

Gettysburg College

Report of the Sub-Committee on
Institutional Effectiveness

September 15, 2003

Submitted by:
Barbara Fritze
Daniel R. DeNicola
Julie Ramsey
Rhonda Good

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
I. Assessment of Leadership and Governance.	3
A. Governing Documents.....	3
B. Governing Board.....	3
C. Executive Leadership	4
D. Faculty Governance.....	5
E. Student Participation in Governance.....	7
F. Alumni Leadership in support of the College.....	7
II. Integrity.....	8
A. Institutional Integrity.....	8
B. Academic Integrity.....	9
C. Students & Integrity Issues.....	12
D. Admissions.....	16
E. Communications and Public Relations.....	17
F. Institutional Support and Fundraising.....	18
G. Human Resources.....	19
III. Assessment of Administrative Effectiveness.....	20
A. Institutional Planning	20
B. Resource Assessment	25
IV. Assessment and the Educational Program.....	34
A. Assessment of Courses.....	34
B. Assessment of Academic Departments and Programs.....	35
C. Faculty Evaluation.....	36
D. Evaluation of Department Chairs and Program	
Coordinators.....	39
E. Benchmarking	40
V. Conclusion.....	40

INTRODUCTION

Gettysburg College has had a strong approach to incorporating assessment and planning into the culture of the College. Assessment activities are currently tied to:

- Strategic planning
- Divisional planning
- Enrollment planning, including monitoring net revenue
- Budgeting
- Performance indicators

In order to examine the effectiveness of the institution in achieving its goals, the subcommittee first reviewed current practices of assessment across divisions in four areas: Leadership and Governance, Institutional Integrity, Administrative Effectiveness, and Educational Offerings. This examination took place grounded in the mission of the College which is to provide the best environment to promote student learning.

Mission Statement.

Gettysburg College, a national, residential, undergraduate college committed to a liberal education, prepares students to be active leaders and participants in a changing world.

This statement is grounded in the core values of the institution:

- The **worth and dignity of all people** and the limitless value of their intellectual potential;
- The **power of a liberal arts education** to help students develop critical thinking skills, broad vision, effective communications, a sense of the inter-relatedness of all knowledge, sensitivity to the human condition, and a global perspective, all necessary to enable students to realize their full potential for responsible citizenship;
- The **enrichment of the traditional liberal arts and sciences** curriculum with the most promising intellectual developments of the age;
- The **free and open marketplace of ideas** and the **exploration of the ethical and spiritual dimensions** of those ideas, both indispensable to helping students learn to determine which have lasting value;
- The **value of a lifelong commitment to service**, and the role of the College in both providing an example of public service for students and fostering a commitment to service among our young people; and
- A belief that a **residential college** is the most effective means of promoting the personal interaction between student and professor, and student and student which develops the community that is the heart of a liberal arts education.

I. ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Current Practices:

Gettysburg College maintains a high standard for leadership and governance and conducts regular assessments to ensure that these critical elements of the College remain efficient and effective. The College follows a model of shared governance.

A. Governing Documents.

Gettysburg College is governed by a Charter and Bylaws that are reviewed and updated as needed by the Board of Trustees and College Counsel. These Bylaws conform to the requirements stipulated for not-for-profit corporations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

B. Governing Board.

The Bylaws provide for a maximum of 39 Trustees, including the President of the College who is a voting member of the Board. Officers of the Board are elected on a regular schedule determined in the Bylaws. Trustees are elected to six-year terms and may serve no more than two consecutive terms, thus assuring routine transition and turnover of membership. Standing committees of the Board mirror the administrative divisions of the College.

The Board of Trustees has clearly stated assessment plans and engages in regular self-evaluation and self-renewal. A subcommittee of the Executive Committee has been established to monitor both individual members and overall board performance. This Trustee Subcommittee reviews the data generated from the current assessment process and reports this information to the entire Board annually. The Trustee Subcommittee also monitors the overall composition of the Board to insure representation of different points of view, areas of expertise, and various characteristics of race, age, gender, and affiliation.

Every trustee is asked to evaluate his or her own performance based on clear standards of attendance, participation, and support. Decisions on re-election are made in light of these standards; in recent years, members of the Board have been asked not to stand for re-election when their record of attendance, participation, or financial support is insufficient. As an example, one hundred percent participation in the Annual Fund is expected and has been achieved by the Board on a consistent basis.

The Board routinely evaluates the effectiveness of meetings, members' comprehension of the mission and goals, and relationships with key constituencies. The Board holds periodic retreats and special focus meetings, which give the trustees additional opportunities for reflection and self-evaluation. As a result of a recent self-study, the Board recognized a need to establish stronger relationships with faculty and students. Following that decision, additional retreat time was provided at the following meeting to

allow for formal presentations by faculty, structured dialogue with faculty and students, and informal social interactions. At the end of retreats, the Board evaluates the session by a summary discussion led by the Chair of the Board.

The Orientation program for new trustees is evaluated on an annual basis. New trustees are advised of their duties during that orientation which focuses on the appropriate role of trustees within the shared governance model, the role of trustees in assuring the quality and integrity of the institution, and their role in making policy that will guide the institution to carry out its educational mission. The orientation process also is designed to help new members understand their legal and fiduciary responsibilities and the need to avoid interference in the day-to-day operations of the College. A signed agreement to disclose any conflicts of interest is required of all trustees. Members are required to excuse themselves from discussions and votes when potential conflicts are identified. At the conclusion of the orientation program new members are asked, in a summary session with the Chair of the Board, how well the Orientation program met their needs as incoming trustees. This feedback is used to formulate the orientation program the following year.

C. Executive Leadership.

Gettysburg College has developed an explicit process to evaluate the executive leadership of the College. An integral part of this process requires the President and the senior administrative leadership to set annual and medium range (3-5 year) strategic goals and evaluate whether those goals are met.

The President is evaluated annually by a subcommittee of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees according to goals established annually for performance. Feedback on his performance is shared directly with him in a confidential meeting with the subcommittee. In addition, time is set aside at each Board meeting for a "Presidents Hour," a closed session, in which all trustees share feedback, questions, and concerns directly with the President.

All senior administrators submit written annual goals for review and approval by the President. Annual goals for each division are also reviewed by the Executive Committee and standing committees of the Board. Recently, the trustees set aside time at each standing committee meeting for a closed session with each vice president, an opportunity to ask direct questions and to give immediate feedback on issues of concern. President's Council "retreats" each year to review annual goals and progress on the Strategic Action Plan. In this context, President's Council reflects together, assessing its own performance in achieving the strategic goals of the institution. President's Council also tracks data available on the achievement of strategic goals; whenever possible we seek to benchmark that data with like institutions. Appropriate committees of faculty and students also have the opportunity to provide input and feedback on annual goals set by senior administrators. Once each semester, administrators, and support staff are encouraged to attend a campus-wide meeting at which current issues are discussed.

Evaluations of the senior administrators are conducted on an annual schedule by the President. The President solicits informal feedback on senior administrative performance from trustees, faculty, students, and alumni throughout the year. Periodically, special assessments are conducted, such as the self-initiated five-year review of the Provost in 2001. The assessment, involved a two part, comprehensive, anonymous, Web-based survey. The Provost received an electronic summary of the results, which he then shared with the (then) Faculty Executive Committee, with department chairs, and with the President.

Each year the Provost, following a planning retreat with academic administrators, prepares a list of academic goals. These goals are shared in draft form with the President's Council and with academic department chairs and program coordinators. The final list is then sent to each faculty member and posted on the Web at the opening of the academic year. This list is used to guide efforts and to provide assessment benchmarks for the year. It is reviewed again with the same bodies during the following summer as a structured form of assessment – accomplishments are noted and unfinished work helps form the basis of the following year's list.

Gettysburg College is also intentional about the implementation of interdepartmental teams to accomplish key strategic and tactical goals. Standing committees, established by the new faculty governance process, aim at creating teams of faculty, students, and administrators to review policies, processes, and procedures of the College. Recently, new cross-functional teams have been established to deal with safety concerns, budget and financial objectives, and enrollment management. Short-term teams focused on special projects, such as creation of a new diversity plan, the design of a new Athletic and Recreation Complex and the Science Center, and the review of policies relating to college and fraternity housing. The effectiveness of these groups is assessed by their members annually based on how well they accomplish goals established for the group at the outset of the year. Many of these groups share their summary of accomplishments with either the Faculty Council or President's Council or both; these groups also evaluate the effectiveness of the teams and provide feedback to the groups.

D. Faculty Governance.

Gettysburg College has a venerable tradition of shared governance. Faculty members engage in governance through arrangements that are common to the professoriate: faculty-adopted legislation creates a "faculty governance system." The faculty has created a set of standing committees, commissions, and *ad hoc* committees – including student and administrative members – that conduct the business of the faculty. The faculty meets as a body; there is no representative senate. However, the chairs of the major committees, along with the President and the Provost, comprise the Faculty Council; this Council sets the agenda of faculty meetings. The governance structure, including the composition and responsibilities of each committee, is described in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Previously, change in the governance system was initiated by a Committee on Committees activated every five years to assess the committee structure for efficiency and effectiveness and to make recommendations for action by the full faculty. In its last incarnation, however, the faculty chose to expand the normal role of the Committee on Committees, creating instead a special Faculty Governance Commission in 2000-2001 that was asked to review faculty governance more broadly and to consider the role of governance in the professional life of faculty members. The Commission noted that despite the fact that we are in a new millennium characterized by high-tech communication systems and time-pressured faculty, the usual forms of collaborative governance derived from the late 18th and early 19th centuries were still in use.

The Faculty Governance Commission brought forward a series of proposals designed to produce a more efficient, effective, broadly participatory, and professionally satisfying governance system. After much deliberation, the faculty adopted a sweeping restructuring of the faculty governance system in 2001-2002. These reforms were in three areas:

- (1) The procedures and policies for conducting faculty meetings were revised. *Roberts Rules of Order* was replaced by *The Modern Rules of Order*; discussion meetings were distinguished from business meetings; new protocols were adopted for the consideration of new motions and amendments.
- (2) The committee structure was significantly reformed. New committees, including a Faculty Development Committee and the Faculty Council were introduced. The resulting system is “streamlined,” allowing smaller committees to focus on coherent tasks.
- (3) A “Cycle of Eligibility” for governance was introduced. Full-time faculty are now required to accept assigned committee service with fairly heavy governance responsibilities for four years, followed by three years (around their sabbatical year) when they may decline all College-level committee service.

In this new system, the Governance Committee, a standing committee that manages the election and appointment of faculty and others to committees, conducts regular assessment of faculty governance and constantly monitors the need for changes. The 2002-03 academic year was the inaugural year for this new governance system. The Governance Committee brought forward several changes that were adopted even in this first year, yet the system passed an unusually difficult test: a revision of general education requirements – a comprehensive set of eleven motions – was successfully considered and adopted by the faculty during the spring term.

