|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RECOMMENDATION** | **STATUS UPDATE** | **INDICATOR** |
| ***From Self-Study 2011 - 2012*** |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 1: We need to establish and assess learning goals for students’ intercultural knowledge and competence. | Learning objectives articulated for intercultural knowledge & competency (http://www.lvc.edu/commonlearningexperience/learning-outcomes.aspx); student learning in IC assessed regularly using multiple measures, including the IDI and GPI http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/student-learning-assessment.aspx | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 1: Policies pertaining to intellectual property and copyrights need to be formulated by the faculty. All current policy documents should be easily accessible through the MyLVC portal. | Policies and standards pertaining to intellectual property created and approved by faculty: http://www.lvc.edu/mylvc/documents/policies/ipr\_policy.pdf | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 1: In keeping with current recommended practices, and in an effort to publicize how LVC contributes to a quality, liberal arts education, we need to post more direct and indirect evidence showing that LVC students achieve a knowledge base and develop core competencies needed to live and work in a changing, diverse, and fragile world. | Evidence of student learning (knowledge base & core competencies) accessible to internal and external audiences  (http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/student-learning-assessment.aspx; http://www.lvc.edu/institutionalresearch/survey-summaries.aspx). Student success stories reported in various publications and online sources, including departmental webpages that include information about student outcomes. | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 2: In keeping with efforts to ensure greater transparency between administrators and faculty, progress reports on strategic goals should be shared with all relevant stakeholders, and any changes made to the *Strategic Plan* should be shared with the entire campus community. | Strategic Plan updates are posted to the MyLVC or LVC website including metrics, goals, and content related to progress. A new dashboard (visualization) has been created to help communicate Strategic and Institutional goals. Updates are shared regularly with the College community at Faculty Business Meetings and Campus Communications meetings. | In progress |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 2: A comparative analysis of fund-raising efforts should be undertaken, and the Advancement staff should develop a planning document that outlines a strategy for maximizing gift income over the next five years. | An assessment and capacity analysis of LVC’s fundraising was completed by Richard Ammons of the firm Marts and Lundy in the spring and summer of 2016. Ammons suggested the build out of LVC’s fundraising staff (to be completed by December 31, 2016) and engagement with contributors on a more systematic basis, both through staff contact and through a series of engagement dinners (underway.) Since July 1, two major gift staff, one staff member in corporate relations, and one staff member in planned giving have been added. One engagement dinner has been held; one is scheduled for this week, and four are forecast for the remainder of the fiscal year. | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 2: In order for the College to remain current with technology that enhances teaching-learning, targets for key IT metrics need to be established and priority given to providing annual funding allocations to meet or exceed these targets. | IT provides a Key Indicators document annually to the Board of Trustees and as part of the annual assessment process. However, no explicit priority is given to technology to meet or exceed these targets. | In progress |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 3: To ensure effective governance of and administration at the College, the Board of Trustees should investigate implementing an assessment of both itself and its committee structure, and the College should investigate implementing a measure where all general officers are evaluated by their direct subordinates. | VPAA/Dean remains the only senior leader who receives periodic evaluations from his subordinates. However, the College has recently purchased and will be implementing an HRIS (HR Information System) that has 360 reviews built into the product.  Bylaws were amended and restated in 2014 and amended in 2015 and 2016. The Board Policy Manual was extensively revised in 2015. Board governance and committee structures were assessed as part of that process. The Finance and Investment Committee and the Facilities Committee were reorganized into a separate Investment Committee and a Finance and Administration Committee. The Strategic Planning Committee was eliminated and strategic planning processes have been reorganized, no longer “owned” just by the Board. Terms of office for committee chairs and board offices have been instituted; term limits have been imposed. Committees have reviewed and updated their charters. The trustee self-evaluation process was reviewed in 2016 and self-evaluation forms were updated to reflect board members commitment to the strategic plan and institutional goals. A new vetting process for trustee candidates is under consideration, with vetting to be based on a conscious review of demographics and needs. A Board infographic with comparable data has been created. The Board and committees of the board are more intentional in assessing their operations. | In progress |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 3: To ensure that the review process is an effective measure of job performance, the Director of Human Resources and a task force of administrators and support staff should examine the process and determine whether or not a self-assessment be included uniformly. Further, a working group should periodically review the evaluation instrument to ensure that it continues to be a meaningful measure of employee performance. | In 2015, the College’s attorney, Liz Maguschak, recommended that the self-assessment not be included in the college’s formal appraisal process. A working group was convened in February 2014 to discuss the appraisal process and tighten metrics used to measure performance. The performance review process