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Commissioners
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
3624 Market Street, 2nd Floor West
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Commissioners:

The Cheyney University community appreciates the work of the Commission and the Visiting Team that came to campus in early December 2010. The team is to be thanked for their attention and interest in our University. We are especially grateful for the commendations, as they truly reflect a great deal of effort on the part of many people at Cheyney.

However, we fundamentally disagree with their conclusion regarding Cheyney University’s compliance with MSCHE Standards. Cheyney University maintains that it is in full compliance with all 14 Standards for Accreditation, as defined by Middle States in its Characteristics of Excellence (2009, online version). More specifically, the institution maintains that it demonstrates compliance with Standards 2 and 3. The faculty, staff, alumni, and significant stakeholders request that the Commissioners review this document, and the other supporting documents, and find in the University’s favor by removing the Warning label from our accreditation status.

This response is organized into two main sections. The first provides a short summary of previous steps Cheyney University has taken to demonstrate compliance. The second provides specific discussion of the recent special team report and why we believe that report is fundamentally flawed in its analysis. Thus, this response presents evidence that should furnish a solid foundation for the Commissioners to remove the Warning from Cheyney University of Pennsylvania.
Enclosed with this response are the September 1, 2010 Monitoring Report, the University’s response regarding errors of fact to the November 30/December 1, 2010 small team MSCHE visit, the University’s Strategic Plan—Pathways to Excellence, the University’s Financial Plan, and a sample of monthly status reports that measure the institution’s progress towards the University’s Strategic Plan.

The commendations and observations of the MSCHE visiting team made during its visit to Cheyney University demonstrate that the stakeholders of the University are dedicated to continuous improvement, to employing various assessment strategies and benchmarks to measure our progress, and to continuously fueling institutional renewal. Further, as a member of the State System of Higher Education in Pennsylvania, Cheyney University participates in a Performance Funding system that uses empirical data to measure Cheyney University’s continuous improvement in areas such as graduation rates, retention, enrollment demographics, and financial indicators. The performance funding matrix compares the University’s empirical indicators on several essential and interrelated outcomes to prior performance, the performance of peers, and the performance of other institutions in the State System.

**Background of MSCHE activities**

About a year prior to the arrival of President Howard-Vital, MSCHE notified Cheyney University on June 22, 2006 that its accreditation had been reaffirmed and a Periodic Review Report would be due in 2011. This reaffirmation occurred even though there was evidence of financial issues related to policies, procedures, and controls. These problems were documented in a series of audits by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and other entities, and were sufficiently serious as to place the University in some risk. On September 24, 2008, MSCHE contacted Cheyney University and requested that the University review its compliance with Standards 1-7. MSCHE expressed a concern that there might be impropriety at the University regarding appropriation of financial resources. On October 14, 2008, President Michelle Howard-Vital responded for the University affirming that “neither the Performance Audit nor the Compliance Review reveals any findings of misappropriation of funds.” President Howard-Vital traced comments alleging misappropriation of funds to remarks made by disgruntled employees; these unsubstantiated remarks appeared in local newspapers. Further reviews and analyses supported the President’s statements.

On November 20, 2008, MSCHE responded to the October 14, 2008 communication from Cheyney University by requesting a Monitoring Report by March 1, 2009. The Monitoring Report required that the University further demonstrate, through documentation, that there was a comprehensive strategic plan that linked planning to decision-making and the budgeting process. On March 1, the University submitted a Monitoring Report, and on May 4-5, 2009 a
small MSCHE team visited Cheyney University. On June 25, 2009, the MSCHE team thanked the University and informed us that the Commission would act on the report at its November 2009 meeting. On November 19, 2009 MSCHE acted to warn Cheyney University that its accreditation may be in jeopardy because of a lack of evidence that the institution was currently in compliance with Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal), Standard 3 (Institutional Resources), and Standard 6 (Integrity). On September 1, 2010, Cheyney University submitted a Monitoring Report, with appendices, to demonstrate that the University is in compliance with Standards 2, 3, and 6 and has responded appropriately to specific actions recommended by the May 2009 MSCHE visiting team. An Outline for Developing the Strategic Plan was included as an appendix in the Monitoring Report; this outline summarized major elements of the planning process and highlighted a list of major documents reviewed. However, it is critical to note that the planning process for new strategic direction and institutional renewal began in the 2007-2008 year when President Howard-Vital assumed the role of college president.

During the first year of her tenure, Dr. Howard-Vital reviewed earlier studies of Cheyney University such as the one written by the Commission on the Vitality of Cheyney University (1994) and an earlier enrollment management study conducted by the Pappas group (2003). Moreover, President Howard-Vital engaged in conversations with campus constituents, members of the Board of Governors, the Council of Trustees, legislators, representatives of secondary educational institutions, and alumni. From these discussions, President Howard-Vital composed a Vision Statement (January 2008). This vision statement reflected the institution’s legacy, its strengths and shortcomings, the educational needs of the region, and the potential for transitioning the University into a premier institution of higher education that would help to resolve some of the problems of the region. It is important to note that the 2008 Vision Statement was circulated to a wide range of constituencies and refined as feedback was received from various stakeholders. A refined Vision Statement was circulated for further input in September 2008. The 2008 Vision Statement was also reviewed by the Strategic Planning Council during the process of reviewing the earlier strategic plan. This process is very similar to that used by other colleges and universities in Middle States, and has been determined to be in compliance with Standard 2 for other institutions. We argue that same determination must be applied to Cheyney University under a fairness approach.

As evidence of continual renewal of the strategic plan, steps were taken to implement suggestions from the May 2009 Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, and Students of Cheyney University submitted by the MSCHE visiting team. These actions are addressed in the Monitoring Report of September 1, 2010. The chart that follows appeared in the Monitoring Report and documented the actions taken by Cheyney University to address the concerns outlined in the report. These steps clearly demonstrate Cheyney University’s compliance with
Standard 2 through the solicitation and implementation of feedback from key constituencies, as well as explicitly linking the plan with the financial steps that were taken.

| Development and implementation of a Strategic Plan. | On February 19, 2009, the President charged the Strategic Planning Council to initiate a series of actions to review, assess and revise the University’s strategic plan. University constituents met weekly, and collected data about the views and needs of the community through survey research. The survey research was evaluated, and findings were incorporated into revisions of the University Strategic Plan. The strategic goals were reviewed by the Council of Trustees and adopted in spring 2010. |
| Development of a long-range Financial Plan, tied to the University’s Strategic Plan. | A Financial Plan was completed for Cheyney University, which incorporates data projections based on historical trends, factors related to the current economic climate, the financial circumstances of the University, and strategic goals outlined in the Strategic Plan. |
| The Financial Plan guides budget development. | The University’s governance structure includes a budget committee that is charged with the responsibility of matching financial resources with its strategic goals. This representative body utilizes templates and a budget-hearing process. This process occurred in the Spring 2010. |
| The University utilizes an “all funds” budget approach and incorporates all revenues to maximize goals. | The University’s budgeting process integrates all forms of revenue, including state and federal appropriations, grants, tuition and fees revenue, gifts and miscellaneous revenues. Institutional priorities drive the procurement of grants, and these funds contribute an essential portion of the university’s all funds budget. |
| The University’s Strategic Plan links long-range planning to decision making. | The University’s Strategic Plan guides the University community as it makes critical decisions on resource allocation, academic programming, student support activities, facilities, development activities, and strategic initiatives. |
· EX. In accordance with Cheyney University’s Strategic Plan Goal 2: Advance Student Achievement and Success, Cheyney University has decided to transition to a University College model that would be unique to its needs and that would augment student engagement in the freshman and