The Faculty Governance system is made up of committees whose regular task is the assessment of programs and policies in many areas that contribute to institutional effectiveness including the curriculum, faculty personnel matters, professional development, admissions, student life, etc. The Faculty Council, which coordinates

faculty business and consults regularly with the Provost and the President, and the Governance Committee together ensure the effectiveness of the system.

E. Student Participation in Governance.

Students are an integral part of the governance process at Gettysburg College and are involved, as appropriate, in the decisions and policies which most directly impact them. Students serve as members without vote on several of the committees of the Board of Trustees and provide valuable input to the trustee deliberations.

The Student Senate is the duly constituted voice of the students; administrative officers frequently solicit their input on pending decisions affecting students. Students also serve on faculty committees where appropriate, such as the Academic Policy and Planning Committee and the Student Life Committee.

Student participation in the governance process is assessed by regular discussions with student groups, including Student Senate and the Student Life Committee, and also by informal discussions between students and those with whom they serve on committees. The level of student participation in the decision-making process is also one of the questions asked on student surveys; Gettysburg has improved in recent years in the percentage of students reporting satisfaction with the level of student input in decision-making.

F. Alumni Leadership in Support of the College.

The College benefits from the strong support of an Alumni Association first organized in 1835. The stated purpose of the Board is to “stimulate and vitalize interest in the welfare of Gettysburg College and to foster a lifetime of learning and community among its alumni and friends.” When it was determined that the Board of Directors, including a representative of each graduating class, had grown ineffective, the association reorganized itself in 1998. It now operates under the direction of twenty-four Directors who have a clear understanding of the expectations of the College for their engagement and support. They have played important roles in the current fund-raising campaign and the President of the association serves on the Board of Trustees. In addition to the President of the Alumni Board, five additional trustees, nominated by the Alumni Association, serve on the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Fellows functioned as another avenue for institutional support by alumni. Founded in 1970 by the Board of Trustees, it served as a vehicle of engagement for alumni and friends of the College. When the Board of Trustees came to realize that many Fellows were concerned that their mission was not clearly defined, it conducted an assessment of the role of the Board of Fellows and concluded that it should be dissolved. A resolution to that effect was passed by the Board of Trustees at their January 2003 meeting.

Observation: Gettysburg College has a sound governance structure and strong leadership. The Board of Trustees accepts its role in setting policy while allowing the management decisions associated with that policy to reside with senior administrators.

1. Recommendation: It is recommended that the College conduct periodic reviews of the Bylaws with particular attention to communication requirements so as to take advantage of modern technology.

Observation: The Board of Trustees and senior management recognize the vital importance of alumni engagement and support. The College leadership is committed to providing continued administrative and operational support to ensure that the alumni relations program grows in strength and that alumni have a growing depth of commitment to the advancement and support of the College. The renovation and conversion of the “White House,” on the historic old campus, former home to College presidents and more recently the home for the Department of Political Science, to become an Alumni House is one of the featured objectives in “The Unfinished Work . . . Campaign for Gettysburg College.”

2. Recommendation: It is recommended that the renovation and conversion of the “White House” remain a priority as soon as funds are available, and securing additional gifts for this purpose should be an urgent priority in the last year of the campaign. Completion of this project will be a powerful expression of the College’s appreciation for its alumni.

II. INTEGRITY

An examination of “*Integrity*” across the institution asks the question, “Are we who we say we are?” A core value of Gettysburg College is to provide “*The free and open marketplace of ideas and the exploration of the ethical and spiritual dimensions of those ideas, both indispensable to helping students learn to determine which have lasting value.*” Policies that support the free exchange of ideas in an atmosphere of trust are delineated for all members of the institution. The Student, Faculty, Administrative, and Support Staff Handbooks provide guidelines that clearly state the policies for joining, participating, and leaving the college community. The Bylaws of the College address these issues as they relate to the Governing Board. It is a fundamental requirement that all members of the College community adhere to ethical standards and conduct themselves honorably.

Current Practices

A. Institutional Integrity

Board of Trustees. The Gettysburg College Board of Trustees has the ultimate responsibility for creating and maintaining the integrity of the institution. The Charter of the College formally states its purpose “to serve the cause of liberal education in

changing times, by providing a community of learning committed to the discovery, exploration, and evaluation of the ideas and actions of man, and to the creative extension of that developing heritage.” The Board, through its oversight role, monitors adherence to that mission by regularly examining the various policies of the institution and evaluating the need for change. Its members and the senior administrators of the institution annually attest to their own integrity in serving the institution by confirming that they, as individuals, do not have any interests which are, or may be, in conflict with those of the institution. The Board, particularly through its Trustee Subcommittee, regularly assesses its own members to assure that they are serving the best interests of the institution.

B. Academic Integrity

Integrity in Faculty Appointments and Evaluations (and Department Reviews):

Gettysburg College subscribes to the Statement on Professional Ethics of the AAUP, and follows the general guidelines of the AAUP in its practices for all faculty appointments and evaluations – including those for tenure and promotion. These practices are reflected in the *Faculty Handbook* and in the “Standard Operating Procedures” of the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC). All full-time faculty are required to submit an official transcript showing their highest degree (or their diploma) to the Provost’s Office; this is a condition of employment, and these materials are kept in the respective personnel folders. Faculty who are denied tenure or continuance in a tenure-track appointment may file a grievance with the Faculty Grievance Committee. A grievant must claim that he or she did not receive full and fair consideration in the process through a procedural error, bias, or some other circumstance. The Faculty Grievance Committee may recommend a rehearing to the President, but it does not itself conduct an evaluation. Over the past decade, grievance filings have been rare, but one case did result in a reversal of the initial judgment; another was heard but reached a negative decision; a third was dismissed.

Faculty reviews frequently involve the external review of scholarship. (There is proposed legislation to require such reviews in all cases.) The FPC has promulgated a procedure for selecting and engaging such reviewers; it is designed to ensure the integrity of the review. The intent in both of these is to provide independent, objective, and informed judgments by scholars who are expert in the area of scholarship. (A parallel procedure is used in the selection of the external reviewers for academic departments and programs.)

Throughout the faculty evaluation process, the normal precautions are taken to maintain both the actuality and the appearance of fairness and integrity. For example: student course evaluation forms are not returned to the faculty member until after grades are issued; members of the candidate’s department must recuse themselves from the evaluation by the FPC; and a level of confidentiality is maintained through the review process (of course, the candidate receives a full evaluation report), though the candidate’s legal right to disclosure of all evaluation materials is honored – but only upon specific written request.

Observation: Although current practice in the pre-tenure and tenure review process often involves external review of scholarship, standardizing this process would ensure its integrity. Proposals which seek to balance transparency with confidentiality have been developed that could provide valuable formative feedback without jeopardizing the integrity of the evaluation. Adoption of the common student course evaluation form will also affect this process.

3. Recommendation: It is recommended that the Faculty consider the requiring of external reviews for scholarship and changes in the evaluation process to provide greater transparency. For example, one proposal directs the department chair to write the annual and triennial review letters directly to the candidate, copying the Provost, instead of the current practice of writing the letter to the Provost and, at the chair's option, sharing the letter with the candidate.

4. Recommendation: It is recommended that the proposed common student course evaluation form be administered and collected by a standardized procedure that is followed faithfully.

Faculty Governance: The recently adopted faculty governance system includes a Faculty Governance Committee. This body, in addition to overseeing the process of appointing and electing faculty to governance posts, regularly reviews governance processes and policies as set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*. In its first year, the Committee focused on reworking the *Handbook* to present accurately the new committee structure; in addition, it adopted policies regarding the implementation of the "Cycle of Eligibility for Service," which applies to all continuing faculty. The Governance Committee will work to assure compliance with the By-laws and faculty legislation, but will also propose changes where policies are unworkable.

Presentation of Academic Programs, Policies, and Grades: Academic programs and policies are described in the Gettysburg College Catalogue, an annual publication, and on the Web. Catalogue copy is reviewed and edited each year by appropriate department chairs and program coordinators, the Provost's Office and other relevant offices, and by the Public Relations Office. Courses not offered within a three-year period – the years of, before, and after, the catalogue's issuance, are normally purged from the publication (but kept on the Master List of Approved Courses.) The official description for each course, however, is the one posted on the Web. These may be more current or fuller than the catalogue copy.

Grades at Gettysburg have not been inflated. For roughly twenty years, the Registrar has shared grade point averages with fifteen other strong liberal arts colleges; inevitably, Gettysburg's is the lowest average GPA of the group. This average has crept up very slowly during the past three years, as the profile of the entering classes have improved, but still remains below our peers. The awarding of *Incomplete* is quite rare compared with our peers. Moreover, grades may not be changed after official submission, except upon approval by the Provost. This faculty-adopted policy permits only an outright instructor miscalculation, mistake in acknowledging received work, or failure to comply

with one's own syllabus as justifiable reasons for grade changes. Grading practices of individual instructors are monitored by the Registrar and the Provost. There is a formal grade appeal process, described in handbooks for both faculty and students, that concludes, if resolution has not been achieved at earlier stages, with the Provost's decision. The Provost may change a grade if he or she concludes the grade reflects bias, capriciousness, or violation of College policy by the instructor.

Observation :The Registrar and the Provost should continue to monitor grading practices. In the past, concern was expressed by students and alumni regarding Gettysburg's tradition of strict grading practices. "Does this not put our students at a distinct disadvantage compared with their peers?" This concern may fade as our institutional GPA has crept to 3.0.

5. Recommendation: It is recommended that the new possibility of grade inflation and the old concern regarding unduly rigorous grading be reviewed.

Monitoring of Federal and State Compliance (Academic Areas): The Office of the Provost is responsible for institutional compliance with federal and state policies pertaining to academic matters. This office has developed various procedures and policies intended to assure compliance and sound practice. In most cases, direct responsibility has been assigned to the Assistant Provost. For example, the College has an appropriately constituted Institutional Review Board (IRB) for human subjects research and for research with animals, as required under federal policy. Proposals for research projects and for internal and external grants must be approved by the IRB when applicable. These policies are posted on the Web under the Provost's Office pages, and the need for review is described in the procedures for filing proposals. The Assistant Provost, who is the College's authorized IRB officer, chairs the IRB. Similarly, the College monitors compliance with federal policy regarding Research Integrity.

The opening of the Science Center required the decommissioning of the old radio-isotope laboratory and the commissioning of the new facility. An independent firm was hired to assure the old site was "clean," and both processes were approved by the Atomic Energy Commission. The College identifies a Radiation Officer to assure compliance with federal safety guidelines. A Chemical Hygiene Officer was appointed to coordinate the stockroom of the Science Center and keep a computerized inventory of all chemicals; in addition, this person serves the campus at large in matters related to EPA compliance, especially disposal of toxic and other hazardous waste, and matters of chemical hygiene and safety. (As his responsibilities broadened and his training deepened, his reporting shifted from the academic division to the Office of Human Resources.)

