent families will become the norm. The number of women in the work force will steadily increase.

These national demographic patterns will be evident in Indiana, but the rate of change will be more moderate. The birthrate in the state is expected to be lower than the national rate, the percentage of citizens above the age of 65 will be higher, ethnic diversification will occur more slowly, and the number of dual-career and single-parent families will increase but more slowly than they will nationally. The population of West Central Indiana is not likely to experience growth and so will decline to less than its current 10 percent of the state's population.

The implications of these trends for society and public policy must be incorporated into the University curriculum and will mandate expanded efforts to recruit an increasingly diverse student body, faculty, and staff to reflect more closely the educational needs of the nation. To increase enrollment, the University will have to attract more Hoosier students who reside beyond a 50-mile radius of Terre Haute.

The Shift from an Industrial to a Technologically Driven, Knowledge-Based Economy

The nature of work is changing in America, with manufacturing jobs experiencing limited growth; with high-skill, service, and government jobs increasing; and with life-long learning becoming an expectation of all workers. International competition, sophisticated technology, and the pressure to increase productivity will demand new organizational structures and management techniques.

In Indiana, a greater dependence on manufacturing and agriculture than is the case nationally will require more substantial restructuring of the economy. Hoosier per capita income and the accompanying generation of tax revenue, both below the national average, will have to improve. This will most likely be accomplished through the creation of additional high-skill industry as well as service and retail businesses. Levels of educational attainment, low in national comparisons, will have to increase to prepare citizens for new kinds of employment to raise per capita income.

The University's curriculum must remain current with changing employment needs in the nation and the state. Many citizens who entered the work force directly from high school now will be entering post-secondary education, and more future high school graduates will continue their education. As a result, the number of first-generation college students enrolling in the University will increase. The expertness which will shape economic development in the future will largely be developed on the campuses of Indiana State University and public institutions like it.

The Change in Expectations of Public Education

The rising high school drop-out rate in the nation and the state will continue to contribute to high unemployment rates unless high school graduation rates improve. The high rate of functional illiteracy of high school graduates will produce a societal insistence upon improvement of public school graduates' language, mathematics, communication, and reading skills. The growing diversity of the nation's population will require significant changes in teaching and learning strategies throughout the public schools. Responding to the impact on children of changes in the makeup and roles of families will become a growing responsibility of the schools. Preparation of teachers for the public schools will be tied to expectations of greater accountability for student success.

In response to these trends, Indiana State University must give ongoing assessment to admissions criteria for recent high school graduates as well as those who seek to continue their education after a period of employment. Faculty consideration of alternative teaching and learning strategies will be essential as the student population comes to reflect changes occurring in the population generally. Support services and institutional procedures appropriate to new student populations will need to be developed and evaluated. The partnership between the School of Education and public schools in West Central Indiana will work toward the professional development of public school teachers and the development of strategies to assist public schools to respond to the changing expectations of society.

The Increasing Influence of Articulated Goals and Public Policy on Higher Education in Indiana

The State of Indiana has fewer citizens with college experience than all but two other states and fewer college-educated adults than the national average. Rates of participation in post-secondary education have increased in the last five years even with a decrease in the size of high school graduating classes in that period, but progress toward the national average has been slow.

The percentage of the state budget spent on higher education ranks in the upper half of the states, but the expenditure per capita on higher education ranks in the lower half. State revenues spent per student have declined in real dollars since 1975; student tuition rates have increased in real dollars during that time. Revenues available to meet public needs in the state are projected to remain level or increase slightly for the foreseeable future, and competing demands for governmental services will limit the state's ability to increase resources significantly for higher education.

The Indiana General Assembly and the Commission for Higher Education have articulated a series of statewide goals for public higher education which will guide state funding and university priorities through the remainder of this decade. Those goals include: increasing the participation of Hoosiers in post-secondary education; increasing minority student access to post-secondary education; improving rates of retention, progression, and degree completion among college students; linking state funding increases primarily to enrollment growth; expanding the delivery of degree programs statewide by means of distance education; imposing restraints on the cost of college education to students through limits on tuition increases and greater support of student financial aid; placing controls over the rising state debt incurred from new building construction and earmarking capital funds to maintain the state's investment in existing buildings; increasing emphasis on faculty productivity, evaluation of student performance, and cost effectiveness in university operations; and, in general, enlarging higher education's level of accountability.

As a public institution in the state of Indiana, Indiana State University will be required to address the statewide goals set for higher education, to operate within the budget restraints set by the state, and to respond effectively to inquiries about its achievements, its policies, and its operation. Few aspects of the University can be expected to be exempt from external examination in the decade ahead.

The Increasing Expectations for University Assistance in Addressing National, State, and Regional Needs

American society has come increasingly to depend upon universities and their faculties for the development and application of knowledge. Progress in improving health care, prolonging life, reducing poverty, combating ills in urban and rural communities, ameliorating racial and cultural conflict, restoring the balance between human needs and environmental stability, elevating the quality of life, and meeting other societal needs will be possible only with the direct and continuing involvement of universities with society at large. University research and service are resources the nation must continue to cultivate and support during the next century.

Although the state's attention in recent years has been more on the University's role in economic development and the issue of student access to undergraduate programs, Indiana State will have increased opportunities to apply the faculty's expertise to regional, state, and national needs. Continuing development of that expertise, successful recruitment of well-qualified faculty in the years ahead, and expanded efforts to secure external funding through grants, contracts, and gifts will be essential responses to meeting these societal expectations.

Conclusion

Societal change is inevitable, and Indiana State University must evolve in response to that change. State resources will be constrained, and competition for those resources among universities, as well as between universities and other social agencies, will be intense. Public expectations of accountability will require universities to be more forthcoming in explaining what they do and how well they do it. In addition, cost effectiveness within the institution will be expected to generate resources to do more for society with limited additional support.

CHALLENGES TO THE 20TH CENTURY UNIVERSITY

The state university of the 20th century, especially since the end of the Second World War, has been charged by society with performing several distinct functions, not all of which have been readily compatible. It has been expected to educate ever-increasing numbers of students, initially those who continued on to baccalaureate programs directly from high school and, more recently, those who entered the work force after high school and later resumed their education as adults on a full- or part-time basis as well. The justification for expanding access to post-secondary education has largely centered on preparation for employment, which has given the baccalaureate and graduate degrees alike an increasingly vocational orientation.

The state university also has responded remarkably well to societal expectations for the expansion of knowledge through scholarship and published research. Through state funding of the state university budget, student tuition, federal and state financial aid, and public and private funding of research, society has contracted not only for the extension of the frontiers of knowledge through basic research but also for the aggregation, synthesis, and interpretation of knowledge for dissemination to the society. Public and private institutions and organizations alike have come to rely upon the generation of knowledge by university faculty.

A third societal expectation of the state university has been the contribution by faculty of their expertise to the improvement of society. Through grants, contracts, formal and informal agreements, professional consultation, technical assistance, conferences, workshops, and seminars, the state university has provided an ever-widening array of service to the external community. The reform of public education; the transfer of technology to production and communication; the sharing of laboratory research with health providers, pharmaceutical companies, government agencies, manufacturers, and public interest groups; the application of new insights into human behavior to psychological practice, social analysis, and government policy; the infusion of creative expression in arts and letters throughout the culture; the challenges to thought and practice of cross-cultural analysis; and the impact on public policy of studies of poverty, racism, criminal behavior, and violence are only a few examples of the interaction between state university faculty and society at large.