| Integrated systems between the Office of Financial Aid, the Office of the Bursar, and the Office of the Registrar. | · EX. In accordance with Goal 2: Advance Student Achievement and Success, the university’s vice presidents for Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Finance and Administration developed an Enrollment Management Committee to study policy, practice, and processes relative to the recruitment, admissions, enrollment, registration, retention processes and ways to further implement improvements.  
· EX. In accordance with Goal 3: Manage and secure fiscal resources and facilities needed to enhance institutional effectiveness, in the Division of Institutional Advancement, long range planning and programs of the division are directly guided by the goals of the University’s strategic plan. More specifically, the Office of Institutional Advancement developed a Comprehensive Action plan in July 2009 which emanated from the president’s vision, the University’s strategic goals, the University's Academic Plan (2009), and the president’s vision to develop centers of excellence.  
· Personnel in all three areas were charged to establish a “Registration Team” to manage and integrate all facets of the student registration process. New systems were implemented in all three areas to improve the level of services delivered.  
· PowerFAIDS Software is being procured to assist in awarding, communicating, reporting, and tracking financial aid. PowerFAIDS is from the College Board, and is recognized as a leader in financial aid software and services.  
· Financial Aid awarding is now managed by Cheyney University Personnel.  
As outlined in a Letter of Understanding between Cheyney University and the PASSHE system, all financial aid processes were transitioned from the PASSHE system to Cheyney University, as of March 11, 2010. The Office of Financial Aid is now operating under a set of fully revised and vetted financial aid policies and procedures. |
| Personnel Vacancies for key positions have been filled. | · The Director of Financial Aid position was filled by Chris Hanlon on September 29, 2009.  
· The Vice President for Finance and Administration position was filled by Gerald Coleman on June 1, 2009.  
· The Vice President for Student Affairs position was filled by Suzanne Phillips on September 8, 2009. |
| A series of training sessions were offered the Cheyney University personnel on administrative software. | Training sessions were offered throughout the spring 2010 semester. |
| Revised the University’s Enrollment Management Plan. | The Enrollment Management plan operates in concert with the University’s Strategic Plan and Financial Plan. It incorporates a marketing plan, goals, strategies and tactics for goal attainment. This plan was included in the Monitoring Report. |
| Enhanced Retention Efforts | The University has transitioned to a University College model that augments student engagement in the freshman and sophomore years. The University College model focuses on increased graduation rates. |
| The Office of Financial Aid now operates under a set of fully revised and vetted financial aid policies and procedures. | Policies have been reviewed by the PASSHE system, and upon review, enabled the transition of financial aid processing from the PASSHE system to Cheyney University. |
| Policy Review Process | The President and the vice presidents took responsibility for leading the efforts to review and revise policies within their divisions. As policies were updated, the information was shared at a number of policy retreats held throughout the year, reviewed and formally approved by the Cabinet, and presented for approval to the Council of Trustees. |

The next section will specifically address two things: specific issues raised by the December 2010 Visiting Team and the broader steps Cheyney University took to ensure compliance with both Standards 2 and 3.
Specific Refutation of Visiting Team Concerns

In our view, the Visiting Team’s report has a number of critical flaws. The two most important are (1) a failure of the Team to recognize the comments they made regarding what remains to be done to achieve compliance are steps actually taken already by Cheyney University, and (2) a tendency to be overly prescriptive in its comments in a way that goes well beyond the intent of the Standards.

As context, the section on interpreting and applying Standards in The Characteristics of Excellence, states:

a. “The particular way in which a Standard is evidenced may vary, consistent with differences in institutional mission and purpose.”

“In light of this, neither the institution nor evaluators should use the Fundamental Elements as a simple checklist. Both the institution and evaluators must consider the totality that is created by these elements and any other relevant institutional information or analysis. Where an institution does not demonstrate evidence of a particular Fundamental Element, the institution may demonstrate through alternative information and analysis that it meets the standard.”

We will return to this central premise a bit later in this response.

Standard 2: Strategic Plan

As summarized earlier, the University created its current Strategic Plan through an inclusive process that began in the 2007-2008 academic year. Also as noted earlier, Cheyney University’s monthly reports are employed to measure the institution’s progress towards its strategic goals. These reports provide an earlier warning of difficulty in the spirit of continuous improvement.

The Visiting Team did not acknowledge these efforts, past and ongoing. For example, the Team reports, “On the actual strategic plan, there is no timetable or assigned roles.” However, a careful reading of the Plan indicates that the time table for the Strategic Plan is 2010-2015 as it so states in the first line in the Strategic Plan.

Further, in the Strategic Plan itself, there are numerous references to dates and to the fact that Fall 2010 data would be used as baseline data. For example, in the Academic Affairs divisional plan, it is reported that the assessment of the outcomes of the general education curriculum would commence with Educational Testing Services (ETS) in the 2010-2011 academic year.
As additional context, the Plan is being used now in shaping departmental and unit plans. Specifically, the Monitoring Report states, “Three academic departments have already submitted departmental strategic plans to the Office of the Provost for review and comment. These departmental plans will be made available on-site to the visiting team. Further, unit/departmental strategic plans will be employed to guide the work of individual employees and inform supervisors of progress towards goals as part of annual evaluations. It is expected that the strategic planning process and the resultant divisional plans that are delineated in this Monitoring Report will guide the University’s future actions and result in a highly effective and competitive institution.” The development of departmental strategic plans clearly assigns responsibility and accountability for the goals of the strategic plan. Moreover, there are five divisional plans included in the Strategic Plan that comprises our strategic framework: Office of the President, Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Office of Student Affairs and Student Life, Office of Institutional Advancement, and Finance and Administration. Furthermore, the team was informed during the site visit that each unit was writing its strategic plan. Thus, the work of the strategic plan is in the process of being “drilled down” to the individual position descriptions, as stated in the Monitoring Report and reported verbally to the team. Through the human resources unit at the University, all positions descriptions are currently being reviewed to insure that there is a significant correlation between position descriptions, unit strategic plans, divisional strategic plans, and the overall Strategic Plan.

The Team report also stated, “The process included relatively little environmental scanning. Without adequate external scanning, the institution cannot prepare appropriately for the dynamic environment in which it exists. For example, there is no evidence that any significant research on workforce needs was undertaken although it is cited as one of the three major components of the plan.” The University provide the following information to the Team, which it repeats here, that supports our position that environmental scanning not only occurred, but continues, and is essential for us to respond to the needs of the workforce:

- During the 2008-2009 academic year a consultant was hired to develop a marketing plan for the University, based on environmental scanning, that would develop an appropriate University brand, and help position the University competitively among its peers.
- During the summer 2008, President Howard-Vital hosted a retreat for members of the University community. The consultant facilitated a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats and form of environmental scanning). One outcome of this process will occur this academic year (2010-11); based on demonstrated need, the first online courses will be offered.
- The consultant worked with the University community for an entire year, assisted by a Noel Levitz consultant for the University community. Among the other outcomes were a
new brand for athletics, the development of a modified style guide, and a marketing plan.

- The Strategic Planning Council reviewed President Howard-Vital’s September 2008 Vision Statement. The President’s Vision Statement was also shared with the Board of Governors, the Council of Trustees, and legislators. They and the broader University community presented an internal analysis of the University’s strengths and weaknesses and an analysis of the role that Cheyney University could play in the Philadelphia region (which includes portions of Delaware and New Jersey) to increase the college-going rate and the college graduation rate among African Americans and first generation college students. This process led to the development of the concept of centers of excellence.

- As evidence of the Plan’s implementation, the University is currently pursuing two centers of excellence: Center of Excellence in Communications Media, Fine Arts, and Entertainment Arts, and a Center of Excellence in Applied and Natural Sciences.

- The Monitoring Report states that a survey was designed and administered to gain feedback for the Strategic Planning Council. It states, “The survey was forwarded to approximately 1,000 staff, alumni, legislators, and other stakeholders. Approximately, 250 persons responded to the survey. The survey asked respondents to comment on specific academic directions for the development of centers of excellence. Thus, the survey also furnished empirical data for future analysis.”