6. Recommendation: Assuming a cost/benefit analysis is favorable, it is recommended that the College apply for accreditation by the American Laboratory Association for its animal research facility.

7. Recommendation: The Chemical Hygiene Officer now reports to the College's risk management officer – the Director of Human Resources – though there remains

a “dotted line” reporting to the Provost for science department issues. It is recommended that this arrangement be clarified.

Federal and state policies regarding academic employment are monitored by the Vice Provost (as well as by the Office of Human Resources). Federal immigration policy, state policy regarding employee identification, state policy regarding the English language fluency of faculty – these are examples of compliance areas that require monitoring and recurring reports by the Vice Provost.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education has special regulations regarding teacher education with which the College must comply to hold accreditation for its teacher education programs. The certification of candidates, the posting of test scores, reporting on program matters, etc., are examples of required state compliance. The College appoints a Certification Officer, identified to the DOE, as responsible for these tasks. A job description for this position is on file in the Provost’s Office.

C. Students & Integrity Issues

With regard to students, there is one broad concept of integrity that we find particularly powerful: Helping students learn how to take actions that are consistent with their espoused values and the values of the institution. In working toward this sense of integrity, we therefore strive to:

- Help students understand the central values of the institution.
- Encourage students to engage in careful consideration of their own values.
- Promote student’s individual and corporate actions consistent with these values.
- Demonstrate in day-to-day activities those qualities we want to communicate to students.

Observation: One emerging institutional goal is the coordinated effort to engrain reflective elements in all activities in which students are involved. Developing the skill of reflection gives students a tool for self-assessment, allowing them to explore their own values and evaluate the consistency of their actions with these values.

8. Recommendation: **It is recommended that students be encouraged to reflect in writing on whether their actions are in accordance with their values.**

Honor Code/Honor Commission: The existence of an Honor Code at Gettysburg sends a clear message to the entire community that academic integrity is central to the mission of the institution. Students are expected to give and receive no unauthorized assistance on any academic work, and to report any knowledge of another student who violates this code. The Honor Commission is the group of students (elected by the student body) to administer and enforce the Honor Code.

Rutgers Survey on Academic Integrity: In 1999, the College conducted a survey of students and faculty on the Honor Code. Our results were compared to results at nine other schools which have traditional Honor Codes, thus providing valuable benchmarking

information regarding where Gettysburg stands in relation to other institutions on the issue of academic integrity. The Office of Academic Advising provides the primary advising support to the Honor Commission and works with them regularly on assessment.

Observation: The Honor Code is designed to express our collective commitment to academic integrity. It is not designed as a system to monitor cheating and plagiarism. However, violations of the Honor Code occur. Though the process of case review and appeal is described elsewhere, it is appropriate to note here that faculty members whose students are charged with a violation of the Honor Code do not judge either the guilt of the student or the appropriate penalty.

9. Recommendation: It is recommended that the Honor Code be scheduled for a comprehensive two-year review to begin in 2003-04, involving faculty, students, alumni, administrators, and trustees. Many possibilities should be considered, ranging from the elimination of the Code to modifying our practices, to extending the honor system to other aspects of student life and conduct. There are many reasons that motivate the review – the age of cyberspace, collaborative learning and other new pedagogies, difficulties of administration of the current system, concerns about student and faculty commitment, etc. Any recommendations resulting from this review will have to be approved by faculty, students, and trustees.

Student Conduct Issues: The Department of Judicial Affairs and Community Development takes primary leadership in educating students regarding the Student Code of Conduct. It works with other departments (e.g. Residence Life, First-Year programs, etc.) to help students understand the Code of Conduct as an expression of the fundamental values of the College. Various College staff members (from Judicial Affairs, Residence Life, Safety and Security, and Counseling) have conversations with students involved in disciplinary incidents. These conversations provide a form of assessment in that the staff members are able to gain a sense of whether individual students are gaining a better understanding of their own and the institution's values, and whether they are developing the ability to make sound decisions, leading to taking actions consistent with these values.

The Student Conduct Review Board, made up of students, faculty, and administrators, hears the most serious cases of alleged violations of College policies and thus serves as a major role in identifying and assessing institutional values. Regular reports that assess the conduct of students include the Annual Judicial Affairs Report that summarizes the number of violations of College Policy in a variety of different categories, Daily Damage Reports that summarize damage occurring in College residence halls, and the Safety and Security Annual Report that summarizes reported incidents on and around campus. All of the data in these reports are analyzed annually and used to inform ongoing policy and practice development.

Student Senate: Senators are elected by the student body to represent student interests and perspectives on all critical campus issues. Senate takes a particular interest in challenging students to learn how to take actions that are consistent with their values and

the values of the institution. In their discussions of critical issues, Senate strives to take a balanced approach that educates members of Senate and the student body as a whole on the full range of perspectives involved in these kinds of complex issues. Senate does intentional work (through retreats, training, ongoing discussion with advisors, etc.) with its members to help them more clearly identify their own values, and to help them develop a clear understanding of the values of the institution. While there are healthy disagreements among senate members on many issues, the group has developed a strong model for having lively, meaningful discussion that leads to decisions/actions based in a strong sense of personal and institutional values. By modeling this approach to its work, Senate serves as a strong example to students of the integrity that is central to effective leadership.

Policy Review and Development: The Student Life Committee is responsible for studying matters pertaining to student life on campus and for recommending policies, rules and regulations. It is made up of faculty, administrators, and students. This committee works in conjunction with the Student Senate College Advisory Committee to provide more in-depth student input on student life matters. These groups, along with the Student Conduct Review Board, conduct reflective discussions with members asking them to assess the value of the work of the group during the year, and to give suggestions for improvements for the future.

Programmatic Initiatives on Integrity: Many of the programs within College life challenge student leaders to examine institutional and personal values and assess their behavior within their program in relation to these values. Part of each program's assessment process then becomes a review of how effective the program has been in helping students develop this sense of integrity. A few of our programs are particularly strong in helping students assess and examine their own integrity, and in assessing their program's effectiveness in this endeavor.

- **Experiential Education:** This program has developed a clear set of learning goals/outcomes around integrity, focusing largely on the concept of "professional ethics" in leading participants through outdoor experiences.
- **Center for Public Service:** This program focuses on the concepts of "social responsibility" and "social justice" as ways of thinking about integrity. The students in both of these programs do written and verbal reflection throughout the year on this concept. They consistently display significant growth in their ability to clarify their values/their understanding of program values, and in their ability to align their behavior with these values.

Student Surveys: Assessment of the College community's ability to influence the development of and adherence to commonly accepted standards of integrity is accomplished through analysis of a number of student surveys.

CIRP Survey: This national survey is administered annually to all First-Year students during their New Student Orientation program. A number of questions on this survey refer to values-based issues. By determining where students stand on these values-based

issues before they start classes, we develop a baseline for assessing their development during their time at Gettysburg. Some of the areas explored in the CIRP survey relevant to the Integrity standard include:

- Student self-rating on concepts such as: cooperativeness, competitiveness, religiousness, self-understanding, spirituality.
- Activities from the senior year of high school: participation in demonstrations, voting in student elections, discussing politics, socializing with someone of another racial/ethnic group, discussing religion, performing community service and/or tutoring.
- Objectives considered to be essential to new students: influencing social structure/values, helping others in difficulty, developing a meaningful philosophy of life, participating in community action programs, helping to promote racial understanding,.
- How would you characterize your political views: a series of value based questions on things like – race, gay/lesbian rights, politics, abortion, drug use/testing, socioeconomic class, etc.

Senior Survey: Gettysburg administers this survey annually to graduating seniors. A number of questions on this survey refer to values-based issues. By comparing where students stand on these values-based issues as they leave Gettysburg to data collected during their time as students, we can assess student development in clarifying their own values, and in learning to take action consistent with these values. Some areas explored in the Senior Survey relevant to the Integrity standard include:

- Importance to career choice: Working for social change, expressing personal values and ethical standards.
- Satisfaction with the campus climate on a variety of issues: racial/ethnic diversity, religion/spirituality, climate for minority students.
- Degree to which the College enhanced ability to: relate to different people, identify moral and ethical issues, engage in pursuit of knowledge and truth, develop awareness of social problems.
- Participation in: Social action groups, volunteer service.
- Frequency of: organizing demonstrations, attending religious services, discussion with students of different beliefs.
- Gettysburg prepared me for: critical thinking, breadth and depth of knowledge, relating to different people, volunteering to help the less fortunate, service learning experience.

Alumni Survey – Conducted Five Years After Graduation: This survey developed by the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium is administered bi-annually to an Alumni cohort that graduated five years earlier. A number of questions on this survey are values-based. By determining how alumni perceive these values-based issues we can determine the degree of change from the baseline established at the time they entered the College and their senior year at Gettysburg. An important measure is the alumni assessment of the contribution of their undergraduate experience to their current level of satisfaction. The added value of the survey is in the ability to compare the responses of Gettysburg

alumni to those of other institutions. Some of the areas included in the Alumni Survey are:

- The importance of skills that may have been developed at Gettysburg College, such as writing effectively, communicating well orally, thinking analytically and logically, formulating creative/original ideas, appreciating art, literature, music, drama.
- Current participation in activities, volunteer organizations, and leadership positions, in their community.
- Graduate school attendance, current employment, and general life satisfaction.

First-Year Experience Survey: This survey was developed by the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Pennsylvania. The purpose of this survey was to gather information on the First Year student experience. The survey was designed to permit the comparison of the responses of students who continue to those who withdraw. These differences in attitudes and perceptions may allow the identification of students academically at risk or those likely to withdraw, and provide clues into interventions that may assist their transition to college. The results of this survey for any one institution may be compared to a set of other participating institutions.

10. Recommendation. It is recommended that the use of existing student assessment data be improved by conducting a more thorough audit of existing data relevant to the Integrity standard (e.g. Identify related questions on the CIRP and Senior Survey data cited above that provide “pre” and “post” experience data.) It is further recommended that this data be circulated more widely and intentionally with staff members working in the area of Integrity.

Alcohol and Drug Issues: Each year, the College conducts a survey on student alcohol and drug use, and student attitudes towards these issues. Questions on this survey relevant to issues of integrity include:

- Campus climate regarding alcohol and drug use
- College enforcement of alcohol and drug policies
- Negative consequences of alcohol and drug use (explores the link between values and behaviors)

The Department of Judicial Affairs and Community Development designs an annual alcohol education program based on the data from the survey. This program is meant to provide students with accurate data about peer drinking norms with the expectation that this information will lead to better decisions by students regarding alcohol or drug consumption. The survey also provides data to assess whether student behavior is actually changing in response to this, and other, alcohol education intervention.