will again be reviewed in 2017 to better align performance expectations to performance evaluation / improvement, and then to high performance rewards / recognition. | In progress |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 4: The Student Affairs Division and other student support services (disabilities, Writing Center and peer tutoring) need to establish clearly articulated, measureable student learning goals and formalize assessment plans. | Student Affairs offices and other student support services have articulated student learning objectives and are engaged in the regular and systematic assessment of student learning relative to their operations (Institutional Effectiveness Plan, departmental TracDat reports). Paul Fullmer and Beth Julian have each presented on assessing student learning at professional conferences. | Successfully achieved & implemented |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 5: Given faculty concerns about how much scholarship and service figure in their evaluation, faculty should define exactly what is meant by “scholarship” and determine what the balance of teaching, scholarship and service should be in the evaluation process. | The faculty remain somewhat divided over how they define “scholarship” and what the balance of teaching, scholarship, and service should be in the evaluation process. Standards for tenure and promotion have been debated at least twice since the self-study, resulting in only modest changes to language. Scholarship remains something that is mainly defined by departmental criteria. A sizable group of faculty has called for more rigorously defined campus-wide definitions and criteria, but the majority prevails in keeping it all determined at the departmental level. | In progress |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 5: Since the issue of teaching loads is a concern of a significant portion of the faculty, the current 4‐4 load needs to be evaluated with respect to the College’s needs and limitations, and a clear policy regarding load reductions should be established. | A task force was assembled to propose a load reconfiguration plan. An initial policy has been drafted that allows credit for contributions made outside the 4-4 load (e.g. student-faculty research, advising & mentoring, independent studies). Currently, the faculty, Registrar and VPAA are considering a plan that reduces faculty load based on the extra work faculty are doing. We have begun implementation on the first part of this plan. Discussion and implementation of remaining portions of the plan are forthcoming. To move to a 3-4 or 4-3 model creates major financial challenges as well as challenges regarding equity. (i.e. faculty who are not serving on committees would have the same load reduction as those who are serving the College.) Financial ramifications of the plan will be considered as part of our PRAC process. | In progress |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 5: Because the institution relies on adjunct faculty, it is important that a study be implemented to better understand the current use of adjuncts, the courses they teach, and whether or not compensation is at a competitive level. Further, it is critically important that we continue to strengthen our mentoring of adjunct faculty, enhancing  departmental supervision and providing professional development opportunities. | Progress has been made with respect to the compensation of adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty received a 10% salary increase in 2015 – 2016 and a 3% increase in 2016 – 2017. The mentoring and supervision of adjunct faculty remains the responsibility of the department chairs, and while the *Chairs’ Handbook* articulates expectations and responsibilities, there is no monitoring or evaluation of how well chairs supervise adjuncts. Further, there is no tracking to make sure that adjunct faculty are regularly observed in the classroom. Professional development opportunities are open to all adjunct faculty through CETL, but participation is minimal.  An online course was developed by CETL to assist adjunct faculty with logistical details. CETL currently developing a survey to ascertain needs of adjunct faculty. | In progress |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 6: As part of the efforts to retain our first‐year students, we need to continue exploring options for an enriched first‐year and consider how we might provide some type of common experience in the first semester. | First-Year Experience course/program developed and approved by faculty to provide incoming students with a cohesive, common learning experience. FYE involves collaborative partnerships between faculty and Academic Affairs/Student Affairs professionals. Program aims to improve first-year retention; preliminary data from pilot year suggests success. | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 6: To strengthen our assessment of General Education, academic departments should systematically assess their General Education objectives, particularly those core competencies developed in both the General Education curriculum and the academic major. Further, the Associate Dean, the Academic Assessment Committee and the Director of General Education should collaborate on assessment strategies and means of tracking changes. | A comprehensive assessment plan for student learning in general education/Constellation courses has been implemented. This plan makes use of multiple measures (direct and indirect, course-embedded and standardized assessments). The plan allows for the assessment of all learning objectives on a 3-year cycle. An ePortfolio will provide a comprehensive assessment of the LVC experience. (General Education TracDat report, http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/student-learning-assessment.aspx; and http://www.lvc.edu/institutionalresearch/survey-summaries.aspx.  