- The Strategic Plan, under Goal 1 - Strengthen Academic Excellence, includes the objective to “Modify existing programs and implement new programs that are relevant to the demands of the 21st Century.” page 10. The strategies that reflect both continual feedback and ongoing assessment are:
  1. Continuously conduct reviews of the University’s academic programs in accordance with the approved cycle/schedule agreed on by the University and PASSHE.
  2. Create new professional/applied programs in Natural and Applied Sciences that meet state, regional and national needs.
  3. Establish joint academic and non-academic programs with other system universities.
  4. Establish a center of excellence in science and technology education.
  5. Provide professional development and support services to improve student success in core introductory courses.
  6. Increase student engagement via service learning and the establishment of learning communities.
  7. Identify mentors for every student.
  8. Provide internships for students related to programs that reflect student career choices.
  9. Provide mechanisms, programs, and support services needed to better ensure career-readiness and/or readiness for graduate school.

The program review processes required by the State System, as well as Board of Governors policies regarding assessment of student learning, require appropriate data
be collected, analyzed, and used in program improvement. Such data are also required for the Performance Funding assessment and review. See Attachment 1.

The team also affirmed that “Certain critical topics are missing from the strategic plan (i.e., the role of the urban site, distance learning, and new academic programs under consideration). The plan includes no contingencies if enrollment does not materialize. The goal of 2000 FTE by 2015 may be difficult to attain. The plan also includes no contingencies if the goal of $9 million to be raised in 3-5 years contained within the Comprehensive Fundraising Plan is not realized.”

In response, the University responds that:

- The role of the Urban Site is discussed in the Strategic Plan on pages 32 and 35. It is difficult at this time to provide more detail, especially in a strategic plan, as the development of the Urban Site is part of a much larger legal settlement being negotiated with the U.S. Office of Civil Rights (OCR) as a part of a decades-long process between the federal government and the Commonwealth. Cheyney University does not set the agenda for nor does it control the outcome of this negotiation process, even though the Urban Site is a central part of the proposed settlement.

- Online courses (distance learning) are mentioned in the Strategic Plan on page 35. As noted earlier, online courses will be offered during the 2010-11 academic year for the first time. Again, the specific mix of online courses and programs are likely to be part of the overall OCR settlement agreement, and may be out of Cheyney’s direct control.

- In the division plan for the Office of the President, page 23, the Strategic Plan states, “Goal 1: Strengthen Academic Quality and Excellence: Objective – Work with Academic Affairs to develop Centers of Excellence that are interdisciplinary, encourage grant support, serve as internship placements, focus public service, and enhance the academic quality of the University.’” The Strategic Plan, in that same section, also states that the expected outcomes are two centers of excellence in Communications Media, Fine Arts, and Entertainment Arts, and in Natural and Applied Sciences. These centers are intended to respond to the workforce needs in the region (as documented in the environmental scan discussed earlier and on the University’s historic strengths), help recruit talented students and faculty, and build a more positive image for Cheyney University which was identified as an internal threat in the September 2008 Vision Statement of President Howard-Vital. Moreover, it should be noted that the aforementioned centers of excellence are supported in the capital master plan by a refurbished theatre and a new science building in 2012.

- The University reviews its strategic goals and strategies monthly. If it is apparent that the goals are not attainable within the projected timeline, the goals and strategies will be recalibrated to respond to the new realities.
The team also stated, “No assessment of the planning process itself appears to have been built into the plan...Develop and implement a mechanism to assess the effectiveness of the planning process.” During the December Team visit, various University staff outlined the following assessment strategies for the Strategic Plan:

- Monthly status reports that are prepared by all managers and submitted through the vice presidents to the president to monitor progress towards the strategic goals. Sample monthly reports were provided in the document room for the Team during their visit. We can only surmise that they did not examine them.
- The PASSHE Performance Funding Matrix measures the University’s progress and compares its progress to its own prior performance, peers, and to the other PASSHE institutions in key areas such as graduation rates, retention, enrollment, and other quality variables that link to the University’s strategic goals. The revised Performance Funding Matrix, which will be implemented in summer 2011, requires each university to include aspects of their strategic plan in metrics that will partially determine base-level funding. Tying progress on the strategic plan to base-level funding goes well beyond the minimum requirements of Standard 2.
- During the site visit, the University discussed its plan to implement TracDAT by the end of the academic year to help measure progress towards the Strategic Planning goals. TracDAT is a software program designed to support the assessment needs of academic and student support programs. It provides a tool for managing assessment processes such as planning, data storage, data analysis, data utilization and follow-up. Data can be organized into reports for faculty, staff, and administrators to support formative and summative evaluation of program progress toward five year goals. [http://www.nuventive.com/products_tracdat.html](http://www.nuventive.com/products_tracdat.html)
- The position description for the Director of Institutional Research includes the responsibility of convening the Strategic Planning Council monthly to monitor the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Moreover, we believe that the Strategic Plan was developed, articulated, and is assessed in accordance with Standard 2. Consequently, we believe we meet the test of compliance with Standard 2.

Finally regarding Standard 2, the Team also raised concerns about specific administrative positions it believed were vacant, stating, “Some critical positions remain open and may negatively impact accomplishment of goals (i.e., Director, Institutional Effectiveness and Research; Executive Director of the University College; Director of Enrollment Management; VP for University Advancement; and Director of Development.)” Although Cheyney University appreciates this concern, we note that only two of the aforementioned positions were, in fact,
open. There is an interim vice president in the position of Vice President for Institutional Advancement. Recruitment activities are nearly completed for the Director of Development; the position should be filled in Spring 2011. Both of these positions have been affected by the Commonwealth’s determination that the relation between the University and its Foundation must be fundamentally altered, making recruitment extremely complicated. PASSHE is currently awaiting a formal ruling from the Commonwealth on this point, so that recruiting a Vice President is ill-advised at this time. The University College is headed by an interim director who has experience leading a University College unit at a much larger and complex institution. She has an earned doctorate. After 36 years of service, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Research retired in July 2010. The University is currently outsourcing the institutional research activities to a specific person in the State System Office in Harrisburg. There is currently a search for this position, and it is expected that it too will be filled in the Spring 2011. The Director of Enrollment Management has served in the role of interim for two years. The Visiting Team’s determination that Cheyney University is out of compliance with Standard 2 in part because of legal hiring complications out of the University’s control, as well as specifying that certain positions must be filled with Cheyney University employees rather than the service be provided by the System, goes well beyond the guidelines listed in the Standards, as noted earlier. Because MSCHE itself points out that it is the essence of the standard, and not a specific incarnation of it, that matters, we argue that because the functions are being performed by Cheyney staff or by PASSHE personnel, we are in compliance with Standard 2 in this regard as well. We would also comment that in the current very difficult economic times for public higher education, the over-specification of administrative staffing requirements is inappropriate.

Standard 3: Linking of Strategic Planning with Resource Allocation

Despite commending the University on several points related to finances, the Visiting Team raised several concerns about the linking of budget/funding and the Strategic Plan. At this point, we must remind the reader again of the numerous issues facing Cheyney University upon the arrival of President Howard-Vital that related to financial controls and processes; especially relating to the problems related to revenue collections (e.g., students were not being billed). Clearly, linking budget/funding with the Strategic Plan presupposes that all financial processes and controls are adequate the appropriate. When this assumption is untrue, the first step toward the required link is the correction of all financial process and control issues.

This is exactly what President Howard-Vital and her senior team did. Beginning in 2007-08, a review of the entire University budget and expenditures was undertaken, along with a detailed staffing review. As a result of this review, numerous administrative personnel were removed; processes changed, and appropriate oversight and training initiated. Through this process, the University ultimately cut $2 million from its expenditures (nearly all in administrative areas),
filled academic positions in areas that would support the development of centers of excellence, and reallocated specific resources to finance and administration. Student billing lapses were eliminated, and financial aid processing was fundamentally restructured and improved to provide timely distribution of aid. For the first time in many years, the University received a clean audit. In total, the correction of process and control problems, the staffing review, and strict adherence to the Strategic Plan resulted in a one-year swing from a roughly $2 million deficit to a roughly $2 million operating surplus to be used to address debt (the University’s debt has now been cut in half) and strategic directions. In short, the financial process mechanisms were corrected so that they could be aligned with the strategic directions, which have now occurred. The University is in its best financial position in decades.

