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HISTORICAL AND CURRENT PERSPECTIVES

In the closing decades of the nineteenth century, Philadelphia financier and philanthropist Anthony J. Drexel envisioned an institution of higher learning uniquely suited to the needs of a rapidly growing industrial society and of the young men and women seeking their place in it. In 1891, he realized his vision with the establishment of the Drexel Institute of Art, Science and Industry.

In founding the Institute, Anthony J. Drexel launched a tradition of innovation, which today is carried on by Drexel University. Although distinguished by decades of growth and change from Mr. Drexel's Institute of Art, Science and Industry, the University remains faithful to his vision. Its greatly expanded enrollment, campus and curriculum reflect a history of responsiveness to societal and individual needs, which Mr. Drexel sought to address in his day.

Originally a non-degree-granting institution, Drexel began conferring the bachelor of science degree in 1914, when its 18 departments were organized into four schools. In 1927, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania granted Drexel the privilege to confer the master of science degree, and in 1965, the doctor of philosophy degree.

Along with its degree offerings, the institution's curriculum and organization of academic programs have evolved to include nine colleges and five schools. In accord with this evolution, Drexel has undergone two changes in name, in 1936 becoming Drexel Institute of Technology and in 1970, Drexel University. The current name reflects the institution's commitment to research and education, as well as the breadth of its graduate programs.

Despite the many changes during its first century, Drexel's identity has held constant. Since its founding, the institution has remained a privately controlled, non-sectarian, coeducational center of higher learning, distinguished by a commitment to preparing men and women for success in their chosen careers.

The cornerstone of experiential learning and career preparation Drexel provides has been the University's co-operative education program. Introduced at Drexel in 1919, the program has become integral to the University's academic experience for the great majority of its students. Through it, students alternate periods of study with periods of full-time professional employment related to their academic and career interests.

Drexel's was among the first co-operative education programs in the nation, and today it is one of the largest and most diverse programs. Through co-op, Drexel students are currently employed by more than 1,600 businesses and organizations in 29 states and 38 countries.

In addition to its career focus, another constant element in Drexel's identity has been its commitment to providing technological expertise for society's needs. This commitment kept the institution operating around the clock during World War II to serve more than 3,000 visiting participants in the Engineering Defense Training Program. Following the war, rapid expansion of knowledge and the nation's drive for
technological preeminence continued to be a source of growth for Drexel.

In 1983, Drexel became the nation's first university to require all undergraduates to have personal access to a microcomputer for use in all of their coursework. In the years since, the microcomputer has become an integral part of instruction throughout the University's curriculum. Drexel was the nation's first major university to operate a fully wireless campus. It houses impressive resources for teaching and research, as well as facilities to serve a growing population of residential students.

In July 2002, Drexel's mission, services, and opportunities expanded further when MCP Hahnemann University, a major Philadelphia health sciences institution merged with Drexel University to become Drexel University College of Medicine, the College of Nursing and Health Professions, and the School of Public Health. This historic event extended the resources of Drexel, the breadth of its offerings, and led to many productive synergies in teaching and research.

In 2006, Drexel became the first major research university to open a new law school in 25 years. The Earle Mack School of Law at Drexel University is one of only two law schools in the US to follow a cooperative education model.

Today, Drexel continues to build upon strengths in the fields of science and engineering, preparing professionals for leadership in our global technological community through studies in a broad range of disciplines.

**Drexel since 2002**

Drexel University today is a strong yet markedly different institution of higher learning than it was in 2002, the year of the last decennial reaffirmation of accreditation. Since 2002, several substantive changes have been approved by MSCHE that represent adherence to mission while broadening offerings of academic programs, increasing research and scholarship, expanding facilities, and extending the institution's reach nationally and internationally. Drexel University in 2010 enjoyed an enrollment of 22,000 students, 1,293 full time faculty and 962 part time faculty, research expenditures of $103M annually, and a successful distance education enterprise.

The last Middle States re-accreditation in 2002 occurred immediately prior to the merger of Drexel University with MCP Hahnemann University. Earlier, Drexel University had been hired to manage the entity, which, as Allegheny Health, Education and Research Foundation, had declared bankruptcy in July 1998. Amidst the planned substantive change that was occurring at Drexel and the plan to merge, the Visiting Committee, while recognizing the unique opportunity that the merger afforded Drexel, made several recommendations regarding issues that Drexel and the future College of Medicine might face. Ultimately, this merger brought a new Drexel University College of Medicine with a College of Nursing and Health Professions and a School of Public Health into Drexel University. Since then, Drexel opened the Earle Mack School of Law and expanded existing program offerings at additional locations at Burlington County College in Mount Laurel, NJ, at Malvern, PA, and at the Center for Graduate Studies in Sacramento, CA. In addition, Drexel has recently competed an affiliation with the Academy of Natural Sciences, an historic and prolific natural history museum that will contribute significantly to Drexel's
research, education, and service missions.

Guided by a renewed mission and a strategic plan launched in 2007 that reaffirms its commitment to education and research, the University has continued to deliver strong academics with cooperative education as a centerpiece of a strategy to educate and graduate students with real-world experience. Embracing the concept of use-inspired research provides a vehicle for faculty and students – both undergraduates and graduates – to not only create new knowledge in and across disciplines but also to apply new knowledge to societal needs in the nation and world. In 2011, Drexel stands a nationally and internationally recognized comprehensive research University with a Carnegie Classification of Research - High Research Activity.

Senior Leadership and Organization

The remarkable changes at Drexel since 1995 occurred under the leadership of President Constantine ("Taki") Papadakis, who passed away in April 2009. The Board of Trustees subsequently appointed C. R. "Chuck" Pennoni as Interim President. After a national search, John A. Fry was named Drexel’s 14th President on 10 March 2010; he took office on 1 August 2010.

Under the leadership of Interim President Chuck Pennoni, the senior leadership of Drexel University along with the faculty and staff of the institution maintained remarkable momentum through the passing of President Papadakis and in the midst of a major national economic downturn. Enrollment remained steady, co-op job availability was maintained, and international outreach continued to expand. The University is remarkably stable financially. Under President Fry’s tenure, this momentum has increased with a broadly based strategic planning process and the development of an ambitious master plan that will further define Drexel University presence not only in the city of Philadelphia but nationally and globally as well.

Drexel’s Mission and Strategic Plan: The Future is Drexel

Drexel University’s current Strategic Plan, The Future is Drexel has been the guiding document for the University. This five-year Plan, approved in 2007, continues to be fully aligned with the University Master Plan and strategic plans for each academic unit, including the Drexel University College of Medicine. The Plan, approved in May 2007 by the Board of Trustees is being replaced in 2012, the year of the decennial visit. Therefore, the present self-study will inform the discussion as a new strategic plan is formulated.

The 2007-2012 Strategic Plan entitled The Future is Drexel presents a carefully developed set of strategies that are bold, innovative, and well integrated with Drexel’s strengths and serves as a basis for institutional activities over the next five years. With its adoption, the Mission of the University was refined to reflect the comprehensive nature of the institution and respond to the national academic agenda and an increasingly global society, driving forces and themes that will continue Drexel’s academic progression into the top-tier national research Universities. The Mission, coupled closely with as follows:
To serve our students and society through comprehensive integrated academic offerings enhanced by technology, cooperative education, and clinical practice in an urban setting, with global outreach, embracing research, scholarly activities, and community initiatives.

The five strategic objectives of the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan cut across the entire University to both define and transform the institution. These objectives are:

- Enriching the Educational Experience
- Promoting a Culture of Research and Scholarship
- Advancing Faculty Support and Development
- Promoting a Culture of Student Engagement
- Executing the Plan

The attributes of quality, comprehensiveness, use-inspired research, cooperative education and experiential learning, interdisciplinary research and education programs, national and international recognition, international opportunities for students, and presence in a vital urban community are infused throughout the plan. Adherence to the plan's benchmarks is assessed regularly, and linkages between the Strategic Plan and budget allocations are fundamental.

In developing the Strategic Plan, all constituencies of the University were consulted including the Board of Trustees, Deans, Department Heads, and faculty and students through their respective governance structures. Facilities needs were coordinated between the Strategic Plan and the Campus Master Plan.

Currently, the University is in the process of developing the next strategic plan. The Drexel University Strategic Plan: 2012-2017 has been transparent and engaging for the broad Drexel community. Beginning in 2011, the new strategic plan themes are based on understanding Drexel's evolution since its founding to the present. The primary focus asserts Drexel's promise as a re-envisioned urban comprehensive research university whose actions impact positively not only its local community but regional, national, and global communities as well.

Drexel University continues to achieve its mission by engaging in its core activities—education, research, and service—in its urban environment. The mission is further achieved by the development of new initiatives that allow the institution to move forward and define itself in a changing, competitive, and challenging higher education environment.

Drexel is recognized by the broad community, including its peers, as an institution that is innovative, risk-taking, and strategic. These qualities allow the University to deliver on the promise of its mission to undergraduate and graduate students and contribute to society through research, community service, and educational outreach. In the process, the University continues to engage dedicated faculty and professional staff whose ideas, commitment, and hard work have brought increasing regional, national, and global recognition.

Drexel's approach to teaching revolves around experiential learning as exemplified most concretely by its internationally recognized co-operative education program. Aligning with its educational approach,
Drexel’s use-inspired approach to research allows faculty and students to address broad societal problems and establish strong collaborations inside and outside the institution.

Drexel’s main campus is situated in an urban setting surrounded by economically, demographically, and educationally diverse populations and neighborhoods. The opportunities and challenges of this urban environment continue to be key aspects of the way the University achieves its mission and supports its students. Drexel also continues to expand its international presence through its graduates who live and work across the globe. New international partnerships and experiences are being created with focuses on research and education to better prepare students in this context.

In many regards, the type of student that Drexel has attracted and continues to attract over the years is similar to the traits of the faculty and professional staff. In recent discussions, a Drexel student was characterized as:

- An astute questioner and problem-identifier
- An imaginative and analytic problem-solver
- An informed risk-taker with an enterprising spirit
- A curious, motivated, pragmatic learner
- An informed citizen who can also lead
- A hard worker, with real-world experience
- A person ready to be productive and innovative the day he or she graduates

The development of these characteristics is encouraged in the classroom, on co-op, in study abroad experiences, and in everyday life. These characteristics are more fully fleshed out in the Drexel Student Learning Priorities that provide guidance to academic programs and have become an underlying basis for assessment. In advancing its mission, the University has changed significantly over the last ten years:

- Drexel has grown in comprehensiveness dramatically. The merger of MCP/Hahnemann University in 2002 brought to Drexel the largest private medical school in the nation, the College of Nursing and Health Professions, and the School of Public Health. These units are well aligned with the mission of the University in all aspects. The Earle Mack School of Law opened in 2006 as one of two law schools in the US to offer co-operative education as part of the curriculum.
- Recognizing the promise of new technologies for educational delivery, Drexel has become a national leader in online education, now offering over 100 programs. In addition, new initiatives are connecting the infusion of technology in curricula in face-to-face and blended formats and developing novel pedagogical constructs.
- Drexel extended its reach regionally and nationally by opening additional locations to address specific student cohorts offering undergraduate degree completion programs at Burlington County College in Mount Laurel, NJ; full-time and part-time graduate programs in Sacramento, CA; and graduate Education programming in Harrisburg, PA. These programs are connected to the main campus through state-of-the-art technologies.
Drexel has become a highly residential campus with about 91% of entering freshmen. The University has moved from a regional institution to attracting students from national and international locations.

New learning assessment strategies have been developed based on newly crafted Learning Priorities that were reviewed and endorsed across all facets of the Drexel community.

Strategic hiring has attracted new faculty at all levels with excellent credentials.

Research has become more interdisciplinary, and funding has increased to about $120M in annual expenditures.

Rankings have risen.

New facilities have been built or leased to accommodate an increasing student body and research agenda. New buildings opened since 2009 include the Recreation Center, Millennium Hall Dormitory, a Medical Simulation Center, and the Constantine N. Papadakis Integrated Sciences Building. Philanthropy has led to two new projects currently underway: the LeBow College of Business building and the URBN Center. A renovation program in existing building has led to the creation of several new learning spaces.

Drexel has also been faced with serious challenges over the past few years including:

- The untimely death of President Constantine Papadakis, the architect of many of the positive developments and initiatives at Drexel, occurred in 2009. The presidency was assumed on an interim basis by Mr. Chuck Pennoni until the appointment of Mr. John Fry after a national search under the leadership of a highly engaged Board of Trustees.
- The serious economic downturn created challenges, but Drexel experienced record undergraduate and graduate enrollments and degrees granted, and co-op placement rates remained at >97.5% through a dedicated effort on job creation.

With the current strategic plan in its last year, embarking on a new strategic plan provides an opportunity for the University to expand its vision for itself for the next five years and beyond. President Fry has begun this process with broad engagement and great transparency, addressing Drexel's place in Philadelphia, its engagement globally, and how partnerships of all kinds can create mutually beneficial opportunities that necessarily align with Drexel's mission. Elements of the plan will consider challenges of access to education, continued economic challenges, changing labor markets, increased globalization, and the role of urban campuses through innovation and planning.

**INTERACTIONS WITH MSCHE SINCE 2002**

Since the 2002 MSCHE Decennial visit and reaffirmation of accreditation in March 2002, several contacts with MSCHE have occurred to seek approval of the merger of Drexel with MCP Hahnemann; expansion of distance learning; opening a degree completion campus at Burlington County College in Mount Laurel, NJ; opening a School of Law; and, establishing graduate programs at sites in Malvern, PA, in Sacramento, CA, and in Harrisburg, PA.
Reports to MSCHE include: substantive changes regarding the merger of MCP/Hahnemann with Drexel University (May 2002; accepted provisionally within the scope of the institution's accreditation, pending PA State approval in June 2002 and requesting a Follow-up report; accepted as part of the institution's accreditation upon receipt of PA State approval in September 2002); distance education (July 2002; accepted in August 2002), and for Drexel programs offered at Burlington County College, NJ (accepted June 2006), Malvern, PA (accepted May 2008), and Sacramento, CA (accepted May 2008). A Follow-up report was submitted in March 2004 and with a Follow-up site visit later that year to address progress with the merger of MCP/Hahnemann and Drexel; Monitoring Reports were submitted in 2005 and 2006; the Periodic Review Report was submitted in March 2007 (accreditation reaffirmed in November 2007 with a request for a Progress Letter); and this Progress Letter was submitted in March 2009. While notified, it was noted by MSCHE that no Substantive Change was required for the School of Law because Drexel already had authorization to offer professional and doctoral degrees. Aspects of these reports are outlined below.

The merger with MCP Hahnemann was effective July 1, 2002. At that point, under Drexel’s management, MCP/Hahnemann University had moved from a $45M deficit in FY00 to a balanced budget for FY02. The Substantive Change Report detailed processes for planning and executing the merger. This included the work of a Merger Transition Team instituted in November 2001 that involved faculty, students and administrators of both university communities. The anticipated positive impact for the entire institution was expressed in the Report as follows: “The vision of Drexel University is the marriage of health sciences and technology that will provide Drexel with a well-defined entry into the healthcare arena, uniquely positioning the combined enterprise in the higher education community.” Notably, this vision has served as a fundamental aspect of Drexel’s strategic planning. The section of the Report entitled “Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education,” outlined the structure of a combined University according to Middle States Standards. Nursing, Health Professions, and Public Health were moved to Drexel while the College of Medicine operates as a separate 501(c)(3) corporation such that the merged institutions comprise two 501(c)(3) corporations – Drexel University (incorporating the College of Nursing and Health Professions, the School of Public Health, and the Department of Psychology from MCP Hahnemann University) and the Drexel University College of Medicine. Each corporation has its own Board of Trustees with unified faculty governance.

Distance education was approved for Drexel University after submission of a Substantive Change in 2002. To support and maintain growth in its distance education programs, Drexel University formed a for-profit, wholly owned subsidiary, Drexel eLearning, to market its programs. The online programs are run, as are all programs, by the University’s schools and colleges, adhering to the same high standards as Drexel’s on-campus programs and guided by an Online Learning Council to develop and disseminate best practices.

Following the Middle States recommendation of the need for strategic planning, particularly in light of the impending merger, a Strategic Plan entitled Drexel University’s Plan for a Time of Transforming Opportunity was developed and issued in 2004. The overall theme was quality, and strategies directed toward repositioning of the University for the 21st century society. Information, biology and healthcare,
nanotechnology, and entertainment became key focus areas. The need for societal awareness particularly in an urban setting and the recognition of opportunities for integration in and between academics and research became guiding ideas. Clearly, Drexel had assumed a new role in the areas of biological- and biomedical-related disciplines and healthcare with the recent merger. The Plan proposed renewed synergistic relationships among Drexel Colleges and Schools which were given a new impetus as a result of the merger with the College of Medicine and the growth of online learning initiatives. Improving student retention was viewed as a key area for improvement.

Two Follow-up Reports were submitted to Middle States in early 2004 to update merger activities and to notify the Commission of the adoption of the 2004 Strategic Plan. A Visiting Team came to Drexel in Fall 2004 to assess the implementation of the 2004 Strategic Plan and the incorporation of the Medical School into the University structure. According to its report, the Site Visit Team used as a measure “the vision and mission for Drexel’s future as defined by President Papadakis in our meeting with him.” It was further recognized that with a reorganization of the Office of the Provost in 2004, “greater confidence in the planning process was attained.” Inclusion of faculty in the planning process was positively noted, while enthusiasm towards the future by faculty and students was tempered by concerns regarding facilities, compensation, promotion and tenure processes. It was recognized that implementation of the Plan was on schedule and that the progress at that point was “more substantial than one might ordinarily expect.” The team noted the substantial progress that had been made since the Accreditation particularly in the merger and the involvement of constituencies in the process. The Visiting Team made several recommendations in their report as well.

In October 2006, Drexel submitted a Monitoring Report entitled Further Progress in the Integration of the Health Sciences Schools Academically and Fiscally into Drexel University to Middle States. This Report described the efforts to promote a seamless relationship among all units since 2004. Linkages between DUCOM and Drexel in terms of research, undergraduate education and medicine, graduate education in the biomedical sciences, and post-baccalaureate and dual-degree programs were developing at a steady pace. The College of Nursing and Health Professions continued its strong array of high-demand academic programs that embed technology to enhance clinical practice and education. In addition, several other important achievements were occurring: marked increases in research with newly developed collaborations across academic units, introduction of a doctoral nursing program, incorporation of cooperative education into its undergraduate nursing program, and the movement of its programs to the quarter system to align the calendars and to move general humanities and science courses (and faculty) to the College of Arts and Sciences, and continuing a strong online learning presence in nursing education. The School of Public Health has also made tremendous progress in its teaching and research missions with the attainment of full accreditation by the Council on Education for Public Health in July, 2007 and the introduction of new masters and doctoral (DrPH and PhD) degrees and the expansion of its executive MPH Program. Research productivity measures such as grant proposal submissions, externally-funded projects, publications and cross-unit collaborations have increased dramatically over this time.

In 2005, entered an agreement with Burlington County College in New Jersey to offer undergraduate
degree completion programs on its Mount Laurel campus and began to phase in programs beginning in 2006. The creation of Drexel@BCC represents a strategic initiative to provide broader access to students. A Substantive Change was submitted and approved as an Additional Location. Thirteen programs are currently recognized by the New Jersey Department of Education. To date, 159 Bachelor of Science degrees have been awarded through the Drexel@BCC program.

In Fall 2006, the College of Law (now the Earle Mack School of Law) opened. The Earle Mack School of Law celebrated its first graduating class of 154 students in Spring 2009. The School received full accreditation by the American Bar Association in 2011.

In March 2007, Drexel’s Periodic Review Report was submitted to address progress on issues that were raised at the 2002 Decennial Visit and to note progress being made with the merger, new Strategic Plan, and other activities at Drexel. A request for a Progress Letter focusing on progress in Drexel’s assessment activities was made and submitted in 2009.

In 2008, two Substantive Change reports were submitted. One was to create an Additional Location in Malvern, PA for the LeBow College of Business. Prior to this time, parts of business programs were delivered at Instructional Sites in the Great Valley region. With this site in leased space at a corporate center, Drexel planned to offer entire programs on site and this site was approved as an Additional Location. The second Substantive Change was submitted to create a Graduate Center in Sacramento, CA as an Additional Location. The Sacramento Graduate Center opened in January 2009, and both sites are currently operational and offering graduate programs. Other Instructional Sites are listed in the Annual Institutional Profile. In 2010, a Substantive Change report was submitted to add the Harrisburg, PA site as an Additional Location.

Campus Growth since 2002

Facilities have been improved and expanded since 2002 including the incorporation of the two MCP/Hahnemann campuses in Center City and Queen Lane (Additional Locations). During this period, existing facilities have been continually upgraded and renovated, and rental space has been leased to accommodate Drexel’s teaching and research missions as well as to accommodate an increasingly residential population. Several new buildings have been constructed, are under construction, or are being designed. Two new dormitories were put into service over the last four years: Race Street Residence (2007) and Millennium Hall (2009). The academic, research and athletic buildings that have been put into service since 2002 include: Pearlstein Building (LeBow College of Business, 2002), Bossone Building (College of Engineering and School of Biomedical Engineering, Science, and Health Systems 2003), Earle Mack School of Law (2006), Queen Lane Simulation Center (2009), Recreation Center (2010), and the Constantine Papadakis Integrated Sciences Building (2011). Buildings under construction or renovation include: the LeBow College of Business (to be occupied in 2014) and the URBN Center for the Westphal College of Media Arts and Design at 3501 Market Street (to be occupied in 2012). Residential and commercial space will increase in 2013 with a new structure under construction on Chestnut Street between 32nd and 33rd, and new teaching and research spaces are in planning and development stages. The new Master Plan is currently being finalized in conjunction with the new Strategic Plan.
NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE SELF STUDY

Intended Outcomes
The 2011/2012 Middle States self-study provides Drexel University an opportunity to reflect and evaluate its achievements over the past 10 years. The self-study effort comes at an opportune time as the institution transitions to a new strategic plan and to the leadership of a new president. As we engage in a comprehensive self-assessment of the institution, we seek to achieve the following outcomes:

1. To determine how well the institution is meeting the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s 14 Characteristics of Excellence;
2. To inform a 2012-2017 strategic plan;
3. To identify, define, and evaluate the institutional impact of the dramatic changes and growth experienced over the past 10 years and ways the institution can approach new opportunities and introduce academic innovations;
4. Identify new efficiencies, open lines of communication, and locate opportunities for collaboration across the institution;
5. To evaluate how well the institution is integrating its planning processes, educational effectiveness and budgetary decision-making; and
6. To determine how well the institution is meeting its objectives as defined in its mission and strategic plan.

ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE

The Middle States Self Study process has been ongoing for nearly two years. The model selected for the Self-Study is the Comprehensive Report Reordering Standards to Reflect an Institution. A Steering Committee was appointed, co-chaired by the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Interim Dean of the College of Engineering, and charged to oversee the work of eight Workgroups formed based on the reordering of the Characteristics of Excellence as follows:

- Mission and Goals (Standard 1)
- Planning, Resources and Institutional Assessment (Standards 2, 3, and 7)
- Leadership and Governance (Standard 4)
- Administration and Integrity (Standards 5 and 6)
- Student Enrollment and Support (Standards 8 and 9)
- Faculty (Standard 10)
- The Educational Experience (Standards 11, 12, and 13)
- Learning Outcomes Assessment (Standard 14)

Each workgroup is co-chaired by a faculty member and an administrator (who serve as Steering Committee liaisons), and includes faculty, staff member(s), and other constituencies of the University including students. The charges, research questions and data sets that workgroups considered, fully encompass the broad range of programs offered by Drexel University, including undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. Below, is a summary of most prevalent insights from each...
The co-chairs of each Workgroup, along with other key senior administrators comprise the Steering Committee. The membership of these Workgroups extends to over 100 individuals. The research questions submitted in the Self-Study Design were developed to address the Characteristics of Excellence in alignment with Drexel's activities over the last decade. The reports of each Workgroup are presented in the following chapters with insights gleaned from analysis of data and broad discussions. Each Workgroup adopted different methodologies and report formats to best address the research questions. They used data from surveys, including a Middle States Self-Study survey administered to a broad range of stakeholders, held focus groups, and considered the historical development of the University particularly over the last decade.

Each workgroup was given the following charge:

"The workgroup will analyze and discuss the manner and degree to which Drexel University fulfills the stated standards by answering the identified research questions.

Workgroup A was charged with examining the University's compliance to Standard 1: Mission and Goals. The workgroup found that Drexel strongly complies with Standard 1 and identified several insights to support improvements moving forward.

While the 2007-12 Strategic Plan has driven growth in enrollment, faculty, research, student quality, interdisciplinary collaboration, online learning and global outreach, senior administration should ensure that Drexel's infrastructure matches and supports its significant growth. The vision of Drexel is has become much broader and more inclusive of external constituencies, i.e., global outreach, community engagement, online students, than in the past, investments to further develop regional and global outreach are key to successfully accomplishing this part of the mission, and all constituencies should be aware of these efforts. Recognizing non-uniform knowledge of the current strategic plan, efforts to involve and inform the broad University community on the development of the 2012-17 strategic plan will help create broad involvement in its implementation.

College and School constituencies should be more aware of their own units' strategic plans and how those plans align to the University's strategic plan. The merger of the health sciences schools into Drexel almost ten years ago has enhanced program offerings, interdisciplinary research and collaboration, innovation and national reputation; processes to facilitate and incentivize increased cross college/school collaboration particularly with the College of Medicine should be enhanced. Workgroup A asserts that evaluation data on mission-driven initiatives must continually be communicated to University to internal and external constituencies to drive continuous quality improvement and successful planning and in the future.

Workgroup B was charged with examining Planning, Resources, and Institutional Assessment (Standards 2, 3, and 7). The workgroup focused on an examination of the initiatives undertaken within the University for resources, budgeting processes, educational delivery method, master planning, technology implementation, human resources, research, and student learning within a transforming
The Workgroup collected and analyzed data for fiscal years 2007-2011. The Workgroup found that Drexel University's response to its extensive growth over the past ten years has been strategic and intentional. Budgetary systems and other processes have been improved or developed to take better advantage of the opportunities presented by this growth and to better ensure their success. Drexel has markedly improved its ability to effectively manage its growth by closely aligning the budgeting process to strategic planning and institutional research. Transparency and comprehensive planning have moved to standard practice, as illustrated in the current budget processes and the processes that have been employed in the development of the new strategic plan.