The contract which society has had with the state university has been clear although not always explicit: in exchange for substantial public funding and the freedom to develop and disseminate knowledge, the state university educates students to be productive citizens and make the knowledge and expertise of its faculty available and accessible. In recent years, however, that contract has come under increasing scrutiny, in part because of its cost but also because of dissatisfaction with the state university's performance. The resulting challenge has brought into public view the tensions that its multiple expectations have created for the state university.

Commitment to expanding student access to post-secondary education has altered both the environment of the university and the character of undergraduate education. The mid-century's large institution of 10,000 undergraduates has become the mega-university of 30,000 or more four decades later. The relatively homogeneous student body of college-prepared, predominantly white, upper-middle class men and women intending to enter business and the professions has evolved toward a microcosm of the society generally, with a dramatic rise in first-generation college students who are more ethnically and culturally diverse and less prepared for the college expe-

rience and who range more widely in terms of age, expectation, commitment, and career goals.

To accommodate this growth, the state university expanded class size, added degree programs, enlarged campus facilities, employed more professional staff, and placed greater responsibility for under-class instruction on part-time faculty and graduate students. Although the total cost of such expansion increased significantly, the per-student cost declined and the efficiencies thus effected helped to support the expansion of other functions expected of the university. One result of this accommodation to growth was the application of principles of mass production to undergraduate education. This, in turn, led to a rise in student dissatisfaction with the educational experience and public doubt about the quality of its graduate. The proliferation of degree programs, the emphasis on preparation for work, the increase in specialization, and the de-emphasis of liberal education have increased disenchantment within and without the academy with the direction of the undergraduate experience.

The state university's commitment to research, although a direct response to public policy and public funding, began to have significant impact on the allocation of university resources and of time and effort of its faculty. Some types of research received direct funding from the state, federal agencies, or private foundations and organizations and thus did not necessarily require extensive university support, but the faculty's commitment to such projects often led to a reduction of their involvement in instruction. Other research was undertaken in preparation for later external funding or at faculty and university expense because external resources were unavailable to support it. As research became an integral part of faculty professional activity, reappointment, tenure, and promotion often were tied to research productivity. In short, research productivity was woven into the fabric of university culture. The more productive the faculty became and the more important its research came to be to society, the more significant the research effort came to be in terms of institutional commitment. Success, then, was measurable, and societal benefit tangible. This situation, however, served to create a certain tension between this expectation and instructional responsibilities, especially given the in-

creasing demands in the latter area caused burgeoning student enrollments. Within this context, research and teaching were often portrayed, within the academy and without, not as complementary and mutually supportive but as competitive and exclusive. In recent years, dissatisfaction with undergraduate education has often been tied to what is perceived as the distracting and disruptive influence of the very research which society has demanded and funded.

The dissemination of faculty research and expertise to segments of society that could benefit directly from them also produced dissatisfaction with the university. Some of that dissatisfaction was similar to criticisms directed at faculty research: consulting off-campus took faculty away from their instructional tasks and gave economic incentives to consider on-campus responsibilities as secondary in their priorities. With the knowledge explosion of the second half of this century and the resultant increase in academic specialization and the splintering of disciplines into an ever-growing number of subdisciplines came questions regarding the adequacy of faculty service to meet certain expressed societal needs. As academic departments and specialized programs within departments divided and subdivided knowledge to better understand and expand it, communication among specialists and across department lines became increasingly difficult.

Consequently, the dramatic expansion of knowledge that resulted from its fragmentation and compartmentalization began to impede its application to the needs of society. Faculty specialists brought to complex societal problems the perspectives and specialized knowledge of their disciplines and subdisciplines, but the task of integrating, synthesizing, and applying knowledge from all relevant disciplines was increasingly beyond the interests or capabilities of these individual specialists. Those social, governmental, and private agencies that wished to utilize the extraordinary expertise resident within the state university to address societal problems or needs found it necessary to themselves integrate the research which the university's discipline-bound experts produced or to adopt the expedient of gathering teams of those experts to undertake collaborative efforts outside the university. In this context, faculty knowledge and expertise seemed to

the layman to be precious and arcane and the state university to be increasingly isolated from the real world and public utility. Academic experts, in their adherence to the rigors of their disciplinary training, seemed incapable of or uninterested in upholding the state university's contractual obligation to make their knowledge useful to society.

The stridency of recent public discussion concerning the state university and the accompanying insistence upon greater accountability and assessment of performance, while resting on the premise of the university's contract with society, reflect an absence of understanding and appreciation of the tensions among the several expectations which society has of the university. The state university now must confront the challenge of justifying and explaining its part of the contract, but to do so it must address the existing tensions among its functions, effect resolutions which are acceptable to the academy and society, and adopt strategic goals which reflect institutional and societal priorities.

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY: ITS PAST AND ITS PRESENT

The societal expectations of the 20th century state university have shaped much of the development of Indiana State University. Since the middle of the century, ISU's enrollment has increased 400 percent. The curriculum has become comprehensive, with dozens of new degree programs at the baccalaureate and master's level and the introduction of doctoral-level study. Expanded scholarship, research, and grant productivity have been consistent with the professional expectations of university faculty. Faculty contributions resulting from their scholarly expertise have had significant impact on social, educational, economic, political, and cultural agencies and institutions throughout the Wabash Valley, the State of Indiana, the Midwest, and the nation.

These responses to societal expectations have produced within Indiana State University some of the tensions and stresses common to the 20th century state university nationwide, but during the past four decades, ISU has resisted several of the pressures which have transformed the state university in that time. Among public institutions in Indiana, Indiana State is well-positioned to respond to the challenges now being presented to higher education.

First of all, Indiana State, despite its substantial growth in enrollment, has continued to give high priority to undergraduate education for an increasingly diverse student population, and its educational philosophy rests upon providing individual attention to the respective academic needs of all of its students. The undergraduate student body is the most distinctive among the residential universities in the state. Many students are first-generation college students whose parents are employed as skilled, semi-skilled, or service workers. More than half of the students rely on some form of financial aid, and two-thirds plan to work during their college years to help meet the cost

of their education. A larger percentage of Indiana State undergraduates is housed in University residence halls than at any other public institution in the state, and a substantial percentage lives in the Wabash Valley and commutes to campus as full-time students. Although 86 percent of ISU undergraduates are Hoosiers, a significant cultural diversity exists with students from every county in Indiana, every state in the nation, 73 nations throughout the world, and a higher percentage of African-American students than is present at other public residential universities in Indiana. In the last generation, women students have become the majority, and the number of part-time and older students has gradually increased with the recent delivery of several degree programs through the technology of distance education and the implementation of initial articulation agreements with associate degree institutions.