In addition to the general structural issues regarding finances, several more specific steps were also taken:

- Employed a firm to decentralize heating and cooling to maximize energy savings. These changes allowed the University to reallocate personnel to buildings and grounds to improve the appearance of the University and to eliminate two positions (2009-2010).
- Reviewed faculty and staff retirements and vacancies to insure that hiring of future faculty and staff supported the strategic goals of the Strategic Plan and the development of centers of excellence.
- Cheyney University received funds to construct its first new residence hall in over 30 years, funds to construct a new science complex, and funds to renovate several other areas on campus. All of these projects are tied to the Strategic Plan in terms of student recruiting and retention, and to the centers of excellence.

With the climate of shrinking state resources and limited resources for many families, the University community has become more aggressive in its efforts to seek private and corporate funds to fund the development of its centers of excellence and its strategic goals. More specifically:

- The University has altered its reporting capacity on private giving, corporate giving, and grant funding to demonstrate how the resources are used to support strategic goals.
- The University has a three year goal of raising funds from alumni. It is on target with this goal as of December 2010.
- The University is employing the construction of its two buildings (residence hall and science building) as an opportunity to raise funds for naming opportunities that will support scholarships (to assist recruitment). President Howard-Vital
hopes to be able to announce a major donor for one of these buildings in Spring 2011.

Summary

Cheyney University is committed to continuously improving its teaching and learning environment, maintaining fiscal solvency, improving its overall institutional image, and improving its competitiveness in the State System of Higher Education. While we acknowledge that the University must be constantly vigilant in monitoring professional practices of all staff, in maintaining appropriate business and financial aid processes, and in measuring students’ outcomes, we affirm that we are in compliance with all MSCHE standards including Standards 2 and 3. Thus, we request that the Middle State Commission on Higher Education remove the “Warning” status from the University’s accreditation. The removal of the warning will allow the institution to more aggressively secure private funds to meet its fundraising targets and generate positive momentum towards the University’s strategic goals.

Under new leadership, the University community has spent the last three years identifying areas for improvement, assessing institutional strengths, marshalling its human and monetary resources to support its strategic goals, and positioning itself to more aggressively respond to Philadelphia Mayor Nutter’s call for, and the region’s economic need for, more competent college graduates. The University’s process of continuous improvement has included embracing a new vision that encompasses best practices and continuous improvement of professional practices in order to develop centers of excellence and programs that align with best practices among its peers and in the PASSHE system.

The Strategic Plan—Pathways to Excellence—is a living document, interwoven into the life of the University community and furnishes guidelines for measuring major University actions on a monthly basis. It is published on the University’s web site and printed on computer mouse pads for all University employees. Again, we request that the Commissioners remove the Warning status from the University and acknowledge the University’s past accomplishments and commitment to continuous improvement. We base our request on the discussion contained in this document.

Sincerely,

Michelle R. Howard-Vital, Ph.D.
President, Cheyney University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education
Performance Funding Program Recommendations
From the Accountability and Performance Funding Committee

Conceptual Framework

The Performance Funding Program must support the strategic direction of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE)

The challenges facing PASSHE are more complex and critical than at any point since its founding in 1983. The face of our students is changing, the global economy into which our graduates head require new skills that give them intellectual flexibility, the issues facing the Commonwealth requires multifaceted and creative solutions, the need for more university-prepared citizens is high, and the need for our institutions to engage their communities has never been greater. These challenges, if they are to be addressed, require a more inclusive approach in terms of people and viewpoints. This approach must be one that breaks down traditional silos and replaces it with a functional, strategic process that is dynamic, responsive, and grounded in a learner-focused culture of continuous improvement. The spirit of entrepreneurship must be reflected in our students and universities. PASSHE universities must be known as places where knowledge is generated to advance understanding across all academic disciplines, improve professional practice, and enhance the quality of life in the regions served. Four primary drivers have been identified to shape the future direction of the universities and PASSHE:

1. Transforming students and the learning environment.
2. Transforming the resources.
3. Transforming university-community relations.
4. Transforming PASSHE’s role in determining the Commonwealth’s future.

As PASSHE and the universities transform teaching and learning, secure resources, engage their communities and regions, and provide leadership for the future, the Performance Funding Program is designed to measure the outcomes of these efforts in the success of our students, comprehensive access to opportunity, and stewardship of our resources and the Commonwealth’s communities and regions.

Success: The primary mission of PASSHE universities is to help students achieve their educational goals successfully. To be successful in the 21st century, students must be prepared for lifelong learning, a habit of the mind that will force them to refresh their content knowledge continually. To ensure this outcome, PASSHE must lead the way in changing the manner in which students learn, faculty teach, and courses are delivered. As the Commonwealth’s universities, PASSHE institutions have a special relationship with the state. As a result, PASSHE is obligated to address the strategic needs of the Commonwealth, filling an appropriate role in creating the policy and direction for the state’s future.

Access: As the state-owned universities, PASSHE serves a critical role through providing access to higher education, building college aspirations and enrollment among underserved populations, and facilitating the opportunity for advancement of educational achievement from pre-baccalaureate through baccalaureate and graduate degrees and professional certifications. PASSHE must ensure that the students who learn in its universities reflect the diversity of the communities from which they come,
that the faculty and staff who teach and support them do as well, and that students are well prepared to enter a global work force.

**Stewardship:** As stewards of public resources, PASSHE universities must be fiscally efficient and responsible. The human, financial, and physical resources necessary to create the highest quality learning opportunities for our students need to be effectively and efficiently managed. PASSHE prides itself as a national leader in identifying and implementing significant cost reductions and cost avoidance strategies. Providing adequate resources in difficult economic times will require continual rethinking of university entrepreneurship and flexibility, and a realization that new ways of thinking and conducting our operations are essential. The communities and regions in which PASSHE universities are located must be better for and enhance those institutions. This mutually beneficial relationship must be nurtured and enhanced in many ways that respect and use each other’s strengths. PASSHE universities have an obligation to enhance the quality of life of the citizens of our communities, and help improve local and regional economic conditions.

**The Performance Funding Program is designed around specific principles:**

- The program will be clear, understandable, and replicable.
- The primary focus will be on results (outputs rather than inputs or throughputs).
- There will be transparency and visibility of all data.
- University efforts to distinguish themselves on programs, students, locations, and delivery methods will be possible.
- The design will reduce inter-institutional competition and will support collaboration.
- The program will align with System and university strategic directions and System policies, e.g., allocation formula.
- The program will align with national accountability efforts, including Middle States accreditation, Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) requirements, and the EdTrust/NASH Access to Success initiative.

**Selection of Performance Measures/Indicators**

To achieve the principles within the three themes, each institution will commit to ten performance indicators for the next five years. The performance indicators are organized into three groups. Each university has the opportunity to determine its performance measures within limitations. All the universities will be responsible for the five performance indicators in Group I. The universities will select the remaining five performance measures from Groups II and III. Each university must select at least one measure from the
Stewardship theme in Group II. Otherwise, there are no limits on the number of performance measures selected from any theme. Group III allows the university to propose to the Chancellor a maximum of two unique performance measures not listed in Group II. Any proposed measure should be derived from the university’s strategic plan, have an element of risk as well as reward, have an external comparative base, and be capable of being quantified such that it can be determined if the university meets or does not meet the goal.

**Performance Measurement**

For all indicators, university performance will be measured via progress toward institution-specific goals and against external comparisons or expectations. Whenever possible, external comparisons will be based upon similar universities participating in national studies. As needed, benchmark institutions will be developed in consultation with the Chancellor and based on, but not limited to, such factors as numbers of FTE students, budgets, etc. Institutional goals, established in concert with the Office of the Chancellor, will take into consideration each University’s historical trends, overall performance levels, and reasonable expectations for improvement. University performance will be measured either as meeting or not meeting each performance target; there will no longer be a three-tiered assessment of performance on each target (e.g., exceeding performance will no longer be used). All indicators and goals must be established by June 2011 to be used for the 2011-2012 award year.