**Workgroup C** was charged to examine Leadership and Governance (Standard 4). The Workgroup found a well-designed organizational structure among the various units of the University with an engaged Board of Trustees and strong, collaborative leadership within the administration. An insight gained from the process regards the alignment of the operating structures between Drexel University and Drexel University College of Medicine (DUCOM) where improved communication between these entities would better support the degree of desired collaborations. Another insight was to encourage efforts to strengthen the understanding of department heads and other administrators on how the Board makes decisions. In addition, efforts should be made to clarify and better communicate faculty roles in University decision-making processes in the manner that was done with respect to the establishment of the law school and, more recently, has been done with respect to the 2012-2017 strategic planning process. Overall, the positive trajectory of the University over the last ten years serve as evidence that the University's governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy development and resource allocation in support of the University's mission and goals of the institution.

**Workgroup D** was charged with examining Administration and Integrity (Standards 5 and 6) and considered a set of research questions that address the response of the administration to significant changes that have occurred over the last ten years and the integrity of processes and policies that govern the University's operations. Additionally, it is noted that most of these changes have been supported by strong management and planning, as well as the creation of sound operational structures, that accommodate and administer what has become a comprehensive urban research University. The Workgroup recognized the emphasis placed on improving the educational experience and services for all students and making a long-term commitment to learning assessment using new technologies. The Workgroup also determined that the University adheres to a high standard of ethics and integrity. Moving forward, work on improving the way in which University policies are communicated and organized, as well as implementing a continual policy renewal process, will support the continuation and refinement of these high standards.

**Workgroup E** was charged with examining Student Enrollment and Support (Standards 8 and 9). The Workgroup observed that Drexel continues to strategically plan and allocate resources and services, and implement policies to encourage, and better prepare for, an increase in international students, racially diverse students, and female students. Additionally, the University provides training focused on the needs of first-generation and international students, as well as providing increased financial assistance
through institutional fundraising and further commitment of institutional resources. The Workgroup noted that alternate pathways to the Drexel degree should be explored to address the needs of an increasing population of students who wish to reduce the amount of student debt or work while completing their degrees. Over the past ten years, Drexel has steadily increased both undergraduate and graduate enrollment while continuing to improve the quality of students and student services. The University continues to upgrade and expand services and planning for additional enrollment growth over the next decade.

**Workgroup F** was charged to examine Faculty (Standard 10). The Workgroup analyzed the manner and degree to which the University supports the institution’s instruction and research through a diverse and growing faculty. Drexel faculty generally find the University a good place to work. There is a clear recognition among the faculty for the need for more classroom, office, and lab space. Although, all faculty are included in invitations to a wide range of development opportunities, they appear to be seeking activities targeted to their specific needs. In terms of faculty development, new and junior faculty seem to feel that they have the most support. Mid-career faculty are typically still invested in research, but there remains a desire for more post-tenure guidance, and senior faculty often look for guidance on redirecting their interests in a growing and rapidly changing University. Teaching faculty have benefited by opportunities for longer contracts and better opportunities for promotion. However, care needs to be directed at maintaining a faculty that feels unified and not tiered. While an increased number of online programs have been well received by adjuncts, faculty members teaching online courses remain a group that is generally hardest to reach.

Another priority that was identified in increasing the number of underrepresented groups of faculty in STEM areas. Given Drexel’s historical and current prominence in these fields, progress in this area could greatly improve the reputation of the institution. In addition, novel programming has helped junior faculty achieve broad recognition and research support.

**Workgroup G** was charged with examining Drexel’s Educational Experience (Standards 11, 12, and 13). The Workgroup identified three key educational practices that will most help Drexel University students to achieve their educational goals: i) rigorous grounding in core intellectual and practical skills as well as experiential and applied learning competencies; ii) integration of experiential learning across the curriculum and throughout the degree from freshman year to graduation; and iii) establishment of a prevailing civic and global engagement culture. These core intellectual skills and experiential learning goals are reflected in the Drexel Student Learning Priorities.

The Drexel education experience is still aligned closely to the University mission. Faculty members, across the university, continue to bring state-of-the-art knowledge, skills, research experience, experiential learning expertise, international experience, a global outlook, interdisciplinary backgrounds, pedagogical expertise, and curricular innovations to Drexel students.

The Workgroup believes that the future of Drexel University hinges on the ability of its administrative leadership and faculty to successfully integrate experiential learning creatively across the curriculum and throughout a student’s degree program. Experiential learning should not be separate from a student’s
curriculum and should not serve only a narrow career track. Rather, building on the University’s strong “learning-by-doing” culture—best evidenced by the longevity and success of the co-op—the Workgroup suggests experimentation with several augmentations and alternatives to co-op that would allow students to learn-by-doing at research sites, through service learning, and through travel-integrated courses and study abroad experiences. Online courses or seminars should be offered while students are on co-op to connect the work experience with academic content—truly supporting experiential and applied learning. Academic departments must creatively partner with industry to transform the co-op experience—both in terms of obtaining feedback on what competencies will be needed for the future as well as working together to solve problems and address opportunities in their respective fields.

Additionally, the Workgroup proposes a bold and innovative strategy to help shape the future of Drexel University by implementing a model of education focused on the achievement of a relevant, practical education, global citizenship skills, an interdisciplinary mindset, a thirst for knowledge, as well as a recognition system for innovations in and dedication to teaching.

Workgroup H was charged with examining Learning Outcomes Assessment (Standard 14). The collected data demonstrate the significant progress Drexel University has made toward a sustainable and meaningful culture of evidence-based learning and teaching. This effort has been supported by the use of technologies, some developed in-house, to support learning, teaching, and assessment. Additionally, Faculty research on learning assessment and the ongoing development and improvement of new tools, make the University a real-world laboratory to test new conceptual models.

The development of the Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) provides a structure around which University stakeholders can engage in an ongoing conversation about student learning and structures the assessment of that learning. Drexel’s cooperative education program provides a portal to the direct assessment of student achievement by employers giving Drexel unique insights into student learning with the ability to advance research in the field of work-integrated learning. The Workgroup also found that course-level evaluations have been improved by integrating them with a revised core requirement checklist for syllabi that includes learning outcomes.

The coordination of learning assessment efforts among academic units some of which are still developing full assessment protocols provides a means to share best practices and approaches with a rich shared toolbox of methodologies that can be customized to specific program needs and foci. These assessment efforts are supported in the 2012-2017 strategic plan through new structures to support student learning. The Workgroup concludes that while many areas of assessment are in need of improvement, the University is well organized to support a sustainable culture of evidence-based learning.

Future Directions
The Self-Study will be appended with an overview of the 2012-17 strategic plan and master plan that is being presented to the Board of Trustees in late February 2012.
WORKGROUP A
MISSION AND GOALS
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1.0 STANDARD

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

The institution’s mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are used to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The original mission of the Drexel Institute of Art, Science and Industry, a co-educational institution founded in 1891, was to provide education suited to the needs of a rapidly growing industrial society. Originally a non-degree granting institution, Drexel began conferring the Bachelor of Science degree in 1914, when its 18 departments were organized into four schools. In 1927, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania granted Drexel the privilege to confer the master of science degree, and in 1965, the doctor of philosophy degree. Along with its degree offerings, the institution’s curriculum and organization of academic programs have evolved to include nine colleges with five schools. In accord with this evolution, Drexel has undergone two changes in name, in 1936 becoming Drexel Institute of Technology and in 1970 it became Drexel University. In 1993, under the leadership of newly appointed President Constantine Papadakis, Drexel began its quest to become one of the top one hundred colleges in the nation — Drexel is currently ranked at 88th by the U.S. News & World Report (Appendix A-I, 2011 Ranking Statistics 1996-2012).

President Papadakis' tenure was marked with significant expansion in academic offerings and research activities while continuing to adhere to the mission of the institution. In November 1998, Drexel University began managing the schools of the Medical College of Pennsylvania Hahnemann University (MCPHU), which had faced bankruptcy under the leadership of Allegheny University. In July 2002, Drexel's mission, services, and opportunities expanded further when MCP Hahnemann University, a major Philadelphia health sciences institution merged with Drexel University to become Drexel University College of Medicine, the College of Nursing and Health Professions, the School of Public Health, and a Department of Psychology. While Nursing, Health Professions, Public Health and a department of Psychology were moved to Drexel, the College of Medicine (DUCOM) legally operates as a separate 501(c) (3) corporation. Each Corporation has its own Board of Trustees and system of faculty governance (see Appendix A-II, DuCOM 501(c) (3) IRS).

The addition of Health Sciences programs have deepened and extended the University's mission and goals to meet societal needs. In academic year 2006-07, Drexel became the first major research university to open a new law school in 25 years. The Earle Mack School of Law at Drexel University is one of only two law schools in the US to follow a cooperative education model. In Spring 2009, the Earle
Mack School of Law celebrated its first graduating class of 154 students and in August 2011, the School received full accreditation from the American Bar Association (ABA) (see Appendix A-III. ABA Accreditation Letter).

In order to reflect these new and expanded academic offerings and the growing research portfolio of the University, the institution's mission was appropriately revised with the implementation of the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan - The Future is Drexel. With its adoption, the Mission of the University was refined to reflect the comprehensive nature of the institution and respond to both the national and global academic agenda that will continue Drexel's academic progression into the top-tier of national research Universities. The current Mission Statement reads as follows:

To serve our students and society through comprehensive integrated academic offerings enhanced by technology, co-operative education, and clinical practice in an urban setting, with global outreach embracing research, scholarly activities, and community initiatives.

This Mission serves as the framework for the mission and goals of each of Drexel's Colleges and Schools (see Appendix A-IV. Mission Statements of All Drexel University Colleges and Schools)

Throughout Drexel's history dating back to its founding and with its substantial growth in enrollment from approximately 13,900 in 2001 to 23,500 students in 2011 and a significant increase in the number of degree offerings, Drexel's identity is evolving with the changing times and circumstances (see Appendix A-V. 2001-2011 Enrollment Data and Degree Offerings)

All of Drexel's colleges and schools, including the Drexel College of Medicine (DuCOM) have held true to the primary elements of their mission: cooperative education, technology infusion, innovative and practical degree oriented programs, and use-inspired research that serves society regionally, nationally and globally.

Along with refining the mission of the University, the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan, The Future is Drexel, presents a carefully developed set of strategies that are bold, innovative and well integrated with Drexel's strengths. This plan identified five major objectives that reflect the university's mission and goals:

Objective 1: Enriching the Educational Experience
Objective 2: Promoting a Culture of Research and Scholarship
Objective 3: Advancing Faculty Support and Development
Objective 4: Promoting a Culture of Student Engagement
Objective 5: Executing the Plan

The plan integrates these objectives with a set of attributes important to the institution and aligned to its mission: quality, comprehensiveness, use-inspired research, co-operative education and experiential learning, interdisciplinary research and education programs, and national and international opportunities for both faculty and students (see Appendix A-VI. 2007-2012 Strategic Plan: The Future is Drexel).
As a result of the implementation of the 2007-2012 strategic plan, a campus master plan was designed. Facility needs identified in the Strategic Plan informed the Campus Master Plan and new proposed expenditures were aligned with the strategic plan.

While the 2007-2012 strategic plan serves as a basis for institutional activities for the last four years, currently the institution is developing a new strategic plan under the leadership of a new president. With the untimely passing of President Papadakis in 2009, Mr. Chuck Pennoni was named interim President. After a national search Mr. John A. Fry became Drexel’s fourteenth president on August 1, 2010. As the 2007-2012 strategic plan recedes with a majority of its stated initiatives accomplished or in progress, in Spring 2011 President Fry began to engage a broad range of University constituencies in the development of the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan. This plan will be directly tied to a new campus master plan. To support these initiatives, a strategic planning website that catalogues all the activities, processes and documents that will become the basis for the Drexel University 2012-17 Strategic Plan went live in May 2011.

### 4.0 METHODOLOGY

To support the development of the Self-Study, eight workgroups - reflecting the eight groupings of standards - were created in accordance with the model selected for Drexel’s self-study, i.e., The Comprehensive Report Reordering Standards to Reflect an Institution. Working group A focused on Standard 1: Missions and Goals. This workgroup was co-chaired by a senior administrator and a senior faculty member. In addition to the co-chairs, the workgroup was comprised of 11 faculty members, six administrative staff, one graduate student, and three additional members.

The charge of Workgroup A was to “analyze and discuss the manner and degree to which Drexel University fulfills the stated standards by answering the identified research questions”. Refined versions of these questions were placed into the Middles States Self-Study Survey that was made available to a broad range of Drexel University stakeholders (e.g., students, faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, and employers) in the Winter term of 2011. The results of the survey provided topics for follow-up focus group meetings conducted in the Spring and Summer terms of 2011. The workgroup developed eight research questions to guide the investigation:

A-1. How does the mission of the University, as revised for the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan, “The Future is Drexel” reflect the historical vision of Drexel University?

A-2. How well have initiatives and enhancements, i.e., academic programs, research programs, infrastructure, etc. been driven by the Strategic Plan 2007-12?

A-3. How have the current mission, goals and strategic plan of the University guided the approval and implementation of new programs and initiatives?

A-4. How effective are the University’s mission driven initiatives in achieving the goals of the strategic plan?
A-5. Through what processes have mission driven initiatives been evaluated? How has evaluation data on mission driven initiatives been used for improvement purposes?

A-6. To what degree are faculty, staff, and students cognizant of the mission and goals of the University and their implementation? To what degree have faculty, staff, and students contributed to the formulation and evolution of the mission and goals?

A-7. What challenges does the University face in fulfilling its mission and strategic plan and how are these challenges being met?

A-8. To what extent are the University's mission and goals relevant to the next ten years at Drexel and what refinements should be made based on outcomes and experience thus far?

In order to elicit information related to the mission and goals of the University's Strategic Plan, Workgroup A convened four focus group meetings across the campus, which were attended by invited individuals selected by Deans and Department Chairs to represent their respective academic units. Further, Workgroup A organized one general town hall meeting open to the entire University community.

Each of these two-hour meetings were moderated by selected groups of Workgroup A committee members. The questions (listed below) were posed to those in attendance. These questions were inspired from the MSCHE Self-study survey and were aligned to the Fundamental Elements of Mission and Goals and the items listed in the Optional Analysis and Evidence under Standard 1 of the Middles States publication, The Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.

1. How does the mission of the University, as revised for the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan, "The Future is Drexel" reflect the historical vision of Drexel University? {3, 6, 7}

2. What new initiatives and enhancements, i.e., academic programs, research programs, infrastructure, etc. have been driven by the Strategic Plan 2007-12? {1, 3, 6, 7} (a, b)

3. How have the current mission, goals and strategic plan of the University guided the approval and implementation of new initiatives and enhancements? {1, 3, 6, 7} (a, b, e)

4. How effective have the University's new initiatives and enhancements been in achieving the goals of the strategic plan? {1, 3, 6, 7} (a, b, e)

5. Through what processes have new initiatives and enhancements been evaluated? How has evaluation data on new initiatives and enhancements been used to improve them? {2, 3, 5, 6, 7} (a, b, e)

6. To what degree are the faculty and staff cognizant of the mission and goals of the University and their implementation? To what degree have faculty and staff contributed to the formulation and evolution of the mission and goals? {2, 4} (c, d, e)

\[\text{The numbers and letters found in parentheses after each question identify the alignment to information found in the MSCHE publication, The Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, under Standard 1. The numbers reference the relevant fundamental element from the document and the letters identify optional analysis elements (see APPENDIX A-VII, Standard 1 Expectations and Effectiveness of the Process).}\]
7. What challenges does the University face in fulfilling its mission and strategic plan and how are these challenges being met? (1, 5, 6, 7) (a, b, e)

8. To what extent are the University’s mission and goals relevant to the next ten years at Drexel? What refinements should be made based on outcomes and experience thus far under the current strategic plan? (1, 3, 5, 6, 7) (a, c, e)

The purpose of these focus groups was to enable faculty to provide feedback on the University’s Mission and Goals and more broadly on achievements under the current 2007-2012 Strategic Plan. In order to ensure that all data was captured, all sessions were audio recorded and extensive notes were taken. In addition to the MSCHE Self-Study survey and focus group data, the workgroup also reviewed summaries from two campus-wide President’s Forum meetings, where President Fry discussed the Strategic Academic and Campus Master Plan and elicited responses/feedback from Faculty and Professional Staff.

Based on this body of information, Workgroup A assessed how Drexel University uses the mission and goals of the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan in order to both develop and shape its academic programs and practices, and to provide a framework for ongoing institutional development and self-evaluation. More specifically, the information gathered reflects how 1) Drexel’s mission defines it as an academic institution, explains its character and individuality, and articulates its values, and (2) Drexel University’s goals are consistent with its mission and are realistic statements of outcome.

5.0 RESEARCH QUESTION FINDINGS

5.1 2011 MSCHE Self-Study Survey Results - Drexel University Mission

The MSCHE Self-Study survey was developed and implemented to inform Drexel's MSCHE Steering Committee and associated workgroups in the development of the Self-Study document. The survey was distributed to the entire Drexel Community and 317 external employers of co-op students. A breakdown of the overall response rates are provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. Survey Response Rates by Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel Total:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Total:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For more comprehensive data regarding the significant statistical differences between the respondent and non-respondent profiles, please see the introduction section of the MSCHE Self-Study Survey (APPENDIX A-VII. 2011 MSCHE Self-Study Survey. Overview Introduction).

As evidenced in the Mission and Strategic Planning section of the MSCHE Self-Study survey, the percentage of participants who responded that they had prior knowledge regarding the 2007-2012 The Future is Drexel Strategic Plan varied widely by the respondents’ roles. The majority of respondents, learned about the university strategic plan through university announcements. The respondents included populations of non-faculty advisors (52.17%), full-time faculty (49.16%), administrators (48.40%) and academic administrators (40.40%).
Question 2.1: How did you learn about the University Strategic Plan -- The Future is Drexel: 2007-2012 Strategic Plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Total Liked at the Strategic Plan</th>
<th>University Awareness of the Plan</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>命中 in the Survey</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrators</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>55.43%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>40.40%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>49.34%</td>
<td>9.57%</td>
<td>48.40%</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Employers</td>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>48.52%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>49.16%</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
<td>7.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Faculty Advisors</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52.27%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>52.17%</td>
<td>13.04%</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>23.99%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>6.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>33.19%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>22,987</td>
<td>3,458</td>
<td>15.04%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>16.74%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,423</td>
<td>5,553</td>
<td>19.54%</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>26.22%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>6.65%</td>
<td>56.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Question Q2.1 uses skip logic to hide questions Q2.2 – Q2.6 for all respondents who select the skip response: "I did not know about it until I took this survey" – the "I did not know" option was removed for questions 2.2 – 2.6. The calculated response rates for questions 2.2. – 2.6 have been normalized. In addition, a conditional response rate is provided. The conditional response rate is the percentage of question completions for the population who completed Q2.1 and chose something other than the "skip" response (i.e., the population that was shown the question).

Other sources for learning about the Strategic plan that were mentioned in the MSCHE Self-study survey were direct contribution to the development of the plan, Provost’s presentation of the plan, and the Strategic Plan website. However, even if in general participants were aware of the Strategic Plan’s existence, most of the student respondents (71.98%), part-time faculty (55.11%) and staff (41.91%) did not know about the plan prior to participating in this survey.

When asked how confident the participants are in finding the Strategic Plan if they chose to do so, nearly half of the participants expressed that they are either very confident (45.03%) or somewhat confident (44.86%) as contrasted to those participants that considered themselves to be not very confident (8.14%) or not at all confident (1.97%).
**Q2.1 → Question 2.2: How confident are you that you could find the Drexel University Strategic Plan, if you chose to do so?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Relative Rate</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Not Very Confident</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrators</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>51.66%</td>
<td>91.79%</td>
<td>58.95%</td>
<td>34.74%</td>
<td>5.79%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>44.62%</td>
<td>88.96%</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>42.07%</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>45.41%</td>
<td>91.88%</td>
<td>49.26%</td>
<td>39.79%</td>
<td>9.47%</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty Advisors</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52.27%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23.45%</td>
<td>95.05%</td>
<td>47.92%</td>
<td>42.71%</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>31.38%</td>
<td>90.64%</td>
<td>43.07%</td>
<td>45.84%</td>
<td>9.82%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>22,987</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>15.03%</td>
<td>99.59%</td>
<td>40.52%</td>
<td>49.33%</td>
<td>7.67%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,423</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>19.09%</td>
<td>94.73%</td>
<td>45.03%</td>
<td>44.86%</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2.1 → Question 2.3: To what extent do you think Drexel University has benefitted from the implementation of the 2007 - 2012 University Strategic Plan?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Relative Rate</th>
<th>A Lot</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrator</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>51.66%</td>
<td>91.79%</td>
<td>44.74%</td>
<td>28.95%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>25.79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44.88%</td>
<td>89.57%</td>
<td>49.32%</td>
<td>27.40%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>20.55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>45.48%</td>
<td>92.07%</td>
<td>33.82%</td>
<td>30.88%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty Advisors</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52.27%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23.45%</td>
<td>95.05%</td>
<td>44.73%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>48.96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>31.29%</td>
<td>90.18%</td>
<td>38.73%</td>
<td>22.03%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>38.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>22,987</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>15.04%</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
<td>40.19%</td>
<td>20.87%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>36.98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,423</td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>19.10%</td>
<td>94.86%</td>
<td>39.73%</td>
<td>23.56%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>34.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When participants were asked how they thought Drexel University has benefitted from the implementation of the 2007-2012 strategic plan, 1.88% of the respondents considered that the plan had no impact. Most of the results fell at the extremes of the continuum. While 39.73% perceived the plan to have benefitted the university a lot, 34.83% did not know whether the plan impacted the institution in any way. For an extensive view on these response rates, please see the table 2.3 above.

Another question that the MSCHE Self-Study survey asked was whether the university communicated the strategic plan efforts in an efficient way. 51.38% of the surveyed populations (academic administrators, administrators, co-op employers, full-time faculty, non-faculty advisors, part-time faculty, staff and students) considered that the plan was communicated somewhat successfully as contrasted with 8.26% of this population that didn’t know.

Q2.1 ↔ Question 2.4: How well do you think the University communicates its Strategic Plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Relative Rate</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrators</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>51.66%</td>
<td>91.79%</td>
<td>16.32%</td>
<td>58.42%</td>
<td>20.53%</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44.88%</td>
<td>89.57%</td>
<td>14.38%</td>
<td>47.95%</td>
<td>26.03%</td>
<td>9.59%</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>45.41%</td>
<td>91.88%</td>
<td>11.79%</td>
<td>54.74%</td>
<td>22.32%</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
<td>6.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty Advisors</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52.27%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23.35%</td>
<td>94.06%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>56.84%</td>
<td>11.58%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>31.34%</td>
<td>90.41%</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>50.76%</td>
<td>19.70%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>7.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>22,987</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>15.04%</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
<td>16.32%</td>
<td>48.66%</td>
<td>19.52%</td>
<td>4.13%</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,423</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>19.10%</td>
<td>94.82%</td>
<td>15.96%</td>
<td>51.38%</td>
<td>20.33%</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the surveyed populations were asked how well they think the university budget processes address relevant goals and objectives outlines in the strategic Plan, 37.92% believed that this alignment was somewhat successfully. However, 36.04% of the surveyed populations did not know. Please see the table below.
Q2.1 ➔ Question 2.5: Please rate how well you think the University's budget processes address relevant goals and objectives outlined in the Drexel University Strategic Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Relative Rate</th>
<th>Very S</th>
<th>Somewhat S</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly S</th>
<th>Most S</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrators</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>51.44%</td>
<td>91.30%</td>
<td>16.40%</td>
<td>38.62%</td>
<td>13.23%</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>30.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44.88%</td>
<td>89.57%</td>
<td>14.38%</td>
<td>43.15%</td>
<td>12.33%</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
<td>23.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>45.19%</td>
<td>91.30%</td>
<td>7.63%</td>
<td>37.29%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>40.04%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty Advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23.35%</td>
<td>94.06%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>46.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>39.68%</td>
<td>91.85%</td>
<td>11.42%</td>
<td>37.92%</td>
<td>11.86%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>36.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly fewer individuals across the range of surveyed constituents responded to the question that addressed how well their college/school/unit's strategic plan goals and objectives link to the university mission and objectives. The response average was that only 34.26% believed that the alignment is somewhat successful. The table below provides details on the range of responses for all population categories.
Question 2.6: How well are your college's, school's, or unit's strategic plan goals and objectives linked to the University mission and objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>Somewhat Well</th>
<th>Not Very Well</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Not Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrators</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>50.11%</td>
<td>35.84%</td>
<td>34.96%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>21.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>44.09%</td>
<td>36.31%</td>
<td>35.12%</td>
<td>8.93%</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>14.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>25.50%</td>
<td>38.67%</td>
<td>6.83%</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty Advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
<td>20.62%</td>
<td>19.07%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>58.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>38.08%</td>
<td>28.20%</td>
<td>34.26%</td>
<td>5.39%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>28.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MSCHE Decennial Reaffirmation of Accreditation
Additionally, the survey also addressed the relative importance of the seven elements of Drexel’s mission by constituency. The following table summarizes the findings.

**Question 2.7: The Mission of Drexel University is:**

To serve our students and society through comprehensive integrated academic offerings enhanced by technology, co-operative education, and clinical practice in an urban setting, with global outreach embracing research, scholarly activities, and community initiatives.

All of the following are specifically mentioned in the Drexel University mission. Indicate the importance of each one to your current program or unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Urban Settings</th>
<th>Student Outreach</th>
<th>Global Outreach</th>
<th>Community Engagement</th>
<th>Percent of respondents who selected &quot;Essential&quot; or &quot;Important&quot; for each item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrators</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>48.34%</td>
<td>93.58%</td>
<td>71.95%</td>
<td>59.01%</td>
<td>56.50%</td>
<td>70.98%</td>
<td>87.95%</td>
<td>70.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>43.04%</td>
<td>89.02%</td>
<td>58.79%</td>
<td>41.82%</td>
<td>58.08%</td>
<td>51.81%</td>
<td>59.39%</td>
<td>68.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>43.70%</td>
<td>87.12%</td>
<td>73.49%</td>
<td>56.11%</td>
<td>53.09%</td>
<td>58.19%</td>
<td>87.83%</td>
<td>61.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty Advisors</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>95.45%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>68.18%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>59.09%</td>
<td>86.36%</td>
<td>59.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
<td>90.21%</td>
<td>75.38%</td>
<td>58.76%</td>
<td>45.60%</td>
<td>56.70%</td>
<td>80.51%</td>
<td>57.73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>29.62%</td>
<td>91.98%</td>
<td>69.75%</td>
<td>62.80%</td>
<td>52.61%</td>
<td>59.25%</td>
<td>78.42%</td>
<td>67.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>22,987</td>
<td>3,427</td>
<td>14.91%</td>
<td>89.00%</td>
<td>73.07%</td>
<td>62.30%</td>
<td>41.75%</td>
<td>56.73%</td>
<td>74.31%</td>
<td>58.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,423</td>
<td>5,288</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>89.43%</td>
<td>72.36%</td>
<td>60.79%</td>
<td>45.62%</td>
<td>57.57%</td>
<td>76.75%</td>
<td>60.55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As evidenced in the table above, the university constituents that participated in this survey, ranked **Technology** as the most essential or important - with 60.67% deeming technology as essential.