Admission criteria have changed in the past eight years to ensure that entering students have a better opportunity to be successful. More than two-thirds of entering undergraduates are in the upper half of their graduating high school class. Those in the third quartile of their high school class whose academic record and test scores indicate college potential are given conditional admission and required to participate in a number of academic support activities designed to enhance their chance for success. Those in the bottom quartile are generally denied admission. To ensure the best possible attention to the needs of this student population, the University has configured its classroom, laboratory, and studio environments to emphasize small to medium-sized class enrollments for first-year students as well as upperclassmen. No course section on the campus enrolls as many as 225 students, and average class size for courses in the General Education Program ranges from 22 students in basic studies to 35 in liberal

studies. Reinforcing this emphasis on personal, quality instruction, the University has maintained a favorable faculty-student ratio; a continuing practice of assigning full-time, regular faculty to lower- as well as upper-division undergraduate courses; and a resistance to widespread use of graduate students as undergraduate instructors. The compact dimensions of the campus, unique to comprehensive public universities in the state, also reinforce the institution's intimate, attentive, and personalized approach to teaching.

Because a vast majority of ISU's undergraduate students are oriented toward career goals, their choices of degree programs are often shaped by employment opportunities. Yet the University has sustained and strengthened the general education curriculum central to all undergraduate programs. In its requirement of in-depth and broad study in the arts and humanities, the social and behavioral sciences, and the physical and mathematical sciences, General Education is designed to prepare students to assume the duties of responsible citizenship in a free society as well as to form the educational foundation of successful careers. The program also seeks to ensure that students attain acceptable competency levels in the fundamental skills of written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, and computation. In response to rapid enrollment growth and an increase in the number of first-generation college students, minorities, and older, part-time students, Indiana State has remained committed to its long-established philosophy of personalized undergraduate education on a campus of human dimensions rather than adopting the strategies of many other 20th century public universities: sprawling campus environments which rely on large undergraduate classes taught by part-time and graduate student instructors and an increase in admission standards as the primary means to control enrollment.

As a second example of a balanced institutional response to pressures confronting the 20th century state university, Indiana State has linked research to the entire spectrum of university education rather than primarily to graduate education. Faculty in all academic departments of the University, including those involved primarily in undergraduate instruction, regard scholarship as essential to the mastery of their disciplines and the education of their students. Many undergraduates, as a result, have opportunities to become involved with faculty in research or creative projects of the kind that are reserved for graduate students in most large research universities.

The University also has encouraged in many of its academic disciplines an applied as well as a theoretical orientation to scholarship and research. Building upon the University's origins in the preparation of public school teachers, the School of Education has encouraged faculty and students to apply current theories of learning, pedagogy, and school organization toward the facilitation of improving public school education. The School of Technology has directed its attention to the transfer of technology to manufacturing processes and work force development. School of Business faculty have undertaken research on the insurance industry, public finance, information management, and small business development. A recent reorganization of the School of Nursing has elevated health promotion to equal status with health restoration and offers new directions in the delivery of health care. Faculty in the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation have undertaken research in health promotion and fitness, the prevention and rehabilitation of injuries, and environmental safety. Among the many faculty research interests in the College of Arts and Sciences are projects involving cell products technology and its societal implications, a wide range of environmental issues, gerontology, criminal justice, and ethics.

University faculty have achieved success as well in more traditional forms of scholarship, research, publication, and creative expression within their disciplines. The scholarly effort of faculty, however, has largely remained in balance with their other responsibilities and has been consistently incorporated in the undergraduate and graduate classroom, laboratory, and studio environment as well as presented to professional audiences in scholarly journals, books, and public performance. Research has not been pursued at the expense of instruction at Indiana State University.

The interdisciplinary and applied nature of faculty research has enabled Indiana State to meet a third societal challenge to the 20th century state university: the transfer

of knowledge in a usable form to society. Many University faculty have embraced the professional model of service to society, and an increasing number have expressed an interest in working across disciplinary lines to develop integrated approaches to complex societal problems rather than restricting their research to narrow, specialized study. Institutional organizations such as the Center for Research and Management Services, the Technology Services Center, the Partners for Educational Progress, the Center for Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Services, the Interdisciplinary Center for Cell Products and Technologies, and the Blumberg Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Special Education have secured external funding for research grants, contracts to provide technical assistance and professional consultation, and training agreements with public and private agencies and companies. The School of Education's creation of Professional Development Schools gives evidence of the commitment of faculty to a collaborative relationship with public school teachers and administrators in pursuit of school improvement. Federal planning funds for new or renovated quarters for the physical sciences rested heavily on the commitment of the science departments to foster interdisciplinary education and research. The University's participation in Project 30 in support of collaboration between teacher education programs and the liberal studies disciplines in arts and sciences reflects faculty recognition of the interrelationship of professional studies and General Education. And faculty in the creative arts have consistently sought to foster community access to their exhibitions, concerts, and performances.

The multiple expectations which society has of Indiana State University do not always reinforce each other, and the University has been moved in multiple directions by the increase in size and diversity of student enrollments; by the relentless expansion of knowledge; by the influence of professional accreditation and certification agencies; by

the interests of employers; by the social, economic, political, and cultural needs of citizenry; and by the professional and personal interests of its faculty and staff. The years ahead will require setting priorities, making choices among many valid and competing needs, retaining flexibility to respond to changing societal expectations, and responding to greater societal insistence upon assessment and accountability.

In sum, Indiana State University has become a distinctive institution during the last four decades, with characteristics, qualities, and values different from any other university in Indiana. It is an opportunity university, offering education to first-generation college students and those seeking to improve their lives. It fosters diversity, attracting students from throughout Indiana, the nation, and the world; a significant number of African-American students; and a majority of women. It emphasizes intimate, personalized instruction, with small classes, full-time faculty in the classroom, a compact campus, and a carefully nurtured sense of community. It values quality and excellence in its selection of faculty, its innovative General Education Program, its nationally accredited degree programs and its production of successful graduates. It encourages innovation with its careful balance of teaching and scholarship, its encouragement of undergraduate as well as graduate student research, its faculty commitment to applied as well as theoretical research, and its enthusiasm for interdisciplinary study. It also offers professional service to the community and society, honoring the contract which public universities have with the American people to contribute knowledge for their well-being. Indiana State University is prepared to respond more favorably to the nation's current challenge to the 20th century state university than many of its sister institutions, and its strategic planning process is put in place to provide the direction and the strategies to meet the challenges of the next century.

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

A PROGRESSIVE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY

Defining the future course of Indiana State University requires a deliberate blending of the institution's established traditions, its present strengths, and its potential to respond to the future needs of society. The University should not attempt to become something entirely new, just as it cannot be content merely to perpetuate its past. Change must be balanced with continuity. The goals and strategies set forth in the following pages build upon what is now in place, enhancing, expanding upon, and augmenting the accomplishments and service that the University has provided to the citizens of Indiana for 128 years.

PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS

Among the many existing features of the University which underlie its foundation for the future, the following seem particularly worthy of remark:

• The present institutional mission, which has been approved by the Board of Trustees and confirmed by the Commission for Higher Education, enunciates the functions, responsibilities, roles, and scope appropriate for the university of the 21st century. Refinement, clarification, and shifts of emphasis will keep the mission statement current.

• Although new degree programs will be added and some existing degree programs will be discontinued, the existing range of programs at the associate, baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral levels will be generally maintained. The institution will continue to be a doctoral degree-granting university as that category is defined by the

Carnegie Corporation of New York and the United States Department of Education.