**Performance Funding Pool and Distribution**

In recent years, performance funding was provided from two separate fund sources: 6% of the Educational and General (E&G) Appropriation and the equivalent of 2% from the Program Initiatives Line Item. Given the impact of the current economic downturn on Commonwealth funding for PASSHE, it is likely that this source of funds will continue to diminish and, perhaps, that the Program Initiatives Line Item may be discontinued. To maintain a reasonable performance funding pool that will continue to encourage performance, it is proposed that the performance funding pool be established as equal to 2.4% of PASSHE’s total E&G revenue, which is roughly equivalent to the current performance funding level. The performance funding pool will continue to be funded completely from state appropriations. Several options for the distribution of these funds were considered. The recommended distribution method is outlined below.

**Distribution Method**

- Each university will have the ability to meet performance on each measure for a maximum total of ten points, or one point per measure. Measures will include components for individual performance and performance in relation to peers or external standards.

- Points are earned by a university for at least meeting the performance requirement. For measures that contain submeasures, each submeasure is worth the appropriate fraction of a point. For example, for an indicator with two submeasures, each submeasure is worth 0.5 point.

- All points are totaled for each university, then weighted by the university’s base appropriations funding determined by the allocation formula, to adjust for institutional size.
The weighted points are divided into the total performance funding pool to create a dollar-per-point value that is multiplied by the number of points the university earned to establish the allocation.

Transition Year
Performance funding awards to be distributed in 2010-2011 will be based upon a set of transitional indicators. These indicators have been used in the current System Accountability Plan and are consistent with the focus of the new performance funding program, approximating the focus of the five mandatory indicators that will be in place for the 2011-2012 award year. The following indicators will be used, with some slight modifications.

- Degrees Awarded
- Second-Year Persistence
- Graduation Rates
- Faculty Productivity (in the absence of the Common Cost Accounting Report, calculations will be based on course data submissions)
- Employee Diversity
- Private Support (including the top three gifts)
- Faculty with Terminal Degrees

Performance will be measured in the same manner used in recent years, based upon a combination of historical trends. Awards will be determined based upon individual performance and peer comparisons; the System target comparison will no longer be used. Similarly, awards will be determined based upon meeting or not meeting performance; exceeding performance will no longer be recognized.

Distribution of awards in 2010-2011 will be based upon the new distribution methodology, presented above.

**Performance Indicators**

The mandatory and optional indicators for each theme are summarized below. See Appendix A for more information about each indicator.

**Student Success**

**Group I: Two measures**

1. Degrees Conferred (1.0)
   a. Number of associate, baccalaureate, and master’s degrees conferred (.50)
   b. Baccalaureate degrees awarded per FTE undergraduate enrollment (.50)

2. Closing the Achievement Gaps (1.0)
   a. Closing the Achievement Gap for Pell Recipients (.50)
   b. Closing the Achievement Gap for Underrepresented Minority (URM) Students (.50)

**Group II: Universities can select from the following:**

1. Deep Learning Scale Results—National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (1.0)
2. Senior Survey—National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (1.0)
a. Academic challenge (.20)  
b. Active/collaborative learning (.20)  
c. Student/faculty interaction (.20)  
d. Enriching educational experiences (.20)  
e. Supportive campus environment (.20)  

3. Student Persistence (1.0)  
a. Overall percentage of students returning for a third academic year (.50)  
b. Overall percentage of students returning for a fourth academic year (.50)  

4. Value-Added—Senior CLA, CAAP, or ETS® Proficiency Profile Scores (1.0)  

5. STEM Degree Recipients—Percentage of university degree recipients in high need programs such as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) or health care (1.0)  

Access  

**Group I: Two measures**  
1. Closing the Access Gaps (1.0)  
a. Closing the Gap for Pell Recipients (.50)  
b. Closing the Gap for Underrepresented Minority Students (URM) (.50)  
2. Faculty Diversity (1.0)  
a. Percent of full-time tenure/tenure-track faculty who are nonmajority persons (.50)  
b. Percent of full-time tenure/tenure-track faculty who are female (.50)  

**Group II: Universities can select from the following:**  
1. Faculty Career Development (1.0)\(^1\)  
a. Percent of Associate Professors who are nonmajority (.25)  
b. Percent of Associate Professors who are female (.25)  
c. Percent of Professors who are nonmajority (.25)  
d. Percent of Professors who are female (.25)  
2. Employment (Nonfaculty) Diversity (1.0)  
a. Percent of Executives who are nonmajority (.25)  
b. Percent of Executives who are female (.25)  
c. Percent of Professional staff who are nonmajority (.25)  
d. Percent of Professional staff who are female (.25)  
3. Student Experience with Diversity and Inclusion—Measured by average of the combined scores of seniors on applicable NSSE items (1.0)  
4. Student Diversity (1.0)  
a. Percent of total student enrollment who are federal Pell Grant recipients (.50)  
b. Percent of total student enrollment who are nonmajority (.50)  

Stewardship  

**Group I: One measure**  
1. Private Support—Three-year average of total dollars raised (1.0)  

---  

\(^1\) Need to be careful about limit on full professors and distribution across disciplines/departments.
**Group II: Universities must select at least one from the following:**

1. Facilities Investment—Composite measure of annual stewardship, operating effectiveness, and quality of service in the physical plant arena, as measured by the annual Sightlines Return on Physical Assets (ROPA) Study (1.0)
2. Administrative Expenditures as Percent of Cost of Education (1.0)
3. Faculty Productivity—Student credit hours as ratio of total FTE faculty (1.0)
4. Employee Productivity—FTE student/FTE employee (faculty and staff) (1.0)

**University-Specific Indicators**

**Group III:** Universities may create no more than two Group III indicators, which have to be approved by the Chancellor for inclusion in the performance funding program. Proposals should follow the prescribed template for defining the performance indicator including the data source(s). The Accountability and Performance Funding Committee members are available to consult with universities to help develop successful indicators. (See Appendix B.)
Appendix A

Proposed Performance Measures

Measure 1: Degrees Conferred (1.0)

Theme: Success
Group: I, Mandatory

Description: Pennsylvania will need 57% of the adult population to have a post-secondary credential by the year 2025 to meet the Commonwealth’s expected work force needs. Currently, only 38% of the state’s working age adults hold at least a two-year degree. To meet these work force needs, the Commonwealth needs to increase degree attainment by an average of 5.5% each year for the next decade.

PASSHE, as Pennsylvania’s public universities, is committed to assisting the Commonwealth in meeting that goal. In 2007-2008, PASSHE awarded 22,589 associate, bachelor’s, and graduate degrees. PASSHE will commit to setting a goal of an additional 16,000 quality degrees/credentials by 2020. To achieve this goal of 38,500 degrees in 2020, regression lines will be developed for each university to support a System-wide interim target of 28,400 degrees awarded in 2015.

Assessment

Submeasure 1A: Number of Degrees Conferred (.50)
This submeasure evaluates the increase in the number of degrees conferred (associate, bachelor’s and graduate). Regression lines are being developed for each university to achieve a 26% increase in degrees conferred by 2015-2016 using 2007-2008 as the baseline.

University has met performance if measure is at or above the regression line.

Submeasure 1B: Baccalaureate degrees per FTE undergraduate enrollment (.50)
This submeasure evaluates degree completion for undergraduate baccalaureate degree-seeking students. The FTE undergraduate enrollment is the average of the most recent four years of 12-month FTE enrollment from student data submissions.