**Research/Scholarship** was ranked essential by more than half of the full time faculty (66.33%), academic administrators (58.93%), and non-faculty advisors (54.55%) while staff (47.32%), part-time faculty (46.14%) and students (40.96%), ranked this mission element lower on the essential scale. Only 32.73 % of administrators perceived research/scholarship as essential. This finding suggests a possible disconnect between the administrators and the other surveyed populations within the University.

**Cooperative Education** was perceived as essential by 41.44% of all the surveyed populations. When we compare the responses among the population samples we observe that only 30.91% from the administrator sample perceived co-op education as essential. This finding may be contrasted with the academic administrators sample: 46.61% perceived this mission element as essential. The student and faculty population (full time and part-time) responses were similar. These specific respondents perceived co-operative education to be essential: students (43.68%), full-time faculty (38.25%) and part-time faculty (36.92%).

When comparing the relative perceived importance between the **Clinical Practice** and Cooperative education mission elements, we can observe that clinical practice is on a lower standing than co-operative education. Knowing that clinical practice is mandatory only in clinical fields, the results reflect this reality. While there are not many significant response differences among the surveyed populations, only 17.58% of the administrators perceived clinical practice as essential as contrasted with students (38.43%) and part-time faculty (38.14%).

All the surveyed populations, perceived **Global Outreach** (33.54%), **Community Initiatives** (34.51%) and **Urban Setting** (28.35%) as important. Overall, as the MSCHE Self study survey results indicate (see **APPENDIX A-IX. 2011 MSCHE Self-Study Survey A. Mission and Strategic Planning**) all seven elements of the institution’s mission are perceived as either essential or important. Technology, Co-operative education and Clinical Practice, and Research/Scholarship continue to be instrumental in Drexel’s mission for innovative research and professional experience. Furthermore, the institution’s urban setting, community initiatives, and global outreach continue to hold importance to the Drexel community as they are seen as positively impacting not only the regional but the national and global community as well.

**5.2 Focus Groups and Open Forum Summary**

In an effort to address and discuss achievements under the current 2007-2012 Strategic Plan, a series of focus groups were organized. These focus groups were attended by small groups of faculty, administrators and students. In response to how the University’s mission as stated in the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan reflects the historical vision of Drexel University, participants referenced the historical vision of Drexel University but did so in order to contrast it with the current mission and vision.

Comments voiced by the participants suggested that the historical vision embraced the co-op model and its relationship to “real world” applications of education. In the current environment, greater value is...
placed on research, which, even if it can often be applied to the “real world,” has a different emphasis. Three themes were articulated:

- The vision of Drexel is much broader than it was previously.
- There is a more inclusive perception of the community in which Drexel exists.
- Drexel’s “can do” attitude, which is very much in harmony with the historical mission, can be a "double edged sword" because it has tended in the past to minimize and sometimes disregard the essential role of the strong infrastructure that is needed to build a research institution.

In discussing new initiatives and enhancements that have been driven by the Strategic Plan 2007-2012, participants indicated that Drexel University has instituted many new initiatives and enhancements that improved the school’s reputation and ranking. The two topics most often mentioned were research and globalization. The participants of the focus groups, indicated that the institution’s commitment to become a major research university has been realized based on the following evidence:

- Increased the number of research grants and PhD programs
- Reached a milestone by being ranked 88th out of the top 100 universities in the US News and World Report rankings
- Enhanced research collaboration with other departments in the university

In terms of globalization, Drexel has become more globally focused in several areas including:

- International co-operative opportunities for students
- Global outreach and partnerships
- Increased number of international research contacts
- Larger and more diverse body of faculty and staff

Many successes have been noted, including the faculty international exchange through online programs, increased research support for faculty through Synergy Grants, and Tobacco Grants, which have leveraged additional extramural funding. Other noteworthy initiatives have been the creation of the Earle Mack School of Law in 2006, Drexel’s on-line learning programs, Sacramento Center for Graduate Studies and the Office of Civic Engagement.

In asking how the current mission, goals and strategic plan of the University have guided the approval and implementation of new programs and initiatives, it was noted that colleges and schools consciously align their strategic plans with the University plan. Many of the new programs and initiatives developed over the last 5 years, relate to one or more of the 5 objectives of the Strategic Plan: The Future is Drexel.

Specific mention also was given to global programs, faculty development and recruitment, development of standards and career recognition for teaching and research faculty, increased student resources, continuation and expansion of the co-operative programs, and community engagement.

The open forum focus group participants identified funding infrastructure and budgetary issues as primary considerations in realizing new programs and initiatives. Within this group, some initiatives
were perceived as being well received for the purpose of being tied to the goals of the strategic plan. Others considered that getting enough funding for some of the identified initiatives is a struggle. However, even if funding is an important issue, some participants expressed that ultimately ideas generate funding, particularly when increased funded research opportunities were concerned.

In discussing the University's mission-driven initiatives that strive to achieve the goals of the strategic plan, it was noted that Drexel has a strong entrepreneurial culture that reflects the "can do" attitude of the faculty and professional staff. This attitude allows for the creation of innovative initiatives to be launched and, if some are not effective, "we will try something else." This "can-do" attitude is modeled for all students attending Drexel University, especially for incoming students. Focus group members noted that students with higher SAT scores are more academically prepared when they enter Drexel. Regardless of their academic preparation, all students enjoy opportunities to become engaged in the community especially through the efforts of the Center for Civic Engagement.

In assessing the processes by which mission-driven initiatives have been evaluated and used for improvement purposes, participants noted that there are many evaluative processes embedded in the University, but that collecting evaluation data is not sufficient. In order for the community to implement the changes indicated by the collected data, participants argued that the results of evaluations must be fed back to the community. One participant noted that, "The filter down is not working as well as the filter up. Lots of data gets collected at the university level and it doesn't make it anywhere beyond administration." In considering the degree to which the faculty and staff are cognizant of and contribute to the formulation, evolution, and implementation of the mission and goals of the University it was noted that only those administrative faculty and staff that are involved in planning issues and serve on University committees are definitely aware of the University's mission and goals. Participants noted that more recently, the University administration began to solicit participation in its planning processes. Even if these solicitations appear to be inclusive, some participants argued that more communication regarding the implementation of the plan is needed. In order to address this issue, the President has established a new 2012-2017 Strategic Plan website that catalogs developments and encourages feedback from University constituencies. However, even if information regarding the new strategic plan is readily available, some participants expressed that many faculty are too busy teaching and dealing with ongoing issues to take the time for long-range or large-scale strategic discussions, some incentives would need to be offered.

5.3 Presidential Forums Summary

As a preliminary activity to the development of the next strategic plan, President Fry conducted two forums in January 2011. The purpose of these forums (one for faculty and one for professional staff) was to elicit information that would be incorporated into the 2012 – 2017 Strategic Academic and Campus Master Plan. The discussions at the President's Forums were wide-ranging, stretching from small issues like a better campus-wide calendar of events to envisioning how Drexel could become a global leader in 21st century instruction.
Besides discussing the new strategic plan initiatives, both faculty and professional staff forums tackled issues such as university communications and environment, instructional strategies, research, facilities, employment, tuition billing and budget. The faculty and staff suggested ways for Drexel to emphasize quality, interdisciplinary collaboration, entrepreneurial spirit and a more inclusive decision-making. There was consistent interest in improving the student experience at every level: financial, administrative, residential, and educational.

Additionally, faculty and professional staff discussed ideas that would make the university a more rewarding and stimulating place to work. Overall, the discussions underline the fact that Drexel’s problems were known and solvable with sufficient resources and that Drexel’s greatest challenge was one of opportunity, i.e. finding the best ways to realize its potential. For more comprehensive details regarding this information please see APPENDIX A-X. Faculty and Professional Staff Forum / Strategic Academic and Campus Master Plan.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND INSIGHTS FOR THE FUTURE

Although challenged by many changes that took place in the last ten years, the institution’s mission has broadened. The merger of the Health Sciences Colleges into Drexel University and the creation of the Earle Mack School of Law have played crucial roles in the evolution of the University’s mission and goals. The Workgroup on Mission and Goals developed a set of questions for the MSCHC Self-Study survey and analyzed the results. Further, the workgroup conducted four invitational focus groups and one open focus group, reviewed the comments of the two Presidential forums, and analyzed datasets. Several prominent themes emerged from the collected data. These themes are listed below along with related insights to inform future planning.

• Finding that more faculty than staff or students know about the 2007-12 Strategic Plan, Drexel needs to make ongoing and systematic efforts at involving and informing the entire University community on progress in the development and implementation of the new strategic plan. The Strategic Planning website for the 2012-17 plan and periodic Presidential Forums are a significant start.

• Identifying that allocation of resources should be more closely tied to strategic planning processes, Drexel needs to demonstrate greater transparency in documenting how resources are being allocated to achieve the goals of the strategic plan can provide broader buy-in and intentionality and purpose among stakeholders at accomplishing goals.

• Finding that College and School strategic plans need to be better aligned with the University strategic plan, Drexel needs to make sure that such alignments are documented, widely disseminated, periodically assessed, and adjusted when appropriate.

• Finding that the vision of Drexel is much broader and more inclusive of external constituencies, i.e., global outreach, community engagement, online students, than in the past, Drexel needs to make investments to further develop regional and global outreach to successfully accomplish this part of the mission, and communicate these efforts to all constituencies.
• Noting that the 2007 - 2012 Strategic Plan has driven growth in enrollment, faculty, research, student quality, interdisciplinary collaboration, online learning and global outreach, Drexel needs to ensure that its infrastructure matches and supports its significant growth - now and in the future. The University’s Master Plan for Facilities needs to be closely aligned with new the Strategic Plan.

• Finding that the merger of the health sciences schools (College of Medicine, College of Nursing and Health Professions and School of Public Health) into Drexel almost ten years ago has enhanced program offerings, interdisciplinary research and collaboration, innovation and national reputation, Drexel needs to develop processes to facilitate and incentivize increased cross college/school collaboration particularly with the College of Medicine should be enhanced,

• Identifying that evaluation data on mission-driven initiatives has been systematically collected, Drexel needs to makes sure that such data must continually be fed back into University systems and to internal and external constituencies to drive continuous quality control, improvement, the realization of mission and goals, and successful future planning.

Data indicate that the essential concepts in Drexel’s Mission reflect the blending of traditional emphases with major university growth and development over the past ten years. Among the seven essential elements of the mission statement, technology is the most highly ranked concept followed by Research and Scholarship and then by Cooperative Education. These concepts are followed by the importance of growing research and expansion of globalization initiatives. While all these elements create the holistic mission of the university, co-operative education remains paramount to the institution’s identity.
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1.0 STANDARDS

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

The human, financial, technical, physical facilities and other resources necessary to achieve an institution's mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution's mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution's resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Drexel University has expanded its reach both in the real and virtual worlds through its establishment of new educational locations regionally, nationally, and internationally. In the virtual world, Drexel's expansion culminated in the delivery of numerous online degree programs at the undergraduate, graduate, and certificate levels. The University also transitioned to a more residential campus by adding new residence halls, providing more dining options, adding more shuttle services, creating additional recreation spaces, offering additional parking, and expanding retail locations. These changes have presented new challenges and opportunities for the University.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

Workgroup B was charged with addressing the MSCHE Standards of Excellence 2, 3, and 7. To frame the evaluation, the workgroup developed the following eight research questions:

B-1. How effective were resource allocations toward new, established, and renewal of strategic plan initiatives?

B-2. How well does the budget planning process respond to changing financial conditions?

B-3. How effective is the University in determining and responding to needs for additional locations and delivery methods for advancing the University's mission?

B-4. How successful was the University's process for evaluating and improving space utilization in
enhancing the institutional mission?

B-5. How have the technology investments on campus, off-campus, and for on-line programs been used to benefit the University in achieving its strategic goals?

B-6. How have the policies and practices in Human Resources improved the institution’s effectiveness in achieving its mission and strategic goals?

B-7. How successful was Drexel at using resources acquired through grants and contracts in advancing the research mission of the University?

B-8. How influential has the assessment of student learning outcomes been in establishing resource allocation priorities?

The workgroup organized itself into three subgroups to allow better focus on each of the three standards under its charge. Each group reviewed the 2002 Middle States Self Study and the 2007 Periodic Review Report, the comments of reviewers, and the strategic and campus master plans for this period. The subgroups next reviewed reports generated by committees, internal governance groups, and consultants that responded to suggestions and recommendations in the Middle States evaluation reports. Members of the workgroup collected and analyzed data for fiscal years 2007 through 2011 by meeting with key members of the Office of Budget and Planning, Senate Budget, Planning & Development Committee, Office of Research, University Facilities, Office of Strategic Development & Initiatives, Office of Student Retention, Colleges, and Office of Student Learning. The teams requested information related to college/school, department, and discipline-specific accreditation processes completed during this period, and other assessment data including the Educational Benchmark Inc. (EBI) assessments, National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and internal surveys.

4.0 RESEARCH QUESTION FINDINGS

B-1: How effective were resource allocations toward new, established, and renewal of strategic plan initiatives?

Resource allocation

Resource allocations were effectively distributed consistent with the priorities established in the 2004-2009 strategic plan, “Plan for a Time of Transforming Opportunity.” Under the leadership of Provost Director, this plan was revised in 2007 through a comprehensive, University-wide process to “The Future is Drexel.”

In addition to the strategic plan, the growth also was guided by this period’s University Master Plan. Over this time, the freshman class increased along with overall enrollment. As noted by workgroup E, student selectivity and the overall quality of students increased with higher numbers of applications, higher SAT scores, and a larger number of high school students in the top ten percent of their class selected. Consistent with this planned growth, operating revenues, campus assets, capital expenditures, research funding, and the endowment all grew as well.
By allocating resources to support the growth in enrollment, student success, and retention resources were increased in several areas, including University housing, new buildings, renovations of existing spaces, leased space, faculty size, and faculty salaries.

Information Resources and Technology (IRT) operating expenditures increased in order to grow the infrastructure needed to support the hard-wired and wireless academic, research, and administrative systems. Electronic library resources were increased as well. The resources allocated to further developing electronic learning management systems harnessed Drexel's academic strength and improved the way academic resources were delivered to students. By creating online and hybrid classes and by enhancing revenue generated through Drexel University Online, Drexel's reach expanded into new student populations.

During this expansion, renewal was guided by an increased number of program accreditations (Appendix B-I. Program Accreditors), data generated from the Educational Benchmarking Institute (EBI) Assessments, the National Student Satisfaction Inventory (NSSI), increased research on academic success and retention, and space assessments with utilization studies. Consistency between the growth in the academic enterprise and the resources to support this growth are demonstrated in Appendix B-II. Enrollment, Academic, and Research Enterprise Growth and Appendix B-III. Operating Budget, Capital Expenditures, Technology, Facilities, and Infrastructure.

Institutional Advancement Responding to Economic Conditions

In recent years, the Office of Institutional Advancement was expanded to develop increased philanthropy at an increasingly comprehensive and recognized Drexel University. Even in the environment of continued economic instability and the transition in presidencies upon the untimely death of President Papadakis, philanthropy has increased with two recent gifts for buildings for the LeBow College of Business and the Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts and Design. A new capital campaign was recently announced with a goal of $400M after a quiet phase, and several initiatives have begun to increase fundraising momentum. The Office of Institutional Advancement recently formed a principal gifts team specifically focused on donors capable of making commitments of $1M or more. Planning and collaboration between individual academic units and the Office of Institutional Advancement have been implemented with each college/school and other units assembling teams to assist in identifying, cultivating, and interacting with prospective donors. New marketing collateral includes brochures and websites focused specifically on capital projects requiring assistance from private donors. In spring 2010, the Drexel Magazine included an article highlighting the need for new and renovated facilities and the role private contributions are playing. Resources have also been committed to strengthen and systematize outreach to previously under-solicited constituencies such as faculty, staff, and parents.

B-2: How well does the budget planning process respond to changing financial conditions?

The 2001 Middle States report noted issues with respect to the budget process at Drexel: "little, if any, effort is being made to involve academic administrators and faculty in building the budget and in setting up budgeting priorities that address the University's strategic initiatives" (Appendix B-IV. Drexel
After a description of the financial context of the budget, and the budgeting process itself, Workgroup B documented changes to the budget process that have resulted in improvements in efficiency and transparency. Under the current leadership, the Senate Budget, Planning, and Development Committee and the Administration continue to work closely to further improve efficiency and transparency.

Financial context

Drexel University continues to find itself operating from a position of relative financial strength. The University continues to move forward with its 2007-2012 strategic plan and the new 2012-2017 strategic plan, which will include a comprehensive financial analysis. Despite a very difficult economic climate, enrollment remains strong with an overall 33% discount rate. There have been no mandatory reductions in force or furloughs, and the University continues to offer excellent health and retirement benefits to its employees. However, the University has experienced severely reduced state appropriations, reduced endowment income, and increases in energy and healthcare costs. Planning in such an environment of financial uncertainty requires fluidity and the ability to adjust quickly to external factors.

Due to President Fry's renewed commitment to fundraising, the University's fundraising gained momentum in FY2011 and raised $70.1M — the second most successful fundraising year in Drexel's history, bringing the campaign total to $280M towards the $400M goal.

Drexel formulates operating and capital budgets each fiscal year (July 1- June 30). The operating budget broadly comprises the University's generated revenue and expenses incurred. The capital budget identifies capital projects that will need funding in the coming fiscal year and beyond, as well as target amounts of ongoing maintenance that need to be addressed.

The annual operating budget process proceeds as follows (Appendix B-V, Budget Timeline): the Provost, Senior Vice Presidents (SVPs), and Vice Presidents (VPs) are provided with budget instructions and assumptions for the upcoming fiscal year. They, in turn, distribute this package of information to those in their organizations with budget responsibility. In many cases these individuals may then further distribute the instructions within their organization.

Current year budgets are reviewed and reallocated to match strategic objectives. Requests for additional funding (either permanent or temporary) are prepared and submitted at this time. The request for funding is evaluated at the SVP or Provost level. These requests are consolidated into a single proposal and sent to the President and Senior Vice President for Finance for consideration. Once all the budgets are submitted, the President and Senior Vice President for Finance meet with the Senior Vice President of each major unit to review their overall requests. The President decides, in consultation with the Senior Vice President for Finance, what additional requests will be funded. Once the operating budget is finalized, it is presented at the May Board of Trustees meeting for approval.

The formulation of the capital budget differs from that of the operating budget. Each year, the Office of the Senior Vice President for Finance informs the Division of Student Life and Administrative Services...
(SLAS) of the funding it can expect to spend in the following fiscal year. SLAS, in conjunction with discussions held over the course of the current fiscal year with the President’s Office, the Provost’s Office, and the Office of the Senior Vice President for Finance, sets a proposed capital budget for internal review and discussion within these offices. Once the total dollar amounts, as well as the specific projects, have been agreed to, the capital budget is presented at the May Board of Trustees meeting for approval.

**Avenues of cooperation between faculty and administration**

Since 2002, the Budget, Planning, and Development (BPD) Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate has been responsible for presenting analysis of the budget via the Steering Committee to the Faculty Senate for its review and recommendations. The Senate’s analysis, review, and recommendations are then forwarded in writing to the President for transmission to the Board of Trustees as part of its consideration of the budget. The budget process has changed significantly over the past several years, and these changes have created more participation of a broad range of stakeholders, increased transparency, and a less "top-down" process. On the academic side, the process allows more stakeholder representation, as it now incorporates input from the faculty to their department heads and from the department heads to the deans.

The Senior Vice President for Finance, its previous and current provosts, and vice provosts have worked diligently to provide the Budget, Planning, and Development Subcommittee with information at each stage of the budget process. In addition, the deans have shared their overall budgeting priorities for each year’s budget earlier to allow for additional examination of the proposals. Currently, the Senior Vice President for Finance meets with the Budget, Planning, and Development Subcommittee periodically during the year, outside of the budget process timeframe, to discuss issues of interest or concern, and the results of these meetings are reported to the Faculty Senate.

Due to increased budgetary buy-in across all stakeholders, a more inclusive budgeting process, improved long-range forecasting methods, and increased budgetary information periodically being made available to the Budget, Planning, and Development Subcommittee, Drexel is clearly better able to respond to changing financial situations than in the past.

**Budget and Strategic Planning**

In the 2007 Middle States Periodic Review Report, Drexel reported that a process has been established for faculty involvement in budgeting and strategic planning (2007 PRR, p 13), and a strategic plan had been put into place (see Appendix B-VII. 2007 Middle States Periodic Review Report). With members of Budget, Planning, and Development Subcommittee meeting with senior administrators throughout the academic year, there have been improved opportunities to link the budgeting process with the implementation of the current and future strategic plan. The recent appointments of President Fry and Senior Vice President for Finance raise the prospect of increasing the transparency of the budget process even further.
Strategic Planning in the Drexel University College of Medicine (DUCOM)

As a recently incorporated unit in 2002, Drexel University College of Medicine was to establish a separate strategic plan. The plan established in 2007 was separate but in alignment with the 2007-2012 University Strategic Plan. The Drexel University College of Medicine strategic planning process that resulted in its 2007-2012 plan, Building on Our Strengths: Embracing a Culture of Inquiry and Collaboration, began in June 2004 when the then Interim Dean appointed two senior faculty members to chair the Strategic Planning Committee (Appendix B-VIII. Strategic Planning Committee Information). The Strategic Planning Committee included faculty, residents, graduate and medical students, alumni, members of the Board of Trustees, and two members of the administration to facilitate the process going forward. The group’s work began with a one and a half-day retreat, which laid the groundwork for the creation of the school’s mission statement, vision statement, and values statement. A SWOT analysis was performed very early in the process. Faculty, students, professional staff, and alumni were asked at departmental meetings and via email to participate in an online survey (Appendix B-IX. DUCOM Survey) addressing each area. Responses were grouped by theme. Based on the SWOT analysis, the committee formed subcommittees around the areas of education, clinical practice, research, and the environment.

Planning moved forward under the leadership of a permanent dean, Dr. Richard Homan, who served from October 2005 after a national search until recently. He worked to gain a deep understanding of the culture, finances, strengths, and limitations of the College as part of Drexel University. Four areas of strength were identified and strategic themes around each were created: Excellence in Education, Outstanding Applied Biotechnology, Excellence in Women’s Health and Leadership, and Expansion of Our Research Enterprise. A fifth theme, Enhancement and Growth of Our Clinical Enterprise was developed in parallel with the rest of the plan by the executive board of the practice plan. A retreat held in June 2006 included the key individuals in the College of Medicine and University to shape and structure the objectives and initiatives within each theme in a highly focused approach to maximize the expected financial allocations. A core group including members of senior management and the co-chairs of the Strategic Planning Committee was assembled to refine the plan with broad, ambitious vision grounded in fiscal reality defined in a detailed pro forma document. Details included operating expenses such as salaries for recruits and professional staff, operating revenue such as tuition, gifts, and sponsored program support, and capital expenses for building and equipment, itemized by year. An equally detailed plan for renovation of existing space and construction of new space was also developed. For each overriding objective, clear goals were developed. Strategies for achieving each goal, concrete metrics, timelines, and plans for periodic review were established. Institutional Advancement opportunities were also identified. As of early 2011, DUCOM achieved approximately 80% of metrics. Nine of the 14 objectives were viewed as successful and sustainable. Four are under continued development, and one initiative was completely discontinued. Over 30 “lessons learned” have been identified, which are being incorporated in the planning for the new, single Drexel Strategic Plan 2012-2017.
B-3: How effective is the University in determining and responding to needs for additional locations and delivery methods for advancing the University's mission?

Over the last ten years, the University has introduced regional, national, and international initiatives. In order to respond to various aspects of the mission, online education, additional locations, and international partnerships were developed. Drexel University Online represents an expansion of Drexel's reach in the virtual world through its establishment of online degree programs at the undergraduate, graduate and certificate levels. In a unique model for marketing distance learning programs, Drexel eLearning was created as a for-profit, wholly-owned subsidiary of the University.

Drexel's additional locations include Malvern, Burlington Community College, and Sacramento Graduate Center. The LeBow College of Business site in Malvern, PA, in suburban Philadelphia is situated at a regional business hub critical to the growth of the graduate business student population. The Malvern site is set in a state of the art industrial park and occupies an entire third floor of a new building. Currently, this location houses the LeBow Evening Accelerated Drexel (LEAD) MBA Program and Corporate and Executive Education programming (see Appendix B-X, The Malvern Campus).

In order to support Drexel's strategy of regional undergraduate growth and increased access for regional non-residential students, the degree completion Drexel@BCC was initiated Burlington County College in Mount Laurel, NJ. This program with nine majors currently in place increases student access at lower tuition costs than those students attending Drexel on the main campus.

In 2009, The Sacramento Center for Graduate Studies was established as an additional location to serve several purposes. First, as demographics in the Philadelphia region indicate a decline in population, Sacramento, CA, represented an opportunity to expand the University's educational mission to the West Coast. Second, the move to the West Coast enhances our brand recognition nationally so that Drexel can leverage unique capabilities in experiential education and entrepreneurship in a new market at the graduate level while increasing brand awareness for undergraduate students to enroll in Philadelphia. Third, our graduate programs in Sacramento would serve as a test bed for further consideration of distant sites. In terms of space, the Sacramento site occupies much of one floor of an office building in West Sacramento just off Interstate 5. The space is equipped with state-of-the-art, technology-enhanced classrooms, with video-conferencing technologies that are mirrored in Philadelphia and elsewhere to accommodate synchronous distance teaching.

As previously noted, Drexel University Online offers programs spanning all colleges in the University, fulfilling the mission of educational outreach in a global setting. The University has worked extremely hard to train faculty to teach online and to develop appropriate curriculum and assessments for the online educational experience. Most recently, these efforts have been placed under the umbrella of the Online Learning Council.