• Student enrollment—undergraduate and graduate, full-time and part-time, on-campus and off-campus, traditional and nontraditional age—will increase gradually during the next decade. Such growth will depend upon the recruitment of a greater number of recent high school graduates throughout the state, increased enrollments in selected graduate programs, and the expansion of opportunities for nontraditional students on campus and by distance education, but it will be managed so the academic character, educational philosophy, and campus environment of the institution will not be fundamentally altered.

• While recognizing the critical role of graduate education at a university, the education of full-time undergraduate students will continue to be the primary responsibility of the University, and the largest number of those students will live on campus or commute daily. Because only 10 percent of Indiana's high school graduates within any given year live within 50 miles of Terre Haute, special attention will be directed toward maintaining an attractive residential campus. Nontraditional students and students outside normal commuting distance will be served through outreach programs.

• The competitive position of the University among public institutions in the state will continue to rest upon its appeal as a comprehensive yet moderate-sized university, reflecting the breadth and quality of its programs, its physical compactness, and the personal attention its full-time faculty give students in small classes.

• While the primary emphasis will be on instruction, the responsibilities of faculty will continue to be divided among the three traditional categories of teaching, research/creative expression, and service.

- The resources available to the University from public revenues and student fees will likely remain stable or increase only slightly and thus be insufficient to keep pace with inflation during the remaining years of this century. Continued institutional development will depend upon the generation of additional funds from external sources as well as the allocation and reallocation of internal resources.

UNIVERSITY VALUES

The established values of the University have served it and the citizens of Indiana well and will remain central to the progressive public university. The goals and strategies of this plan are intended to enhance these values.

- **Access.** The University long has sought to be an inclusive academic community, providing opportunity to students with a wide range of academic abilities and educational backgrounds, of ethnic and cultural heritage, of family experience and economic means, physical and learning differences, of mobile and place-bound circumstances, and of career and life expectations.

- **Service.** The University long has been committed to being a responsive and caring institution, dedicated to the interests of the entire campus community and in particular its students. The value of service has extended as well to being responsive to the needs of the local community and society in general.

- **Success.** The University has been dedicated to assisting students achieve their goals through personal attention, a supportive environment, essential academic and personal services, and broad-based financial assistance.

- **Innovation.** The University has sought to be creative and innovative in meeting the needs of its students, the faculty, and society through curriculum revision, scholarship, and the contribution of professional expertise to the larger community.

- **Excellence.** The University has encouraged students and faculty to excel in all they do by meeting rigorous professional and academic standards.

With this foundation, the University has the means and the intent to become a dynamic model of the progressive public university.

THE PROGRESSIVE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY

The emerging progressive public university is destined to play a significant role in American life. Universities pursuing this mission will not only make dramatic contributions to innovation and change in American higher education but they also will become a dynamic force for educational opportunity and equity, social change, and technological progress throughout society.

The salient characteristic of this new university will be the "interactive" relationships it will foster between the university and the community it serves, between teacher and student in the learning process, between and among the various academic disciplines and fields of study, and among the university's fundamental missions of instruction, scholarship, and service.

The new progressive public university will use its intellectual and human resources not simply to impart knowledge to students but to address the needs, inequities, and imbalances in our society. It will be a community of scholars that is externally focused; it will be "connected" with the outside world through cooperative endeavors and partnerships. The progressive public university will aggressively seek to serve the public interest and contribute to the quality of life in the state, the nation, and the world.

Knowledge is the fundamental material of the university, and its advancement, transmission, and application are the university's responsibilities. It will value a variety of scholarly endeavors. Faculty will be encouraged not only to extend the frontiers of knowledge through basic research, but also to facilitate its dissemination and application by society through innovative means of aggregation, synthesis, and interpretation.

The interactive quality of the progressive public university will be reflected in the dynamic connectivity among the various disciplines and fields of study. Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary intellectual activity will be highly visible and valued in the life of this new progressive academic community. The interrelationship of knowledge will be manifested in the curriculum, the learning process, in scholarship, and in public service.

The progressive public university will extend and apply knowledge through mutually beneficial partnerships with

government, other schools and colleges, business and industry, health care providers, other professions, and the artistic community among others. A variety of service and continuing education programs will provide opportunities for the progressive public university to contribute to the welfare of the general citizenry.

STRATEGIC GOALS

The following strategic goals which will guide the University of the present toward the progressive public university of the future emerged from discussions in four strategic planning forums held on the campus in January and February 1993 and from initial drafts of strategic planning documents presented in March 1993 by the Schools, the College, the Library, and the Division of Continuing Education/Instructional Services. The strategies to accomplish these directions are illustrative.

Strategic Goal One. Enhancement of Undergraduate Education

ISU will be a "benchmark university" that is known and admired for its teaching excellence and as an exemplar, a national model for the distinctiveness and quality of its undergraduate educational experience.

Indiana State University's philosophy of undergraduate education is firmly established and well-suited to address societal expectations of the state university of the 21st Century. But clarification, refinement, and improvement of undergraduate education are essential to the institution's stability, viability, and future success. In an environment characterized by limited public resources, the increasing diversity of students seeking access to higher education, the necessity of containing the cost of college attendance, the demand for measuring the effectiveness of teaching and learning, and the growing insistence on cost effectiveness in the expenditure of public funds, Indiana State must satisfy itself, its students, and society that its delivery of undergraduate instruction achieves the full realization of its educational goals. To this end, the University will explore the following strategies:

- Review and refine admissions standards to ensure that enrolled students will perform successfully in the classroom.

- Design and implement a first-year student experience which will introduce entering students to the community of learning and prepare them fully to realize their talents and abilities.

- Ensure that teaching and learning throughout the curriculum are adapted to an educational environment characterized by small to moderate-size classes; experienced, full-time faculty; and personalized instruction which is responsive to diverse student learning styles.

- Incorporate in the instructional effort new, innovative forms of technology which will enhance, expand, and complement traditional classroom teaching through the creation of a Teaching and Learning Center.

- Improve incentives for and recognition of teaching excellence throughout the curriculum.

- Conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness and coherence of the General Education Program.

- Review all existing undergraduate programs for the purpose of identifying those which should be enhanced, consolidated, or discontinued.

- Devise and implement the means to assess students' achievement throughout their academic careers.

- Provide academic support services which will assist qualified students in improving their academic performance.

- Undertake a comprehensive effort to improve the academic advisement of all students. Advisement must not only be accurate but convey the goals of General Education and the academic coherence of the major.

- Enhance the academic and social climate of the campus through the recruitment of faculty, staff, and students from underrepresented cultural and ethnic groups and through the active promotion of support for and appreciation of cultural and ethnic diversity.

- Enhance the quality of campus life through the effective integration of academic and social experiences of residential and commuter students.

- Commit the University community to the principle of service to students.

The full realization of the benefits of Indiana State University's distinctive philosophy of undergraduate education will improve the academic success of students, expand the appeal of the institution to prospective students, increase the University's academic reputation, enhance the career opportunities of the University's graduates, and broaden the University's base of financial support by the government and citizens of Indiana.

Strategic Goal Two. Extension of Advanced Knowledge

ISU will be a distinguished institution for graduate study by carefully selecting advanced program offerings that respond to societal needs, are innovative in approach, and reflect a commitment to excellence.