University has met performance if measure is at or above the ratio of similar institutions. (.25)
University has met performance if number of degrees has increased from prior year. (.25)

Source: University Completion Submissions (summer, fall, and spring conferrals)
IPEDS (Submeasure 1B)

Benchmark: Submeasure 1A—Complete College America
Submeasure 1B
All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities
Measure 2: Closing the Achievement Gaps (1.0)
Theme: Success
Group: I, Mandatory

Description: The national Access to Success (A2S) initiative compares the six-year graduation rates for Pell recipients (proxy for Lower Income or LI) to non-Pell students and of Underrepresented Minority Students (URM) to majority students. PASSHE’s ratio is 84% for lower income and 67% for URM students. PASSHE is committed to pursue aggressive goals aimed at improving student success and, by 2015, cutting in half the gaps in completion rates that separate LI and URM students from their peers.

Underrepresented Minority Students (URM)—Includes African-American, Hispanic, and American-Indian students; as well as students who report a combination of Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander with any other race. Students who select Hispanic and another race are considered Hispanic, not multiracial. Non-URM students include White, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and students who report White and Asian as their multiple races. Unknown and nonresident aliens are excluded.

Assessment
PASSHE will adopt the ratio-based metrics used by Access to Success (A2S) for LI and URM students. Specific goals for PASSHE, as a whole, are ratios of 92% for LI students and 84% for URM students. For bachelor’s degree cohorts, the metrics compare the percentage of Pell (or URM) at entry students from the fall 1999 cohort who obtained bachelor’s degrees in the System within six years (by summer 2005) with the percentage of non-Pell (or non-URM) at entry students who obtained bachelor’s degrees within six years.

Submeasure 2A: Closing the Achievement Gap for Pell Recipients (.50)
Using the 1999–2005 baseline year, each university is expected to cut the achievement gap in half by 2015-2016. Criteria for met are being developed for each university.

University has met performance if measure is at or above the established criteria.

Submeasure 2B: Closing the Achievement Gap for Underrepresented Minority Students (URM) (.50)
Using the 1999–2005 baseline year, each university is expected to cut the achievement gap in half by 2015-2016. Criteria for met are being developed for each university.

University has met performance if measure is at or above the established criteria.

Source: Data Warehouse, Student, Financial Aid and Completion Submissions
EdTrust Access to Success (A2S) Metrics (Submeasures 2A and 2B)

Benchmark: Access to Success (Submeasures 2A and 2B)
Measure 3: Deep Learning Scale Results—National Survey of Student Engagement (1.0)
Theme: Success
Group: II, Optional

Description: In recent years as institutions attempt to more fully develop students’ abilities, many campuses are devoting substantial effort to design active, learner-centered teaching and learning environments. This deep learning approach can be measured through the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

University performance will be measured based upon the following Deep Approaches to Learning Scale Sub-Scales of the NSSE:
- Reflective learning
- Integrative learning
- Higher-order learning

Assessment
University performance will be measured as follows:
50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
50% based upon at least meeting the average scores of similar institutions participating in the study

Source: National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Deep Learning Scale and Sub-Scales Results

Benchmark: Of those institutions participating in the study:
All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities

Note: A sufficient number of university students must participate in the study for credit on this measure.
Measure 4: Senior Survey—National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (1.0)
Theme: Success
Group: II, Optional

Description: NSSE created the five institution-level benchmarks of effective educational practice as a means to facilitate conversations about student engagement and its importance to student learning, collegiate quality, and institutional improvement. The NSSE Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice are five broad measures derived from student responses to 42 survey items that are key to student learning and development, as follows.

Submeasure 4A: Academic Challenge (.20)—Index that measures time spent preparing for class, amount of reading and writing, deep learning, and institutional expectations for academic performance.

Submeasure 4B: Active/Collaborative Learning (.20)—Index that measures extent of class participation, working collaboratively with other students inside and outside of class, tutoring, and involvement with a community-based project.

Submeasure 4C: Student/Faculty Interaction (.20)—Index that measures extent of talking with faculty members and advisors, discussing ideas from classes with faculty members outside of class, getting prompt feedback on academic performance, and working with faculty on research projects.

Submeasure 4D: Enriching Educational Experiences (.20)—Index that measures extent of interaction with students of different racial or ethnic backgrounds or with different political opinions or values; using electronic technology; and participating in activities such as internships, community service, study abroad, co-curricular activities, and culminating senior experience.

Submeasure 4E: Supportive Campus Environment (.20)—Index that measures extent to which students perceive the campus helps them succeed academically and socially; assists them in coping with non-academic responsibilities; and promotes supportive relations among students and their peers, faculty members, and administrative personnel and offices.

Assessment
University performance on each submeasure will be measured as follows:
50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
50% based upon at least meeting the average scores of similar institutions participating in the study

Source: NSSE “The College Student Report” Survey Results

Benchmark: Of those institutions participating in the study:
   All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
   All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
   All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities

Note: A sufficient number of university students must participate in the study for credit on this measure.
Measure 5: **Student Persistence (1.0)**

**Theme:** Success  
**Group:** II, Optional

**Description:** This measure evaluates students’ persistence from first year to third year and first year to fourth year. Cohorts of first-time/full-time students are used in this analysis. This measure does not require a certain level of credit attainment each year.

**Submeasure 5A: Student persistence from fall of freshman year to fall of third year (.50)**  
Using the 2007 Fall Census as the baseline, the percentage of students retained from fall 2007 to fall 2009 will be evaluated.

**Submeasure 5B: Student persistence from fall of freshman year to fall of fourth year (.50)**  
Using the 2007 Fall Census as the baseline, the percentage of students retained from fall 2007 to fall 2010 will be evaluated.

**Assessment**

University performance on each submeasure will be measured as follows:

- 50% based upon annual improvement of indicator  
- 50% based upon at least meeting the average scores of similar institutions participating in the study

**Source:**  
Student Enrollment File Submission (Fall Census)  
The Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE)

**Benchmark:** Of those institutions participating in the study:  
- All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University  
- All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University  
- All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities
Measure 6: Value-Added Senior CLA, CAAP, ETS® Proficiency Profile (1.0)
Theme: Success
Group: II, Optional

Description: This measure evaluates the effectiveness of value-added CLA, CAAP, or ETS® Proficiency Profile

Assessment
University performance will be measured as follows:
50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
50% based upon at least meeting the average scores of similar institutions participating in the study

Source: CLA, CAAP, or ETS® Proficiency Profile scores

Benchmark: Of those institutions participating in the study(ies):
All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities

Notes: Further work needs to be done to define this measure.
A sufficient number of university students must participate in the study for credit on this measure.
Measure 7: STEM Degree Recipients (1.0)
Theme: Success
Group: II, Optional

Description: STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) education fields are an essential part of the foundation for U.S. competitiveness in a global economy. This measure attempts to evaluate the increase in graduates from these programs.

Calculate the percentage increase of degrees conferred in all STEM fields, combined. STEM fields are identified as the two-digit Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) as follows:

- 03—Natural Resources and Conservation
- 10—Communication Technologies
- 11—Computer and Information Sciences
- 14—Engineering
- 15—Engineering Technologies
- 26—Biological and Biomedical Sciences
- 27—Mathematics and Statistics
- 40—Physical Sciences
- 41—Science Technologies
- 52—Health Professions

Assessment
University performance will be measured as follows:

- 50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
- 50% based upon at least meeting the average scores of similar institutions

Source: University Completions Submissions (summer, fall, and spring conferrals)
        IPEDS Spring Completions Survey

Benchmark: All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
           All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
           All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities
Measure 1: Closing the Access Gaps (1.0)
Theme: Access
Group: I, Mandatory

Description: The national Access to Success (A2S) initiative compares the economic and racial diversity of the System’s entering undergraduates with the diversity of the state’s high school graduates. For income, the percentage of entering students who were Pell Grant recipients in 2005-2006 is compared with the percentage of high school graduates classified as lower income (LI), those students with family incomes below 200% of the poverty level. For race/ethnicity, the percentage of entering students who were Underrepresented Minorities (URMs) in 2005-2006 is compared with the percentage of high school graduates who were URMs in the state. PASSHE’s ratio is 77% for lower income and 81% for URM students. Specific goals for PASSHE, as a whole, are a ratio of 89% for LI students and 94% for URM students.