The ADAA has been managing assessments of student learning in general education/Constellation courses since 2012 – 2013, as well as managing the General Education TracDat account. It is not clear, however, who should be responsible for these assessments. This expectation needs to be articulated and included in the IEP. | In progress |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 6: Given the value of high impact experiences, all student interns should be assessed by their on‐site internship supervisor and the College needs to explore additional, cost-effective study abroad opportunities. | All immersive experiences (formerly known as “high impact”) have been vetted by the GEC and the CCA and each approved proposal includes methods for how student learning will be assessed. A model for HIE was developed by the ADAA and approved by the faculty; this model includes assessment strategies for each experiential learning event. An Internship Guide articulates expectations for the on-site supervisors to evaluate each student intern. The on-site supervisor evaluation form includes competencies related to the institutional learning outcomes. Likewise, student interns evaluate their internship sites and experiences. (Senior Associate Dean Academic Affairs) Nevertheless, while this assessment has been fully implemented, the findings are not consistently reported in annual assessment reports, suggesting a disconnect between this assessment and the annual program assessments. | In progress |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 7: Considering the importance of good assessment practices that inform planning, resource allocation and program effectiveness, the College must continue to strengthen its assessment of administrative units and services. | All administrative units have assessment plans and reports that connect up to College wide institutional effectiveness efforts. While considerable progress has been made towards improving assessment processes in administrative units, the College is continuously engaged in assessing its assessment practices and making improvements at the departmental and divisional levels. In general, improvement is needed most in how assessment results are shared and how they are used. Further, the College needs to be more mindful about including its diverse stakeholders in the process, most notably students and alumni. Finally, those responsible for assessment must feel empowered to make changes. Without this authority, the quality of assessment is compromised. | In progress |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 7: While the *Strategic Plan* has served as the basis for annual assessments, it is critically important that a comprehensive institutional assessment plan be written, one that embraces the *Strategic Plan* but also includes goals inherent in our mission and program offerings. | The assessment of the strategic plan is developing.  The plan is now in Trac Dat with assessment methods and targets.  This could continue to be improved.  Key metrics are also found online on the institutional EV2020 dashboard. Institutional priorities are articulated on an annual basis by the President’s Office and communicated to all vice presidents. These priorities are included in each division’s assessment plan. A five-year plan to assess the institutional learning goals was developed and it currently in its second year of implementation. | In progress |
| *Self-Study* Chapter 7: For the sake of efficiency and effectiveness, a mechanism needs to be instituted whereby the three committees charged with assessment (AEPC, AAC and IRC) identify needs and develop a centralized repository of data. | The OIR serves as a key centralized repository for data and much of that data is shared on the IR website. Additionally, assessment plans and the data associated with them are stored in Trac Dat. | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| **RECOMMENDATION** | **STATUS UPDATE** | **INDICATOR** |
| ***From Visiting Team Report, March 2012 (other than what was articulated in the self-study)*** |
| While the institution has demonstrated the ability to assess, plan, and fund capital projects on a more systematic, long-term model the institution as a whole would be benefited by applying the same approach to linking the strategic planning process with long-range financial modeling and planning. While many constituents noted the need for additional sources of revenue, no concrete plans, metrics or decision-making processes appear to be in place to assist the institution in addressing this critical challenge. Without a more explicit and intentional connection to long-range budgeting and resource planning, the institution’s ability to achieve its strategic goals may be compromised. | Significant strides have been made when linking strategic planning with long-range financial modeling and resource planning. Progress has been achieved both in the operational budget and in the capital planning. There is now a long term budget model that can be used for scenario planning that including SP funding. This was developed by the CFO and includes projections from IR and is maintained by the Director of Finance and budget. | In progress |
| There is evidence that a forecasting budget tool that allows for scenario and assumption testing is in place; however, constituents acknowledged that in recent years this tool has not been used extensively at the Board or General Officer level. The college should return to using the budget-forecasting tool to insure that they have sufficient resources to support their mission and programs. | The College currently uses a budget-forecasting tool. Shawn Curtin developed a ten-year financial model that may be run with multiple scenarios in order to understand the impact of a particular decision or specific reality (e.g. drop in retention rates). (Evidence found in agendas for the Board and agendas for the Finance Committee) | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| The college should define the enrollment, student learning outcomes, and financial metrics for the graduate programs and part-time undergraduate programs. Multiple constituents cited the lack of clear direction and goals for these programs. LVC must determine the role of these programs relative to its mission, strategic planning and resource allocation. If they are to be continued, LVC should better define policies and procedures to insure appropriate levels of quality in the enrollment, retention and student learning outcomes. | Financial metrics, goals associated with the number for enrollments, discount rates, and housing have been set at the UG-level for at least five years. A consultant has been employed to recommend a strategic direction for part-time graduate programs and the department of GPS. A preliminary report was made to the Board of Trustees in October 2016, and a full report should be available by mid-December 2016. | In progress |