Research

In its research mission, Drexel has established a few off-campus sites to assemble teams in quality spaces for specific purposes. The Applied Communications and Information Networking (ACIN) Center,
located in Camden, NJ, is a research and technology site dedicated to research and commercialization of new technologies and fostering growth in private-sector companies that are developing new technologies and products to be used in military and commercial applications. Established in 2001, ACIN houses a high-technology, full-service incubator, together with state-of-the-art research facilities for Drexel University faculty and students. Recently, research for Drexel's Plasma Institute moved to space at this site.

The Pennsylvania Biotechnology Center of Bucks County is a research site and incubator that represents a joint collaboration with the Hepatitis B Foundation and Delaware Valley College. The research at the center is focused mainly on advancing biotechnology in Bucks County and the surrounding region. It houses the research efforts of scientists from the Drexel University College of Medicine.

B-4: How successful was the University's process for evaluating and improving space utilization in enhancing the institutional mission?

In order to fulfill the institutional mission, the University has developed a comprehensive process for evaluating and improving space utilization. Balancing space and resources is challenging for both the urban campus as well as for satellite campuses. In order to improving space utilization, the University has successfully employed a master planning process for the past 10 years.

Beginning with the 1997 Master Plan and continuing to revise and update the plan as done in 2002, 2007, and most recently implementing a commission to set forth a new 2011-12 Master Plan, Drexel continues to move forward guided by a collaborative strategic planning process.

2007–2012 Master Plan

Two major concerns influenced the 2007-2012 recommendations for development: increased enrollment and the need to improve the gateways to the campus. The objectives of the infill (space between the buildings) sites were to promote the urban character of the campus by framing spaces and paths interior to the blocks, while also framing the exterior of the blocks to create an urban scale along the streets. In recent years a strong relationship between the Office of the Provost and University Facilities has been developed to plan space used for education and research in the University.

The 500-bed residence hall proposed in the 2007 Master Plan for 34th Street, Millennium Hall, was completed in 2009. Millennium Hall and the Race Street Residence Hall, combined with a third 500-bed residence hall, have largely resolved the needs identified for housing and increased urban density. The plan recommended a new academic building along 33rd Street north of and adjacent to the Academic Building. Coupled with the new dormitories, this building was intended to help frame the street and reinforce the north/south corridor. The need for this new academic building was fulfilled by the acquisition of buildings at 3501 Market and 3401 Filbert Streets.

A new health and recreation center and a replacement for Matheson Hall, both proposed in the 2007 plan, would continue the strategy of bringing the buildings closer to the edge of Market Street, a strategy initiated with the construction of the Edmond D. Bossone Research Center and the Earle Mack of Law. The 2007 Master Plan included the Pearlstein Building in the list of buildings advancing the
strategy. The new Recreation Center was built in 2010, and contributes significantly to improving the look and feel of the campus.

The 2007 Master Plan also recommended new street trees, lights, and banners along Market Street to help reinforce the vision of the “Avenue of Technology.” Additionally, the 2007 plan recommended clustering new shops and restaurants along Market and Chestnut Streets to address the retail shortage and further enliven the campus core. In addition, it was recommended to add outdoor furniture, greenery, and colorful signs to draw attention to the proposed retail areas. A new ground-floor retail addition was proposed along Chestnut Street in front of Creese and MacAlister Halls to create a strong urban edge along Chestnut Street. Recently, studies supporting a larger addition with retail and residences have been completed, and a developer has begun construction of this structure.

The 2007 plan recommended developing a hotel on the corner of 30th and Market Streets serving both Drexel guests and business travelers with West Philadelphia destinations. In addition, the plan recommended the development of guest rooms, conference space, commercial space, and a parking garage. Development plans were in progress at the time of the economic downturn, at which point the project went on hold. Since then, the site has been incorporated into a Keystone Opportunity Zone favoring mixed uses including retail. Development activity will resume with improved economic conditions.

The 2007 plan proposed a new integrated sciences building and a large sculpture for the corner of Chestnut and 33rd Streets. The composition of building, sculpture, and streetscape was expected to create a dramatic gateway from the west. The Papadakis Integrated Sciences Building (PISB) includes a mix of wet and dry teaching and research laboratories along with 541 classroom seats in various instructional formats, strategically located in the heart of both the core undergraduate campus and the Arts & Sciences precinct. Once the PISB is complete other buildings and Stratton Hall, which was partially vacated as Biology moved to the PISB, are scheduled to be renovated.

Two final projects proposed in the 2007 Master Plan were a new parking garage west of the Hess Engineering Building and a replacement for the west wing of the Rush Building. With the acquisition of buildings at 3501 Market and 3401 Filbert Streets and the adjacent parking lots, the purpose for a new garage has been satisfied.

With the completion of the Millennium Hall, Recreation Center, and the PISB, along with the leasing of the Armory, and the acquisition of 3501 Market and 3401 Filbert Streets, Drexel is an increasingly well-balanced campus from a planning perspective. The apparent surplus of recreation space and shortage of special use space balance one another, leaving only a glaring shortage in library and study space. The University will continue to reclaim unassigned and underutilized corners of buildings for conversion to group study space, relieving pressure on the Library.
Discussion of the New Master Plan

B-5: How have technology investments on campus and off campus and for online programs been used to benefit the University in achieving its strategic goals?

Communication is the critical ingredient for making our system work effectively. The Office of Information Resources and Technology provides enterprise-wide services to academic and administrative units. These services include email, central storage, network and system security, Ethernet and wireless networking, Enterprise system management, online learning management system and technology support across the University. With a campus-wide wireless network and Internet 2 connectivity already in place before 2002, during the ensuing period of study, the IRT department has provided an enhancement to the enterprise-wide service. A list of these enhancements is provided in Appendix B-XI, IRT Enhancements.

A main theme for advancement at Drexel over the past ten years is the movement to a more flexible education environment for both students and faculty beyond the classroom walls. To achieve this level of flexibility, the Office of Information Resources and Technology has made numerous enhancements to the campus in recognition of the shift in computer usage by both students and faculty from desktop to laptop to mobile devices. IRT accomplished this in part by installing new open design furniture, increasing the number of AC outlets and Ethernet ports, and outfitting classroom spaces with videoconference technology, which resulted in mirror classrooms to offsite Drexel educational classrooms. In addition, IRT introduced the campus to live streaming, recording, capturing, and archiving of faculty lectures and academic and social events. IRT has also been involved in mobile app development, such as the DrexeiOne mobile app, for increased student connectivity for academic information, administrative records, and critical push of information such as emergency alerts.

Enhancements to the IT infrastructure allow interaction by students working in teams and faculty working with students, and even members serving on committees to communicate in a real time manner. IRT increased the network bandwidth and wireless connectivity, improved the central server and storage environments, and expanded SharePoint Services to name a few such initiatives.

Additionally, in line with the University’s strategic vision for improving learning assessment, a series of investments have been made in assessment-supportive technologies. These include the TracDat documentation tool, Qualtrics survey tool, Academic Evaluation, Feedback and Intervention System (AEFIS), as well as investing in technologies being developed by Drexel researchers (e.g., EduApps Portal). A more complete list of technological investments is provided in Appendix B-XII, Technological Investments.

B-6: How have the policies and practices in Human Resources improved the institution’s effectiveness in achieving its mission and strategic goals?

Over the past several years, there has been a marked effort in the University’s approach to Human Resources aimed at best practices in hiring, retention, and competitiveness. Development of strong policies and practices in Human Resources has been directed to improve the institution’s effectiveness
in achieving its mission and strategic goals. Since the 2002 Self-Study, Drexel implemented improved codifying and disseminating of its policies so that they are accessible to all University stakeholders. In 2002, Drexel University’s Human Resource Department undertook a major policy review moving all existing HR policies into a standard format and setting a process for future review and updates including participation of the Office of General Counsel and the President’s Cabinet as part of the approval process (See Appendix B-XIII. All HR Policies). Academic policies are published on the Provost website and the University Policies site.

**Equal Opportunity, Hiring, and Training Programs**

To increase its efficiency and effectiveness in its Human Resources enterprise, Drexel University has implemented a variety of programs to address issues of diversity in the workplace and recruitment. To promote and protect all members of the Drexel community, the University created the Office of Equality and Diversity (OED) in 2008 and hired an Assistant Vice President. The newly-formed OED developed a new equality and non-discrimination policy and launched the “Intercultural Engagement and Diversity Initiative.” The OED also implemented a new user-friendly website as a portal for its affirmative action plan, the “Diversity Achievement Plan” (see Appendix B-XIV. Diversity Achievement Plan). The OED offers a range of programs to promote its policies, including a workshop called “Diversity Works,” that allows faculty and professional staff to explore the skills that can be used in promoting the University’s mission with regard to diversity and intercultural engagement. In addition, an employee ambassador program has been instituted to create an inclusive work environment for those new to the University community. The OED provides annual Preventing Workplace Harassment training, a mandatory online module with assessment, for all faculty and professional staff.

The OED’s newly developed mediation services assist in turning potentially volatile situations into opportunities for growth. In addition, a new Intercultural Center has been developed from University funding and an alumni donation, and a President’s Award for Intercultural Engagement & Diversity has been established. Additionally, diversity focus groups are held regularly for faculty, students, and professional staff.

Other areas of the University have also participated in the effort to promote diversity and equality. Employee recruitment and hiring have been revamped with an eye toward avoiding discrimination, as well as to increase efficiency and effectiveness. Hiring tools have been standardized, an applicant tracking system has been developed, and procedures are in place for consistent offer letters and new hire paperwork. Policies have been established for the location and duration of listings for open positions.

As a result of a partnership between the Office of the Provost and the Office of General Counsel, to avoid discrimination, the University now has improved and consistent contracts for adjunct faculty members as well as revised agreements for independent contractors. The Department of Talent Acquisition has been created to work with managers on the importance of diverse applicant pools and on the Diversity Achievement Plan. A dual-career plan is in place to assist new faculty bringing their partners to the area to find work.
In addition to promoting equality and diversity within its doors, in 2006 Drexel became a founding member of the New Jersey / Eastern Pennsylvania / Delaware regional affiliate of the Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC), an organization fostering the hiring of women, minorities, and dual-career couples. The consortium is a collaborative response of member institutions to the many challenges of academic recruitment and retention (see Appendix B-XV, Higher Education Recruitment Consortium).

The mission of the Drexel University Human Resources Department includes a commitment to "attracting, rewarding, developing, and retaining a diverse and talented workforce." In line with this direction, the department has developed a range of policies and programs to provide and retain the personnel the University needs for its overall mission. On the academic side, the Office of the Provost created the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence for the development of faculty at every stage of their careers. Through this Center, the University develops the faculty to accomplish its work with students and society through research, scholarly activities, and community initiatives. Both offices have made their programs easily available to all through their websites.

**B-7: How successful was Drexel at using resources acquired through grants and contracts in advancing the research mission of the University?**

Drexel University now claims a leadership role in creating technological solutions to solve societal problems in the 21st century. This bold statement reflects not only the accomplishments of our faculty and leadership during the recent past, but more importantly, their collective vision going forward. In barely more than a decade, Drexel's research enterprise increased expenditures for sponsored projects (see Appendix B-XVI, Historical 10-Year Research Expenditures).

Drexel is committed to facilitating research activities across the institution. The synergies provided by bringing the health sciences of medicine, nursing, and public health together with the technological prowess of the engineering units have yielded dramatic successes in translating the questions of clinical care and epidemiology into new answers for our community. Such advances led to major, new programs funded by the National Institute of Health, National Science Foundation, and other sponsors from government, foundations, and industry. Our gains in commercializing technologies in partnership with industry, through the efforts of the Office of Technology Commercialization, reveal the real ethic of Drexel to translate discoveries rapidly to improve the quality of life for our citizens. Additionally, in order to create technological applications, a university must have a solid foundation of discoveries in basic science and engineering. We have established major research initiatives in engineering, plasma medicine, biology, and neuroengineering. Similarly, our faculty members in education and media arts and design are creating the best means for training scientists, engineers, and clinicians of the future. Indeed, the interdisciplinary nature of our work provides a rich environment for research and also for educating our undergraduate, graduate, and professional students.

Drexel's funded research over the past 10 years has more than tripled student support ($4M to $12.6M), and more than doubled student remission ($1M to $2.5M) and equipment ($1M to $2.4M). In
addition, recent funded grants has supported the University in advancing its mission toward biomedical translational research (Coulter Foundation) and civic commitment (Lindy Grant).

The Office of Research Administration (ORA) is continuously reinventing itself to meet the demands of the researcher and the changing funding agencies. For example, the ORA has moved from an application structure to a pre/post award organization. Thus, each department will be assigned a two-person team—one pre-award administrator who will provide assistance in areas such as searching for funding opportunities, budget development, proposal review/submission; and a post-award administrator who will assist with the set-up and financial management of the project from award through closeout. These changes have improved the efficiency and clarity of the application and implementation process.

B-8. How influential has the assessment of student learning outcomes been in establishing resource allocation priorities?

To maximize the opportunity for all students to succeed in learning, the Office of Academic Advising, Retention and Diversity (AARD) was created to provide central support to academic advisors and students, in conjunction with appropriate university partners, to maximize graduation outcomes. To fulfill its mission, AARD makes informed use of student-level data and survey findings to develop, test and disseminate data-driven practices that have high impact that is, that contribute to persistence gains. These practices must be demonstrative, sustainable and ultimately scalable. Because persistence analysis reveals that nearly 85% of all attrition occurs within the first two years of study, AARD analytics focus on these critical gateway years. In providing central support to academic advisors, students, and university partners including faculty, AARD envisions building a community of practice among professional academic advisors and first-year faculty that supports students’ achievement of developmental and learning priorities, in particular: creative and critical thinking and self-directed learning.

Recent survey findings have surfaced the link between 1) student preparation with regard to cognitive depth in mathematics; 2) non-cognitive factors such as attitudes and behaviors; and 3) academic self-management as critical components of readiness to learn and developmental components of critical thinking and self-directed learning. The results of AARD initiatives, analytics, and surveys are continually fed back to improve processes and maximize opportunities for student success.

The University also began its transition to a more residential campus eight years ago. This transition gave students greater access to resources and was aligned with University retention initiatives. Consistent with this direction new residence halls were built and other needs associated with a growing residential community were assessed using the Educational Benchmark, Inc. (EBI). EBI is endorsed by the Association of College and University Housing Officers—International and is recognized as the premier assessment tool for student housing incorporating data from hundreds of colleges and universities across the country. Using a regression analysis, factors from the assessment are plotted into four quadrants to identify priorities. The four quadrants are Top Priority, Maintain or Improve, Maintain, and Monitor. Budget allocations were guided by these results.
Race Street and Millennium Residence halls were built to provide additional beds. Each residence hall included common areas, amenities, and suite style housing designs consistent with housing needs students desired. In addition to constructing new buildings, Kelly Hall was renovated upgrading indoor heating and air conditioning systems, improving interior spaces, and upgrading furniture. Furniture in existing residence halls without built-in furniture was also upgraded. University residence halls were also enhanced to provide both hard wired and wireless internet service. Increases in the EBI “Facilities Satisfaction” scores over this period show alignment between budget allocation, assessed needs and improvements.

Safety needs for the growing residential population also increased over this period. Student perceptions of safety were another EBI factor. Over the last three years the Board of Trustees approved funding for creating a University police force. A former Philadelphia Police Officer with many years of university public safety leadership experience was hired as a new Senior Associate Vice President for Public Safety and began the assembling the new Drexel University Police Force. The police force is now fully operational. In addition to the police force, Drexel continued to maintain its public safety security force, expanded technology for monitoring the university and issuing immediate campus wide alerts through e-mail and text messaging systems. Drexel Public safety also was instrumental in expanding the safety and security services for the University City District surrounding the University City Campus. Increases in the EBI “Safety and Security” factor shows alignment between assessment, budget allocations, and improvements.

A rising student population with a rising residential population required additional attention to dining and retail options on campus. During this period a new food service contract amendment was negotiated providing addition capital for expanding dining locations, introducing new dining plan options and providing additional brand concepts. A Strategic Dining Master Plan based on additional surveys of the entire campus community was created. The dining hall was upgraded and modernized. New food locations were added in the Main building, the Library, Matheson Hall, Kelly Hall, the Recreation Center and the College of Medicine. A food court was constructed in front of Kelly Hall adding Chick-fil-a and Subway brand concepts and other non-brand food favorites. As part of the Recreation Center Project, LandMark America a privately run sports grill restaurant was added. With all the dining and retail food options added the EBI dining satisfaction score increased dramatically. Once again alignment between assessment, budget allocation, and improvements yielded positive results.

Other improvements supporting the overall growing student population over the last five years include renovation of all centrally schedule classrooms, expanding the shuttle service to accommodate a 95% increase to over 487,000 riders, a 12% increase in green space and a 44% increase to 13,947 in events and meeting booked through our event services office. Perhaps the greatest addition supporting the transition of the campus was the expansion of recreation facilities. The University invested in three major recreation improvements: the construction of the 240,000 square feet state of the art Recreation Center, the conversion of the Amory to a year round multipurpose indoor recreation space, and major improvements in the Vidas Athletic field complex. The results of these improvements over the last five years include a 102% increase it over 900 intramural and club sports.
In addition to the improvement discussed earlier in this section, overall budget allocations of resources tied to assessment have yielded an increase in overall resident student satisfaction, a 29% increase in freshman to sophomore retention in residence halls in the last five years, and a 28% increase in visits to the DAC/Recreation Center with over 300,000 visits projected in 2011. This alignment between assessment, budget allocations, and improvements supported the successful transition to a more engage residential campus. Appendix B-XVII. EBI Assessment Charts

These findings have led to four priorities for practice and resource allocation that are linked to the Learning Priorities:

1. Prioritization of developmental advising to integrate into professional practice the mounting body of knowledge and evidence that behavioral and non-cognitive (developmental) factors are linked to course performance outcomes. A developmental framework and training has been developed to guide the professional practitioner in supporting student development and engagement in their motivations and aspirations. This has impact on advising caseload, and the University has grown advising staff consistently in the colleges and schools. A recent advising caseload analysis has been conducted to explore the human resources and organization to meet the demands of such a model.

2. Expansion of the skills preparation course, GSTD 380, based on course outcomes results. In 2011, nine sections of the course were offered between winter and spring to freshmen on probation.

3. Creation of a professional academic coaching staff and cascade mentoring model to support advisors and guide student development to become more autonomous learners through an experience that promotes goal commitment, course planning and organization, course progress and monitoring, and growing academic confidence and resiliency. Four professional academic coaches reside in the Drexel Learning Center to manage caseloads including students admitted at risk (where non-cognitive factors mitigate over-reliance on SAT); low income students; students on probation; students placed on early warning in their first year; students with learning style differences; and students returning from Leave of Absence. These students are identified through the use of technology. Technology solutions like e-portfolio are being tested to explore scaling this approach for all students.

4. Development of new mathematics supplemental sections for engineering students as a beta-test to intentionally develop problem-solving and critical reasoning skills. The Math Practicum for Engineers has been developed as critical reasoning and learning development seminar for CoE freshmen that have not demonstrated their academic potential in the “gateway” mathematics course. Eight sections of this course have been offered in winter and in spring terms to students who withdrew from, or earned a D, in their first term or section term of mathematics. The Practicum allows for space and time for engineering freshmen to refine problem-solving skills while developing the latent attributes essential to reaching their potential, but are not assessed on traditional examinations (i.e., heuristics, flexibility, locus of control, risk taking). Graduate student facilitators are specially hired and trained, with an emphasis on modeling the behaviors and strategies we want students to adopt. An assessment of skill and math attitudes preceded course participation to better understand students' K-12 experience of mathematics.
The assessment of student learning has been well-integrated into budgets and new resourcing priorities. The University invests over $300,000 annually in technologies to support learning assessment (e.g., TracDat, iWebFolio, Academic Evaluation Feedback and Intervention System, and Qualtrics). Additionally, the University resourced the evaluation of writing in the First-Year Writing Program, as well as investing in the reworking of the Steinbright Career Develop Center’s co-op surveys and reporting processes and tools. All of the colleges and schools have identified personnel to lead the assessment effort in their respective units. The College of Arts and Sciences and the Goodwin College have both hired full-time Directors of Assessment.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND INSIGHTS FOR THE FUTURE

The University successfully managed its growth in enrollment and colleges along with its transition to a more residential campus by aligning resource allocations to strategic and master plans and measuring results with targeted assessments over this period. Budgeting and planning processes continued to be more inclusive with University-wide participation.

The new strategic planning and master planning processes are being formally integrated, with expanded University-wide participation through the use of social media, town meetings held by the President, and updates communicated campus wide. University-wide participation in processes for charting the future direction of the University will continue to drive alignment around the University’s mission and execution of its strategic plan. This alignment once again positions Drexel University to produce extraordinary results in the future.
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1.0 STANDARD

Standard 4 - Leadership and Governance

The institution’s system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Workgroup C developed a set of five research questions designed to assess the effectiveness of the governance structure of Drexel University. These questions, and specific relevant follow-up questions, were asked during five focus group sessions and twenty-five individual interviews conducted by the members of the Workgroup C subcommittee in November and December of 2010.

These sessions were attended by representatives of the key relevant constituencies such as deans, faculty (including tenured and non-tenured faculty), senior leadership of a cross-section of Drexel colleges and schools, faculty senate leadership and undergraduate and graduate student leadership. Additionally, among those interviewed were leaders of the Boards of Trustees of Drexel and the Drexel University College of Medicine, senior administrators (including the President, senior vice presidents and other key academic and administrative officials), and the CEO of Drexel e-Learning. In order to obtain further information and feedback about the governance of the institution a separate MSCHE Self-Study survey regarding Leadership and Governance was also administered to the entire Drexel University and Drexel University College of Medicine. Appendix C-1. Drexel University Organizational Chart – Senior Leadership.

2.1 Governance Structure | Drexel University

Drexel University is chartered by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The Charter can be found in Appendix C-II. Drexel University Charter.

The Board of Trustees of Drexel University, a 501(c)(3) corporation, has a minimum of twenty and a maximum of forty-two Term Trustees. Term Trustees are divided into three classes, each of whom serve three-year terms, except for trustees who serve in an ex-officio capacity as well as those trustees who are designated to serve by an elected official in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (collectively, “Commonwealth Trustees”). No person who is a full-time student or a full-time employee of the University (except for the President) is eligible to serve as a Term Trustee. The Board of Trustees is composed mainly by Drexel alumni who are prominent civic leaders and successful in their fields. Appendix C-III. Board of Trustees Membership.

As of May 19, 2011, there were forty Term Trustees, inclusive of the ex-officio trustees and the Commonwealth Trustees. Ex-officio Term Trustees are the President of the University, the Chair of the Board of Governors of the Drexel University General Alumni Association, the Chair of the Earle Mack...
School of Law advisory board, the Chair of the Board of Philadelphia Health & Education Corporation and the Chair of the Board of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia.

The Chair of the Faculty Senate attends all Board meetings, as well as meetings of the Board's Executive Committee, and reports at each Board meeting on the activities of the Faculty Senate. All Trustees have voting rights. Please see the chart illustrating each category of Drexel Board appointments and the Drexel University bylaws. Appendix C-IV: Board of Trustees Emeritus Members and Appendix C-V. Drexel University By-laws.

2.2. Governance Structure | Philadelphia Health and Education Corporation (PHEC)
The Board of Trustees of PHEC, a 501(c)(3) corporation, has a minimum of twenty-two and a maximum of thirty trustees.

Drexel University has the right to appoint a majority of the PHEC Board (i.e., between thirteen and twenty members) and Drexel appointees are divided into three classes, each of whom serve three-year terms. In addition, Tenet Health System Philadelphia, Inc. (Tenet) appoints two (2) voting members of the Board. There may also be up to five (5) Commonwealth Trustees. The President of PHEC, the President of the Drexel University College of Medicine Alumni Association and the President of Drexel University serve as ex-officio trustees on the PHEC Board.

As of May 19, 2011, there are 28 PHEC Trustees, inclusive of the ex officio trustees, the Tenet Trustees and the Commonwealth Trustees; seventeen of the twenty-eight PHEC trustees are Drexel appointees. All Trustees have voting rights. For a comprehensive description of their rights and privileges, please take a look at the chart illustrating each category of PHEC Board appointment. Appendix C-VI. PHEC Board Trustees.

The PHEC Board operates as a fiduciary Board, with similar (though not identical or as many) standing committees under its bylaws as are provided under Drexel's bylaws. Please see Appendix C-VII. PHEC bylaws.

2.3 Drexel University Affiliations and Subsidiaries

Drexel University has broadened its efforts to improve the quality and accessibility of its resources by developing for-profit ventures and establishing affiliations. In order to support its academic mission, Drexel University maintains an affiliation with the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia (which conducts business as "The Academy of Natural Sciences of Drexel University") and also controls the following nonprofit corporations (Academic Assets, Inc. and Academic Properties, Inc.) and a for-profit corporation (Drexel e-Learning, Inc.). The relationship between these organizations and Drexel University is described below.

2.3-i. Academic Assets, Inc. and Academic Properties, Inc.

Academic Assets, Inc. ("AAI"), a nonprofit corporation, is the sole member of Academic Properties, Inc. ("API"), which is a nonprofit corporation that owns, manages, leases or operates a portfolio of over one million square feet of both commercial and residential holdings. API acquires properties of strategic importance to the future growth of the University, maintains and offers housing properties for the
Drexel community and maximizes appreciation and income derived from Drexel properties. Drexel appoints each of AAI’s three Board members; AAI appoints six of the eight API Board members and Drexel directly appoints the remaining two API Board members.

2.3-ii. Drexel e-Learning, Inc.

Referred to as Drexel University Online, Drexel University develops technology-mediated instructional materials for a wide range of courses, programs and curricula, the completion of which may result in the granting of Drexel academic credit or the award of academic degrees. Drexel e-Learning, Inc. ("Del") is a for-profit corporation organized for the purpose of marketing such courses and programs to students who are geographically remote from the University’s campuses via principally electronic means. Drexel is the sole shareholder of Del and elects the Directors of Del, of which there may be between seven and thirteen. The President of Del and the Chair of the Drexel Board are ex-officio voting Directors on the Del Board.

2.3-iii. The Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia

Effective as of September 30, 2011, Drexel became the sole voting member of The Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, which will conduct business as The Academy of Natural Sciences of Drexel University ("ANS"). ANS, a 501(c)(3) corporation founded in 1812, is dedicated to encouraging and cultivating the sciences and advancing learning. The Academy of Natural Sciences operates as a public museum and conducts systematic research, including integrating research in aquatic ecosystems with education regarding biodiversity and the environmental sciences. In deciding to affiliate, Drexel and ANS determined that their respective missions would be achieved best by creating a more integrated institution that can offer students and public better programs and access to resources. Additionally, these programs can encourage and support additional research by ANS scientists and Drexel faculty. It is also anticipated that the affiliation will allow the combined institutions to attract more federal research and private foundation grants. Appendix C-VIII. ANS - 501(c)(3) corporation.