Underrepresented Minority (URM) Students—Includes African-American, Hispanic, and American-Indian students; as well as students who report a combination of Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander with any other race. Students who select Hispanic and another race are considered Hispanic, not multiracial. Non-URM students include White, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and students who report White and Asian as their multiple races. Unknown and nonresident aliens are excluded.

Assessment
PASSHE is committed to pursuing aggressive goals aimed at improving student success and cutting in half by 2015 the gaps in access rates that separate LI and URM students from their peers.

Submeasure 1A: Closing the Access Gap for Pell Recipients (.50)
Using the 2005-2006 baseline year, each university is expected to cut the access gap in half by 2015-2016. Criteria for met are being developed for each university.

University has met performance if measure is at or above the established criteria.

Submeasure 1B: Closing the Access Gap for Underrepresented Minority Students (URM) (.50)
Using the 2005-2006 baseline year, each university is expected to cut the access gap in half by 2015-2016. Criteria for met are being developed for each university.

University has met performance if measure is at or above the established criteria.

Source: Data Warehouse, Student, Financial Aid Submissions
EdTrust Access to Success (A2S) Metrics

Benchmark: Access to Success

Note: PASSHE will adopt the ratio-based metrics used by Access to Success (A2S) for LI and URM students.
Measure 2: Faculty Diversity (1.0)

Theme: Access
Group: I, Mandatory

Description: This measure is intended to evaluate the diversity of the faculty at each institution. Race/ethnicity and gender will be the indicators used to determine the overall diversity of the faculty.

Faculty member—All persons whose specific assignments customarily are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research, or public service as a principal activity (or activities), and who hold academic rank titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer, or the equivalent of any of these academic ranks. Include executive officers of academic departments (chairpersons, heads, or the equivalent). Only fall semester full-time, tenure, and tenure-track faculty are included. Those whose race/ethnicity is unknown are excluded.

Race—A person is counted in only one racial/ethnic group. Groups used to categorize U.S. citizens, resident aliens, other noncitizens and nonresident aliens are: American Indian or Alaska Native, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, two or more races, and Unknown.

Submeasure 2A: Percent of faculty who are nonmajority persons (.50)

Faculty with race/ethnicity indicator that is other than White or Unknown
(Other than Black or Unknown for Cheyney)
All full-time, tenured, and tenure-track faculty members for fall semester

Submeasure 2B: Percent of faculty who are female (.50)

Female Faculty
All full-time, tenured, and tenure-track faculty members for fall semester

Assessment
University performance on each submeasure will be measured as follows:
50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
50% based upon at least meeting the average scores of similar institutions

Source: SAP Human Resources, Fall Census
IPEDS Fall Staff Survey

Benchmark: All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities
Measure 3: Faculty Career Development (1.0)

Theme: Access
Group: II, Optional

Description: This measure is intended to evaluate the advancement of female and nonmajority faculty members at each institution. Advancement will be measured by associate and full professor rankings.

Faculty member—All persons whose specific assignments customarily are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research, or public service as a principal activity (or activities), and who hold academic rank titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer, or the equivalent of any of these academic ranks. Include executive officers of academic departments (chairpersons, heads, or the equivalent). Only fall semester full-time, tenure, and tenure-track faculty are included. Those whose race/ethnicity is unknown are excluded.

Nonmajority faculty—All faculty with a race/ethnicity designation other than White or Unknown (other than Black or Unknown for Cheyney University). Two or more races and nonresident aliens will be included, and Unknown faculty will be removed from the measure.

Submeasure 3A: Nonmajority Associate Professors/total nonmajority faculty compared to total Associate Professors/total faculty (.25)

Submeasure 3B: Female Associate Professors/total female faculty compared to total Associate Professors/total faculty (.25)

Submeasure 3C: Nonmajority Full Professors/total nonmajority faculty compared to total Full Professors/total faculty (.25)

Submeasure 3D: Female Full Professors/total female faculty compared to total Full Professors/total faculty (.25)

Assessment
University performance on each submeasure will be measured as follows:
50% based on annual improvement of indicator
50% based upon at least meeting the average ratios of similar institutions

Source: SAP Human Resources, Fall Census
       IPEDS Fall Staff Survey

Benchmark: All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
           All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
           All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities
Measure 4: Employment (Nonfaculty) Diversity (1.0)

Theme: Access
Group: II, Optional

Description: This measure is intended to evaluate the diversity of nonfaculty employees at each institution. Race/ethnicity and gender will be the indicators used to determine diversity. All employee data is as of fall census.

Executives—All permanent, full-time, nonfaculty employees whose assignments require primary responsibility for management of the institution, or a customarily recognized department or subdivision. Assignments require the performance of work directly related to management policies or general business operations of the institution, department, or subdivision. Assignments customarily and regularly require the incumbent to exercise discretion and independent judgment and to direct the work of others. Report all officers with titles such as president, vice president, dean, director, or equivalent, as well as those subordinate, such as associate dean, executive officer, etc. Exclude academic department chairpersons.

Race—A person is counted in only one racial/ethnic group. Groups used to categorize U.S. citizens, resident aliens, other noncitizens and nonresident aliens are: American Indian or Alaska Native, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, two or more races, and Unknown.

Professional Employee—All permanent, full-time, nonfaculty persons employed for the primary purpose of performing academic support, student service, and institutional support activities, whose assignments would require either college graduation or experience of such kind and amount as to provide a comparable background. Include employees such as accountants, systems analysts, computer programmers, research associates, and coaches.

Submeasure 4A: Percent of nonmajority executives (.25)

\[
\frac{\text{Executives with race/ethnicity indicator other than White or Unknown}}{\text{Total Executives (excluding race/ethnicity of Unknown)}}
\]

(Sub Black or Unknown for Cheyney)

Submeasure 4B: Percent of female executives (.25)

\[
\frac{\text{Female Executives}}{\text{Total Executives}}
\]

Submeasure 4C: Percent of nonmajority professional nonfaculty employees (.25)

\[
\frac{\text{Professional Employees with race/ethnicity indicator other than White or Unknown}}{\text{Total Professional Employees (excluding race/ethnicity of Unknown)}}
\]

(Sub Black or Unknown for Cheyney)

Submeasure 4D: Percent of female professional nonfaculty employees (.25)

\[
\frac{\text{Female Professional Employees}}{\text{Total Professional Employees}}
\]
Assessment
University performance on each submeasure will be measured as follows:
- 50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
- 50% based upon at least meeting the average scores of similar institutions

Source:  SAP Human Resources, Fall Census
        IPEDS Fall Staff Survey

Benchmark: All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
            All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
            All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities
Measure 5: Student Experience with Diversity and Inclusion (NSSE) (1.0)
Theme: Access
Group: II, Optional

Description: This measure is intended to evaluate students’ experience with diversity and inclusion while enrolled at PASSHE institutions. Responses to specific questions in the senior student survey of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) will be used to measure student experience.

An average of all applicable scores on NSSE survey questions that deal with diversity and inclusion will be used. Questions include: 1e, 1u, 1v, 6c, 7f, 10c, 10f, and 11l, as reflected below.

In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?
- 1e: Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments.
- 1u: Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own.
- 1v: Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values.

During the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?
- 6c: Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality (worship, meditation, prayer, etc.).

Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate from your institution?
- 7f: Have you or will you participate in a Study Abroad program?

To what extent does your institution emphasize each of the following?
- 10c: Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds.
- 10f: Attending campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural performances, athletic events, etc.).

To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?
- 11l: Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds.

Assessment
University performance will be measured as follows:
50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
50% based upon at least meeting the average combined scores of similar institutions

Source: National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Senior Survey Results

Benchmark: Of those institutions participating in the study:
- All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
- All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
- All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities

Note: Institutions must have an adequate response rate in order to select this measure.
Measure 6: Student Diversity (1.0)

Theme: Access
Group: II, Optional

Description: This measure is intended to evaluate the diversity of the student population at each institution. Race/ethnicity and socioeconomic statuses will be the indicators used to determine overall student diversity.