The task of clarifying, refining and enhancing graduate education is no less important to the Indiana State University of the future than is the task of enhancing undergraduate education. Student interest in graduate degree programs, the faculty's evaluation of the quality of those programs, the University resources required by the programs, the graduate education plans at other universities in Indiana, the state's commitment to funding graduate education generally, and society's need for graduates of the programs must be taken into consideration in assessing current Indiana State University's graduate offerings and in planning future program development.

Indiana State's graduate programs should be distinguished less by their scope and number and more by the fact they respond to demonstrated societal needs, are innovative in approach, and reflect a commitment to excellence.

To enable the University to reach decisions on the directions it should take in graduate education:

- The deans of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Schools of Graduate Study; Business; Education; Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; Nursing; and Technology, working with their graduate faculties and the Graduate Council, will develop and apply criteria for measuring the quality and appeal of their graduate degree programs and to establish priorities for supporting excellence in graduate education.

- The deans will be asked to review all existing graduate programs for the purpose of identifying those which should be enhanced, consolidated, or discontinued.

- Academic departments will develop new doctoral programs and innovative master's programs in a select number of disciplines.

Strategic Goal Three. Service to the New Clienteles

ISU will be recognized as an "opportunity university" that brings education to new life-time learning clienteles both on and off-campus.

The demand for university instruction by previously underserved populations and the availability of new technology to deliver that instruction in an ever-widening array of media mandate that institutional policies, attitudes, and curricular offerings be responsive to place-bound, part-time, and adult learners. To address that need, the University will seek to serve students through extended on-campus scheduling and distance education statewide. Deans and faculty will pursue the following strategies consistent with their defined School/College missions and goals:

- Facilitate greater access to baccalaureate and graduate programs for non-traditional students through the transfer of credit, evaluation of experience, and articulation with associate degree-granting institutions.

- Develop and expand late afternoon, evening, weekend, and short-term courses and programs on campus during the academic year and the summer and provide campus services at hours convenient to students enrolled in them.

- Develop a wider range of courses and programs to be delivered by distance education throughout the state and beyond, expand institutional capabilities to deliver them, and assist faculty in adapting their materials and teaching styles for this mode of instruction.

- Explore new, non-degree curricular responses to the professional needs of employed students, including individualized course sequences, enhancement of technical skills, and preparation for professional certification.

- Review the implications of distance education to existing residency requirements, credit transfer policies, and academic expectations developed for traditional campus classroom environments.

• Devise promotion and recruitment strategies to support expanded course and program offerings for part-time and off-campus students.

There is little doubt that society will expect its public universities to educate an increasing number of all its citizens in the years ahead. It is incumbent upon Indiana State University to identify which of its programs it will make available to those citizens and through what means.

Strategic Goal Four. Expansion of Knowledge

ISU will be recognized for the value it places on scholarship and for the support it gives to faculty and students in the pursuit of new knowledge.

Faculty research and scholarship, vital to undergraduate and graduate education, is also deserving of more careful definition and evaluation. The nature and form of scholarly effort can vary widely from discipline to discipline, reflecting not only disciplinary expectations but faculty interest and the needs of society. Critics of the 20th century state university, within academia and beyond, have portrayed instruction and research as competitors for the attention and energies of the faculty. What constitutes appropriate scholarly effort and how it is to be balanced with instructional effort are issues central to many of the goals and strategies established for Indiana State University in this document. To this end, Indiana State will:

• Engage the School/College faculties and the deans in the careful definitions of scholarship and research/ creative expression appropriate to disciplinary and interdisciplinary work and to contributions to professional and societal goals.

• Implement programs, policies, and services that will foster faculty and student scholarship.

• Explore the establishment of "centers of distinctiveness" that incorporate scholarship with the dissemination and application of knowledge at high levels of excellence.

Strategic Goal Five. Transfer of Knowledge and Expertise to Society

ISU will be nationally known among progressive public universities for its contributions through the development of "public service partnerships" with particular focus on the quality of life in Indiana.

Indiana State University's origins reside in a pact with the state to prepare teachers for the common schools of Indiana, and it has sustained a commitment to meeting societal needs ever since. To the University's primary task of educating students to assume productive roles in society has been added the responsibility to transfer faculty knowledge, expertise, and creativity to the public and private sectors in the Wabash Valley, the state, and the nation. Such contributions by the faculty were, until recently, made largely on an informal and voluntary basis in response to individual requests for information and assistance. But an increasingly complex and technically oriented society's ever-greater reliance on expertise, which is often available only on university campuses, has produced an interest in more extensive and formal partnerships with the institution. This has increased to the extent that the leaders of the region and state now publicly acknowledge that the vitality of the economy and the society depend upon interaction with Indiana State faculty. To fulfill the obligation now incumbent upon it, Indiana State University commits to the following strategies:

• Establish or expand partnerships with agencies, institutions and organizations to provide interdisciplinary, collaborative research, technical assistance, policy analysis, in-service training, and consultation in such fields as:

  • public school improvement and professional development;
  • pharmaceuticals, cell product engineering, and bio-technology;
  • technology transfer in industry and manufacturing;
  • development of small- and medium-sized businesses;
  • a wide range of environmental fields, including waste management; resource conservation, utilization, and management; and pollution control;
  • regional and state economic development;
  • public service careers such as corrections, law enforcement, criminal justice, and fire science;
  • improved and alternative health care delivery systems, especially for rural populations.

• Develop a consortium of higher education institutions in West Central Indiana which collectively will provide

the educational, research, and public services that these institutions are less able to offer individually. Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology, St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, Indiana Vocational and Technical College, Vincennes University, the Indiana University Center for Medical Education, and the Purdue University Extension Center have undertaken partnerships with Indiana State University on specific projects in the past such as sharing access to library information resources of regional and statewide colleges and universities. These institutions have, in a consortium arrangement, significant potential to generate greater funding from external sources and to facilitate expanded faculty collaboration on a wide range of projects of benefit to the citizens of the region.

• Expand the number of faculty and student internships in public and private agencies and organizations and of co-op opportunities for students in their major fields. Interaction can increase understanding between the University and work environments and thus exert a positive influence on education and society.

• Expand the University partnership with the community of Terre Haute and the Wabash Valley through cooperative relationships intended to advance the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the area. Although the University has a state and national mission, it has a special responsibility to support and enhance the immediate community in which it is located. Assistance to small businesses and support for agencies of local and regional government are vital to the interests of the University and the community alike.

• Seek external funding in grants and contracts to support existing University centers and to develop new centers which support the University's interactions with society. The Center for Research and Management Services and the associated Small Business Development Center, the Technology Services Center, the Center for Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems, the Interdisciplinary Center for Cell Products and Technologies, the Center for Governmental Services, the Blumberg Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Special Education, the Partners for Educational Progress, and the Sycamore Nursing Center are University-funded offices which facilitate and support faculty work with a variety of

public and private organizations and agencies. Their contributions and the contributions of other units yet to be created can be enhanced significantly with increased support from those in the society who benefit from them.

University faculty possess expertise and knowledge in a wide range of fields and disciplines that are of enormous potential benefit to the community, the region, the state, and the nation. Given appropriate support and encouragement, the integration and synthesis of knowledge and the application of expertise to the needs of the society are possible for Indiana State University and vital to the nation's future.

Strategic Goal Six. Enhancement and Advocacy of Multicultural and International Values

ISU will be recognized for its commitment to equal educational opportunity, its ethnic and cultural diversity, and its international perspective.