The ANS Board of Trustees has 26 members (maximum 32 members), 21 of whom are existing members of the ANS Board prior to the closing of the affiliation. Drexel will be entitled to designate five voting members of the Academy Board -- the Drexel President, ex officio; the Drexel Chief Financial Officer ex officio; the Drexel Provost ex officio, and two other members. The ANS Board (excluding the Drexel designees) will be divided into three approximately equal groups, with terms of office ending in 2013, 2014 and 2015, and thereafter, commencing in 2013, Board members will be elected for three-year terms. ANS Board members (other than the Drexel designees) will be elected, and any vacancies will be filled, through a process that involves approval by the ANS Board’s Governance Committee in consultation with specified Drexel representatives, followed by ANS Board approval, approval by the Drexel Board’s Nominating and Governance Committee and final approval by the Drexel Board. Appendix C-IX. ANS Board’s Governance Committee.
2.4 Drexel Board of Trustees | Functions and Responsibilities

The primary functions of the Drexel Board are policy making and responsibility for sound resource management. The Board determines the general, educational and financial policies of the University. Among the Board’s responsibilities are to determine and periodically review the purposes and the mission of the University, to review and approve strategic and long-range plans for the University.

The Board appoints the President, assess his/her performance, and set appropriate conditions of the President’s employment, including compensation. Additionally, the Board approves institutional policies regarding faculty appointment, promotion, tenure and dismissal and approves, upon recommendation of the President, the granting of tenure to members of the faculty. A detailed list of all functions and responsibilities of the Board may be found in Appendix C-X. Board of Trustees Responsibilities: University’s Bylaws. Drexel Board is formed by standing committees such as Academic Affairs, Audit, and Enrollment Management. Please see complete list in Appendix C-XI. Standing Committees of Drexel Board.

2.4-i. President and Senior Administration

The President of Drexel is elected by the Board and serves as the University’s Chief Executive Officer. The President is responsible for leading the University, implementing all Board policies, keeping the Board informed on appropriate matters, consulting with the Board in a timely manner on matters appropriate to its policy-making and fiduciary functions, and serving as the University’s chief spokesperson. Additionally, the President is responsible for the educational management of the University and for monitoring the performance of the duties of the senior administrators, faculty, and employees of the University.

Senior staff, consisting of Drexel’s Senior Vice Presidents, meets with the President on a weekly basis. The President’s Cabinet (nineteen members), consisting of the Senior Vice Presidents and selected other Vice Presidents and senior officers, including the President/Dean of the College of Medicine and the President of Drexel e-Learning, meets with the President every two weeks, and is charged with, among other matters, recommending policies for approval by the President.

The President’s Executive Council (forty-two members), comprised of the members of the President’s Cabinet, all academic deans, the dean of students, and additional senior officers, meets on a monthly basis.

2.4-ii. Provost and Dean’s Council

In Drexel’s governance structure, the Provost/Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs, who reports to the President, is the chief academic officer of the University. The Deans and Directors of each of Drexel’s colleges and schools report to the Provost; they have direct responsibility and oversight of the academic programs, research activities and operations of their respective colleges and schools. The Provost conducts bi-weekly meetings with the Dean’s Council that consists of the Provost and senior
members of the Provost’s Office, and the Deans and Directors of each of Drexel’s colleges and schools. Appendix C-XII. Members of the Dean’s Council and Deans/Directors of each Drexel College/School.

2.4-iii. Faculty Senate

Drexel’s Faculty Senate meets on a monthly basis. As the elected representatives of the University faculty, and as provided in the Charter of Faculty Governance the Senate’s responsibilities are to advise and make recommendations to the President in the spirit of collegial responsibility on the formulation of policies and decisions. These policies are related to the appointment, retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, faculty duties and prerogatives, the setting of fund-raising priorities for development and academics. Additionally, faculty members participate in the formulation of priorities and review of the annual operating budget of the University, the development and expansion of the campus, and the expression of University views on matters of public concern. For more comprehensive details regarding the Faculty Senate’s responsibilities please see the Charter of Faculty Governance. Appendix C-XIII. Charter of Faculty Governance.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The charge of Workgroup C was to analyze and discuss the manner and degree to which “the institution’s system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making.” In order to structure the exploration, five research questions were developed:

C 1. What is the governance structure of Drexel University and how effective is it in achieving the mission of the institution?

C 2. What is the governance structure of the Philadelphia Health and Education Corporation (PHEC; d/b/a Drexel University College of Medicine) and how does it relate to the overall governance structure of Drexel University. How effectively does the relationship between the College of Medicine and Drexel University function?

C. 3 How has faculty governance evolved as Drexel University has grown and changed over the last ten years?

C 4. Is the Charter of Faculty Governance adequate in allowing the Faculty Senate to participate effectively in the policy development and decision-making activities of the institution?

C 5. How have decisions been made for the establishment of major for-profit ventures and external initiatives (e.g., Drexel eLearning and the Sacramento Center for Graduate Studies)? Once established, have these ventures and initiatives been effectively integrated into the governance structure of Drexel University?

In order to elicit information related to the university’s leadership and governance, Workgroup C convened five focus group meetings across the campus, and twenty-five individual interviews. While members of the Board of Trustees, the President, selected department heads, faculty senate leadership, and deans were interviewed individually, selected department heads and leaders, Faculty Senate
leaders, tenured faculty and student government leadership expressed their views in focus groups. These sessions were moderated and conducted by members of the Workgroup C.

The purpose of this series of focus groups and individual interviews was to enable the Drexel community to provide feedback on the University’s leadership and governance structure.

After these focus groups were conducted in November and December of 2010, the MSCHE Self-Study survey was administered in the winter term of 2011. Both these qualitative and quantitative data are presented below.

3.1 Focus Groups and Interviews | Research Questions Findings

C 1. What is the governance structure of Drexel University and how effective is it in achieving the mission of the institution?

Drexel’s governance structure is described above. The trustees who were interviewed indicated that Drexel has a very effective governance structure that has dealt with the significant growth of the University in a reasonable and responsible way. The Board operates with a robust committee structure by which the standing committees review in great detail the matters that are to come before the Board; the Committee chairs report on those matters, and move action items under their area of responsibility, at the Board meetings.

The President believes that the Board members take their roles very seriously and that the committee structure works very well. He has emphasized his interactions with the Board’s Executive Committee to allow for thoughtful consideration and nimble decision-making on critical issues.

The Deans broadly viewed the administration under President Papadakis as “top down.” While some felt that some key decisions were made without appropriate input from the Deans and faculty, there was also general acknowledgment that much was accomplished during the presidency of Dr. Papadakis. At the time of the interviews, President Fry had only been in that position for a few months, so there were only a few comments regarding the effectiveness of his leadership style. Several deans commented on what they viewed as “thinness” of staffing in the Provost’s office, which can lead to delays in approvals or deficiencies in oversight. However, other deans did not note this as a problem. To alleviate this issue, the Provost office increased its staffing.

While Drexel University trustees provided most of the information, College of Medicine academic department chairs indicated very little involvement in how Drexel governance works. College of Medicine faculty have limited, if any, understanding, of the governance of Drexel, as they are focused on their particular missions (medical education, clinical care, research) and have limited exposure to Drexel outside of the medical school.

Faculty Senate leadership indicated that the governance structure is generally sound, although time constraints and having multiple campuses pose impediments to faculty involvement in governance.

Department heads and faculty had little knowledge about the way Board decisions are made. Some felt that there are too many senior administrators who report to the President and that the role of academics
can be diluted when colleges and their faculty do not have sufficient input into decisions that directly affect the colleges. However, they readily acknowledge the achievements of the governing body in moving the University forward.

**C 2. What is the governance structure of the Philadelphia Health and Education Corporation (PHEC; d/b/a Drexel University College of Medicine) and how does it relate to the overall governance structure of Drexel University. How effectively does the relationship between the College of Medicine and Drexel University function?**

Even though the College of Medicine is an affiliate of Drexel, the potential synergies between the medical school and Drexel have not been realized nearly to the extent they could be due in significant part to the fact that the medical school is a separate legal entity (primarily for liability reasons).

**Appendix C-XIV. DuCOM 501(c) (3) IRS.**

While this "firewall" has been successful in insulating Drexel from major liabilities of the medical school (e.g., medical malpractice claims), it has been viewed by some as impeding interactions between faculty and students across academic units, especially in the area of research. Another component of these real or perceived barriers is the physical separation of the College of Medicine's Queen Lane and Center City campuses from Drexel's University City Main Campus.

A number of focus group participants believe that the current governance and corporate structure should be reassessed because of the real and/or perceived impediments to collaborations among faculty at the College of Medicine and Drexel's other colleges and schools. Anything that can be reasonably done to foster the kinds of collaborations and synergies that have not been realized would generally be viewed positively.

Some College of Medicine faculty leaders expressed the view that there is very little communication between the University and its College of Medicine. Specifically, they are not consulted on matters where they could provide good input, or are excluded from programs that could benefit from the College of Medicine's people and resources. Some faculty members expressed the view that the College of Medicine and the University will not reach their full potential without a more fully integrated health sciences structure (inclusive of the School of Public Health and College of Nursing and Health Professions) and, at a minimum, improving the communications among those colleges and schools.

In contrast, the Deans and faculty representatives who were interviewed from the College of Nursing and Health Professions and the School of Public Health were adamant that a more fully integrated health sciences structure would be an impediment to fully realizing the potential of those two academic units. Since these two academic units were part of such an integrated structure in MCP Hahnemann University (before the merger with Drexel University), they believe there is strong evidence that the College of Nursing and Health Professions and the School of Public Health have undergone significant improvements in productivity and scholarship since they joined Drexel University as independent academic units.
From the perspective of College of Medicine administrators and faculty, the current structure has worked well in enhancing Drexel's reputation and mission, but has resulted in insufficient resources provided by Drexel over the years since the College of Medicine formally became an affiliate of Drexel in 2002. The general view is that the College of Medicine has had to maintain a significantly higher level of malpractice insurance than is typical for similar medical schools because of its relationship with Drexel, resulting in such premiums accounting for a very high percentage of its revenues as compared to peer institutions. Related to that, several respondents noted that without a truly integrated hospital affiliation, the College of Medicine cannot fully leverage its assets or operate in a way that is operationally viable in the long-term.

**C 3. How has faculty governance evolved as Drexel University has grown and changed over the last ten years?**

The growth in academic units and program offerings, largely due to the incorporation of the College of Medicine, the College of Nursing and Health Professions, and the School of Public Health, as well as the opening of the Earle Mack School of Law, has been the most notable change in Drexel over the last ten years.

Faculty governance has evolved with these changes to varying degrees. There was a general view among most respondents that faculty governance has become more effective in the last ten years, primarily in areas relating to curriculum. In the past, the Office of the Provost would direct the creation of new courses. However, this is no longer the case. The Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs works more closely with the Faculty Senate and the Senate Committee on Academic Affairs than had been the case in the past. The participants' general view is that the Senate is generally collegial in its interactions with the administration but not particularly strong or empowered and is frequently slow to act (e.g., in the approval of new academic programs). However, no respondent thought that a more contentious relationship would be desirable.

Faculty members are represented at every Board meeting and Board committee meeting. The broad view of the administration is that regular consultation and sharing of information with the Senate is important in order to minimize the likelihood of conflicts and reach consensus. However, when it is critical that a resolution of a particular matter be reached quickly, then those matters must move forward up the administrative chain of command, if the Senate is unable to reach a conclusion expediently.

During the focus groups it was noted that faculty representatives were active and engaged members of the Presidential Search Committee that resulted in the appointment of President Fry. As part of that process, the Chair of the Search Committee and the Chair of the Faculty Senate traveled to Lancaster, PA to meet with President Fry and other stakeholders at Franklin & Marshall College. This has been perceived as indicative of greater faculty involvement in key appointments over the past several years.
C 4. Is the Charter of Faculty Governance adequate in allowing the Faculty Senate to participate effectively in the policy development and decision-making activities of the institution?

Interviewees and focus group participants were queried on the adequacy of the Charter of Faculty Governance for allowing the Faculty Senate to participate effectively in the policy development and decision-making activities of the University.

For those respondents who were familiar with the Charter of Faculty Governance (and many were not), they understood that it provides for a model of shared governance, particularly in academic-related areas. In the context of that understanding among those familiar with the Charter, it was generally acknowledged that the Faculty Senate has an advisory role and, while it is consulted on various matters and not sufficiently on other matters in the view of some, the President and the Provost ultimately make decisions.

The Faculty Senate officers view the Faculty Senate as a partner with the administration and the Board in the shared governance of the University. However, in addition to Senate representatives on Board committees, the academic deans, administrators and designated undergraduate and graduate student representatives are ex-officio members of the Senate, without vote. Many of those individuals are also ex-officio members of Senate standing committees.

C 5. How have decisions been made for the establishment of major for-profit ventures and external initiatives (e.g., Drexel eLearning and the Sacramento Center for Graduate Studies)? Once established, have these ventures and initiatives been effectively integrated into the governance structure of Drexel University?

The last question addressed by Workgroup C, sought opinion on how decisions have been made for the establishment of major for-profit ventures and external initiatives (e.g., Drexel eLearning and the Sacramento Center for Graduate Studies) and how they have been handled. Additionally, once established, how these ventures and initiatives have been effectively integrated into the governance structure of the University.

As a benchmark, the creation of the Earle Mack School of Law, one of the most recent major initiatives of the University, was generally viewed as a collaborative effort among the Board, the administration and the faculty. On the other hand, it was generally acknowledged that the decision to create the Sacramento Center for Graduate Studies (SCGS) was a “top down” decision driven by former President Papadakis and approved by the Board with relatively little faculty involvement.

Faculty generally viewed other major decisions as having been “top down,” including the creation of Drexel e-Learning (Del) to market online programs as Drexel University Online and the decision to formally incorporate the Medical School, College of Nursing and Health Professions, and School of Public Health as colleges of Drexel University in 2002. During the focus group sessions, respondents had mixed views regarding the level of collaboration in the process to integrate the College of Medicine, College of Nursing and Health Professions, and School of Public Health into Drexel. A number of respondents expressed the view that there was significant input obtained from many stakeholders while others felt that it was a “top down” decision.
In particular, the decision to establish the SCGS, was viewed by many respondents as impulsive, without proper due diligence and planning, did not align resources, strategies and risks, lacked any consensus, and was a distraction from Drexel's core programs and mission. It was generally acknowledged that former President Papadakis drove the establishment of each of the University's external ventures, with the SCGS and online learning initiatives being the least collaborative. While many respondents acknowledged that there was significant collaboration with, and input received from, most stakeholders in the Medical School and Law School initiatives, didn’t agree. It was also noted that from a financial perspective, the amount of investment in Del and the SCGS substantially paled in comparison to the investments in the Medical School and the Law School.

While those respondents familiar with Drexel University Online and Del acknowledge that the financial model has been successful for Drexel and its participating colleges and schools, some expressed concern that colleges and schools are not sufficiently represented on the Del Board so that their suggestions and views about proposed actions and their impacts are not always adequately considered. Del is generally viewed by those familiar with it as effective in marketing Drexel's online academic offerings and that those offerings are at the requisite high quality level of Drexel courses and programs.

3.2 MSCHE Self-Study Survey | Leadership and Governance

The Middle States Self-Study Survey was implemented and administered to a broad range of stakeholders within the Drexel Community (e.g., students, faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, and employers) in the winter term of 2011. While both Drexel and DUCOM respondents were invited to respond to the same questions, the answers differ because these entities have different governance structures.

For instance, 46.19% of the Drexel University respondents agreed that they are familiar with the governance structure of Drexel University as contrasted to 32.69% of the DUCOM respondents. When asked whether faculty, through its elected representatives on the Faculty Senate, participates effectively in the policy development and decision-making activities of the institution, 33.89% of the Drexel University respondents agreed, in contrast to 41.03% of the DUCOM respondents.

While Drexel University respondents (34.24%) neither disagreed nor agreed that DUCOM faculty is part of the Drexel University faculty, DUCOM respondents (49.36%) agreed that they consider themselves to be part of the Drexel University faculty.

When Drexel University respondents were asked whether they are familiar with how the governance of Drexel University College of Medicine interacts with the governance of Drexel University, 23.57% of the Drexel respondents community (23.57%) neither disagreed nor agreed while 34.62% of the DUCOM respondents community (34.62% agreed) agreed.

As evidenced by the table below, when asked how effective is the governance of the University in accomplishing its mission and goals, 46.28% of all participants, agreed that the governance of the University is effective in accomplishing its mission and goals.
Q3.3: In general, how effective is the governance of the University in accomplishing its mission and goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>451</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>45.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>41.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>18.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>34.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results may be contrasted to the effectiveness of the college/unit in accomplishing its mission and goals. As shown in the table below, 47.67% of the respondents indicated that their college governance is effective in pursuing the realization of its mission and goals. Since the results are similar, it can be inferred that there is a connection between the college and university governance.

Q 3.4: In general, how effective is the governance of your college or school in accomplishing its mission and goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>451</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>46.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>41.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>18.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>34.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When academic administrators, full-time faculty and part-time faculty were asked how faculty opinions impact the discussions affecting Drexel University and affecting their college or schools, results indicate that faculty consider that they are given the opportunity to voice their opinions. While only 33.44% of this population agreed that their opinions are heard at the institutional level, 40.15% of the same population agreed that they are given an opportunity to voice opinions at the college/school level. For a comprehensive view of the results ranges for both the institution and college level, please see the tables below.
Q3.8.1 In general, the members of the faculty are given an opportunity to voice their opinion on major discussions affecting Drexel University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>45.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>41.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>17.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>34.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.8.2 In general, the members of the faculty are given an opportunity to voice their opinion on major discussions affecting my College or School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>45.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>41.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>18.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>34.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another important question asked by the MSCHE Self-Study survey, was whether the Board of Trustees exerts an appropriate level of authority in governing Drexel University and Drexel University College of Medicine. Only 37.94% of the Drexel University surveyed population (academic administrator, full-time and part-time faculty, non-faculty advisor and staff) responded yes while 59.06% responded that they did not know whether the Board exerts an appropriate level of authority in governing the Drexel University.
Q3.9 The Board of Trustees of Drexel University exerts an appropriate level of authority in governing Drexel University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>1.47%</th>
<th>43.63%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>64.76%</td>
<td>54.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATOR</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>41.01%</td>
<td>28.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>57.99%</td>
<td>61.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-FACULTY ADVISOR</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>61.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>19.93%</td>
<td>80.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>48.94%</td>
<td>59.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,893</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>45.49%</td>
<td>59.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the DUCOM population (academic administrator, full-time and part-time faculty) was asked the same question, we can observe slightly different results. While 50.32% of the participants responded yes, 44.52% expressed that they did not know whether the Board exerts an appropriate level of authority in governing the Drexel University College of Medicine. The slight change in results may (though it cannot be definitively stated) be attributed to the fact that the DUCOM population did not include non-faculty advisor and staff opinions.

Q3.10 (DUCOM ONLY) The Board of Trustees of the Philadelphia Health & Education Corporation (which does business as Drexel University College of Medicine) exerts an appropriate level of authority in running the Drexel University College of Medicine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>48.78%</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>51.22%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30.15%</td>
<td>48.78%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>25.94%</td>
<td>41.24%</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>25.41%</td>
<td>44.52%</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the MSCHE Self-Study survey also addressed how effective Drexel University Online, the Sacramento Center for Graduate Studies and Drexel @ Burlington County College have been integrated into the Drexel University governance structure. A significant percentage of the surveyed population (academic administrator, administrator, full-time and part-time faculty and non-faculty advisor) indicated that they don't know. Specifically, the participants responded that they don't know how effectively Drexel University Online (46.85%), the Sacramento Center for Graduate Studies (64.89%) and
Drexel @ Burlington Community College (73.06%) have been integrated into the Drexel University governance structure. For a detailed view on the range of responses for all population categories, please see Appendix C-XV. 2011 MSCHE Self-Study Survey B. Governance.

These results indicate that in order for the Drexel community to be better informed on these issues, current efforts to increase transparency and effectively seek the input of affected constituencies on key strategic plans and initiatives need to be continued and strengthened.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND INSIGHTS FOR THE FUTURE

Several broad themes have emerged from the focus groups and interview discussions as well as the MSCHE Self-Study survey. One of the most pressing issues is the relationship between Drexel University (DU) and Drexel University College of Medicine (DUCOM). Specifically, there seems to be a lack of understanding between these organizations in regard to their operating structures. The collected data may also suggest that opportunities to enhance collaboration and communication between them should be pursued more proactively. The data may also suggest that the ongoing efforts to improve communication between Drexel University and DUCOM need to be continued and strengthened.

Other important findings concern two of the most important stakeholders of the university: the Board of Trustees and the faculty. According to the data, there is little knowledge among department heads and other administrators in regard to how the Board makes decisions. In addition, while the Charter of Faculty Governance clearly provides the faculty with an advisory role, the faculty was not sufficiently consulted on several major decisions, including the development of major for-profit ventures and external initiatives. In contrast, most members of the faculty indicated that they have input into major discussions affecting their own college or school. These findings suggest that efforts should be made to clarify and better communicate faculty roles in University decision-making processes, in the manner that was done with respect to the establishment of the law school and, more recently, has been done with respect to the 2012-2017 strategic planning process.

Overall, these data and the positive trajectory of the University over the last ten years serve as evidence that the University's governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, and is effective in supporting the mission and goals of the institution.
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1.0 STANDARDS

Standard 5 - Administration
The institution's administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution's organization and governance.

Standard 6 - Integrity
In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Workgroup D was charged with analyzing the institution's administrative structure and services that facilitate learning, support research and scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution's organization and governance. In doing so, the workgroup detailed a tremendous period of growth of the University since 2002. Although the institution underwent significant changes during this time, Drexel proved to manage them in unique and effective ways. Additionally, the workgroup reflected on the support for academic and intellectual freedom and on how the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

In order to analyze and discuss the manner and degree to which Drexel University fulfills Standard 5 (Administration) and Standard 6 (Integrity), the committee developed a set of research questions based on these standards.

D-1. What have been the main impacts of administrative changes and reorganization at the University since 2002, especially as these bear on Drexel's ability to realize its mission?

D-2. What evidence is there that the administrative structures of the University are supporting its academic mission and facilitating learning?

D-3. How well articulated are Drexel's institutional policies? How accessible are its policies? Is there a "policy directory," and how useful is it? How effective are the responsible administrative bodies at implementing and enforcing institutional policies?

D-4. What instruments are available for measuring the effectiveness of current administrative structures? Can these instruments provide evidence that current administrative structures are effective? If so, what is this evidence?

D-5. What evidence is there that the principles of academic freedom held by the faculty and students are being adhered to? How would disputes involving alleged denials of academic freedom be dealt with at the University?

D-6. Are the needs of constituencies supportive of curricular improvement being met? To what extent are their needs being met, and what evidence is there of this?
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D-7. What evidence is there that the institution follows through on its policies, initiatives and plans as they relate to its academic mission?

Evidence to support the findings in this section was based on close inspection of relevant documents (see Appendices) and conversations with colleagues.

Due to its importance in providing a context for addressing Standard 5 and Standard 6 and considering the significant changes that Drexel has experienced since 2002, the first question is addressed in greater detail and length than the subsequent five questions.

4.0 RESEARCH QUESTIONS ADDRESSED

D1. What significant administrative changes and reorganizations were made in the period 2002-2010, and what has been their impact?

Office of the Provost

During the period under review (2002-2011), there have been four Provosts: Dr. Harvill Eaton (2002-2004); Dr. Ali Houshmand, Interim (2004-2005); Dr. Stephen Director (2005-2008); and Dr. Mark L. Greenberg (2008-present). This period was marked by tremendous growth in Drexel’s academic programs and supporting administrative structures. The year 2002 saw the addition of the Drexel University College of Medicine, the School of Public Health, the College of Nursing and Health Professions, and in 2006 the Earle Mack School of Law. Several notable achievements have been realized during the tenure of each of these Provosts. These achievements and ongoing institutional improvements have been guided by careful review, assessment, and planning.

In 2002, guided by the results of the previous Middle States self-study, a tenure and promotion policies handbook and an academic policies workbook were developed and several new workgroups and committees were appointed: an academic policy workgroup, a course cycling workgroup, and a Faculty Development Advisory Committee. Additionally, the first Office of the Provost web site and online University Catalog were developed in 2002.

In 2003, due to the merger with MCP/Hahnemann, several new programs were added as Drexel University offerings. Since many of these programs were on a semester calendar, they were migrated to the quarter calendar. However, Drexel continues to maintain multiple calendars to meet the educational needs of its students. New Faculty Orientation was expanded and the third-year review and tenure workshops were initiated. Additionally, the sabbatical leave program was revised to be financially self-supporting. A Provost’s Committee on online learning was created, which has now become the broader Online Learning Council.

In 2004, policies continued to be developed or revised. Among the most notable revised policies were the tenure and promotion, program review, and annual scheduling policies. Currently, annual scheduling includes online scheduling and the program review process is being revised in the context of learning assessment initiatives. Additionally, the Council of Associate Deans and the Student Resource Center (SRC) were created.
In 2005, Provost Stephen Director, who served from July 2005 until 2008, instituted several significant changes in the administration of the Office of the Provost. In order to examine issues surrounding the diversity of Drexel's faculty and make related recommendations, a Provost's Task Force on Faculty Diversity was initiated. Additionally, new retention initiatives were implemented with a pilot program in enhancing mathematics success in the LeBow College of Business and the institution of an early warning system for new freshmen. With the hiring of a new Executive Director of the Steinbright Career Development Center, which manages co-op, a new COOP 101 course was launched. A Vice Provost for Budget, Planning, and Administration was appointed to manage the processes of budgeting, strategic and space planning and improvement for the academic units. As a consequence, the academic budget process was revamped, enhancing the relationship between the academic units and the Office of the Provost. In addition, the Office of Academic Advising, Retention and Diversity was created.

In 2006, the Colleges, the University Libraries, and Enrollment Management were required to create strategic plans. In order to provide an opportunity for broader discussion, all Deans and Directors engaged in a SWOT analysis and attended a retreat to discuss their respective strategic plans. Additionally, special budget requests and hiring requests were accompanied by justifications linking the request to the unit's strategic plan. The Provost began the process of developing a comprehensive institutional Strategic Plan for 2007-2012 to link long-range planning to academic decision-making and budgetary processes.