D. Admissions.

College literature, especially all literature supporting our Admissions marketing and enrollment efforts is developed with the assistance of outside consultants and the Office of Communications and Public Relations. The language is developed after extensive

focus group meetings with students, faculty and staff. The Office of Admissions works closely with all divisions and the Office of Communications and Public Relations to have preliminary drafts reviewed/edited so that the publications clearly represent Gettysburg.

Admissions literature is updated yearly. New publications series are developed every 5/6 years. The most recent re-design was conducted in 2002. The official college catalogue is updated yearly with review, updates and additions provided by each department on campus.

We evaluate and monitor the success (and ultimately) the integrity of these publications each year by administering an enrolling/non-enrolling survey to all admitted students. Further insight on this matter is also gained each year in the Freshman CIRP Survey and the Senior Survey. These measurements permit the College to evaluate and validate the literature we use in attracting students to Gettysburg.

E. Communications and Public Relations

As noted above, the Office of Communications and Public Relations works closely with all divisions as well as outside consultants to insure that printed materials, web resources, and communications accurately represent the College as it is. A standing Marketing Committee, composed of distinguished alumni in the field, provides on-going counsel to the College on all aspects of its marketing, communications, and public relations. Alumni who serve on the 14-member *Gettysburg Magazine* Advisory Board evaluate the College's quarterly alumni magazine. A volunteer Editorial Board oversees the publication of *Our Legacy*, the planned giving newsletter issued three times each year. Cognitive Marketing, of Rochester, New York, is on retainer to advise the College in its brand development. Genovese, Coustenis, Foster (GCF), of Baltimore, Maryland worked with trustees, alumni, and staff in providing counsel for the development of communications and fund-raising materials for *The Unfinished Work... Campaign for Gettysburg College*. In 2002-03 the C&PR office implemented the College's new web policy throughout campus and created a web liaisons' program to provide for greater support and consistency in web content.

Observation: The College has made substantial progress over the past several years in developing a more effective approach to marketing and has developed an ambitious and promising plan to enhance the brand awareness of Gettysburg College in the minds of its various publics.

11. Recommendation: It is recommended that the College continue to support the work of its internal Marketing Committee and provide needed resources to support implementation of select initiatives that are judged to have the greatest likelihood of enhancing the College's reputation with the aim to strengthen the College's institutional marketing effort.

F. Institutional Support and Fundraising.

The College makes use of an extensive cadre of volunteers and consultants to insure that its development programs are noteworthy for their integrity and adherence to the highest standards of ethical practice. The College Relations Committee of the Board of Trustees oversees all fund-raising, alumni relations, and communications and public relations of the College. In addition, the Campaign Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees provides direct oversight of the conduct of *The Unfinished Work... Campaign for Gettysburg College*. All fund-raising programs of the College are conducted (or at least coordinated) by appropriate members of the staff of the Division of College Relations or others whom they recruit, train, and supervise. All fund-raising efforts conducted in the name of Gettysburg College must have the explicit approval of the Vice President for College Relations. All gifts to the College must be booked through the Advancement Services Department within the College Relations Division and forwarded to the Finance Office for disposition. Volunteer committees, composed of alumni leaders, meet regularly to advise on annual giving, planned giving, and athletic fund-raising programs. Fund-raising programs are guided by the Gettysburg College Gift Policy, approved by the Fiscal and Personnel Management and College Relations committees of the Board of Trustees in December, 1994.

Accounting and legal counsel review the College's gift agreements (including pledge forms and governing documents for planned gifts). Written documentation and the signatures of officers in four departments are required for gifts made for restrictive purposes. Instruments governing income-retained gifts—charitable gift annuities, charitable trusts, and pooled income funds—are approved by the College's legal counsel and donors' advisors. The College has retained the services of State Street Global Advisors (SSGA), Boston, to manage the investment and administration of income-retained gifts in accordance with all applicable laws.

In recognizing gifts, the College clearly distinguishes among outright and deferred gifts, unconditional and conditional commitments, irrevocable gifts and revocable commitments.

The mission statement of the College Relations division commits staff to ten principles and values that include adherence to "the highest standards of personal and professional conduct" and valuing "the diversity of skills, values and opinions our colleagues bring to our work." The College Relations division ascribes to the Donor's Bill of Rights developed by The Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) and other professional organizations. College Relations staff are members of professional associations such as CASE, Association of Fund-Raising Professionals (AFP), Association of Lutheran Development Executives (ALDE), National Committee on Planned Giving (NCPG), and American Prospect Research Association (APRA), all of which have standards governing professional conduct, integrity, ethics, privacy and respect for diversity and human dignity.

Observation: As the College enters the final year of the current, six-year comprehensive campaign, “The Unfinished Work,” it clearly recognizes the appropriateness of the campaign’s title. The work of campaigning will not end when this campaign concludes in 2004. The College expects and must plan for another comprehensive fund-raising effort in the near future. Indeed, the future success of the College will depend on continued growth and expansion of its fund-raising program. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees, with support from the President and Senior Staff, has committed to continue 80% of the additional special funding that currently supports the campaign commencing with the Fiscal 2005 year. This will require only modest staffing reductions and will give the College Relations Division the resources it requires to prepare for the next campaign.

12. Recommendation: The President should monitor the commitment of resources allocated to the fund-raising function and receive regular reports to be shared with the Board of Trustees and others in the community that demonstrate the value of the substantial investment that is being made in the area of charitable resource development. Planning for the next campaign should begin early in the tenure of the new president.

G. Human Resources.

Policies: Integrity is of paramount importance in Gettysburg College’s interactions with its various employee groups – faculty, staff, and student employees. Human resource policies and guidelines are written with the intent that all clearly understand the issues and that information is available to all in an easily accessible manner in a variety of venues. Continual assessment of policy, positions, employees, compensation and benefits, and conditions in the work place is at the heart of all of the activities of the Human Resources office.

Written policies, procedures and guidelines serve as the foundation for the employee’s individual and/or collective actions. Institutional policies and guidelines have been developed using the concepts of academic freedom, reasonableness and rationality, and current best practices.

The Human Resources staff works with supervisors and employees to determine position descriptions for all positions to ensure that duties and responsibilities are correctly stated. These serve as the foundation for compensation decisions that are in compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act, decisions related to benefits, workers’ compensation processes, unemployment claims, promotions, transfers, voluntary demotions, and annual or biennial performance appraisal processes.

Handbooks, including standards of conduct for non-faculty employees, developed by the Human Resources office are available on its website and in hardcopy. Because these rules are essential to our most important function - high quality service to our students - and the efficient operation of our business, the provisions of this section are promptly and uniformly enforced. With a large majority of information about the College available

on the College's web pages, our practices and procedures are available 24-7 for all to reference. The Human Resources Office operates under the assumption of progressive discipline and the consideration of extenuating and mitigating circumstances when working with employees and supervisors on the issues of termination. The handbook includes a grievance procedure for employees who feel that they have been treated unfairly. The Grievance Procedure exists as a means to contest a final decision that has been made on the basis of inaccurate information, in a discriminatory manner, or due to a failure to follow a prescribed set of steps. The Grievance Procedure is available in its entirety at http://www.gettysburg.edu/administration/employ_equity/grievance.htm'

13. Recommendation: It is recommended that the Faculty Handbook be thoroughly edited and presented in a more coherent and visually attractive format. The balance between print and Web-based presentation, especially regarding personnel policies and benefits, should be given careful consideration.

Diversity Issues: The Gettysburg College Report on Diversity was prepared by an outside consultant after examining employee attitudes about issues of cultural difference and equity at the College. In 2002, the Office of Employment Equity and Diversity completed the Gettysburg College Student Diversity Assessment to obtain data pertaining to student attitudes about race, sexual orientation, religion, and other aspects of cultural difference on campus. Based upon the survey instruments described above, and the work of a campus-wide committee on campus diversity, the Gettysburg College Five-Year Plan for Campus Diversity was developed. This document lays out a plan for increased campus diversity and improved climate in the areas of employee recruitment and retention, student recruitment and retention, community relations, co-curricular programming, and the College curriculum.

III. ASSESSMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS

A. Institutional Planning

Current Practices:

Long-term strategic plans as well as short-term institutional and departmental planning and evaluation are deeply rooted in the culture of Gettysburg College. In 1995 the Board of Trustees adopted *Preparing Students for a Changing World: Strategic Thinking at Gettysburg College*. This document, in which President Haaland articulated the mission of the College and a vision for its future, was based on ideas generated by six faculty task forces that had met for several months in the preceding year to consider the role of the liberal arts college in the 21st century. Endorsement of that document set in motion a strategic planning process that involved a wide variety of College constituencies.

Commission on the Future. In an extraordinary effort to build the commitment of key volunteers and to strengthen support for the strategic planning process, the Board of

Trustees convened the Commission on the Future of Gettysburg College. This Commission was brought to campus on several occasions in order to test the College's strategic priorities against the critical judgment of 367 distinguished alumni and friends in 1997. It was divided into nine task forces each of which was given a specific area to examine: Student Recruitment and Retention, Supporting Student Success, Enhancing Residential Life, Culture and the Arts, Collaborative Learning and Teamwork, Information Technology, Excellence in the Sciences and Psychology, Economics and Management, and Public Affairs and Public Service. These groups met with a variety of students and faculty over the course of several months, assessed the current situation in these areas, and provided the College with over 100 recommendations on ways to improve the College's use of volunteers, to build a stronger resource base, and to set strategic goals. Evidence of the Commission's success at building the commitment of key volunteers is demonstrated by the fact that 19 of the 39 current members of the Board of Trustees first served the College as members of the Commission on the Future.

Strategic Action Plan. In January 1999 the Board of Trustees adopted the Strategic Action Plan that is currently still operative although not static. While some of the original specific objectives of the plan have been revised over time, the underlying goal of the Plan is to "help the College not only be perceived as one of the best colleges in America but, more importantly, to be one of the best." The Plan provides a set of initiatives to achieve this goal. These initiatives are organized into four categories: Enhanced Academic Excellence, Learning Beyond the Classroom; Dynamic Student Life, and a Vibrant College Community.

The Board of Trustees has led the effort to assure the Plan is at the heart of the College's strategic decision-making process. At each meeting of the Board, the Chair of the Board reports on those activities directly related to the Strategic Action Plan that will be addressed in detail by each standing committee.

The College measures its success in reaching institutional and divisional goals through formal and informal methods using appropriate quantitative and qualitative measures. Overall progress of the Plan was recently evaluated by a visiting ACE fellow. This report was presented to the faculty and to the Board of Trustees at their regular meeting in February, 2002. The original 1999 Strategic Action Plan and this analysis of its progress are available on the President's web page.

In August 2002, President Haaland shared with the campus community his thoughts on the characteristics of best colleges. He began with "a strong ethos of teaching and learning." One measure of this ethos is the success in faculty and student recruitment. Gettysburg College's faculty recruitment has improved markedly over the past 10 years, with growth in the number of applicants and in the quality of the candidates. In admissions there has been similar improvement. The student applicant pool has grown steadily from 3,500 in 1993 to 5,000 in 2003, the diversity of the applicants has increased, and the academic quality of the pool has improved.