To ensure that the University community gains a greater appreciation of cultural and ethnic diversity in the nation and of the changing relationship of the United States with other nations, the University must seek to expand cultural diversity among students, faculty, and staff, and incorporate into the curriculum, research, and campus life an understanding of global economies, politics, environment, and cultures. To these ends, the University will:

• Improve the recruitment and retention of students, faculty, and staff from groups that historically have been under-represented in American and Indiana higher education.

• Encourage and support the inclusion of multicultural perspectives in academic programs and campus life activities.

• Expand instructional support, advising, and retention services for students of diverse cultural backgrounds.

• Implement in-service programs for University personnel which promote cross-cultural communication and relations.

• Foster campus values, norms, and conduct which increase the sense of community among all members of the University community.

- Strengthen the international focus of the curriculum through the recruitment of faculty with international expertise and establish workshops for enhancing international awareness of current faculty.

- Strengthen faculty and student exchange opportunities with universities in other nations.

- Encourage students to acquire foreign language facility and to participate in a study abroad program.

- Work with leaders of student organizations to build networks between international students and other campus organizations.

- Participate in statewide initiatives that emphasize expansion of economic, cultural, and social ties with such nations as Mexico, Canada, and Japan.

The development of distinctive undergraduate experience at Indiana State University must provide opportunities for increased attention to issues of diversity, new pedagogues which permit collaborative learning in the classroom, and increased interaction among all faculty, students, and staff. It is through the enhancement and awareness of ethnic, cultural, and international values that Indiana State University will more vigorously fulfill its commitment to academic excellence and equal educational opportunity. This effort in turn will foster a greater sense of shared community among all of its constituencies.

Strategic Goal Seven. Promotion of an Interdisciplinary Culture

ISU will be a national model for interdisciplinary instruction, research, and public service.

The Indiana State baccalaureate degree rests upon an integration of knowledge from many General Education disciplines as preparation for citizenship as well as upon a mastery of knowledge in the major discipline. Increasingly, however, the world of work has come to require collaborative effort and an integration of knowledge across disciplinary and subdisciplinary lines. Societal needs, as well as job performance, dictate an understanding of the interrelatedness of ideas, processes, and actions. The conventional expectations of the University curriculum—that faculty will teach their specialized knowledge in discrete courses and students will integrate that knowledge independently—are

now legitimately being called into question. Similarly, the assumption that specialized research produced by University faculty will be assimilated, integrated, and applied by non-academic generalists to larger issues and problems in society has been challenged. The integration, assimilation, and application of specialized knowledge must be undertaken by faculty of the progressive public university and incorporated in their teaching as well as their research.

Indiana State University faculty members give substantial indication of their willingness to expand their involvement in interdisciplinary course offerings, research, and service to society. The strategic plans of the Schools and the College include many references to such interest, and the University now must undertake a concerted effort to stimulate, encourage, and support that development. To that end, the University will:

- Encourage formal and informal relationships among faculty to pursue interdisciplinary connections in existing undergraduate and graduate courses, programs, and research projects.

- Give priority to the development of new and strengthening of existing interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary courses and degree programs such as international business, computer integrated manufacturing and business, corrections and law enforcement, several allied health fields, international and cross-cultural studies, women and gender studies, gerontology, bio-technology, problems of rural America, environmental studies, ecology and conservation science, and health psychology. Many of these programs can be developed by current faculty by integrating courses in existing programs.

- Address the organizational impediments to collaborative work across disciplines, and facilitate, encourage, and reward such effort.

- Seek external funding in support of curricular innovation, scholarship, and collaborative centers in interdisciplinary fields.

- Encourage students to pursue double majors and minors and to spend one or two semesters in study abroad programs.

Although the integration of knowledge by faculty and students runs counter to century-long trends in academic instruction and scholarship, Indiana State University seems

poised intellectually and organizationally to undertake the task. The strategies outlined above can move the institution toward a goal which will work to its advantage and to the benefit of the society at large.

Strategic Goal Eight. Enhancement of Intellectual and Creative Expression in West Central Indiana

ISU will be known for fostering intellectual and creative activity within the University and in partnership with the larger community.

The University has sought to support creative expression in the arts by faculty and students and to provide as an important element of its educational function a wide range of intellectual, artistic, and creative performance. In recognition of its unique responsibility to foster and promote intellectual and artistic creativity in the larger community, the University has sought to include the citizens of the Wabash Valley and the state in its cultural community, and has contributed to the support of city and area organizations sponsoring creative effort. In furtherance of this commitment, the University will:

• Stimulate intellectual discussions through the University Speakers Series, the Michael M. Williamson Memorial Residency/Lecture Series, the Provost Minority Visiting Scholars Program, the Annual Pan-African Conference, the Schick Lecture Series, and other forums for the expression and evaluation of ideas.

• Sustain and enhance on-campus support of the arts such as the University Convocation Series, the Contemporary Music Festival, Department of Theater productions and SummerStage, student and faculty recitals and exhibits, Turman Gallery exhibits, Hulman Center concerts, ISU Friends of Jazz concerts, Afro-American Cultural Center exhibits and performances, the Ebony Majestic Choir, and state, regional and national conferences.

• Expand its partnerships with such local and area cultural organizations as Arts Illiana, the Terre Haute Symphony, the Sheldon Swope Art Museum, and the Vigo County Library. The University will seek especially to encourage the building of a greater appreciation for the arts and creative expression in the larger community through participation of events both on the campus and throughout the Wabash Valley.

• Seek expanded funding of artistic, literary, and creative expression through collaborative proposals among University departments and with local organizations to such agencies as the Indiana and National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities, the Lilly Endowment, and private charitable foundations.

• Display art and ISU history throughout the campus to enhance the aesthetics of the academic community.

YEAR TWO: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

During the period from January to July, 1994, the President will discuss the completed University Strategic Plan with the Board of Trustees and will distribute copies of it to the campus. The Provost will begin implementation of selected academic initiatives in support of the strategic goals. By mid-March the academic deans will present to the Provost for his review and for discussion with the vice presidents and the Deans Council revisions of their initial School/College strategic plans. These revised plans will reflect the comments and suggestions provided by the President and Provost and will address the strategic goals in the adopted University plan. In their annual reports, the deans will present to the Provost for his review their accomplishments to date as well as their priorities for implementation of their plans for the 1994-95 academic year. The Provost and vice presidents will provide the President with progress reports on activities in their administrative units which support the strategic goals of the University. During the spring and summer of 1994, the University Plan and the School/College plans will inform the preparation of the institutional biennial budget request for 1995-97.

During the fall semester, 1994, the Provost, the vice presidents, and the deans will complete for campus review and implementation the Academic Master Plan, the Physical Facilities Plan, the Student Life Plan, the Institutional Development Plan, and the University Enrollment Plan.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTING ACADEMIC INITIATIVES

Implementation of the strategic goals during a time of constrained resources will require the University to select carefully the activities to which it gives immediate support. During the next several years, the initiatives which best reflect the following criteria will receive highest institutional priority for reallocation of faculty, staff, and financial resources:

- Central to the mission of the University;
- Consistent with one or more of the University's strategic goals;
- Performed at a high level of quality and result in increased state, national and international recognition and prominence;
- Developed in response to demonstrable societal or environmental needs and built on existing institutional strengths;
- Capable of attracting external financial support;
- Internally coherent, thereby contributing to the fulfillment of multiple University missions;
- Internally interactive, resulting in interorganizational and multidisciplinary activities;
- Financially feasible and responsible; and,
- Likely to produce measurable outcomes and have a high positive impact on both the campus and external communities.