Aligned with the strategic plan development, more cross-disciplinary research collaborations were formed to address grand challenges facing our society and the world. In that year, the Wallace H. Coulter Foundation initially awarded a team lead by the Director of the School of Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences to accelerate translational research by increasing effective collaborations between biomedical engineers and clinicians. Initially the amount of the award was for $580,000 each year for the next five years; recently the Coulter Foundation awarded Drexel a $10M grant. Other initiatives included the opening of the Earle Mack School of Law, and the introduction of Drexel degree-completion programs at Burlington County College. Additionally, in order to encourage colleges and schools to enhance their participation in educational programs that are delivered online, a new revenue sharing policy was created.

In 2007, the Office of the Provost continued to review and revise policies and processes. Focused especially on improving quality and enhancing efficiency, a number of policies were revamped and modified including those that address faculty hiring, promotion and tenure, emeritus status for faculty, appeals of promotion and tenure decisions, overriding course enrollment caps, adding and dropping courses, graduate student registration, supplemental pay, and plus/minus grading. In addition, the "Behind Every Graduate Program" was created to recognize excellent high school teachers who have inspired Drexel students.

In June 2008, Dr. Director left Drexel, and Dr. Greenberg was named Interim Provost. Several months later, he was named to the position permanently. A new position dedicated to Assessment and Curricular Development was created in March of 2009. The University began its self-study during this period and involving over 150 faculty and staff throughout the University in preparation for Middle
States its reaffirmation of accreditation review in 2012. The Online Learning Council was created to coordinate and enhance the online experience for students and to ensure the quality of online courses and supporting curricular materials. In order to improve communication and coordination of the growing online initiative, an advisory committee was created consisting of individuals from Drexel University Online and Deans of units offering online programs. Since Fall 2008, much work has been done to improve service to students and faculty and refine administrative effectiveness. In order to provide more support to the administration of the colleges, the Office of the Provost has invigorated the Academic Administrators' Group and the Department Leaders' Forum. In an effort to improve inter and intra departmental communication and also promote activities and services of the Office of the Provost, a Provost's newsletter was created along with several new websites. In terms of administrative reorganization the Study Abroad Program merged with the Office of International Programs and a new Vice Provost for Research was appointed. The Office of Research, part of the Office of the Provost, has launched the COEUS research proposal application and submission tool enabling researchers to collaborate online to create and submit research proposals more efficiently and effectively. Preparations for the opening of the Center for Graduate Studies in Sacramento, CA, Drexel's first distant additional location were conducted through 2008, and the first class began in January 2009.

Enrollment Management

The student application process, as well as a large number of essential student services underwent profound changes from 2002 to 2010. In 2003, the Department of Enrollment Management converted its undergraduate and graduate operations to the Banner system. This conversion resulted in all authorized users having desktop access to student application materials. The transformation to a more fully electronic operation was continued in 2007-2008 with the move to scan and store all Enrollment Management documents. The effect was to allow multiple users to review the same document simultaneously, while also eliminating the need to regularly move and store physical files. In 2004, Enrollment Management assumed responsibility for managing the operations of the Office of Financial Aid and the Student Resource Center (SRC). A comprehensive review of all operations related to providing students with financial aid information and the processing of student-initiated academic transactions was conducted. This review was conducted in the context of improving the efficiency of operations by a centrally located office on each of Drexel's campuses where students could have their questions and needs immediately and efficiently answered. As a result of the review, financial aid and SRC operations merged in 2005, with a thorough renovation of its facilities. In 2006, the CRM, RightNow customer relationship management system was implemented. This system consolidates all data related to phone, in-person, and email student inquiries. As a result, customer service staff had immediate access to transactional histories allowing for better-informed follow-ups with students.

In 2006, the operations structure of the Office of Admissions underwent a major transformation. The structure had been based on a population-centered model - the office staff was organized into groups each focused on a different population, specifically, freshmen, transfers, and graduate students. By contrast, the new structure is based on a function-centered model - the office staff is organized into different groups each having a separate function while all serving the same general population. These
functions include Recruitment, Admissions, Enrollment Planning & Retention Services, and Operations. The new model has made it possible to better understand and manage the particulars required to optimize the performance of each function, leading to greater efficiency within and between each. In 2008, facilities were renovated for the Enrollment Management's Operations Department with a view to processing more efficiently a greater volume of student applications—this in light of Drexel’s burgeoning student population. The principal objective was to create more attractive spaces for prospective students visiting the departments, while also enabling staff to respond to an increasing volume of visitors.

Office of the General Counsel

In 2002, the Office of the General Counsel (“OGC”) consisted of six attorneys, two risk managers and five administrative support staff divided between two offices—one in University City and one in Center City. In 2003, an attorney from the OGC was appointed by the President to serve as Chief Compliance Officer, to oversee the Drexel University Whistleblower Hotline (currently overseen by the Office of Internal Audit) and the Conflict of Interest Program. Over the ensuing years, with the addition of the College of Medicine, College of Nursing and Health Professions, the School of Public Health, the Earle Mack School of Law, several additional locations, as well as the increase in faculty, staff, and student enrollment, the OGC grew to nine attorneys, four risk managers and six administrative support staff.

Finance Division

In 2002, under the direction of the Senior Vice President for Finance, Treasurer and CFO, a number of organizational changes occurred connected with the management and later merger of the College of Medicine (PHEC). In 2002, the separate financial staffs of Drexel and PHEC were combined into one unit in order to take advantage of available economies and synergies. This included the functions of Accounts Payable, Payroll, Tax, General Accounting, Treasury and Budget. This would later include the Bursar’s Office functions although this office would continue to maintain a physical presence at each campus. In 2003, The University and PHEC legally merged, and this necessitated the full consolidation of PHEC’s financial statements into Drexel’s. This was greatly facilitated by previously migrating and implementing the Banner Financial systems used by Drexel to PHEC in a nearly identical structure and format. While consolidated financial reports are prepared annually, Drexel still maintains separate financial statements for PHEC that retained its separately legal identity and status. It should be noted that upon the merger, the College of Nursing and Health Professions the School of Public Health programs under PHEC and the Psychology program were transferred to Drexel.

In 2004, the University created and established a captive insurance company, Schuylkili Crossing Reciprocal Risk Retention Group, to provide savings on rapidly growing malpractice insurance expenses experienced in the general market. The following year, 2005, an annual billing program which was designed to simplify the billing process and also ensure that all students were classified as “Drexel” students regardless of whether their program was run by Drexel or PHEC, was implemented. The billing program presents advantages but also raises some challenges, for students changing programs that are currently under review.

MSCHE Decennial Reaffirmation of Accreditation
In 2007, the respective Drexel and PHEC Boards of Trustees agreed to transfer the responsibilities of the PHEC Investment Committee to the Drexel Investment Committee and to manage the combined portfolios of each entity in a unified manner under the latter’s guidance. This resulted in the creation of a full-time in-house Investment Office to oversee and support the combined portfolio and provide other functions that had previously been limited or outsourced. In 2008 and 2009, the Drexel Investment Committee established a newer more diversified allocation strategy to address the deteriorating market conditions. Consequently, the Investment Office function has continued to expand in order to provide the necessary resources to oversee and implement the new strategy.

Finally, since 2002, the University has continued to maintain an aggressive capital expenditure program to address the additional space requirements demanded by growing programs as well as to address ongoing deferred maintenance. Accordingly, the University issued over $300M in new bond financings to provide the necessary funding for the projects and to restructure existing debt facilities carried forward from prior periods. As a result, the University has added several new academic, research and residential facilities during this period (See Appendix D-I. Timeline for Academic, Research and Residential Facilities from 2002-Present).

Human Resources

Human Resources, managed by the SVP of Student Life & Administrative services, has undergone a number of administrative changes over the past eight years. While HR transformed from a reactive to a highly proactive unit, these changes have affected all University employees from applicant to retiree.

In 2002, HRIS, Finance, and IRT added to the Web*Financials suite by releasing Web*Budget, an online fiscal year budgeting tool. In 2003, Human Resources, worked to streamline the faculty and staff hiring process with the implementation of an online recruitment system. Also in 2003, Web*Merit was added to the Web*Financials package allowing managers to process their employees’ merit increases online and track merit pool balances and the Electronic Personnel Action Forms (EPAFs), which allow for the electronic hire of new and rehired student employees and adjuncts, were introduced.

Since 2005, Human Resources also worked to support the university’s mission through service excellence through greater assessment and review of processes, in some instances borrowing from industry models.

In order to improve customer service to Drexel’s students, Dr. Papadakis believed that in order for students to be truly engaged in Drexel, employees must first be engaged. To address this, President Papadakis developed the Students First Initiative. The programs under Students First—communication, training, and rewards/recognition—were designed to enhance the work experience for our employees and to inspire them to achieve high performance in service to our students.

In 2006, a Gallup Survey was launched for students, faculty and staff. The anonymous survey gave students the opportunity to share their opinions about University administrative services and operations. Faculty and staff employees participated in a similar survey. As a result of the data collected from the survey, billing and financial aid policies and processes were improved.
HR was reorganized in 2006, and a Talent Management and Organizational Development area was created to focus efforts on re-engineering, recruitment and training. In 2007 a dedicated, proactive employee relations function was created to support all employee relations issues in collaboration with Office of Equality and Diversity and the Offices of the General Counsel. Also in 2007, a dedicated HR function was formed on the College of Medicine campus. Since 2006, HR has made continuous improvements to the performance management process for both Drexel and DUCOM. The performance process has been overhauled, resulting in an electronic performance evaluation system with a revised 5 point rating scale, SMART goals and standard competencies aimed at creating a pay-for-performance process. Performance evaluations, conflict of interest, and non-discrimination training were all linked to merit increases in 2008. HR also completed an Executive Compensation Market analysis in 2008 (see Appendix D-II. HR Executive Compensation Market analysis in 2008).

From 2007 to 2009, HR continued to make great strides in technology. Many of the paper processes, such as the Conflict of Interest, leave and time reporting, human capital reporting, effort management, and the keeping of personnel files, went electronic, allowing for a quicker turnover time for many HR processes.

In 2007, Human Resources reengineered the new employee orientation process to provide a more engaging first day for new employees, and standardized all employment contracts. In 2009, the Human Resources department was reorganized and moved under the direction of James Tucker, SVP of Student Life and Administrative Services and Deborah Glenn, Vice President of Human Resources.

In 2009 and 2010, Human Resources introduced many new training and development opportunities for Drexel and DUCOM employees. As part of an initiative to reduce liability insurance premiums over a three-year period, HR created and facilitated mandatory risk-management training and Managing Performance Issues for Drexel managers and supervisors. This training involved a change from the corrective action model to a proactive and consistent performance improvement process. HR also launched a series of 12 comprehensive training courses for front-line and client-facing staff. In 2009, 360° assessments were completed for all Executives. In 2010, HR launched electronic introductory period performance evaluations, as well as a revised introductory period policy.

HR continues to improve the manner in which processes are performed. In 2010, HR released OrgPlus, organizational chart software (see Appendix D-III. Drexel University Organizational Chart). The work-study process was also streamlined in 2010, making the process to hire work-study students faster and more transparent for departments.

Human Resources has also worked to ensure that Drexel employees are taken care of after they retire from the University. In 2009, HR coordinated fiduciary training for our investment company, and in 2010, the Board granted to delegate fiduciary responsibility to the newly formed investment committee. In 2010, HR also commissioned a request for proposals to select and secure an investment consultant for retirement plans.

Finally, in support of the university mission, HR has continued to increase communication and create relationships within the University and the surrounding community. In 2007 the President's Awards
were introduced, which recognize non-faculty staff for excellence and innovation. Inspire a Child to Dream Day, Employee Appreciation Picnic, Black History Month celebrations, and Shadowing Day were all created to celebrate Drexel and DUCOM employees and the surrounding Drexel community (see Appendix D-IV, Human Resources Awards and Events).

In 2010, HR launched a quarterly electronic newsletter that informs the University about HR events and programs, and also conducted an employee opinion survey to gauge employee satisfaction. Human Resources also collaborated with the University at-large by creating an HR Advisory Committee, as well as creating the HR Roundtable.

Information Resources and Technology

The Office of Information Resources and Technology (IRT) supports technology that is recognized as paramount to the institution and central to both academic and administrative efforts at all levels. This is supported by the cabinet level appointment of the Vice President for Information Resources and Technology and Chief Information Officer.

After the 2002 merger of MCP Hahnemann University with Drexel, and successfully extending technology services across campuses and diverse populations, IRT utilized the same model and launched a series of Academic/Administrative Service Provider relationships with independent, private higher education institutions and the Center for Graduate Studies in Sacramento. These relationships are ongoing through 2010 and they have allowed IRT not only to leverage enterprise system agreements but also to share best practices while promoting the Drexel brand, expanding our reputation regionally and nationally, and adding revenue. In addition, these relationships and the technology service developments during this time period provided the resources to restructure within IRT. The IRT restructure provided Drexel more focused administrative and staff positions dedicated to specialized services such as collaboration (SharePoint, SiteCore), computer and information security, infrastructure and telecom (fiber, wireless VoIP) and multimedia and video technology (media conversion dropbox, web streaming, audio/video capture and videoconferencing). To support these services, several staff positions were created. Among them, are Director of Online Learning and Collaboration, Director of Networking and Telecommunications, Managers for Information Security and Web Technologies, Directors of Software Services, Business Services and Support Services and Asst. Directors of Desktop Support, Client Services, Online Learning, Collaboration and Facilities Services. The current structure of IRT recognizes the importance of managing directly the specific organizational and functional units. In turn this address the increased interest in and provision of the newest technologies.

Faculty Senate

As discussed by Working Group C, the Faculty Senate is the representative body of all university faculty as part of shared governance at Drexel University. The Senate currently has seven (7) standing committees that focus specifically on one aspect of university governance (Nominations; Academic Affairs; Academic Support; Faculty Affairs; Student Life; Budget, Planning and Development; and Research and Scholarly Activity) and report monthly to the Senate as a whole. Members of the sub-committee are also elected by their local units and may not necessarily be senators. The Officers of the
Senate and the Chairs of the Senate sub-committee form the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee monitors all ongoing Faculty Senate affairs and serves as a coordinating body for information collection and dissemination, faculty opinion, and other daily activities representing the Senate and the faculty at-large.

Over the past ten years, as Drexel University transformed into a comprehensive research university, faculty governance has been transformed as well. Some key developments have been the integration of faculty representation of the College of Medicine after the merger, and the inclusion of faculty representation from the new Earle Mack School of Law. Additionally, faculty were an integral part of the University efforts in the merger and in establishing additional locations and faculty are directly involved in the development, implementation, and reporting on strategic planning.

**Students Affairs**

In June of 2003, Dr. David Ruth was appointed Dean of Students reporting to the Senior Vice President for Student Life and Administrative Services. Against the backdrop of the on-going merger of Drexel with MCP Hahnemann University, Dr. Ruth directed the unification of Center City and University City Student Life operations. Additionally, the Office of Housing and Residential Living was transformed by moving “University Housing” to Drexel Business Services. This move created an independent Office of Residential Living to better focus and serve the academic, personal and social needs of Drexel students living on campus. Not surprisingly, these changes within the Office of Student Life would further occasion a comprehensive review of all of its departments and services, the creation of a new prioritization of its goals, and a clearer more relevant statement of its mission. Student support services are discussed in greater detail by Workgroup E.

**Drexel Libraries**

With the merger of Drexel University with MCP-Hahnemann University in 2002, the Dean of Libraries, initiated the project of fully integrating electronic resources and library services for the entire University. As a result, the Drexel community found itself with a more robust and comprehensive collection of materials, accessible anywhere and anytime. Simultaneously, noting a declining reliance on print resources and the grave challenges of administering libraries on four campuses, the transition to an electronic library paradigm began, as did the leveraging of library resources in the medical and health sciences with those serving other disciplines at Drexel. With the addition of the Law School in 2007, a new Director of Libraries and the Dean of the Law School collaborated on placing the Law School’s collection on the third floor of the W. W. Hagerty Library. While this accommodation resulted in reduced seating for non-law students, the benefits to the University included the granting of the accreditation of the Law School and the acquisition of previously unavailable electronic resources. By 2008, Drexel’s libraries were well along the process of converting from physical periodical subscriptions to electronic ones. Thus, the space once given over to periodicals in the W.W. Hagerty Library was converted to a 24-hour study area with retailed café services. The design allows for space and furniture configurations conducive to collaborative activities and group work. Student surveys conducted by the library, as well as usage statistics it keeps, establish that the redesign has been successful (see Appendix D-V. Library Usage Statistics).
Athletics

In May 2003, the Athletic Department's Mission statement changed to incorporate the recreational mission of the department and to align with the overall mission of the institution. Accordingly, the Department added more club sports. These included baseball, volleyball, women's ice hockey, men's and women's squash. The Department also increased intramural participation and eliminated two NCAA Division I Programs, namely, baseball and volleyball. Three years later, in 2007, the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification granted Drexel University a second cycle of athletics certification. The purpose of athletics certification is to ensure integrity in the institution's athletics program and to assist in the improvement of athletics departments. The NCAA's report lauded Drexel's ACHIEVE Center as one of the more progressive and comprehensive academic support units on campus (see Appendix D-VI The: ACHIEVE Center). It also included positive comments about the Faculty Athletic Advisory Committee (FAAC) that provides critical feedback and oversight to student-athlete academic and support services. The FAAC is composed of a group of educators based outside of the athletic department. In 2002, Drexel Athletics was ranked by US News and World Report as the #1 program nationally in gender equity (See Appendix D. VII. US News and World Report on Gender Equity in Athletic Programs).

In 2008, the NCAA awarded Drexel University's Athletics Department the Diversity in Athletics Award in the category of Overall Excellence in Diversity. Research supported by the NCAA and conducted by the Laboratory for Diversity in Sports at Texas A&M University identified Drexel University as one of the top athletics programs in the nation. This designation is for having achieved the highest total combined scores in the areas of diversity strategy, gender and racial diversity of departmental employees, value and attitudinal diversity of departmental employees, graduation of African-American females and male student-athletes, and gender equity compliance. In February 2010 the Athletics Department took charge of the new Recreation Center, offering 87,000 square feet of athletic facilities and a host of new wellness programs for the entire Drexel Community. The Armory also opened adding an additional 30,000 square feet of recreational space for such activities as indoor basketball, tennis, volleyball, badminton and floor hockey.

This historical account of changes and reorganizations at Drexel demonstrates that the institution's rapid transformational development over the past decade has been accompanied by new administrative structures and increased resources that are directed at enhancing the experience of students, faculty, and professional staff.

D2. How can we assure that administrative structures support the academic mission and facilitate learning?

Enrollment Management

The reorganization of the Student Resource Center and Financial Aid Office allowed for cross-training of all staff. This enabled us to reallocate resources to handle increased demand as well as fluctuations in service requests around specific academic and administrative activities including new term starts, drop/add and withdraw deadlines, and placement of financial holds. Technology has been implemented...
to handle repetitive processes (e.g. loan creation, financial aid award processing) allowing counselors more time to spend with students to resolve more complex issues. Additionally, the implementation of self-service products (e.g. transcript request, certification of enrollment) allows students to obtain necessary information in a simple and efficient process from the location of their own choice rather than standing in line during business hours.

Athletics

Drexel Athletics prides itself on offering high quality intercollegiate and recreational athletics within the context of higher education. The mission is “Generating Drexel Pride through Athletic Excellence.” The operating principles include introducing sports and exercise into the fabric of the intercollegiate experience. In response to the growth of the university, athletics took charge of the new Recreation Center, offering 87,000 square feet of athletic facilities, a host of new wellness programs and intramural activities for the entire Drexel Community. Many outdoor recreational spaces including tennis, volleyball, turf fields and a walking park have been developed to meet the diverse needs of the student body, faculty and staff. The Armory also opened adding additional 30,000 square feet of recreational space for such activities as indoor basketball, tennis, volleyball, badminton, squash, and floor hockey.

Drexel Libraries

The most significant challenge faced by the Libraries is also the hallmark of Drexel's success — increased enrollment in many University schools and programs. Until recently, the Hagerty Library locations had not offered adequate study space and seating for the growing student population. The main University City Hagerty Library footprint decreased somewhat as the third floor was dedicated to use by the Law School and five study rooms at Hahnemann were eliminated to free up space for a new classroom.

During that time, library materials, including books and journals were increasingly provided electronically through the Library website and therefore accessible any time. However, students' use of the physical libraries has increased as collaborative and team-based assignments become the norm. The Center City library also serves as a student union in the absence of any other communal gathering site on the Center City Campus. To address these space constraints in 2007, six new study rooms were created form library lounge space at Hahnemann. The same year, an empty vestibule was converted to collaborative workspace with the addition of seven tables and 28 chairs.

in 2004, the Hagerty the library also purchased specialized furniture designed to create computer “hubs”. These configurations use floor space more economically than traditional furniture, allowing for the deployment of more computer stations. Additionally, in 2005, several group study rooms were added in the Hagerty Library, with more constructed in 2008.

During the past nine years, the library implemented new services and initiatives that enhanced the academic mission and enabled students to communicate with the library in a variety of new ways. The new technology facilitated students to communicate in a way that is more consonant with their communication styles: instant messaging, chat service and email reference are examples.
A "personal librarian" program established in Center City in 2008 and in University City in 2010 introduced students to the libraries' structure of disciplinary expertise and broadened students' understanding of how the libraries can become a part of their career of learning at Drexel. In 2009, the library began conducting workshops in conjunction with the Writing Center to provide students with integrated instruction in writing and grammar with bibliographic citation tools and database searching.

D3. How well articulated, communicated, and implemented are institutional policies?

Over the last ten years, Drexel University has come a long way in the development, implementation and enforcement of official University policies. Starting in 2002, the University administration identified and organized all of its official policies in three primary locations on its website: Student Life, Office of the Provost and Human Resources, so that University staff, faculty, students, and guests, could easily find the policies affecting them.

In 2006, the University implemented the policy entitled, Authorizing Official University Policies, which formalized the process by which policies would be implemented, revised and approved. Prior to that, policies required no formal review and were implemented in a very decentralized fashion. Under the new policy, before any policy is made official, review and approval by senior management and by the president is required for any new policy or material revision to an existing policy.

Over the years, the practice has evolved into a two-stage review process that spans 2-4 weeks before new policies or material revisions to existing policies are approved. In 2009, the University developed a Policy Directory, located on the homepage of the University's website, which allows all of the official University policies to be searched by Category, Issuing Department or Policy Title. The Policy Directory is currently administered by the Office of the General Counsel.

D-4. How effective have the various offices (i.e., administrative structures) been at meeting their goals?

Customer service has improved due to new technologies and new policies making offices more responsive and effective in solving student problems. By solving both academic and financial issues, the response time for student problems resolution in key areas has improved dramatically, but work continues to make further improvements. By automating many former manual processes and decreasing processing times, technology enabled staff and advisors to be more rapidly responsive than before.

In terms of faculty, a greater diversity among faculty was achieved. By creating awareness and policies, Drexel University, continue to attract and keep more diverse faculty and to expand opportunities for them. Human Resources Department became more professional and policies were created to ensure equity in hiring, evaluation, promotion for faculty and staff. Among these improvements were the addition of DrexelJobs, consistent annual performance evaluation processes, new position titles/salaries for teaching faculty, conflict of interest training, required new employee orientation, and harassment training (see Appendix D-VIII, Conflict of Interest Annual Conflict of Interest Disclosure and Annual Compliance Requirements).
New policies were created in the Admissions office as well. The online application and waiving fee automated the admissions process for prospective students. This resulted in more applications, greater enrollment and small increases in retention and graduation rates. As evidenced by responses to the NSSE Survey, Drexel students are more engaged and satisfied than in previous years (see Appendix D-IX, The National Survey of Student Engagement). Besides, student satisfaction, there is also a greater employee and faculty satisfaction as evidenced by responses to HERI and HR survey (see Appendix D-X, The HERI Survey of Faculty and Appendix D-XI, The Drexel University HR Surveys: 2010 Employee Engagement Survey, 2006 Gallup Results, Buck Consultants Survey - 2010 Drexel Work Experience).

In the Office of Finance, new tools such as WebFinance for university wide access to and management of academic budgets and FuturePerfect for financial projections as basis for sound planning were implemented. Careful fiscal management of the institution has led to strong bond ratings and a the University’s continued sound financial position.

**D5. What evidence is there that the institution adheres to principles of academic freedom?**

Drexel University’s policy on “Tenure and Promotion,” explicitly endorses the “Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure,” adopted in 1940 by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges. The “Statement” represents the first articulation in the United States of the basic principles of tenure as a system to protect the academic freedom of faculty members. Irrespective of full- or part-time faculty status, the University’s further commitment is stated in its policy on “Academic Freedom,” which clearly spells out the rights and obligations of “the teacher” (see Appendix D-XII, Drexel University Tenure and Promotion Policies).

The best evidence of Drexel’s unyielding commitment to the principles of academic freedom consists in the fact that there has never been any complaint brought against the University by any of its members on any issue bearing on the academic freedom enjoyed by its students and faculty. Nonetheless, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA), the Office of the Ombudsman, the Office of the General Council, and the Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs stand ready to receive, investigate, and resolve any report or claim of a violation of academic freedom should one arise in the future.

**D6. How are the needs of all constituencies (e.g., of the institution) considered in terms of curricular improvement?**

Assessment and curriculum committees, meetings of associate deans, department leaders, research deans, online learning council and other such groups meet regularly to address curricular issues, changes, problems ensuring interdisciplinary communication, collaboration and cooperation in maintaining quality curriculum for all students. Regular communication between the Faculty Senate and its subcommittees takes place with the Office of the Provost to maximize faculty participation.

The Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs convenes the Program Implementation Committee to review academic support and administrative services impact of new or updated programs. This committee includes representation from key offices including: Billing, Financial Aid, Registrar, Academic...
Advising, Retention and Diversity, and Academic Information Systems. The committee reviews current administrative systems to ensure smooth implementation of the new program. Additionally necessary academic supports are evaluated. In cases where an unintended consequence is detected (for example a program being ineligible for financial aid) the Office of the Provost works with academic units to determine if adjustments can be made to reduce or eliminate negative student impacts.

In order to support growth and expansion the Capital Asset Allocation Committee was created. This committee oversees all academic space needs, improvements, renovations and initiatives to ensure quality, safe, comfortable, and properly equipped academic facilities and to ensure quality of the academic programs and initiatives (labs, classrooms, study spaces, etc.

Other initiatives included creating awareness of the Office of Disability Services and Drexel Center for Academic Excellence. The Office of Disability Services has increased and its breadth has been expanded to ensure support and equity for students with special needs. The Drexel Center for Academic Excellence provides workshops, training, and seminars to help faculty stay current and effective with new pedagogies, technologies, and services available on campus.