Race—A student will only be counted in one race/ethnicity group. Resident aliens, and other eligible noncitizens are all included in their respective race/ethnicity group. Nonresident aliens (international students) are excluded. Race/ethnicity groups are as follows: American Indian or Alaska Native, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, two or more races, and Unknown.

Student—All degree-seeking, full/part-time, undergraduate and graduate students reported as official at Fall Census

Pell Grant Recipient—Students who had paid to them a federal Pell Grant at any point of enrollment at current institution.

Submeasure 6A: Percent of total student enrollment who are federal Pell Grant recipients (.50)

\[
\frac{\text{Pell Grant Recipients}}{\text{All Undergraduate Students}}
\]

Submeasure 6B: Percent of total student enrollment who are nonmajority (.50)

\[
\frac{\text{Students with race/ethnicity indicator that is other than White or Unknown}}{\text{All Students (excluding race/ethnicity of unknown)}}
\]

Assessment

University performance on each submeasure will be measured as follows:

50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
50% based upon at least meeting the average of similar institutions

Source: Student Enrollment Submission, Fall Census
IPEDS Enrollment Survey Data for 4-year Public Universities
IPEDS Financial Aid Survey Data for 4-year Public Universities

Benchmark: All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities
Measure 1: Private Support (1.0)
Theme: Stewardship
Group: I, Mandatory

Description: Three-year average of annual private funds raised by University and Foundations.

Private Funds Raised—The committed private voluntary support to the university and its affiliated foundations. This includes cash, the face value of gifts, and appraised value of gifts in kind; excludes pledges and change in market value of endowments.

Assessment
University performance will be measured as follows:
50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
50% based upon at least meeting targets established in relation to peer performance

Source: Council for Aid to Education (CAE) National Database
(Section 3D, Gift Income Summary, Grand Total, Face Value)

Benchmark: Of those institutions participating in the study:
All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities
Measure 2: Facilities Investment (1.0)

Theme: Stewardship
Group: II, Optional

Description: Composite measure of annual stewardship (.5), operating effectiveness (.25), and quality of service (.25) in the physical plant arena.

Annual Stewardship—The annual facilities stewardship metric demonstrates a campus’s ability to preserve its physical assets. The gap between the annual need and actual funding determines an institution’s deterioration rate. This is a long-term indicator of financial and operational performance; however, most institutions lack the measurement tools to quantify it. The institutional goal is based on technical complexity, functionality, size, and age of each building on campus. Within PASSHE, stewardship is made up of planned maintenance spending from the operating budget and Key ’93 expenditures. A three-year average is used.

Operating Effectiveness—The operating effectiveness section is made up of a plethora of benchmarks and comparatives. The maintenance, custodial, and grounds sections are defined by staffing, supervision, and material spending levels. Operational goals are set by factoring in industry standards, peer averages, and best practice institutions. Each operational area is weighted at 20% to give an overall operational index for the institution.

Service—The service evaluation scale measures the quality of service delivery as perceived by the customer. This scale is a composite of two equally-weighted indices: Service Process Review and Campus Inspection. From the assembled information, discussions, and a review of a sample of facilities, assigned scores are summarized in the following manner.

1. Service Process Review—Centralization of customer service requests, scheduling process division, organizational structure and position, work order system, and performance measurement.
2. Campus Inspection—Cleanliness, general repair, mechanical systems, facility exterior, and grounds.

Assessment
University performance will be measured as follows:
  50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
  50% based upon at least meeting targets established in relation to peer performance

Source: Sightlines’ Return on Physical Assets (ROPA) key performance indicators.

Benchmark: Of those institutions participating in the study:
  All public institutions with less than 5 million gross square feet
Measure 3: Administrative Expenditures as Percent of Cost of Education (1.0)

Theme: Stewardship

Group: II, Optional

Description: Percent of unrestricted Educational and General expenditures spent on all administrative functional categories.

Administrative Expenditures—Unrestricted Academic Support, Student Services, and Institutional Support expenditures, as reported to IPEDS.

Educational and General Expenditures—Unrestricted Instruction, Research, Public Service, Academic Support, Student Services, Institutional Support, and Operations and Maintenance of Physical Plant expenditures, as reported to IPEDS.

Assessment
An optimal range for this measure will be developed based upon national data. Universities may only choose this measure if they are outside of the optimal range. University performance will be measured as follows:
- 50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
- 50% based upon at least meeting targets established in relation to peer performance

Source: Unrestricted Instruction, Research, Public Service, Academic Support, Student Services, Institutional Support, and Operations and Maintenance of Physical Plant expenditures, as reported to IPEDS

Benchmark: All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities
Measure 4: Faculty Productivity (1.0)
Theme: Stewardship
Group: II, Optional

Description: Number of student credit hours divided by total FTE instructional faculty.

Credit Hour—A unit of measurement representing progress made toward completion of the requirement of a degree, diploma, certificate, or other formal award. Typically, one credit hour equals roughly 15 contact hours, and represents an hour of instruction (50 minutes) per week over a 15-week semester. Credit hours are a combination of CCAR categories 1.1 (General Instruction) and 1.5 (Other Scholarly Activities). Transcribed credits as submitted to System Research Office for fall and spring terms and reported to University of Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity.

Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTE)—A measure that combines full- and part-time faculty workloads and equates those totals to a full-time number by using a specific formula. For faculty, one FTE equals 12 contract hours per semester and 24 per year. An FTE faculty equals one full-time appointment.

Instructional Faculty (FTEIF)—The FTE calculation applied to the total number of faculty whose primary responsibility is in support of the general instructional mission of the University. This includes all release time and alternative workload assignments unless separately funded for purposes other than teaching, such as research and public service, but excludes summer and winter session activity. Includes all tenured and tenure-track faculty, non-tenure-track faculty, supplemental/temporary/adjunct faculty, and teaching assistants who are instructors-of-record and/or who function as discussion/lab section leaders.

Assessment
University performance will be measured as follows:
- 50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
- 50% based upon at least meeting targets established in relation to peer performance

Source: University of Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity
During transition period, replicate study results and provide historical data through use of PASSHE human resources and student data.

Benchmark: Of those institutions participating in the study:
- All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
- All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
- All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities

Note: Instructional faculty includes all release time and alternative workload assignments, unless for separately funded for purposes other than teaching, such as research and public service. Initially, the Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity excludes summer activity. An estimate of historical trend data for this indicator will be generated through human resources data.
Measure 5: Employee Productivity (1.0)

Theme: Stewardship
Group: II, Optional

Description: FTE Student/FTE Employee (all employee categories)

Faculty—All persons whose specific assignments customarily are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research, or public service as a principal activity (or activities) and who hold academic rank titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer, or the equivalent of any of these academic ranks. Include executive officers of academic departments (chairpersons, heads, or the equivalent). Do not include student teachers or research assistants.

FTE Employees—Total headcount full-time employees plus one-third headcount part-time employees, as reflected in SAP Human Resources as of Fall Census and reported to IPEDS. Student workers are excluded. FTE Employees includes all faculty and nonfaculty employees. Student employees and graduate assistants are excluded.

FTE Students—Annual undergraduate student credit hours divided by 30 and annual graduate student credit hours divided by 24, as reported to IPEDS.

Nonfaculty Employees—All executive/administrative, clerical, professional/nonfaculty, technical/paraprofessional, skilled craft, and service/maintenance employees, as reflected in SAP Human Resources for the last pay period in October and reported to IPEDS. Student workers are excluded.

Assessment
University performance will be measured as follows:
50% based upon annual improvement of indicator
50% based upon at least meeting targets established in relation to peer performance

Source: Student and employee data as submitted to IPEDS

Benchmark: Of those institutions participating in study:
All Public Master’s and Doctoral I Institutions for Indiana University
All Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities for Cheyney University
All Public Master’s Institutions for the remaining Universities
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