ACADEMIC INITIATIVES IN SUPPORT OF STRATEGIC GOALS

The planning conferences, forums, and academic unit strategic planning documents have proposed a number of initiatives to begin the implementation of the strategic goals. The Provost reports the following initiatives are under development or under way:

Initiative 1. Revision of University Statements of Mission and Vision

The President will initiate a campus process for review and revision of the University Mission Statement and approval by the Board of Trustees. The revised statement will incorporate the goals of the Strategic Plan and will reflect the format established by the Commission for Higher Education. An accompanying statement of institutional vision, consistent with the Strategic Plan, will also be developed to identify long-term institutional goals and aspirations.

Initiative 2. Development of the Academic Master Plan

The Provost will work during the next twelve months with deans, department chairpersons, and departments, School/College, and University curriculum committees to prepare an Academic Master Plan which will address future academic priorities, strategies for resource allocation and reallocation, staffing plans, and administration reorganization for the University and for each of the academic units. To enable the University to remain current with the expansion of knowledge, changing student interests, and employer needs, a central feature of the plan will be an Academic Program Plan which will identify new degree programs and courses to be developed, existing programs to be revised, and programs to be consolidated, curtailed, or discontinued.

Initiative 3. Enrollment Planning and Management

The Provost is currently discussing with the Deans Council and the vice presidents the feasibility of establishing in the spring semester a University-wide Enrollment Planning Team to develop a University Enrollment Plan. The goal of the plan will be to ensure during the current decade a student enrollment sufficient to support the academic program base, to provide sound financial support, and to serve the needs of the region, state and nation. Each of the Schools and the College will address enrollment planning and management issues such as student recruitment and retention in their strategic plans.

Student recruitment for the current year was enhanced by the addition of $100,000 to graduate assistant stipends. $50,000 has been added to the base budget in support of recruitment efforts with special emphasis on under-represented and/or high ability students. The undergraduate scholarship program is under review, as is the graduate student stipend and fee remission program.

Significant progress in negotiations with IVTC for program articulation with ISU has been made during the current year, and completion of a comprehensive agreement between the two institutions is expected in 1994.

The Dean of Continuing Education/Instructional Services has been charged by the Provost to work with School/College deans to review and revise the summer school courses to expand service to previously unserved student groups.

Initiative 4. Enhancement of Undergraduate Education

The Director of Admissions has been appointed to chair the First-Year Student Experience Committee, charged by the Provost to develop strategies for introducing entering students more effectively to the community of learning and for preparing them fully to realize their talents and abilities.

The University-wide Advisement Coordinators Committee, chaired by the Registrar, has been charged by the Provost to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the advisement system before the end of the spring semester. The Director of Student Academic Services will conduct student surveys and interviews to gain student perspectives, and other members of the committee will collect information from faculty, staff, and administrators. The registrar has been charged by the Provost to chair a small task force to develop a system for faculty advisers to enroll their advisees in classes through faculty office computers.

Several offices which provide advising and support services to select groups of the first- and second-year students have been consolidated at the beginning of this year in the Office of Student Academic Services and will be located in a single, integrated office complex in Gillum Hall before the end of the current year.

The Provost has charged the Deans of business, education, and graduate studies to work with members of the School of Graduate Studies committee on interdisciplinary education and members of Project 30 to plan a forum during the spring semester which will identify the enablers

and inhibitors influencing the delivery of interdisciplinary education on the campus.

An International Business Concentration offered by the School of Business and the College of Arts and Sciences was approved in 1993; a Biomedical Electronics Technology program in the School of Technology and the College of Arts and Sciences has recently been approved.

In support of multicultural and international values on campus, a steering committee for infusing cultural diversity into the curriculum has been established and funded to support faculty participation in the project; the University Speakers Series has focused on enhancing diversity on campus in this year's program; a set of procedures for extending invitations to visiting scholars has been developed; faculty have conducted research and given scholarly presentations in Africa, China, and India last summer; and the Provost and the Deans Council announced in the fall the implementation of a Minority Scholars Speakers Program.

Initiative 5. Faculty and Staff Development

A Teaching and Learning Center is being created with $100,000 in base-budget funding earmarked for the center. The Provost has appointed a steering committee to recommend during the spring semester a plan for the design, development, and implementation of the center.

The University has applied for an Association of American Colleges Faculty Development and Curriculum Transformation Grant.

A group of faculty, administrators, and support staff attended the Educating One-Third of a Nation Conference and will share with the campus plans for incorporating multicultural perspectives in the curriculum and in University operation.

The Vice President and Secretary of the University, together with the Vice President for Student Affairs, has introduced the staff development programs *Connections* and *Legendary Service*. Under the direction of Human Resources, development and implementation of a comprehensive plan for staff development will be undertaken in 1994.

An expanded recognition of contributions to the University, to the community, and to the professional world will be implemented to enhance the service of faculty and staff and to reward their outstanding performance.

Initiative 6. Academic Resources Development

In a response to a charge by the Provost, the Dean of Graduate Studies has established a task force of successful university grant recipients to prepare by January a report which will identify campus enablers and inhibitors to developing grant proposals. A new position in the Office of Research has been authorized to enhance assistance to faculty in the preparation of successful grant proposals. The Provost will discuss with the Dean of Graduate Studies and her task force additional ways to support development of additional external academic resources.

Initiative 7. Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness

The General Education Program Review Committee, chaired by the Director of General Education, is conducting a comprehensive review and evaluation of the general education program. A report of the committee's work will be submitted during the spring semester.

The Provost will appoint a program committee to work with the University Conference Center to plan for spring, 1994, a campus conference on academic assessment to draw upon the expertise which a number of faculty have acquired at national workshops and conferences on the subject.

The existing institutional system of degree program review will be reviewed and revised during the next calendar year.

The Provost and the Vice President for Planning and Budgets are working in concert to institute assessment and measurement of academic and administrative effort. A University information management system which will support resource allocation and reallocation and reports on faculty workload and productivity, scholarly research, and public service is being developed by the Office of the Provost, the newly-appointed Director of Planning and Institutional Analysis, and a newly-created Advisory Committee for Institutional Analysis composed of two deans, two department chairpersons, two members of the Faculty Senate, and representatives from the Offices of the Provost and each vice president. A comparable information

management system is being created to evaluate administrative services.

The Provost and the Director of University Planning and Institutional Analysis will study the feasibility for reinstating the National Student Satisfaction Survey or explore other means of assessing student attitudes toward their educational experience.

Initiative 8. Consolidation of Campus Computing and Information Services

The Board of Trustees recently approved the President's plan for consolidating computing services and telecommunications under the Dean of Libraries who now holds the additional title of Associate Vice President for Information Services in the Office of Academic Affairs.

The Associate Vice President for Information Services and Dean of Libraries has been charged by the Provost to conduct an assessment of Computing Services and Facilities and propose a plan for the reorganization of these services. The President has made $2,000,000 in one-time moneys available for improvement and enhancement of computing in support of teaching, learning, and scholarship during the current academic year.