In addition to these initiatives, faculty and student support services have been improved. While faculty senate subcommittees are active in improving faculty engagement and the academic experience, student support services (financial aid, student health services, advising) have been expanded and improved to support student academic success and coordinate with academic units to improve curricula and academic experience.

The Hagerty Library’s resources have been taxed by increased enrollment, changes in student work styles and the need for collaborative spaces for students and faculty learning. University administration is dedicated to re-purposing spaces throughout the campus. In order to meet changing expectations and curricular needs, the first library expansion planned outside the main building is a “bookless” Library Learning Terrace. This 75-seat facility is located close to the dormitories and offers space where students and faculty can gather.

Recognizing the importance of incorporating information literacy into the curriculum, the University administration funded a new position in 2010 for a professional Librarian. This professional librarian will act as a knowledge leader in areas of learning, teaching and the use of appropriate pedagogical techniques. Such expertise will allow the Library to conduct formal assessment programs and offer more sophisticated and targeted instructional programs, especially for Freshmen.

**D7. How well does the institution follow through on stated policies, initiatives and plans?**

Several examples demonstrate that the administration has worked collaboratively and diligently to assure that initiatives and plans are not only implemented but also refined as lessons are learned.

The University has provided extensive support to initiatives implement the 2007-12 Strategic Plan. Over the last several years, salary and start-up funds have been committed annually to hire new high-quality faculty across the institution in support of the Strategic Plan. The Office of the Provost renewed its commitment to learning assessment by hiring an Associate Vice Provost for Curriculum and Assessment.
and launching a new assessment initiative. With the cooperation of all academic units, this initiative is centered around the Drexel Student Learning Priorities, a Drexel syllabus template, and other activities intended to assist faculty in creating consistently high quality courses across the institutions (see Appendix D-XIII, Drexel Learning Priorities and Appendix D-XIV, The Drexel Learner-Centered Syllabus Template).

The Office of the Provost extended the discussion and support of online learning by creating an Online Learning Council and various workshops to better deliver online courses and to better integrate online elements for face-to-face and blended delivery as the University moves to a single learning management system, Blackboard LEARN.

Additionally, a policy website (e.g., the Policy Directory) for publication and promotion of all policies, both academic and administrative was created for the entire University. To ensure full compliance with the conflict of interest and harassment policies, the online completion of conflict of interest forms and successful completion of a review course on workplace harassment is coupled to the merit pay process. Human Resources has surveyed the University community, and HR leaders met with each area to review results and discuss ways of addressing areas of concern.

In order to expand study space, new classrooms were added and upgraded to a standard level of technology and “appearance.” Other space constraints have been addressed by the completion of the Papadakis Integrated Sciences Building, the construction of a new classroom suite in the Garden Level of One Drexel Plaza, and the construction of the new Library Learning Terrace.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND INSIGHTS FOR THE FUTURE

The changes that have occurred over the past ten years have been significant but carefully managed. Changes in the senior administration have resulted in more concerted efforts at planning and creating structures to accommodate and administer what has become a comprehensive urban research University. To that end, careful strategic planning continues to advance the University mission by creating a more unified vision for the Drexel community and its stakeholders. The current strategic planning process for 2012-17 will make this even more apparent (see Appendix D-XVII, The 2012 – 2017 Strategic Plan).

Several broad themes have emerged from the discussion. The workgroup particularly recognizes the emphasis placed on improving the educational experience and services for all students and making a long-term commitment to learning assessment using new technologies. In cooperation between the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Senate, an enhanced review process for programs that is based on academic quality and rigor, market relevance and demand, and financial viability compared to benchmark programs is under development.

The University adheres to a high standard of ethics and integrity. Moving forward, work on improving the way in which University policies are communicated and organized, as well as implementing a continual policy renewal process, will support the continuation and refinement of these high standards.
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1.0 STANDARDS

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention
The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission.

Standard 9: Student Support Services
The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Workgroup E sought to analyze Drexel's enrollment and student support services for all its populations: undergraduate, graduate and professional students, including online students and students studying at distant sites. In preparation for this report, Workgroup E reviewed the 2001 Middle States report on student admissions and retention as a starting point and conducted a broad review of admissions practices and student support services.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

In order to analyze how Drexel University fulfills Standard 8 (Student Admissions and Retention) and Standard 9 (Student Support Services), the committee developed a set of research questions based on these standards.

E-1. How do the profiles of Drexel students, which includes new/transfer, full and part time, graduate/undergraduate, attending classes either face-to-face or online align with the University's mission? What information can be obtained from the profiles of graduates and non-retained students that (a) provide measures of success and (b) guide future admission goals, and (b) indicate areas of opportunity to improve our processes?

E-3. How have programs at Drexel allowed leveraging of resources and partnerships to improve the quality of student learning and student life at Drexel?

E-4. How has the delivery of student support services and other services (including security, etc.) been refined to accommodate an increasingly residential campus in an urban setting while still maintaining appropriate services for non-residential students?

E-5. How has Drexel created opportunities for broader access and greater success for the students it serves - locally, regionally, nationally and internationally (transfer policies, veterans and other special groups)? What services have been developed for commuter students, on-line students,
students at off-campus sites, and "resi-muters" (students that live within five miles of campus)?

E-6. How are lessons learned from retention studies used to improve academic and student support programs?

E-7. What do demographic trends suggest will be the future of the institution's student base? How is the institution positioning itself to handle any anticipated demographic changes? What else should it consider doing?

In order to evaluate the current state and to benchmark Drexel's performance, workgroup E gathered data and information from several internal and external sources. These data are provided as appendices to this document.

4.0 RESEARCH QUESTIONS FINDINGS

E1. How do the profiles of Drexel applicants, admits, matriculants (include new and transfer, full-time and part-time, graduate and undergraduate at local and distant sites) align with aspects of the mission and the increasing comprehensiveness of the institution and what information can be obtained from the profiles of graduates and non-retained students that (a) provide measures of success and (b) guide future admissions?

The last two strategic plans at Drexel were developed with the goal of moving the University from its position as a strong regional university to a national comprehensive research university. Each plan called for significant growth in the quantity and quality of the undergraduate and graduate student populations. As evidenced by the tables below, Drexel University experienced increases in freshman and graduate and professional enrollment from 2000 to 2010. See notes below about selection of these specific charts.

Table 1. Freshman Enrollment 2000 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>Freshmen Enrollment</th>
<th>Average SAT</th>
<th>High School GPA</th>
<th>Top 10% Rank in Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 vs. 2010</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Graduate and Professional Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Professional Medical</th>
<th>Professional Law</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3,079</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,841</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4,128</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,732</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>7,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5,326</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>7,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6,224</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>9,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6,748</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>9,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from 2000 to 2010</td>
<td>3,821</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>5,134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, in order to maintain its commitment to diversity and access for students of different races and socioeconomic classes, Drexel University enrolled a more diverse body of students since 2000. Data regarding Drexel University enrollment by ethnicity, by international status (freshman, graduate, transfer) or by gender for 2000 through 2010 are found in Appendix E-I. 2000-2010 Enrollment Management Data

Drexel's freshman-to-sophomore persistence and persistence-to-degree is at the norm for selective PhD granting private institutions. As we continue to refine the selection of students and to develop the undergraduate academic program and corollary support services, the goal is to increase persistence rates to those found in highly selective, PhD-granting private universities.

As demographics and enrollment trends continue to change, we must monitor our recruitment program to ensure that we attract the students that will continue to do well in the Drexel environment. The tables below, evidence the first to second year persistence rates as well as persistence to degree rates (Drexel vs. National Norms).

Table 3. First to Second Year Persistence Rates: Drexel vs. National Norms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All PhD-Granting Private Institutions</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Selective PhD-Granting Private</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective PhD-Granting Private</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional PhD-Granting Private</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* National comparison data taken from ACT website (http://www.act.org/research/policymakers) The Drexel University data looks like a border — we would suggest a lighter color than the border
Table 4. Persistence to Degree Rates: Drexel vs. National Norms (ACT)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All PhD-Granting Private Institutions</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Selective PhD-Granting Private</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective PhD-Granting Private</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional PhD-Granting Private</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>67.0%**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* National comparison data taken from ACT website (http://www.act.org/research/policymakers).
** Projected

E-2. What have been the result of placement activities and the offering of special programs for diverse, at risk, and/or underprepared students towards success at Drexel?

Throughout the last decade, the Office of Enrollment Management and the Office of the Provost have worked together to address any freshman preparation gap and to decrease the number of students with poor academic performance. Placement examinations administered online during the summer prior to a student’s first enrollment term have been reviewed and improved to ensure that students are appropriately placed in their first math, physics and chemistry courses. The Drexel Dragon Summer program was expanded to include more students who, while showing overall potential for success at Drexel, had one or two indicators in their application that suggested additional academic support would provide a better foundation for success.

The Mathematics Department has developed a Math Resource Center where students can drop in for tutoring five days a week. This center is staffed by a full-time manager and the tutors are full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, graduate students and undergraduate math majors. When students earning a C in math courses visit regularly they are able to increase their grade to an A or a B. When at-risk students use the Center regularly they often earn one to two grades higher than they did in previous math classes. In 2010, we began a Biology and Chemistry Resource Center and the University is now planning to open a larger center that will house tutoring in all of the math and science courses along with the English Writing Center.

The number of freshmen students with sub-par academic performance, as measured by probationary status each term of the first year of study, has consistently decreased since 2006, the first year in which Early Warning and reporting dashboards were fully implemented. In 2006, 11.6% of the freshman cohort was placed on probation at the end of the first academic year, having earned either a term or cumulative GPA < 2.00. By 2009 the number of freshman cohort students placed on probation decreased by nearly four percentage points with 7.8% of freshman being placed on either term or cumulative probation. The number of students retained from freshmen to sophomore year has increased from 82% in fall, 2002 to 83% in fall, 2009. First year persistence analysis indicates the need for greater counseling regarding educational financing. We attribute our ability to maintain persistence levels during what have been fiscally constrained times since 2006 to improvements in enrollment selectivity, the use of enhanced testing for the placement of students in first term courses, the
expansion of the Dragon Summer Support Program, and an early warning system that identifies risks associated with income, preparation, and performance.

**E-3. How have programs at Drexel allowed leveraging of resources and partnerships to improve the quality of student learning and student life at Drexel?**

Both the academic and administrative units in the University work to improve the quality of student learning and student life at Drexel. Task forces and or committees that include a cross-section of administrative departments and academic units focus on specific student related issues such as orientation, health and wellness issues, financial aid appeals, student diversity, safety, academic support and a variety of other emerging student needs. An example of a recent partnership includes a pilot program that was developed by the LeBow College of Business and the College of Arts and Sciences where the math courses for business students were offered in small sections of no more than 32 students versus a large lecture format. After the first year, the percentage of students passing MATH 101 went from 84.2% to 93.0%. The pass rate for business students enrolled in MATH 101 has remained at the 90% rate for most of the time. Because of this joint effort and collaboration, all freshman math courses are now being offered in the small lecture format.

Another aspect of the pilot program was the establishment of monthly meetings with the instructors of the math courses and advisors from the LeBow College of Business. The College of Engineering’s Office of Student Services has worked with various units in the University to provide math and physics support to their students. Initially this was done with the Drexel Learning Center and later with the Math and Physics Departments and the Math Forum. The ideal format for delivering the most effective help is still a work in progress.

Drexel’s faculty work closely with advisors to determine students who are at risk in the classroom and residence hall staff are trained to intervene if students are having emotional, social, or academic issues. Extensive resources are provided to the faculty through the Center for Academic Excellence where workshops and training are held throughout the academic year. We have added additional support for students who seek undergraduate research opportunities by developing STAR (Students Tackling Advanced Research), a resource that allows faculty to list their undergraduate research opportunities and for students to apply to those positions. In addition, Drexel had added services that introduce students to competitive fellowships, such as the Rhodes, Marshall and Truman competitions, and that facilitate applications to graduate schools including programs in medicine and law.

In the past ten years the Study Abroad program has grown from offering less than a dozen opportunities exclusively to undergraduate students to offering over 70 opportunities for both graduate and undergraduate students. Program length ranges from one-week study tours to full 12 month programs that incorporate both study and co-op. Not only have our opportunities increased but the locations of our programs have expanded to include Africa, Asia, South America, Eastern Europe and Australia. Drexel students have responded positively to these new options and program formats. In 2007-08, 141 students studied abroad and in 2010-11, 292 students will study abroad. For fall, 2011 we have received over 173 applications and anticipate that 150 of those students will ultimately go overseas.
Table 5. Study Abroad 2007-2011 | Undergraduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Study Tour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Life enjoys long and enduring campus partnerships, which allow for pooling of resources. Examples of such partnerships are the DU Police Department liaison program with the residence halls and fraternity/sorority houses, the CEO student leadership development workshops co-sponsored by the LeBow College of Business and partnerships with the Goodwin College and Campus Activities, to ensure that part time students are eligible to participate in campus programs and events. To enhance participation in campus activities, the Alumni Association provides grant funds for numerous programs.

Additionally, Recreational Sports, Intramural Sports, and Club Sports, together with Student Life’s Office of Alcohol and Other Drug Education, the School of Public Health, College of Nursing and Health Professions, and the Philadelphia Department of Public Health work together to coordinate alcohol and other drug awareness programs. Student Life has a long-standing partnership with the Psychology Department and the Student Counseling Center (Center City campus). The counseling center is a clinical practice site for the students in the graduate programs within the Psychology Department.

In order to provide practical experience to students, Student Life provides co-operative education opportunities (co-ops) for students within the graduate program in higher education administration and co-op experiences within the Office of International Students and Scholar Services, funded by the College of Engineering and the LeBow College of Business.

While we consider the increasing rates of retention and persistence within the undergraduate programs to be the best measure of successful partnerships and the leveraging of institutional resources, we are also pleased to see that our students continue to place well in co-op positions (96% were placed in 2009-2010 and 98% were placed in 2010-2011) and in the most recent survey of seniors 85% of graduates have defined plans within six months of graduation including full-time employment, graduate study or other activities of interest in their personal development. Appendix E-II. Co-op Placement Data AY 2006-2010.

Over the past ten years, the number of collaborations and partnerships among Drexel units has increased significantly to the benefit of students. We monitor the success of the programs and make adjustments where necessary. It is also important to continually evaluate the programs to insure that they are relevant to the current student population. We continue to create more partnerships and break down silos that might still exist among various units.

E-4. How has the delivery of student support services and other services (including security, etc.) been refined to accommodate an increasingly residential campus in an urban setting while still maintaining...
appropriate services for non-residential students?

Student Life and Administrative Services have developed a broad range of services and programs over the last decade to meet the changing needs of both the undergraduate and graduate populations. A complete list of all services provided by Student Life may be found in Appendix E-III, Student Life List of Services. Programs are monitored for scope of outreach and effectiveness and are adjusted based on feedback from students, faculty and staff and are benchmarked against national data such as the Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI) and the International Student Barometer.

Orientation programs have been developed and enhanced for transfer, graduate, domestic and international students. Current students are encouraged to be engaged in the programs and their input is used to meet the changing needs of incoming students. The orientation programs also include a parent component to encourage appropriate involvement and engagement in their student’s experience. Transition Programs such as Commuter Connection Day and the Commuter 3 Weeks and Transfer 6 Weeks Calendars also support first-year students living off campus. The Office of Commuter, Graduate and Transfer Student Programs and Services (CGTSPS) offers commuter lockers and oversees the Charlotte Alletag Commuter Lounge.

Student Life Commuter and Transfer Assistants work with commuter and “resi-muter” students to enhance the college experience for students not living in the residential halls. More study spaces have been added, throughout campus, to accommodate the needs of commuter students. Commuter and Transfer Assistants serve as peer mentors to first-year students and develop initiatives to engage all students living off campus through the Commuter Engagement Model. Programmatic initiatives engage students living off campus through the Drexel Commuter Organization (DCom) and the USGA Commuter and Transfer Senators.

The Residential Living Office offers support for our residential students including learning communities and connections with academic units within the various colleges and schools. To help off campus students, the Office of Off-Campus Housing (OCH) in Student Life provides students with information on leases, tenant rights, how to be a good neighbor, budgeting, safety and much more. The office develops partnerships with area property managers to also engage students in these educational activities and the annual Off Campus Housing Fair. In addition, the OCH office advocates for students through landlord and roommate mediations and assists students to locate housing in the area.

In order for on and off campus students to feel safe and protected, public safety patrols designated areas. The Department of Public Safety is made up of six operating units: the Drexel University Police Department, Security, Operations, Fire & Life Safety, Training & Accreditation and Finance & Administration. In 2009, the University was authorized by the Commonwealth to establish a uniformed police presence on the Drexel campus. Drexel currently has 23 officers on 24-hour patrol on Main campus. Discussions about building police presence at other campuses are currently underway.

The Office of Multicultural Programs in Student Life has various ways to engage all students by getting students and student organizations involved in cultural celebrations (such as Black History Month, Women’s History Month, Latino Heritage Month, Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, and World
Fusion Fest) and through programs such as the Unity through Diversity (a dialogue series that starts conversations with students about diversity topics such as analyzing their beliefs, looking at different perspectives, and creating social responsibility), Lunch and Learn series, and other programming or panels. The James E. Marks Intercultural Center Lounge and Gallery space offer student, faculty and professional staff a space to congregate and lends itself to forums that encourage greater learning and networking around diversity, inclusion and social justice topics.

The Office of International Students and Scholar Services (ISSS) provides immigration services to all international students, scholars, faculty and their dependents. They also organize immigration workshops and programs for international students, faculty and scholars as well as dependents, to assist them navigating the US culture. Each quarter, the office facilitates International Student Orientation for new students. Counseling Services provide free confidential counseling, conflict mediation, victim support services, assault, stalking, sexual violence and self-defense educational programs, literature and workshops. The Office of Fraternity & Sorority Life has a dedicated team in Student Life working with the community to help students grow intellectually as well as socially through philanthropic and community involvement. In addition to the more than 300 campus student organizations on the Main Campus, Center City Student Life works together to engage graduate students through the support of 40 graduate student organizations. The Graduate Student Organization (GSA) serves as the principal graduate student organization whose mission is to enhance graduate student life at the university through programs and other mentorship activities. Appendix E-IV. Graduate Student Programs, Organizations, Accomplishments.

The Educational Benchmarking Survey (EBI), sponsored by Student Life and Administrative Services, measures student satisfaction with co-curricular programming. Administered by the Residential Living Office and the Office of Fraternity & Sorority Life EBI surveys were constructed specifically for the student populations with which they work.

According to the results of the EBI, the Residential Living Office provides a high quality experience for all Drexel residential students. All factors related to residential experience remain strong scoring above a 5.5 on a 7-point scale. Factors contributing to overall satisfaction include hall student staff, residence hall room/floor environment, a community orientation, personal interactions, and diverse interactions.

The strongest asset for building communities within the residence halls is the work of the Resident Assistant (RA) staff. Residents ranked their satisfaction with the RAs at a 6.21 on a 7-point scale. Overall, approximately 92% of the residential population states that they are satisfied or extremely satisfied with the performance of their RA. The Drexel RA staff performed #1 compared to its benchmark institutions, #1 in its Carnegie Class, and #2 in the nation between 2008 and 2010 (results for this year will be released during Summer 2011).

Overall, 89% of the fraternity and sorority population states that they are satisfied or extremely satisfied with their overall Greek experience at Drexel University. Factors contributing to overall satisfaction include academic performance, social interactions, community service, cost/benefit and likelihood to recommend joining the fraternity or sorority community. Appendix E-V. Educational Benchmarking, Inc.
(EBI) Survey results.
As we look to the future, the Office of Student Life consistently assesses the changing interests and needs of the student population so that we may continue to deliver high-quality support programs and services.

E-5. How has Drexel created opportunities for broader access and greater success for the students it serves—locally, regionally, nationally and internationally (transfer policies, veterans and other special groups)? What services have been developed for commuter students, on-line students, students at off-campus sites, and “resi-muters” (students that live within five miles of campus)?

Drexel enrolls approximately 1,000 new transfer students each year and strives to be a “transfer-friendly” institution that provides timely transfer credit evaluation, course placement, and “new” (to Drexel) orientation each fall term. Additionally, Drexel offers merit scholarships for students who perform exceptionally well academically at two-year or other four-year institutions.

While Drexel has offered counseling to veterans since post World War II, the University upgraded services to veterans in 2009 when we joined the newly established Yellow Ribbon program through the Department of Veteran’s Services. Veterans who have served post 9-11 are offered free tuition across the University including tuition waivers in each of the graduate and professional schools in the University. An Office of Veteran’s Student Services was established to ensure that students had the appropriate support and access to services that they require to succeed.

Commuter students needed space for breaks in-between classes and to meet fellow commuter students and socialize while on campus. This type of space has been greatly expanded with the creation of the Alltag Commuter Student Lounge complete with wireless internet access, televisions, and microwaves/refrigerators. We also increased the number of lounge and study areas available at the Handschumacher Dining Hall, Ross Commons, Library Café, and provided additional study spaces in the Bossone Research Center, the Northside Dining Terrace and the Jazzman Café on the Center City campus.

Drexel offers video archived versions of large scale and co-curricular programs for students who are online or away from campus (including Sacramento, Burlington County (BCC), and those who are away on co-op. Examples include the CEO Program workshops (Student Leadership Development), Convocation, Special “Meet and Greet” sessions with University Leadership, and orientation workshops. Drexel offers graduating students who are unable to attend the formal ceremony (due to work, family, or distance) the opportunity to be a part of the University’s commencement ceremonies (students may submit a photo with biographical information which is displayed on the screens at commencement during the formal procession). Commencement, as well as other large-scale events, is offered via webcast and video archive.

As Drexel continues to support socio-economic and ethnic diversity, we host two programs: Act 101 and the Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation. In addition, in 2009 Drexel launched the Liberty Scholars Program. This program that provides 50 new Philadelphia high school graduates per year with...
full tuition scholarships. In 2013-14 academic year, we will have 250 students in this program.

Through the Pennsylvania Higher Education Opportunity Program (also known as Act 101), Drexel is funded to serve approximately 60 students each year. Student participants are required to be in the bottom institutional quartile in terms of both their academic performance and ability to finance their college education. Student participants are also required to be at or below 200% of the Federal poverty guideline. The program has no discipline-specific focus; students represent all of Drexel’s schools and colleges. Services include an academic summer bridge; professional, academic counseling; peer academic coaching and tutoring; interviews; financial counseling; leadership development; and assistance with graduate school selection and application.

Through the Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (LSAMP) Drexel promotes the success and retention of under-represented minority students pursuing degrees in science, technology, engineering and mathematics disciplines. LSAMP, funded by the National Science Foundation, partners with student groups, community-based organizations as well as University departments. The AMP mission is to promote academic excellence for undergraduates, link students to scholarship and other funding opportunities, identify professional development opportunities/internships (both research and non-research) and encourage students to pursue advanced degrees. Drexel-LSAMP participants have access to services that include: academic coaching and counseling, supplemental instruction and learning skills workshops, professional development seminars and workshops, social and cultural activities; research and financial counseling. Drexel's Pathway to Medical School engages students from groups that are under-represented in medical schools including African American, Native American, Eskimo, Mexican American and others.

Drexel’s transfer population has grown significantly in the last decade from 490 students in fall, 2001 to more than 1,000 students annually. Drawn from community colleges and four-year institutions, transfers account for approximately 25% of the “new” enrolling class at Drexel each year. We continue to foster partnerships and dialogues with two-year schools that seek to send us transfer students each year. Appendix E-VI. Full-Time Transfer Population - 2006-2009

In July 2009, we could document 135 veterans taking courses at Drexel. Two years later Drexel’s veteran population has grown to 486 veterans and their dependents with approximately 18% of these students attending with support from the Yellow Ribbon program.

E-6. How are lessons learned from retention studies used to improve academic and student support programs?

We have created an early warning system that identified students, based on first year performance, which are considered to be academically at risk. Individual meetings with academic advisors were instituted and each advisor was equipped with information and tools including a dashboard on academic metrics which provides each college/school quarterly data on withdrawals, non-enrolled students and academic standing. Improved outreach to students on financial hold was coordinated by academic advisors, financial aid and student life staff.
Number of freshmen placed on early warning decreased by 20% between fall, 2006 and spring, 2006. Decreases in 2007, 2008 and 2009 have been less remarkable, at 1.8%; 6%; and 3%, respectively. The impact of the early intervention provided for by the early warning process can be seen in the freshman and sophomore probation numbers. While one-third of students (or more) are given early warning, less than 10% of students are actually placed on probation. The percentage of freshmen placed on probation decreased by 3% between the fall, 2006 cohort and fall, 2007 cohort; by 1.5% between the fall 2007 and fall, 2008 cohort, and 0.5% between the fall, 2008 cohort and the fall, 2009 cohort. The numbers of freshmen and sophomores placed on probation has consistently decreased each term since 2006. Appendix E-VII. Freshman and Sophomore Probation Data - Data Summary

E-7. What do demographic trends suggest will be the future of the institution's student base? How is the institution positioning itself to handle any anticipated demographic changes? What else should it consider doing?

Institutional and national demographic trends suggest that, in the future, Drexel will enroll more women, more international students, more racially diverse students, and more students from beyond the tri-state region. As a large, urban institution, Drexel is well-positioned to absorb changes in the demographic make-up of students. We have, in the last year, undertaken a set of new studies that reviews the academic performance and the satisfaction level of international students, a fast growing population at the University.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND INSIGHTS FOR THE FUTURE

Drexel continues to strategically plan and implement resources, services, and policies to prepare for an increase in international, racially-diverse, and female students. Drexel continues to increase the number and quality of academic, living, and communal spaces on campus. Additionally, the University provides training focused on the needs of first-generation and international students, as well as providing increased financial assistance through institutional fundraising and further commitment of institutional resources. In order to address the needs of an increasing population of students who wish to reduce the amount of student debt or work while completing their degrees, the University must also consider alternate pathways to the Drexel degree, i.e. three year baccalaureate programs, partnerships with community colleges and other institutions seeking to prepare the next generation of students for a high quality university education.

Over the past ten years, Drexel has steadily increased both undergraduate and graduate enrollment while continuing to improve the quality of students and student services. Drexel must work to continue upgrading and expanding services and planning for additional enrollment growth over the next decade. Additionally, Drexel needs to develop more rigorous evaluation plans and associated metrics to help improve the support of students moving forward.
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1.0 STANDARD

Standard 10: Faculty

The institution's instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

A highly qualified, engaged, and dedicated faculty are key to Drexel University realizing its educational, research, and service missions. As the positive trajectory of Drexel's size, rankings, and impact as a comprehensive research university has evolved over the last ten years, its faculty continued to be central to these efforts. New programmatic offerings including those arising from the merger with MCP/Hahnemann University and the opening of a law school, the expansion of the research agenda, the establishment of new instructional locations, and increasing number of programs delivered online relied on the active participation of a diverse faculty.