Another, more public benchmark of the College's quality is the *U.S. News and World Report's America's Best Colleges* ranking. Gettysburg College has improved on nearly all of the individual criteria used by this rating guide, and since 2001 Gettysburg College has been listed as one of the top 50 schools.

The Strategic Action Plan clearly directs the institution's resource allocation decisions. The numerous plan accomplishments, such as the strengthened commitment to sciences through the construction of the new Science Center and the introduction of an interdisciplinary program in Neuroscience, could not have been achieved without significant resource investment. Funding of the plan has been achieved through careful financial planning that has included revenue bond issues, a comprehensive campaign, and the re-appropriation of capital, from annual operating budget surpluses.

As a result of these long-term goals, President Haaland has also reorganized departments to strengthen their collective effectiveness. One such reorganization was the creation of the Enrollment and Educational Services Division that brought together Admissions, Financial Aid, Athletics and Institutional Analysis. Strategic decisions have also included combining the Internship Office with the Career Services Office. Academic Advising, once a function of College Life, was moved to the Provost's Division.

The Campaign. In addition to serving as a basis for the Strategic Action Plan, initiatives stemming from recommendations of the Commission on the Future are mirrored in the financial goals of the College's \$100 million comprehensive Campaign, "The Unfinished Work." The campaign seeks capital funds to enhance academic excellence (\$28.5 million), to support learning within and beyond the classroom (\$8.5 million), to ensure dynamic student life (\$21.5 million), and to enhance the College community (\$22.5 million). An additional \$19 million is being sought in current operating support (through the Annual Fund and the Orange & Blue Fund) over the five-year period of the campaign. At the end of June 2003, a total of \$86.2 million had been committed to the campaign.

The Campaign Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees oversees the work and progress of *The Unfinished Work* campaign. This group meets regularly and submits reports to the full Board at each of their meetings. Detailed financial reports on campaign progress are reviewed monthly. Various campaign committees (e.g., Leadership Gifts, Athletics-Recreation, Majestic Theater, Sciences) report directly to the Campaign Executive Committee.

Administrative: Department Planning and Effectiveness. The College's senior staff has followed the trustees' initiative by integrating the Strategic Action Plan into their annual goals and decision-making processes.

Responsibility for the development of divisional plans and final oversight for departmental and programmatic plans within each division fall to the respective division head, who also serves on President's Council. Yearly goals are established for each division and department and tied to the Strategic Action Plan. Assessment of these yearly goals takes place at the completion of each academic year. While formats differ

among divisions, all divisional and ultimately department goals will address the following:

- **Departmental Mission:** Statement of purpose and how the department's mission relates to the College's mission and goals.
- **Departmental Goals:** Statement of overall goals for the given time period. These goals are specific in nature and convey the long-term (and short-term) intended purpose of the department. By what standards will success be measured?
- **Outcomes:** Reviewed each year, these results answer the questions: What did you find out? Was this effort successful? What changes should be made?
- **Future Plans/Recommendations:** Based on the outcomes, results, what are the next steps? What does the department plan to do now? What barriers or challenges were overcome? Was the process used successful?

Many divisions use focus groups, internal surveys and audits by external consultants to provide feedback and to benchmark against industry standards. Specific examples include: an audit of the financial aid office aimed to improve business processes and the use of technology; an audit of our PeopleSoft (MIS) management infrastructure system and assessment of technology, etc.

Divisional assessments of accomplishments of the previous year and goals for the coming year are shared during the annual senior staff retreat usually held in the summer.

Admissions, Retention, and Enrollment Management. Enrollment Management has become a quantitatively sophisticated area of higher education administration, employing some of the most robust and complex systems of data collection, planning, and assessment. Gettysburg College develops projections and sets goals annually for every aspect of enrollment management, from number of applications to number enrolled on "census day" in October. A sophisticated financial aid model has been constructed enabling the enrollment team and the College to strategically maximize financial aid resources to meet enrollment goals. In an annual cycle, the Office of Admissions and the Vice President for Enrollment Management Services gathers data; they consult with the Faculty Admissions Committee and the Enrollment Management Committee to review projections and propose goals. These goals are adopted after deliberation by the President's Council, led by the President. Projections are integrated into the financial planning of the College; the goals provide guidance and benchmarks for the Office of Admissions. These projections and goals reflect both quantitative and qualitative dimensions of Gettysburg's student body; they affect curricular and student life planning. Examples of these data are as follows:

- Number of inquiries
- Number of applications
- Number of acceptances for admission
- Selectivity, i.e., percentage of applicants granted admission
- Yield, i.e., percentage of accepted students who enroll
- Number of students who make a financial deposit indicating enrollment

- Number of first-year students who are enrolled on census day
- Number of students who apply for early admission
- Number of students who are granted early admission
- Number of Presidential Scholars and Dean's Scholars – those meeting a specific profile who are awarded a merit-based grant
- Average SAT scores for several of the above cohorts
- Profile of the admitted and enrolled students by rank in class, ethnic/racial diversity, gender, geographical distribution, etc.
- Number of returning upper-class students
- Number of students studying off-campus during each term

These and many other data are reviewed in comparison to previous years at Gettysburg and to peer and national figures. They both reflect and feed the educational performance of the institution, and they provide a basis for assessing institutional effectiveness. The number and quality of students applying for admission to the institution is one important, if indirect, measure of perceived institutional performance; the ability to meet the projections and achieve the goals each year is a direct measure of institutional effectiveness. Using comparative data and national benchmarks provides additional information.

Observation: The recent record in enrollment management is excellent. It reflects a strong and crucial aspect of the institutional effectiveness of the College. The system for monitoring and assessing performance in this area, greatly boosted by the implementation of our PeopleSoft management information system, is a valuable institutional tool. Simple sharing of information can be useful in provoking thought and suggesting areas needing attention or reform. These practices range from such sharing to complex annual reporting.

14. Recommendation: It is recommended that, working with the Faculty Admissions Committee, periodic faculty forums on enrollment issues be conducted to strengthen the College community's understanding of enrollment challenges.

Office of Institutional Analysis. The Office of Institutional Analysis engages in college-wide research and issue-specific research for the various divisions. This office has developed an Enrollment/Budget Trade-off Model enabling the College to ask "What if..." questions. While assessment analyses for each division are carried out in the respective areas, the Office of Institutional Analysis provides consultative services when requested. For example, the office developed Gettysburg-specific surveys on student satisfaction, post-graduate activity, and continuing/non-continuing students. A sophomore survey, senior survey and an alumni survey are conducted periodically. Unique sets of local questions have been developed to enhance the value of these surveys. The College also participates in the HERI Freshman Survey, the HERI Faculty Survey and is a charter member of HEDS (Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium). The faculty salary and compensation analysis is conducted by this office.

Where appropriate and when available, all assessment activities provide benchmarking data against national or peer data. This routine activity provides immediate insight to Gettysburg's practices and results. Routine benchmarking activities occur for faculty salary comparisons, tuition and fee structure, finance, financial aid, the *U.S. News and World Report* survey, and many others.

A major activity in the 2002-2003 period was to provide support to the Enrollment & Educational Services Division in developing and assessing our strategic use of financial aid. A Net Revenue Monitoring System Model was developed which is used for strategic planning as well as for monitoring new student net revenue. This ongoing support enables us to assess how effective our strategic packaging approach has been at the College and, where appropriate, make adjustments.

The Office of Institutional Analysis conducts assessment studies and distributes reports. It acts as the key-clearing house for any external reporting agencies and produces a yearly Fact Book for the College.

While the majority of divisional level assessment at the College is happening within each division or at the President's Council level, the Office of Institutional Analysis works to centralize these activities, provide the expertise for divisional studies, and conduct studies across divisional lines.

Observation: Recognizing the limitations of a one-person office, in 2002, each division appointed a liaison with the Office of Institutional Analysis. This individual not only acts as the divisional expert on assessment but works collaboratively with the Office of Institutional Analysis to meet divisional research and assessment needs. This divisional liaison concept has not been fully developed.

15. Recommendation : It is recommended that the current Institutional Analysis Divisional Liaison Program be strengthened so that more ownership and knowledge of it exists throughout the College.

16. Recommendation : It is recommended that administrative assessment workshops be conducted to assist not only the liaisons but others on "outcome-based" assessment techniques.

17. Recommendation : It is recommended that the College review the staff needs of the Office of Institutional Analysis to be assured that the College can meet all assessment, research and planning needs.

B. Resource Assessment

Current Practices:

Five-Year Financial Plan. The Strategic Action Plan works in concert with the Five-Year Financial Plan shaping operating and capital budgets. As part of the normal budget

approval process each spring, the administration presents to the trustees projected operating budgets for the next five-year period along with detailed recommended operating and capital budgets for the upcoming fiscal year. The Five-Year Financial Plan allocates resources to effectively meet the objectives of the Strategic Action Plan and is grounded in a set of financial objectives. The financial objectives outline parameters for all the key revenue and expenses drivers. The premise of the Financial Objectives is defined by overarching financial goals: first, the College will show an increase in total net assets as defined in the audited financial statements, including the value of the physical plant, calculated over the most recent consecutive five-year period; and secondly, the College will maintain a balanced budget in each fiscal year.

Each winter when the Fiscal and Personnel Committee of the Board reviews the Financial Objectives, the trustees evaluate the College's success in meeting these financial equilibrium goals and approve the parameters of the key revenue and expense drivers to be used in projecting the Five-Year Financial Plan and the comprehensive fee for the upcoming academic year. Additionally, economic and industry specific information is presented and considered in the establishing the new Financial Objectives.

Success in reaching each of the specific revenue and expense objectives outlined within the Financial Objectives is monitored and reviewed by the trustees annually. As the budget planning process begins each year, the changes in net assets, the year-end budget surplus from previous years, and the College's ability to meet the specific revenue and expense objectives over a five-year period influence the manner in which subsequent Financial Objectives and budgets are developed.

Over the period covered by this Self-Study, Gettysburg College has increased its net assets as reported on the College's independently audited financial statements. The most recent review showed the total net assets have grown from \$177.8 million in FY 1998 to \$212.0 million in FY 2002. The challenging economic environment, present since the start of the new century, heightens this accomplishment. Over this same period, the College has had modest operating budget surpluses each year.

Financial Structure and the Budget Process. The College has five major financial areas: the current unrestricted fund, which includes all current-year revenues and expenditures; the plant fund, which supports capital projects; the endowment fund, containing both true and quasi endowment; a reserve fund, established for use in the event of a financial shortfall; and special discretionary funds for use in implementing new initiatives or one time activities.