Additional advances in computing include the opening of the recently-completed Student Computing Complex and the implementation of a multiple-year, multi-million dollar program to improve institutional computing hardware and software under the oversight of a newly-formed Committee for Administrative Software and Hardware.

SCHOOL/COLLEGE PLANNING

Initiative 9. Revision of School/College Strategic Plans

The revised strategic plans of the Schools and the College will be submitted by the deans to the Provost in mid-March and will address the following topics:

• The University Strategic Plan: contributions each academic unit will make to each of the eight strategic goals.

• Institutional resources: strategies of reallocation, redeployment of faculty resources, consolidation of structure and services, and external fund development for meeting unit goals and priorities in a period of financial constraints and stable or declining staffing and budgets.

• Academic programs: new programs to be proposed for development and the sources of funds to support them; existing programs to be developed as "areas of distinctiveness" and the extent and source of supporting resources necessary; existing programs likely to experience little change in the near future; and existing programs which should be consolidated, contracted, or eliminated.

• Student services: plans to support student learning and growth, retention, and graduation, particularly the enhancement of the first year experience, the improvement of academic advising, and the assessment of student learning.

• Faculty development: plans for supporting faculty growth and development in teaching, scholarship, and public service.

Following the Provost's review of the School/College plans and their discussion by the vice presidents and the Deans' Council, the deans will develop priorities for implementation of the plans in the 1994-95 academic year.

ACADEMIC SUPPORT INITIATIVES

Other initiatives which complement and support implementation of the strategic goals are the responsibility of vice presidents and their staffs who report the following initiatives and actions currently under development or under way:

Initiative 10. Institutional Marketing and Image Promotion

A coordinated Institutional Development Plan is being designed with faculty, administrative, and student participation to promote and market the University. Particular emphasis will be placed upon adopting a coherent plan to sustain this effort across a number of constituencies including potential students, alumni, friends, parents, opinion leaders, news sources, and coordinating and legislative bodies.

Initiative 11. Institutional Resource Development

Financial Planning: Vice Presidents for Business Affairs, University Advancement, and Planning and Budgets. Financial planning models using national university benchmarks are being identified and are currently being utilized to support a soundly managed economic future for the University. Faculty, alumni, students, and friends will be engaged in this important process of analysis to ensure their understanding and support of efforts necessary to provide for the financial future.

Fund Development: Vice President for University Advancement. The Indiana State University Foundation Board has adopted a plan which revises its mission, its articles of incorporation, and its bylaws to enhance the Foundation's generation of funds from private sources in support of the University. Increases in annual giving, capital giving, and planned/deferred giving programs will sustain existing academic programs, allow for the establishment of new programs consistent with the mission of the University, support student scholarships, and upgrade academic equipment and facilities.

Initiative 12. Student Life and Residential Life Plan

It is essential to the enrollment, academic, and financial futures of the University to maintain the most attractive and needs-based residential climate. The Division of Student Affairs has initiated a broad spectrum of activities which seek to address the physical condition of the residence halls, enhance personal safety on the campus, augment student health and career services, expand connections between the classroom and student campus organizations, and enhance student programming in the Student Union, Student Life, and Residential Life.

A long-range Residential Life Facilities Plan is being developed to identify programmatic and facility needs and directions of campus housing over the next 20 years. An architectural firm has been selected to provide analysis and technical expertise for potential renovation and facility development projects.

An escort program has been developed and implemented by the Office of Safety and Security to enhance personal safety on the campus.

A study is underway to examine the option of contracting for all student health services. The inclusion of faculty and staff in the health promotion program is being examined.

The Career Center is coordinating on- and off-campus employment opportunities for students, expanding co-op and internship experiences for students, integrating student employment with student career development, and addressing career development issues in the classrooms of various academic departments.

Programming initiatives under way in Student Life, Residential Life, the Student Union Board, the Afro-American Cultural Center, Women's Resource Center, and International Student Services include cooperative participation with the General Education in Action Committee, involvement in the First-Year Student Experience Committee, and the development of programs to: encourage faculty and student interaction in the residence halls, integrate academic and social experiences in Student Life and the Student Union, address issues of multiculturalism and diversity on campus and in the society, and expand involvement of international and commuter students in campus life.

Community initiatives include the delivery of programs to public schools and agencies by Student Health Promotion and Peer Health Facilitators, and the providing of leadership training, programs, and workshops to regional public schools and agencies by students of the Leadership Task Force.

The Office of International Student Services is exploring ways and means of intensifying recruitment of additional international students and developing expanding fund raising development and alumni relations with international graduates of the University.

Student Life is developing plans for revising the student conduct system to expand the use of educational sanctions and community service.

Intercollegiate Athletics has instituted plans for compliance with gender equity requirements in athletics.

Initiative 13. Facilities Master Plan Revision

The University Facilities Master Plan, adopted by the Board of Trustees in 1986, is now being reviewed and

updated to address the needs of the University into the next century. Phase II of the plan is guided by the following goals:

• To facilitate and enhance the academic mission of the University. Academic functions will be centrally located on campus. New buildings to meet current and developing programs will be identified. Remote campus locations will be evaluated to ensure accommodation of academic programs, continuing education, professional development activities, and economic advancement programs.

• To improve the physical ambiance and quality of campus life. Pedestrian linkages among campus functions will be emphasized. Campus traffic patterns will be altered to reduce the impact of automobiles by closing selected streets and placing parking on the perimeter. Campus accessibility and safety in compliance with federal and state regulations will be improved. Recreation and athletic facilities will be developed on the perimeter of the campus.

• To establish stronger lines of physical integrity and cohesiveness of the campus. Planning will identify the most efficient use of existing buildings. Existing buildings which are outdated or economically unadaptable to future program needs will be razed. Use patterns which enhance natural affinities among academic, administrative, and student activities will be reinforced. Existing boundaries of the main campus will receive continuing assessment to determine long-range land needs.

• To strengthen the student sense of campus culture and community. Residence hall facilities will be updated to enhance the residential nature of the campus. (See Academic Support Initiative on page 28.)

• To enhance the internal and external aesthetics and ambiance of the campus. Art and records of the University's history will be selected and displayed throughout the campus.

When completed, Phase II will incorporate recommendations for facilities improvements from academic and administrative units and will be reviewed and revised on a regular basis in the future by appropriate university groups to ensure it complements the other planning processes of the University.

Initiative 14. Improvement of the Effectiveness and Efficiency of University Operations

To encourage the most prudent use of scarce University resources and to improve University services, an Administrative Cost Review, Quality Analysis and Continuous Improvement Task Force has been created. The goals of the Task Force are:

• To enhance services to students.

• To increase administrative productivity.

• To contain university costs.

• To recognize individuals who contribute to quality functioning of the University.

The Task Force has broad representation from the campus and will focus on facilities, utilities, craft services, technical services, administrative services, financial services, and human resources. It will design a system to routinely monitor, measure, and identify savings which may be reallocated to more pressing academic and administrative needs of the University.

FUTURE REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

The Strategic Plan will receive campus review, evaluation of progress achieved on the goals and initiatives, and modification as circumstances warrant during the even-numbered years of each biennium.