| The college is poised to spend considerable time examining the impacts of teaching load adjustments. Faculty and the dean should take great care in that examination, invite college-wide input, and move cautiously to whatever new model makes institutional sense. | Currently, the faculty, Registrar and VPAA are considering a plan that reduces faculty load based on the extra work faculty are doing. To move to a 3-4 or 4-3 model creates major financial challenges as well as challenges regarding equity. (i.e. faculty who are not serving on committees would have the same load reduction as those who are serving the College.) | In progress |
| The institution should insure that all programs and departments provide clear statements of specific learning goals (with an emphasis on measurable outcomes of student learning), and should post these statements clearly in the catalog and on the website. | All programs and departments have clearly defined goals and, where applicable, measureable learning outcomes. These may be accessed in the department/program TracDat account. Learning objectives for academic programs are included in the College catalog and on individual departmental websites. All syllabi are required to have clear learning objectives, and all course proposals must include clear, measureable learning outcomes aligned with program-level and institutional learning goals. Expectations and requirements related to departmental assessments of all units are clearly communicated in the College’s Institutional Effectiveness Plan (http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/plan.aspx) and assessment processes are well managed in TracDat. Processes are further outlined for 5-year program-level reviews in academic departments and non-academic units  (http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/policiesprocedures.aspx). Further documentation may be found in the two monitoring reports submitted to the MSCHE in 2013 & 2015:  http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/middlestatesstandards.aspx.  Evidence of how assessment informs institutional planning and resource allocations may be found in the IEC annual reports to the College President(http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/annualreport.aspx)  and in the PRAC minutes on the MyLVC portal. | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| The college should engage in more regular and sustained assessment of its graduate and continuing education curricula. | Graduate programs are assessed on a regular basis, as per the requirements outlined in the IEP. There has been some inconsistency and non-compliance resulting from staff turnover, but moving the part-time graduate programs under the auspices of academic departments has improved this area of weakness. | In progress |
| The visiting team affirms the self-study recommendation that the college continue to explore additional and more cost-effective study abroad opportunities, including more short-term experiences to support the college’s mission, the general education program, and the strategic plan goal of offering “high impact” experiences. | The Center for Global Education has added six short-term study abroad opportunities since 2012 – 2013. Given the increased demands and restrictions in many of our majors, short-term study abroad experiences, while less intensive or immersive than a full-term experience, provide a way for many students to add a global dimension to their education. These programs are available in the following locations: London, England;; Roe, Italy; Maastricht, Netherlands; Ormskirk, England; Barcelona, Spain. (www.lvc.edu/study-abroad) | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| The college should develop an overall plan that integrates the various assessment processes to ensure there is a cohesive, comprehensive, and sustainable approach to institutional assessment. This plan should outline how assessment results and evidence are to be used in the strategic planning, resource allocation, and decision making process as well as how the results are to be communicated to the appropriate constituencies. The plan should be of sufficient simplicity that it is not perceived as burdensome but rather informative. | Expectations and requirements related to departmental assessments of all units are clearly communicated in the College’s Institutional Effectiveness Plan (http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/plan.aspx) and assessment processes are well managed in TracDat. Processes are further outlined for 5-year program-level reviews in academic departments and non-academic units  (http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/policiesprocedures.aspx). Further documentation may be found in the two monitoring reports submitted to the MSCHE in 2013 & 2015:  http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/middlestatesstandards.aspx.  Evidence of how assessment informs institutional planning and resource allocations may be found in the IEC annual reports to the College President(http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/annualreport.aspx)  and in the PRAC minutes on the MyLVC portal.  Progress regarding institutional assessment practices and institutional effectiveness was also reported in the 2013 and 2015 monitoring reports to the MSCHE. | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| The college should develop a mechanism for clearly documenting at all levels institutional effectiveness using assessment results. | The IEC conducts annual reviews of all divisions as a means of documenting how assessment findings are used to inform planning and resource allocations. Departmental assessments are reviewed within the appropriate division. A survey of assessment processes given to mid-level administrators (October 2016) indicated mixed responses regarding how effectively assessment results are used by the institution. Most director-level administrators agree that assessment is a priority for them, but fewer regard it as a priority in their division and for the division head (vice president). While most recognize that the College has made progress in assessment, we need to improve how we are documenting and communicating how results inform change. | In progress |