Current Unrestricted Fund (Operational Budget): The College derives revenues from tuition and fees, government appropriations, trust and estate incomes, gifts and endowment, activities related to educational departments, and auxiliary enterprises. These key revenue streams depend on enrollment, annual fund participation, the endowment spending rate, and housing and board contracts. Like many other independent colleges, Gettysburg is highly tuition-dependent. A five-year enrollment/budget model is updated yearly by a collaborative Enrollment Management

Committee which includes representatives from Finance, Enrollment Services, College Life, Admissions, Academic Affairs, Financial Aid, and Institutional Analysis. Through the responsible stewardship of funds, the College's total revenues have consistently exceeded total expenditures.

Plant Fund: Plant fund revenues are generated from the proceeds of municipal bonds, income from investments of specific fund assets, depreciation and debt transfers from the current fund, gifts to the fund, and other gains from fund transactions.

Expenditures include capital projects, debt service for repayment of municipal bond issues, and expenses associated with the Pooled Income Fund. The activity of the fund is routinely projected for several years in advance.

Most capital expense projects are identified during the annual budget process. All requests for capital improvements are prioritized and those deemed most important compete for funding. Some capital expense projects surface as a result of regular maintenance activities or through planning activities that do not coincide with the budget process. Since requests for funding often exceed available dollars, a second review is conducted of all projects scheduled to compete for funding for a specific fiscal year. During this process, some projects are funded, some are identified as having potential for external funding, some smaller projects are funded through the current fund, and some are rescheduled for future years.

Endowment: The College endowment is composed of true endowment and quasi endowment monies. The Endowment Funds Management Committee of the Board of Trustees oversees the fund, reviews performance, recommends investment policy, and selects fund managers. This committee meets four times per year, but receives monthly reports regarding the management of the fund.

As a part of the budget process, this committee recommends to the full board the percent of the fund's value that ought to be spent (the "spending rate"). The College's endowment spending policy is designed to provide support for current operations while maintaining the future purchasing power of the endowment. This rate has declined steadily over the past six years by 1/8 of a percent. The rate is currently projected to be 5.0% in fiscal year 2004 and thereafter.

Reserves: The College has a long-established policy of carrying reserves. The Board of Trustees may release a portion of these reserves in a time of fiscal crisis. In addition, though not a true reserve, the College maintains an unrestricted revolving loan fund for use as student loans. Currently, the fund is at about \$1.1 million. The major portion is in outstanding loans. The annual collections are awarded to students to meet a portion of their financial need. In fiscal years '01 and '02, the Board of Trustees approved the allocation of operating surpluses in the amounts of \$235,000 and \$217,000 respectively to an unrestricted operating reserve fund. This practice is expected to continue in FY'03. The unrestricted operating reserve strengthens cash flow; it provides short-term interest earnings and the Board may release a portion if financially necessary.

Discretionary Funds: Each year department heads are provided with base budget information. Department heads make requests for One-Time funds through their respective division heads that provide for items such as the acquisition of new equipment. They may also request Enrichment funds for those items or activities that will continue into future years. Each division head reviews and submits, in priority order, the requests of departments within his or her division. Costs associated with new or expanded academic programs are submitted through the Provost. These requests together with base budget information, are reviewed by the President and the Vice President for Finance and Administration. Meetings are held with each division head to clarify requests. The Presidents Council receives the recommendations and selects those projects to fund. All requests are classified as one-time, enrichment, annual operations, or capital projects.

Financial Resource Assessment. The assessment of financial resources at Gettysburg College ranges from institution-wide analysis to division specific to individual operating unit reviews. At each level, the assessment results contribute to financial planning efforts and resource allocation decisions.

A participant in the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) consortium since 1984, Gettysburg College, through the Office of Institutional Analysis, draws institution-wide comparative data from the various surveys compiled by HEDS. This alliance has produced a wealth of useful information about the College's resources relative to peer institutions. This is demonstrated in the HEDS Finance report, which displays the revenue, student financial aid, and expenses for 118 institutions. The College's continuing participation in this consortium also allows historical trend analyses to be prepared.

Gettysburg College also participates in NACUBO's Endowment Survey, AICUP's Financial Analysis & Trends survey, and the ELCA's Higher Education Trends Analysis. These measurements are supplemented by internally generated surveys of peer institutions, comparative financial ratios compiled by the College's independent auditor, and periodic analyses compiled by external consultants.

The manner in which the Endowment Management Committee of the Board of Trustees operates provides an example of how assessment results impact financial planning and resource allocation decisions at the institutional level. The Board has established investment policies with the goal of maximizing total return relative to appropriate risk. They have set a long-term goal to grow the College's endowment to \$500 million through new gifts and investment performance. In setting this goal and monitoring progress toward it, the Endowment Management Committee meets quarterly to review asset allocation strategies, investment performance of managers, and spending rates. They use results from the NACUBO survey as a basis of comparison with our peer institutions. This is a continuous loop that repeats itself annually; the College's spending policy, asset allocation strategy, and performance are reviewed and modified if warranted.

At the operating unit level, external reviews of academic and administrative departments provide evidence of the College's resource assessment practices. Administrative department reviews occur periodically at the initiative of the division head. The review process itself varies depending upon the division and/or the external reviewer. Academic departments, undergo a formal external review every seven years. Academic department reviews begin with the department's self-study and are followed by an external peer review. The process concludes with the department preparing a written response to the external reviewers' report, which, along with the self-study and external review, is shared with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. The adequacy of a department's resources is addressed within this process. Resource recommendations are prioritized relative to other needs across the institution and they are considered as the Five-Year Financial Plan is developed.

Human Resources. Over the past ten years, Gettysburg College has enjoyed a period of increasing enrollments. During this period, clear staffing and compensation goals have been monitored in an effort to ensure the College continues to meet the institution's mission and strategic objectives in an efficient manner. Faculty positions have been added where needed to maintain approximately an 11-to-1 student-faculty ratio, and the full-time to part-time faculty ratio has gradually improved. The College relies on HEDS – IPEDS Fall Staff report, as well as the faculty resource data in the *U. S. News & World Report's Best Colleges* ranking to monitor how well the College's faculty and staff resources compare to peer institutions.

The assessment of employee compensation (salary and benefits) is based upon three indices. For faculty compensation the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Group IIB at the 95th percentile and the median of the 32 comparison institutions is used. Additional information available through HEDS on salary and benefits, entry salaries, and adjunct faculty compensation are also reviewed. For administrative positions the College & University Personnel Association (CUPA) Administrative Compensation Survey is utilized, and for support staff local surveys such as the Gettysburg Area Personnel Association (GAPA) Employment Survey are used. These studies are considered in combination with local cost-of-living and consumer price indices to assess adequacy of compensation levels. In addition to this formal review, useful information about the competitiveness of the College's compensation package is also obtained through informal mechanisms such as employee exit interviews and during the employee recruitment process. Compensation information is then utilized when decisions are made during the budget development process each spring.

The impact of such assessment practices on resource allocation decisions is evident in the salary appropriations made during the past five years in which additional funds have been allocated to faculty salaries to address the competitiveness of full time faculty compensation and to convert part-time to full-time faculty positions. Staff positions, such as security officers, dining services employees, and housekeepers, have had market salary adjustments as inequities have been identified.

Beyond the traditional yearly staff evaluation process which includes 360° feedback in some divisions, Gettysburg College has invested in three important areas, all of which point to continued institutional effectiveness, improvement, and assessment.

- **President's Position Management Team:** This team reviews all administrative and support staff personnel requests (new or upgraded) from all divisions. The aim is to assess additional staff needs and ask the hard questions, to invest in staff expansion after a thorough analysis of need. The team presents to the President, the historic and current facts surrounding the request including the connection to the institutional Strategic Plan. The President then reviews the information with the appropriate Division Head and those requests with institutional priority and greatest need are approved.
- **Staff Recognition:** Staff recognition is a way to maintain top performances at all levels of the organization. This priority of the senior management team provides a small, but important, recognition of superior work. Feedback and assessment of this initiative has provided the College with an understanding of how important this recognition is among employees.
- **Leadership in Action:** This six-month program, designed to encourage the development of the leadership skills of 20 administrators each year, has, for the past two years, provided an opportunity for participants to work in interdepartmental groups studying campus-wide issues. This self-reflective, personal process, which included a personal "coach" for each individual, training classes, and team project work, has had an impact not only on participants but also on the campus culture and climate. Use of "Interactive Assessment Cycle," including the statement of mission/purpose, setting objectives/goals, and analyzing outcomes was reinforced.

Strong planning, both strategic and short-term, are the foundation of Gettysburg's administrative culture. This environment establishes a tone for collaboration, discovery, explanation, and evaluation of ideas and actions.

Technical Resources. Gettysburg College made a strategic decision in the early 1990's to invest in technology throughout the campus. This decision led the College to be named one of America's Most Wired Colleges by *Yahoo! Internet Life* magazine. Since 1995, the College has had a technology renewal fund within the annual capital budget. This consistent flow of resources has allowed the College to keep pace with ever-changing technology. Such investments have included the development of a campus portal, the enhancement of wireless network capability, the replacement of a legacy data processing system with an integrated and robust administrative management information system, periodic modernization of the College web site, and increased Internet capacity.

The Network and Internet: The campus has adopted a "groupware" approach to campus email, calendaring, file sharing and network resource access utilizing Microsoft Outlook/Exchange Server solution. Gettysburg installed "packet monitoring" equipment that analyzes every "bit" of traffic in and out of our system including available bandwidth

and traffic importance. This is done automatically and “on-the fly.” The network staff manages the system to maximize quality of the service on essential communications and traffic. Traffic in and out of the Internet is tracked using a 5-minute sampling and analysis method. If use exceeds the programmed thresholds, immediate action is taken to manage the resources. File space and email space quotas insure that all users have equitable access to file and email based network services. Real-time assessments of application and data files and email sizes allow us to estimate system enhancements are planned using a rational procedure based on past usage. All critical network devices that support the business and educational mission of the College are monitored to insure they provide the necessary support. Gettysburg’s “Spam control” system, installed in 2002, filters unwanted mail from the campus network. Currently, 30-45% of all inbound email is unsolicited junk email or “Spam.”

Academic Support: The Instructional Technology and Training (ITT) department and the Classroom Committee periodically assess the use of technology in the classrooms and determine the need for additional requirements or enhancements. ITT maintains records of audio-visual equipment and loaner laptop use by faculty, staff, and students, and regularly assesses the need for additional services. The Director uses this information to project future needs. Training requests are analyzed regularly to determine training resources. In addition to the “wired network” infrastructure Gettysburg College overlaid 802.11b compliant wireless technology in 2001. At this time wireless network technology is in use throughout much of the campus.

Management Information Systems: Technical and functional personnel who manage administrative data systems meet regularly to review and discuss issues related to internal data systems as business processes are refined or changed. These individuals identify, coordinate and prioritize the implementation of internal data systems changes. The Production Configuration Management Plan contains procedures for maintaining the functionality and reliability of the data management systems.

Hardware Replacement Policy: Three times a year, personal computers considered no longer technically adequate for their current use are replaced. When possible these machines are used to meet lower priority needs. This policy covers machines used in offices, computer labs, student work machines and private labs. The ITT budget process allows for flexible but highly accountable use resources. Servers older than 5-6 years and/or servers that are no longer technically adequate are replaced on a regular cycle.

ITT Planning: A list of projects and their related costs is maintained for the MIS system, system tools, and data components, with 5-7 year budget projections. A high-level plan specifying the technical and functional requirements for restoring critical data systems to operation in the event of a major equipment failure or power shutdown are detailed in the Disaster Recovery and Continuous Operations of MIS data Systems Plan. A campus-wide wiring upgrade has been developed to replace the category 3 wiring to a category 6 when funding is available.

In the spring of 2003 the College engaged a consultant to assist in the development of a long-range technology plan. The goal of this plan is to identify initiatives that will most effectively leverage the College's already strong technology infrastructure. In the near future a study will be conducted to ascertain how the College's technology resources compare to peer institutions. Since the demise of *Yahoo! Internet Life* magazine in July 2002, peer data is not readily available.

Observation: The dramatic and rapid development of the Worldwide Web and the attendant internal and external expectations related to it have placed a strain on the College's resources. Although the College has worked creatively to respond to this new technology and the opportunities it represents, the challenge of continuously maintaining and enhancing the college's web presence is substantial and does not appear likely to decline in the foreseeable future.

18. Recommendation: It is recommended that the College review the resources committed to support of the Web and consider ways to re-allocate other resources related to communications and marketing across the college budget in order to provide adequate financial and human resources to meet the needs and aspirations of internal and external consumers. Special attention should be given to resources committed to printed materials that might be equally or more effectively expended in support of the Web. Consideration should also be given to enhancing coordination of printed publications that support the College's marketing efforts.

Physical Resources. Beginning in 1995, Gettysburg College initiated a comprehensive facilities assessment, which, when completed in 1998, evolved into the Campus Master Plan. The Campus Master Plan is a fifteen-year plan that focuses on three areas: deferred maintenance phase-out, space modernization, and landscape enhancements. The needs for each of these areas were identified through a series of surveys. These studies, which were accomplished with consultants who brought expertise in each of the areas of focus, included the following:

Facilities Needs Assessment: An evaluation of the physical conditions of all College-owned facilities to address deferred maintenance, safety and accessibility, cycle maintenance, and the recurring capital process. This resulted in the Facilities Preservation Plan of March 1995. This plan was revised in September 1998 and updated in March 1999, and is kept current on a regular basis.

A comprehensive evaluation of future space needs resulted in the identification of Space Modernization Priorities. The priorities identified include the creation of a new science complex, enhancement and expansion of residential and activities areas, improvements to the Library, creation of a Center for Creative Teaching, enhancements to academic spaces, construction of a new pool and fitness facilities with the renovation of the athletic complex, renovation of the College Union Building, and other miscellaneous projects. This is a compilation of the recommendations produces by Utility Master Plan, the Space

Utilization Survey, an Americans with Disability Act compliance assessment, the Residence Life Study, the Library Master Plan, and the Classroom Master Plan.

In consultation with a landscape architect the Landscape Master Plan was completed in June 1997, providing an evaluation and recommendations on the campus landscape, including site details for campus improvement.

The development of the Campus Master Plan was accomplished parallel to and in coordination with the development of the College's Strategic Action Plan. The major new construction/renovation initiatives outlined within the Strategic Action Plan are also reflected in the Campus Master Plan. Progress on the Campus Master Plan is overseen by the Vice President of Finance and Administration and monitored by the Board of Trustees, when they receive periodic reviews and a full update each May. The investment in the physical plant of the College has improved the quality of academic and student life. The physical assets have also appreciated over the past decade as a result of these facilities renewal efforts.

Observation: Much has been accomplished to bring the various constituencies into the planning process. Programs such as Leadership in Action have provided a venue for encouraging interdepartmental interaction in the planning process and a commitment to "growing our own" administrators.

The current process for assessing planning and resource allocation has served the College well. It has allowed the College to reach goals outlined within the Strategic Action Plan, and has allowed the College to create a dynamic environment. Though Gettysburg College does not have the same level of resources as most of the best liberal arts colleges with which it competes, the planning and resource allocation processes have allowed the College to markedly improve every aspect of the institution relative to this peer group. This is evident when comparing endowments, operating budgets, and fund raising efforts. Through the implementation of comprehensive plans Gettysburg College has strategically leveraged its resources. Moody's Investor Services decision to upgrade Gettysburg College's bond rating in July 2002 is evidence of the College's prudent and effective use of resources.

Although the processes of planning, resource allocation, and assessment are seen by trustees and senior administrators as central to achieve efficiencies, it is not always clear to other campus constituencies such as faculty and staff. The Faculty Finance Committee meets at least monthly with the Vice President of Finance and the Director of Financial Planning and is engaged in the planning and resource allocation process, and its Chair reports all pertinent planning, allocation, and assessment of the resource allocation process to the Faculty Council, but this information is not consistently shared with the entire faculty. Division heads meet periodically with their budget managers and direct reports to assess current funding levels, and although goals are identified at all levels, as these goals are achieved, the results are not always made known throughout the division and campus.

19. Recommendation: It is recommended that the budget-building and resource-allocation process be clarified by incorporating it into a “budget narrative” that discusses the financial condition of the institution, explains the resource allocations in light of the Strategic Action Plan, and celebrates the funded improvements.

IV. ASSESSMENT AND THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The assessment of aspects of the educational programs of the College is conducted in many forms and ways. These evaluations contribute to the monitoring and improvement of general institutional effectiveness. This section describes the most important elements of regular assessment, both formal and informal, of the educational programs *other than the assessment of student learning*, which is discussed at length in a separate report.

Current Practices:

A. Assessment of Courses.

All courses for academic credit must be approved before they are listed in the Schedule of Courses. A New Course Proposal Form is available on-line; it provides detailed information about the goals, methods, content, and procedures of the course, as well as its perceived relationship to majors and minors, general education requirements, and other courses. In recent years, about one hundred course proposals, changes, or related documents have been submitted annually to the Academic Policy and Programs Committee (APPC) for action. These include proposals for new courses, First-Year Seminars, new selected topics for “*Topics in...*” courses, changes in course titles, etc. In the past, all such proposals were reviewed carefully by the full APPC, which gave or withheld approval and designated which general education requirements the course would meet (if any). Recently, the APPC has delegated the initial, routine review to the Registrar, who works within established guidelines, reporting routine recommendations to the APPC for general endorsement and presenting the more complex or questionable proposals for a full Committee review. The shared goals of such assessment are implicit in the course proposal form; they include: appropriate intellectual depth and rigor, coherence and importance of curricular content, use of contemporary scholarly resources, thoughtful and appropriate pedagogy and assignments; fit with major and general education requirements, etc.

This system of review has been applicable to new (i.e., proposed) courses only, though the APPC once distinguished between “provisional” and “permanent” approval, the former requiring a review after two terms. For reasons of workload, this practice has recently been discontinued. However, in response to the sweeping change in graduation requirements adopted in the spring of 2003, all courses will be put through the APPC review process; the primary goal will be to determine their fit with the new graduation requirements.

In addition, students are asked to complete an evaluation of each class they complete each term. This course and instructor evaluation system has previously been quite decentralized, with each department and program using a unique evaluation form. Considerable intellectual and political work has been accomplished to prepare for the introduction of a common course evaluation form (now scheduled for adoption in the fall of 2003). This includes a core set of questions that targets both the evaluation of the course and the evaluation of the instructor; it may be supplemented by departmental and individual forms. This system provides an indirect but important assessment of the effectiveness of each course.

B. Assessment of Academic Departments and Programs.

The Office of the Provost has established a seven-year cycle of formal reviews of each academic department and interdisciplinary program. The review is comprehensive, covering: curriculum, including major(s), minor(s), and service courses; staffing; departmental facilities, resources, library, equipment, and administrative support; student culture; budget and needs; and history, current challenges, and goals. Starting with the 2003-04 cycle, departments and programs have been asked to do a zero-based budget and to formally address the assessment of student learning as part of the process. The schedule of reviews is available on the Web (see attachment); instructions are provided in the *Handbook for Department Chairs and Program Coordinators*. The process, which is directly managed by the Vice Provost, consists of the following steps:

- (1) Under the leadership of the chair (or coordinator), the department (or program) conducts a self-assessment and produces a Self-Study Report addressing the topics listed above.
- (2) With the approval of the Vice Provost, the department or program selects a team of external evaluators, usually two to four scholars, from strong or peer programs. Upon acceptance, this team receives the self-study for review.
- (3) The External Reviewers conduct a site visit, normally of two days, including meetings with all stakeholders.
- (4) The team produces a Report of External Reviewers, including findings and recommendations. (The reviewers receive a modest stipend for their visit and their report.)
- (5) The department or program develops a written response to the report, which is submitted to the Provost's Office.
- (6) The Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, in most cases and as time permits, receives all documents (self-study, external report, and response), and meets with the faculty of the department or program for a discussion of their challenges, opportunities, and accomplishments.

(7) The Vice Provost monitors progress on recommendations and assures follow-through.

Observation: The policy of conducting departmental and program reviews on a seven year cycle is widely regarded as successful. Faculty and trustees have reaffirmed its importance. It has led to: planning retreats for departments and programs; new faculty positions; restructuring of majors and minors; establishment of new departments; trustee support for specific programs; new facilities and equipment; professional development directions for specific faculty members; and other changes. This program used a five-year cycle; that was discovered to be too ambitious and produced a backlog for trustee interaction. The seven-year cycle is more manageable and encourages more serious and in-depth self-studies.

20. Recommendation: It is recommended that this program of external reviews be firmly embedded as an important milestone in the life of departments and programs. The Vice Provost should conduct training and preparation meetings for each year's cohort of chairs and program coordinators participating in their cyclical review, incorporating methodology for the assessment of student learning. Additionally, a comprehensive review of the budget process should be required as part of the department or program self-study.

21. Recommendation: It is recommended that the review documents (self-study, external review, and response) henceforth be shared with the newly created Committee on Learning Assessment (COLA); an appropriate procedure for this should be established by the Provost's Office.

C. Faculty Evaluation.

Every full-time, tenure-track faculty member at Gettysburg College anticipates a career in which his or her performance is subject to regular assessment. This faculty evaluation system is explicit, well defined, and elaborate. The system includes the following elements:

- Annual reviews by the department chair (and/or program coordinator) prior to tenure. These are largely formative evaluations, but they are submitted to the Provost and serve as the basis for merit increases in salary.
- A pre-tenure review, conducted normally in the third year (or in the second if prior experience is credited). This is a formal, "full-dress" review that mirrors the later tenure review. The candidate prepares a dossier that is examined by the departmental evaluation committee; each member of the committee writes a letter of evaluation and recommends whether or not the candidate should be continued in the tenure process; the chair of the committee writes a comprehensive memorandum that summarizes the case and indicates the vote. These materials are forwarded to the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC). Meeting with the Provost, the FPC studies the dossier and the departmental letters and deliberates

the case. The FPC and the Provost reach independent recommendations and forward these to President, who makes the final decision as to whether to continue the candidate.