| The college should clearly articulate the relationships between the IRC, AAC, and AEPC with respect to advancing systematic and organized assessment across the institution to inform strategic planning, resource allocation, and decision-making. | The faculty committee structure was altered in 2013, and the revised structure allows for a more cohesive approach to student learning assessment. Committee responsibilities related to assessment fall under the governance of the CCA.  It might be useful if the College evaluated the roles and relationships of IEC, PRAC, and SPOC/STAR in order to create better cohesion in institutional assessment processes. | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| The college should continue to invest in staff development activities to promote the use of sound and appropriate assessment activities. For example, these activities might focus on helping units develop multiple and appropriate assessment measures that will provide clear and compelling evidence to inform planning, resource allocation, and decision-making. | Staff development in assessment is done on a regular basis, either through workshops, one-on-one consultations, or the assessment report review processes. All divisions have an appointed assessment coordinator to manage divisional assessment processes (including training for new staff members), and all divisions have an appointed assessment liaison from the IEC to support them with their assessment processes. Funds for travel and conference attendance have made it possible for staff to attend and/or present workshops on assessment. 46% of mid-level administrators reported attending sessions on assessment at professional conferences within the last 3 years(October 2016 survey of assessment processes). The following faculty and administrative staff have presented on assessment at local, regional, and national conferences: Dodson, Damiano, M. Green, Russell, Julian, Pittari, Patton, and Goodfellow. Damiano is a member of the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assessment Leadership Consortium. | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| The college should engage in a review of the existing student learning outcomes for each academic program, general education, and desired high impact learning experiences (e.g., internships) to ensure that they are appropriate for the areas in question. Rather than developing an extensive list of learning outcomes for each program the college should focus on the core competencies associated with that program of study. These competencies should reflect what it means to be a person educated in that discipline and serve as a mechanism for monitoring the effectiveness of the overall program curriculum. Individual course learning outcomes should reflect but not be identical to the program learning outcomes. General education outcomes should be clearly stated and intentionally integrated into the designated courses regardless of course section or instructor. | This was completed in 2012 – 2013 and is reported at length in the April 2013 Monitoring Report (http://www.lvc.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/middlestatesstandards.aspx).  In 2016, the chemistry department was the sole recipient of the national award for excellence in assessment given by the Council for Higher Education Assessment. | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| After reviewing and revising as appropriate the program learning outcomes, departments should clearly identify opportunities in the curriculum where students are asked to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved those outcomes. These opportunities provide a roadmap for the direct assessment of student learning using course-embedded, authentic activities. | All academic departments are required to have updated curriculum maps that show where the curriculum provide opportunities for students to achieve the learning outcomes. These curriculum maps are included in the department’s TracDat account. The 5-year program review requires the departments to reflect on whether or not the curriculum aligns well with the outcomes. | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| Student learning outcomes should be assessed using multiple (i.e., more than 1) and appropriate measures to provides clear and compelling evidence of the extent to which students overall are achieving these key competencies. This evidence is used to inform continued curricular renewal and improvement. | The three institutional learning goals and the Constellation LVC learning objectives are assessed using multiple measures both direct and indirect, summative and formative. Further, the learning is assessed in various experiences. (General Education Assessment Plan, TracDat & Constellation Assessment Plan) In the academic majors, assessment methods are reviewed and evaluated by the assessment sub-committee on an annual basis. In 2014 – 2015, 50% of academic departments earned scores indicating “Good” or “Exemplary” in the assessment methods category. This result did not meet the target that 90% of all departments would achieve ratings of “Good” or “Exemplary” in all categories. | In progress |
| The college should make a clear statement concerning the role and responsibilities of all faculty members in the assessment of overall student learning. | Faculty responsibilities related to assessment are clearly articulated in the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, the Faculty Policies Manual, and in the chairs’ evaluation criteria. This responsibility is further communicated at new faculty orientation, in course development workshops, on course proposals, and on the Syllabi Checklist sent to all faculty from the Sr. ADAA. | Successfully achieved and implemented |
| As appropriate, individuals and/or committees should be empowered to monitor the continual improvement of student learning based on the results of ongoing direct and indirect assessments of student learning. These entities should provide mechanisms by which student learning assessment findings are shared across the institution to inform decisions within and across areas at the college. | The assessment sub-committee of the CCA, the General Education Committee, and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee are empowered to monitor 1) assessment processes, and 2) the continual improvement of student learning based on assessment results. The College needs to improve how it shares assessment results across the institution and involve more stakeholders in the discussions about assessment results. Feedback from EIA reviewers noted that LVC needs to consider more proactive means of communication with students and other stakeholders and mechanisms to foster communication. | In progress |