- A tenure review, conducted normally in the sixth year (or as early as the third depending upon the number of years of prior experience credited). This evaluation follows the process described above; its focus is the determination of whether to grant tenure to the candidate or to terminate his or her employment at the College. In the normal case, promotion in rank from Assistant to Associate Professor is concurrent with the awarding of tenure.
- Triennial reviews are conducted for all tenured faculty by their department chairs (and/or program coordinators) throughout their career. These reviews are based on information provided in the faculty members annual reports, on classroom observations and student evaluations, and on research records. The reports are submitted to the Provost's Office and are reviewed there; they serve as the basis for merit adjustments to salary during each three-year cycle. Ratings of *meritorious*, *highly meritorious*, and *needs attention* are assigned for each of the criteria assessed (see below).
- Promotion reviews are conducted for candidates for promotion to the rank of full Professor. Normally there would be at least seven years between promotion to Associate Professor and consideration for the final promotion to full Professor; however, a candidate has the right to request consideration whenever she or he chooses. These evaluations follow the structure of a tenure review.

In all these various faculty evaluations, the criteria remain the same. These and the relevant methods of assessment may be briefly summarized as follows (the more detailed and authoritative presentation may be found in the *Faculty Handbook* and in the "Standard Operating Procedures" of the FPC):

Teaching and Advising. Teaching effectiveness is determined by a review of syllabi, course materials (handouts, tests, Websites), student evaluations of all courses taught at Gettysburg, and a Personal Statement that reflects on the Gettysburg teaching experience, student learning and response. In addition, each member of the evaluation committee conducts classroom visitations (see the suggested guidelines for such classroom visits) and reports observations as part of the evaluation letter. For pre-tenure and tenure reviews, the department chair is asked to conduct interviews with a group of the candidate's students and summarize the results in the chair's evaluation memorandum. Our guidelines encourage the interviewing of both male and female students, majors and non-majors, beginning and advanced students, those who did well in the course and those who did not. To date, the evaluation of advising relies on much less documentation and more on informal impressions; for advising there is no widely understood goal, as student learning is understood to be the goal of teaching. Nonetheless, the current system does ask each candidate and each evaluator to assess performance as an academic advisor.

Research and Scholarship (and/or Creative Performance). It is clear at Gettysburg that an active and productive research program is another essential criterion for tenure, promotion, and merit awards. There is great respect in these assessments for differences among disciplines – what one expects of a physicist and a pianist, a philosopher and a computer scientist, may be quite different. Different scholarly forms and different venues are appropriate to different disciplines. There is also a respectful understanding of the rhythm of research: an economist who regularly mines a large federal data base can produce perhaps three papers per year; an economist who does field work to produce a data base that becomes the basis for a book requires perhaps a four-year gestation period. These differences are celebrated, not just tolerated, in a mature faculty evaluation process – but they prevent any general statement of standards that is precise, quantifiable, and applicable to all. The candidate’s dossier, including a *curriculum vitae*, a Personal Statement that articulates the candidate’s research program and agenda, and copies of published works (or videos of creative performances) – these provide the basis of judgment of this criteria. In many cases, external reviewers are asked to provide independent assessments of the candidate’s scholarship (see the guidelines for the external review of scholarship).

Governance and Service. Based on the candidate’s dossier, including the Personal Statement, the evaluators assess both the quantity and quality of the candidate’s service to the department, to the faculty through governance appointments (committee service), to the campus at large, to students, to the community, and to the profession. The intent is to assure that each faculty member is a presence outside the classroom and engages fully in the collaborative and collective work of the department, the faculty and the professorate.

Faculty need not prepare a dossier for annual and triennial reviews; these assessments draw upon information provided in the annual reports submitted by each faculty member. The extensive dossiers required for pre-tenure, tenure, and promotion reviews replace annual reports during those years.

There are extensive files that document that process and effectiveness of this complex system of faculty evaluation. It has a sensitive balance of formative and summative (decision-making) evaluation. There is an appeal process for any candidate who feels he or she has not received “full and fair consideration.”

Faculty in term appointments are evaluated only with annual reviews described above. Adjunct (part-time) faculty must be evaluated by their department chair (or program coordinator) by the second term of their employment; no one may be hired for a third term without having an evaluation submitted to the Provost’s Office. Since these faculty are hired on a per course basis, the main criterion of evaluation is teaching effectiveness. The system of faculty evaluation is strong and has helped assure a faculty of high quality. Small improvements in the process will be suggested by the FPC. The introduction of a common course evaluation form should assist in assuring consistency of judgment for candidates across departments. The emphasis on student learning – and the assessment of learning – should increasingly provide sources of evidence for teaching effectiveness.

Observation: The system of faculty evaluation is strong and has helped assure a faculty of high quality. Small improvements in the process will be suggested by the FPC. The introduction of a common course evaluation form should assist in assuring consistency of judgment for candidates across departments. The emphasis on student learning – and the assessment of learning – should increasingly provide sources of evidence for teaching effectiveness.

22. Recommendation: It is recommended that the APPC use the new curricular implementation as a timely basis for the assessment of elements of all courses and related course practice, such as the attachment of labs and other scheduled supplementary sessions.

23. Recommendation: It is recommended that the goal of academic advising should be explicitly stated, e.g., “the systematic attempt to assure that each student receives the maximum educational impact from the Gettysburg experience.” More useful measures for the performance of academic advisors should be sought and employed in the evaluation process.

D. Evaluation of Department Chairs and Program Coordinators.

The Provost, with the approval of the President, appoints department chairs and program coordinators; the normal term of appointment is five years. Members of the Provost’s Office staff conduct a workshop for new chairs and coordinators each fall; in 2002, because of the amount of material to be covered, the workshop was split into two sessions. A list of responsibilities is provided for the position, along with a *Handbook*. There is no regular scheduled of evaluation of performance within each five-year period. However, there is the real possibility of responding to problems and complaints raised about performance – indeed, a few chairs or coordinators have been asked by the Provost to step down during the past few years. Outstanding performance has occasionally been awarded by a one-year bonus.

In the last year of a chair’s or coordinator’s term, the Provost solicits comments from members of the department or program: What, if any, are the concerns regarding the department’s or program’s leadership? What are the significant issues, challenges, and opportunities for the department or program during the next five years? Who is capable of providing leadership? Who should be appointed? The Provost reviews these responses and either renews the current chair or makes a new appointment. Such appointments are seldom renewed more than once (ten years total).

Observation: The duties of department chairs and program coordinators have increased in number and complexity. Routine management is time-consuming and may overwhelm real leadership and progress. The process of departmental and program review (described above) seldom addresses directly the performance of the chair or coordinator.

24. Recommendation: It is recommended that the Provost ask each new department chair to set goals. A more deliberate form of evaluation of department chairs and

program coordinators should be conducted based on both the duties and the declared goals.

E. Benchmarking.

Beyond what has been described previously in this section, it is common at Gettysburg College, as at most institutions, to develop institutional data and seek comparative data regarding the educational program to serve as an assessment of current policies and practices. These often provide one or more elements in the mosaic of measures of institutional effectiveness. These data may be collected and reported regularly or they may be collected only once as part of special inquiry and report. These are far too numerous to list in full, but examples can be provided:

- Sabbatical policies, including percentage of salary provided, is compared with other institutions using the Northeast Deans listserv (perhaps every two years)
- HEDS data is used to provide comparisons with peers and benchmarks for faculty compensation (annually).
- The Gallup organization was commissioned to do a special survey of alumni across all generations. The survey included valuable information about the perceived value of specific aspects of their college experience, including the curriculum then in place (a one-time survey).
- Support for faculty professional development is being compared with that of many other colleges in the Annapolis Group (a one-time survey).
- The general education requirements of peer liberal arts colleges were reviewed as background for the recently successful curriculum reform effort at Gettysburg (one-time).

25. Recommendation: It is recommended that efforts to standardize a set of peer institutions for various comparative purposes be completed and employed, where feasible, even in the benchmarking described in this section.

V. CONCLUSION

The College engages in a continuous strategic thinking which results in support for campus priorities. In fact, high level strategic planning and goal setting is quite advanced but outcomes are not always measured.

Recognizing that much has been accomplished with the current approach and process, one must analyze the strengths and express concern regarding the weaknesses. The strengths of our current effort include:

- Significant data collection and corresponding to multiple questions
- High level strategic planning and goal setting
- Multiple assessment approaches – surveys, focus groups, etc.
- Decision-making at all levels based on both qualitative and quantitative data

- A collaboration framework through which many divisions approach key planning and assessment activities

Opportunities do exist for the current effort to be enhanced. The majority of our assessment and data collection is completed within each division and is decentralized. The College would gain by providing a more centralized approach to planning and assessment. It will be important for the college to recognize the need for staffing to support institutional assessment as well as any new student learning assessment activities.

This report also suggests the need for a broader view into the arena of assessment and planning. A balance between measuring inputs and outputs needs to be achieved. Routine assessment of new initiatives, programs and processes should be integrated into this plan as well.

The College has achieved much success in assessment. Further strengthening of institutional assessment and planning efforts can only benefit the college in the future. We must hold onto the best of what we do and push beyond the barriers to strengthen this effort on all fronts.

Gettysburg College plans to create a stronger culture of assessment and realizes that there are several proactive initiatives the College must consider as we move forward. We understand that assessment should be:

- Meaningful
- Manageable – takes into account varying resources
- Flexible – takes into account assessment learning curves
- Truth-seeking/objective
- Informs decisions for continuous improvements
- Promotes a culture of learning and continuous improvements

This institutional assessment report outlines the current status of assessment within the College. Little time is set aside for substantial analysis and review of the results of various efforts within and across divisions. More substantial use of the divisional liaisons may assist in addressing this concern. A formal committee representing the various administrative units might be established to begin this effort.

We move forward from a position of strength knowing that so many administrative areas embrace assessment and integrate it into their yearly planning efforts. The recommendations that follow recognize that a culture of assessment needs to be cultivated over time and each step will enable us to address the barriers of limited time, limited resources, limited understanding of the benefit for conducting assessment.

1. Recommendation : It is recommended that the College create an Administrative Institutional Assessment Committee to advise on assessment and planning. The current institutional assessment plan should be reviewed and enhanced.

2. Recommendation : Each division of the College should evaluate assessment expectations regularly with consideration to the following questions:

- What are we trying to do?
- How well are we doing it?
- How do we know?
- How do we use the information?
- How do we know it works?