In September 2002, at the time of the merger of Drexel University with MCP/Hahnemann University, Drexel University had 565 full-time faculty members, the merger having added 508 full-time faculty members. As of September 2011, Drexel University had 1011 full-time faculty members, with 366 in the Drexel University College of Medicine. Please see table below.

Table 1. Full-Time Faculty Counts by Tenure Status 2001 - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Tenure Title</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2011, approximately 85% of Drexel University faculty and approximately 99% of DUCOM faculty hold terminal degrees. While new faculty have brought varied backgrounds, talents, and commitment to Drexel, continuing faculty have sustained their contributions to the life of the institution. Retired faculty have transitioned with well-deserved recognition from their colleagues, and many continue to serve in Emeritus roles and several senior faculty members have assumed administrative roles.

In order for the institution to grow its mission, the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan: The future is Drexel identified as key a strategic objective around faculty quality and development. Appendix F-I. 2007-2012 Strategic Plan: The future is Drexel. In particular, the strategic plan objective Advancing Faculty Support and Development was directed at increasing the well-being and recognition of faculty. This objective focused on strategies to enhance faculty quality and development, to promote faculty diversity, to actively value faculty, and to train faculty for leadership roles.

The Office of Faculty Development and Equity (FDE) was created in 2007 to incorporate national best practices for faculty recruitment, faculty retention, and faculty advancement, with special attention to faculty equity and diversity. The FDE also includes the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence, which is the faculty development arm of the office. To demonstrate that Drexel University actively values faculty and their quality-of-life, policies regarding the appointment and promotion of non-tenure track faculty, the tenure policy, and emeritus faculty policy were revised. For example, our tenure policy now includes a “stop the clock” provision for primary caregivers.

Faculty from the College of Medicine and the College of Engineering also developed the new Executive Leadership in Academic Technology and Engineering (ELATE) program, a leadership development for senior women faculty based on the highly successful national Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine (ELAM) program in the College of Medicine. These year-long, part-time programs provide career support and skills training to enable faculty women to advance or move into academic administration. (Appendix F-II. Links to Faculty Websites) and by review of curriculum vitae. (Appendix F-III. Faculty Curriculum Vitae – Link to SharePoint)

3.0 METHODOLOGY

Workgroup F was charged to analyze and discuss the manner and degree to which Drexel University supports the institution’s instructional and research system. In order to answer the research questions, the data were collected from a variety of sources. Workgroup D, distributed the workload among teams of two people which collected information to answer the following research questions.

F-1. How has the hiring of tenure-track and tenured faculty been related to the strategic mission of programs, colleges/schools, and the University, including the formation of interdisciplinary programs?

F-2. How has the balance of research, teaching, and service been articulated in the accomplishments of tenure-track and tenured faculty? How have the accomplishments of all faculty members contributed to the University mission?
F-3. In creating and maintaining a balance between tenured/tenure track and non-tenure track faculty (full time and adjuncts), how has the quality of the experience for all faculty and their contribution to the academic mission of the University been assessed and maintained? This captures faculty performance assessment, workload and rewards.

F-4. Are faculty development opportunities equitably distributed? Is the level of institutional support adequate to support the professional development, teaching, learning, and research goals of the faculty? How has this influenced the university's ability to recruit, develop and retain diverse and qualified faculty? Are there differences between departments/schools?

F-5 How are career life cycle development for all stages from new faculty to long-term senior faculty addressed in order to maintain faculty vitality and effective teaching and student learning? What programs are available for faculty seeking assistance from new faculty to those thinking about retirement, and for engaging our already retired faculty?

F-6. How have faculty been involved in the life and governance of the institution? (note: This overlaps with Working Group C, Leadership and governance.)

F-7 How are faculty involved in academic program development, assessment, and improvement? How have student learning outcomes been assessed and incorporated into this process? (note: This overlaps with Working Group H, learning assessment)

F-8. What impact has the expansion of graduate programs had on faculty resources and workload? How have graduate students been incorporated into the instructional process for undergraduates?

F-9 How is evidence of faculty productivity, development, teaching, learning, and research documented and is this consistent with the academic mission of the University? How is faculty performance/teaching supervised and reviewed? How is progressive development and CQI supported?

F-10 What roles do faculty play in the development of on-line curricula? How has the distance education program been incorporated into faculty workload? What are the rewards and how are the related intellectual property issues addressed? How is the on-line program assessed on the basis of student learning?

F-11 How does faculty advancement, diversity and equity fit into the Drexel University Strategic Plan? How does Drexel University address, execute and assess faculty diversity in recruiting, retaining, and advancing faculty? How does Drexel University address issues of faculty equity, including comparability in salary, academic support, and resources?

In order to provide answers for the research questions, Workgroup F collected data from a variety of sources including interviews and surveys such as the COACHE, HERI and 2011 MSCHE Self-Study surveys.
Some data related to programs and faculty development was obtained from the Office of Faculty Development and Equity, as well as the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence.

4.0 RESEARCH QUESTION FINDINGS

F-1. *How has the hiring of tenure-track and tenured faculty been related to the strategic missions of programs, colleges/schools, and the University, including the formation of interdisciplinary programs?*

Over the last several years, Drexel University has attracted and appointed junior and senior (some appointed with tenure) faculty trained in highly-ranked academic programs. Senior faculty members bring a wealth of experience from other institutions and/or industry and typically come with broad recognition of peers and established research programs. In order to provide programmatic depth, the Office of the Provost in collaboration with academic units focused on strategically assigning junior and senior faculty in various academic areas. *Appendix F-IV. Faculty Hire Degree Information: FY 2009 - FY 2012.*

The process for hiring tenured and tenure-track faculty has been refined over the last several years and begins with the annual approval of new or replacement positions by the Office of the Provost. Requests for positions must be aligned with the strategic goals of academic units and the University. Annual budget allocations provide for new faculty lines and startup funds for new faculty. In addition, new requirements to foster faculty diversity and equity have been implemented, including electronic posting and advertising of all open positions, training on equitable search processes for all faculty search committee chairs, and the creation of a Handbook for Faculty Recruitment (http://www.drexel.edu/fde/recruitment/) which is online and widely disseminated.

As a means to increase interdisciplinary research, the 2007 Strategic Plan identified the need for hiring faculty devoted to interdisciplinary studies. Such hires have included joint appointments between the Earle Mack School of Law and the School of Public Health and between the iSchool and the College of Nursing and Health Professions. The promotion and tenure policy has been revised to recognize and better quantify the achievements of faculty with interdisciplinary appointments (*Appendix F-V. Hiring Plan 2007-2012*).

As the anticipated level of interdisciplinary activity across the University is expected to increase in the future, collaborative discussions across all academic units are being implemented to ensure that all academic units provide input prior to approval of new faculty hiring requests.

In order to provide faculty candidates with greater perspective of the University mission and the alignment of their expertise in achieving mission-related results, members of the Office of the Provost interview all finalists for tenure-track positions. The Provost or a Senior Vice Provost interviews all faculty candidates to be hired with the recommendation of tenure. Once hired, when possible, colleges and schools provide incoming faculty with reduced teaching loads as they work to establish a research agenda. In order to attract and retain these new faculty hires, Drexel strives to offer competitive salaries and start-up packages.
F-2: How has the balance of research, teaching, and service been articulated in the accomplishments of tenure-track and tenured faculty? How have the accomplishments of all faculty members contributed to the University mission?

The research, teaching and service missions of the University are driven by the contributions of all faculty members at all ranks including tenured/tenure-track, teaching/clinical, research, and adjunct faculty. Whether or not faculty are conversant in every detail of the 2007 Strategic Plan, participants in focus groups conducted across campus by Workgroup A supported the belief that several mission-related outcomes have been realized. These include faculty participation in the development and implementation of global programs, the expansion of online learning and the enhanced collaborations across the University with growing interdisciplinary activities. Additionally, the increasing quality and number of faculty publications and research funding as well as the introduction of new graduate programs and increased graduate research demonstrate that faculty members are engaged in contributing to the University Mission. Appendix F-VI. 2011 MSCHE Self-Study Survey Faculty.

F-3. In creating and maintaining a balance between tenured/tenure track and non-tenure track faculty (full time and adjuncts), how has the quality of the experience for all faculty and their contribution to the academic mission of the University been assessed and maintained? This captures faculty performance assessment, workload and rewards.

While tenured and tenure track faculty assume primary roles across the research, teaching, and service missions of the University, a key to advancing Drexel’s mission efficiently and effectively has been the inclusion of non-tenure-track teaching and research faculty at various ranks. For many years, Drexel employed full-time non-tenure-track faculty to assume specific roles as instructors or researchers. The teaching faculty were referred to as “auxiliary” faculty and neither group had provisions for defining rank. The academic life of departments and colleges and schools is enhanced by the close collaboration of full-time faculty in teaching, research, and service. The distribution of faculty of various ranks is provided in Appendix F-VII. Tenure by Highest Degree 2002-2010.

As an outgrowth of the 2007 Strategic Plan, major revision to the Tenure Policy provided recognition for life events and the evaluation of interdisciplinary faculty. The revised policy defines the stature of non-tenure-track faculty colleagues by providing structures and expectations for ranks upon appointment with opportunities for promotion. Thus, teaching faculty may assume titles of Instructor, Assistant, Associate or (full) Teaching or Clinical Professor, and Research Faculty assume titles of Assistant, Associate or (full) Research Professor.

Teaching faculty assuming program directorships under the supervision of department heads and deans have been found to be very effective in selected colleges and schools. Adjunct faculty are hired on term contracts for the purpose of teaching specialty courses to which they bring extensive experience and for additional sections of large enrollment courses. This is especially critical for Drexel, whose educational mission focuses on cooperative Learning and professional career preparation. Many of our adjunct
faculty members are well-known leaders in their professional field and come to Drexel to share their expertise. Credentials of adjunct faculty are strong, but the level of connection with the University is not as strong as it is for full-time faculty. To increase this connectedness, the Office of Faculty Development & Equity surveyed all adjunct faculty to determine their level of engagement and needs, and now conducts a special orientation and resource fair designed for adjunct faculty and quarterly workshops. Adjunct faculty are also included in workshops hosted by the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence. In addition, several colleges provide their own professional development programs for adjunct faculty.

Adjunct faculty coming with strong professional credentials complement the teaching needs of academic units. The balance among these faculty groups is continually reviewed by department heads and deans. Since the current services and new budget requests for faculty require justifications related to needs and strategic objectives, these faculty groups are also reviewed annually by the Office of the Provost as part of the budget process.

While teaching needs are best satisfied by Teaching Faculty, tenured and tenure-track faculty hiring have similarly increased to satisfy the research objective of academic units and the University.

Periodic surveys, such as those administered by COACHE and the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), allow the University to gain a faculty perspective by group in terms of career satisfaction, appropriateness of workload, work-life balance, faculty satisfaction, and rewards to guide planning. Such surveys have provided important assessments to guide the University in responding to faculty views, create a better professional environment, and more effectively satisfy its mission.

The 2007 HERI survey addresses issues such as faculty work climate, commitment, diversity, community service, professional development, publications, and funding. The 2007-08 HERI survey indicated that research remains a scholarly priority for the majority of faculty even for those with no research responsibilities, and that teaching is high priority for all segments of the respondents. Preliminary data from the 2011 HERI survey indicates that, in general, faculty are fairly satisfied but that concerns remain over work-life balance, child care options, and the pressures to produce scholarly work.

Overall there appears to have been positive responses to work satisfaction with some differences by longevity at the institution. Senior faculty felt less strongly about receiving rewards and encouragement. In addition, workload issues along with the need for space appear at all levels. These results were further supported by the survey sent out as part of the Middle States Self Study to the faculty in 2011. While all ranks do not perceive that the expected workload balance is appropriately rewarded, it is stronger among Associate and Full Professors, some of whom also believe that faculty development is not as strongly oriented for them as for new or junior faculty. For a comprehensive view regarding these issues, please see Appendix F-VIII. HERI Executive Summary and Appendix F-IX. COACHE Executive Summary.
F-4: Are faculty development opportunities equitably distributed? Is the level of institutional support adequate to support the professional development, teaching, learning, and research goals of the faculty? How has this influenced the university's ability to recruit, develop and retain diverse and qualified faculty? Are there differences between departments/schools?

Faculty development opportunities have increased over the past several years conducted both through the Office of Faculty Development and Equity and the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence (DCAE) and through programs organized by individual colleges and schools.

New full-time faculty attend a two-day faculty orientation held every year in early September, and numerous workshops are offered throughout the academic year. In addition, a wide variety of resources for faculty members are available online at www.drexel.edu/fde and www.drexel.edu/dcae. As evidenced by the table below, the majority of faculty (43.3%) somewhat agreed that faculty development opportunities are equally available to all full-time faculty regardless of rank or role.
Q4.1.1 Faculty development opportunities are available to all full-time faculty at all ranks and roles, regardless of rank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time Faculty by College</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Information Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts &amp; Design</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing &amp; Health Professions</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University College of Medicine</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Mack School of Law</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin School of Technology and Professional Studies</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett S. LeBow College of Business</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin School of Education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>550</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29.6% of all surveyed faculty members strongly agreed that faculty development opportunities are appropriately distributed to senior faculty and 7.8% of faculty somewhat disagreed that faculty development opportunities are appropriately distributed to junior faculty.

While 37.2% of faculty somewhat agree that there is sufficient support for professional development, teaching, learning, service and research within their academic unit, it is important to note that only 32.2% of faculty somewhat agree that the level of support provided has positively impacted the university's ability to recruit, develop and retain a diverse faculty. (please see table below). For more details, please refer to Appendix F-VII. 2011 MSCHE Self-Study Survey_ Faculty.
How has the level of support (e.g., research, professional development, recognition) provided to our faculty influenced the university's ability to recruit, develop and retain diverse and qualified faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Faculty by College</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Positively Impacted Faculty</th>
<th>Total Recruitment</th>
<th>Positively Impacted Faculty</th>
<th>Total Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts &amp; Design</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56.86%</td>
<td>18.97%</td>
<td>24.14%</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
<td>36.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett S. LeBow College of Business</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>46.88%</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>34.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>46.59%</td>
<td>22.76%</td>
<td>15.45%</td>
<td>19.51%</td>
<td>42.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.41%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>13.46%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Information Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60.47%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing &amp; Health Professions</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54.73%</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
<td>13.58%</td>
<td>18.52%</td>
<td>35.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University College of Medicine</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>29.35%</td>
<td>19.57%</td>
<td>18.48%</td>
<td>32.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlham School of Law</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin School of Education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68.97%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin School of Technology and Professional Studies</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.05%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty development is essential for retention and for improved student outcomes. In 2008, in order to provide opportunities that accelerate the development of new faculty research agendas, the Office of Faculty Development and Equity established the Career Development Award (CDA) program. The program was designed to foster mentoring relationships for junior tenure track faculty with senior faculty at other institutions, in part to compensate for lack of Drexel mentors in several areas of expertise. Capped at $7,500 per recipient, the total investment to date for thirteen awardees - several of whom have been underrepresented minorities and/or women - has been $83,473. The CDA Awardees published several peer-reviewed papers, hosted workshops and mini-symposia at Drexel, and were awarded outside grants totaling over $2M from funders including the NSF, industry, and private foundations. Collaborations have been developed in academia and industry in ten foreign countries on four continents, and has recently acquired more funding from the Provost's Office to support additional awards.
Another opportunity for faculty to further develop their research agendas is the sabbatical leave program. Over the years, faculty from newly-tenured to mid-career and senior faculty have taken advantage of six-month or nine-month leaves funded by the University at two-thirds annual salary. Faculty sabbaticals have resulted in increased funded research, new national and international collaborations, joint publications, books and exhibitions.

Our efforts to recruit diverse faculty have intensified since the Office of Faculty Diversity and Equity was established in 2007, and our data is encouraging. To improve recruitment, the office has trained over 83 faculty search committee chairs on the principles and practices of diverse and equitable recruitment. In addition, the Office worked with Drexel Human Resources to implement Drexel’s first electronic web-based faculty recruitment system, to foster broad advertising and open competition. All faculty positions must now be listed electronically on DrexeJobs, providing a level playing field for open competition and broad recruiting. The FDE also created Drexel’s first Handbook for Faculty Recruitment; works with Drexel faculty and their partners for dual-partner placements; distributes guidelines for equitable interviewing; and participates in the Advisory Board of the tri-state Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC) to enhance dual career searches.

The Office of Faculty Development and Equity collaborates with Drexel’s Office of Equity and Diversity, to track faculty demographics across the university. In STEM (Engineering, Biomedical Engineering, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Math) fields at Drexel, the percentage of female full professors in tenure/tenure track positions doubled from 6% in 2007 to 12% in 2011; the percentage of female Associate Professors increased from 12% in 2007 to 24% in 2011; and the percentage of female Assistant Professors rose from 14% in 2007 to 32% in 2011.

While the percentage of underrepresented minority tenure/tenure-track faculty members has increased less dramatically, we continue to make small improvements and are currently analyzing that data. The 2010 HERI survey indicates that full-time undergraduate faculty considered increasing the representation of minorities in general (27% of respondents) and women in particular (30% of respondents) in the faculty and administration to be of highest or high priority within the university Appendix F-X, 2010 HERI survey.

F-5. How are career life cycle development for all stages from new faculty to long-term senior faculty addressed in order to maintain faculty vitality and effective teaching and student learning? What programs are available for faculty seeking assistance from new faculty to those thinking about retirement, and for engaging our already retired faculty?

The 2002 Middle States Self-Study and the findings of the visiting team positively recognized Drexel’s efforts to address a variety of faculty and faculty development concerns and noted that these should be supported and enhanced. Appendix F-XI, 2002 Middle States -Self Study.

Past faculty development activities had generally been organized by the Office of the Provost around topics common to the majority of disciplines and with a focus on faculty involved in undergraduate programs. Additional faculty development activities were conducted in colleges and schools focused on
the disciplinary areas and their specific requirements. The Drexel Center for Academic Excellence (DCAE) was created to offer a variety of programs to all faculty in order to address essential elements of teaching, the understanding of the connections between teaching effectiveness and positive student learning outcomes, general exposure to research and service.

Ongoing assessment is used to plan subsequent activities. DCAE activities include workshops on the development of Academic and Teaching Portfolios with both summative and formative elements, a two-day orientation for new faculty, a series of topic specific workshops open to all faculty, and, quarterly events for adjunct faculty. In addition, the DCAE hosts monthly Brown Bag Lunches as a mechanism for faculty to come together to informally explore topics of mutual interest. Appendix F-XII. Summary of DCAE Events.

To complement the Center staff, University faculty have been appointed as Center Fellows to assist in planning, presenting and assessing faculty needs. These faculty members have been actively involved in organizing and attending various workshops on the campus as well as presenting at national conferences. These Fellows include senior, midcareer and junior faculty across tenured, tenure-track and teaching ranks. Currently, there is consideration being given to the possible addition of an adjunct faculty member, recognizing both the desirability but limitations of this group in performing service roles. Attendance at DCAE events is voluntary, but faculty members who attend three or more events in a year receive a certificate from the DCAE that many include in their annual reviews as evidence of their engagement in career development. Appendix F-XIII. DCAE Certificate Sample.

Faculty member's opinions were assessed through participation in the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) and the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) surveys. Tenure-Track Faculty responding to the COACHE survey in the 2006-2007 academic year indicated that many new faculty desired greater clarity in a number of areas related to attaining tenure. There were also indications that more women faculty felt that they did not have the same interactions as their male counterparts. Further, for tenure-track and tenured faculty, the reward system in some academic units was perceived as dominated by research and scholarship. Several faculty members felt that they could potentially be penalized if they took time away from these activities to give to the kind of teaching designed to promote measurable continual student learning that requires multiple drafts of written work. To better address workload issues, it is suggested that the University make better use of the HERI surveys to review faculty workloads across the University. Appendix F-XIV. 2010-2011 COACHE Survey.

Based on information gleaned from prior surveys and focus groups with faculty members, the FDE also offers resources on work-life balance and diversity in print and online: (http://www.drexel.edu/provost/fde/worklifebalance.html). In addition, the FDE completed background research for a proposed Drexel child care facility; collaborated with other units on a Resource Guide for International Faculty (http://www.drexel.edu/fde/InternationalFacultyGuidebook.pdf); and developed a Resource Guide for adjunct and part-time faculty (many of whom are female), also available online: http://www.drexel.edu/provost/dcae/Resource%20Guide.pdf.
F-6. How have faculty been involved in the life and governance of the institution?

As noted throughout this Self Study, faculty involvement in the life of the institution is extensive and varied. There are a myriad of community-oriented activities, health and wellness initiatives, and campus-based activities for students and faculty in any given year. Recent strategic planning focus groups have identified that initiatives to promote faculty engagement would lead to even greater satisfaction and productivity and promote a greater sense of ownership and participation across the University.

As discussed by Workgroup C, faculty participate in the governance of the University as elected members of the Faculty Senate or participation in a variety of Senate Sub-committees though appointment or election. Appendix F-XV. Charter of Faculty Governance. These individuals provide input on matters affecting the life and governance of the institution, including Faculty Affairs, Academic Support, Student Life, Budget Planning and Development, and Research and Scholarly Activity. Tenured senior faculty serve on the Provost's Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion, on the Tenure Appeals Committee, and the Faculty Grievance Committee (see Appendix F-XVI. Provost's Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion, and Appendix F-VII. Provost's Advisory Committee and the Faculty Grievance Committee).

In addition, each college or school involves faculty in governance in a variety of ways, including faculty meetings and committee work. A majority of full-time faculty respondents to the 2011 Middle States Survey agreed that they were familiar with the governance structure of the University (53.85%). However, as evidenced by the table below, fewer full-time faculty respondents (37.77%) agreed that the faculty, through the elected representatives on the Faculty Senate, participated effectively in the policy-making and decision-making activities of the institution.

Q3.1.2 The faculty, through its elected representatives on the Faculty Senate, participates effectively in the policy development and decision-making activities of the institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Min Score</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>52.06%</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
<td>39.02%</td>
<td>35.98%</td>
<td>9.15%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>47.75%</td>
<td>7.51%</td>
<td>37.77%</td>
<td>31.97%</td>
<td>14.99%</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART-TIME FACULTY</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>18.50%</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>16.77%</td>
<td>43.87%</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>27.74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>36.87%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>33.89%</td>
<td>35.16%</td>
<td>11.72%</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The latter opinion is consistent with the 2007-08 HERI survey. Full-time faculty responding to the 2011 Middle States Survey believe they have greater opportunities to voice opinions on matters affecting their departments and their college or school than those affecting the University. Part-time faculty
appear to be less knowledgeable regarding such shared governance and their roles in decision making processes. Appendix F-XVIII. 2011 MSCHE Self-Study Survey Leadership and Governance.

It should be noted that the faculty role in providing input at the University level has increased under the leadership of President Fry through Town Halls on every Drexel campus that foster discussions of various issues with senior administrators and through broad participation in the strategic planning process. The Strategic Planning process included eleven Task Forces and over two hundred Drexel faculty, professional staff, and students participated. The findings of the Task Forces have been included in the plan, which is nearing the final draft stage and will be implemented July 1, 2012.

F-7. How are faculty involved in academic program development, assessment, and improvement? How have student-learning outcomes been assessed and incorporated into this process?

Under the Charter of Faculty Governance, the faculty are at the heart of academic program development, assessment, and improvement. In particular, it is within the faculty role to actively participate in curriculum committees charged with the responsibility to address academic issues and to conduct the business related to their academic unit.

Under shared governance, faculty within the academic unit approve curricular recommendations and revisions affecting all offerings—degree programs and courses. Through course evaluation processes residing in academic units, courses are regularly reviewed, revised, and updated by faculty.

The Faculty Senate Committee for Academic Affairs responsibility is to “monitor and review matters related to academic standards, and curriculum, and serve in an advisory capacity in matters related to cooperative education, admission standards and policy.”

Thus, this committee reviews all new, revised, and deleted programs and courses with input from the Office of the University Registrar, Academic Information and Systems, and the Provost. Before the Office of the Provost final review, all proposals are presented to the Faculty Senate for review and final approval.

Upon the adoption of a new faculty charter and ongoing discussions in conjunction with the approval of the Drexel Learning Priorities and the incorporation of technology into assessment, the faculty role in program review is strengthened, and new program review criteria and processes are being put into place and piloted in the current academic year.

F-8. What impact has the expansion of graduate programs had on faculty resources and workload? How have graduate students been incorporated into the instructional process for undergraduates?

The expansion of master’s programs intensified the University’s ability to provide professional education in areas that increasingly demand post-bachelor’s education. With the enhancement of doctoral programs, faculty members were given the opportunity to strengthen their research and also to serve as mentors for doctoral students.
According to the responses from the 2011 Middle States Self-Study survey, the impact of the expansion of graduate programs upon faculty resources and faculty workloads have been mostly neutral.

As evidenced by the table below, 33.8% of the surveyed population across all campuses considered that the impact of the expansion of graduate programs was neutral as compared to 25.7% of the respondents that didn’t know/not applicable. Among the faculty that considered the impact of these expansions positive were the School of Public Health (42.09%), the School of Biomedical Engineering, Sciences and Health Systems (41.7%) and the College of Engineering faculty (40.04%).
The lowest positive response rate came from the College of Media Arts and Design faculty where the majority of faculty considered the question to be not applicable largely because of the nature of the College's program.

**Q4.7.1** What impact has the expansion of graduate programs had on your academic program's faculty resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time Faculty by College</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Medical</th>
<th>Resign</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Information Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts &amp; Design</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing &amp; Health Professions</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University College of Medicine</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Mack School of Law</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin School of Technology and Professional Studies</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett S. LeBow College of Business</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin School of Education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>545</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked how faculty members perceive the impact of the expansion on graduate programs on their workloads, the majority of the surveyed population across colleges and schools perceived the impact to be neutral (35.4%) and negative (26.3%). Among the faculty that perceived the expansion of graduate programs to be negative, the Goodwin School of Technology and Professional Studies faculty (45%), the School of Public Health faculty (42.09%) and the School of Biomedical Engineering (41.07%).

Among the lowest response for the neutral category (7.7%) and the highest response for the don't know/not applicable category (53.09%) was the faculty of the Earle Mack School of Law. This is due largely because the Earle Mack School of Law specializes in only the JD program.

From these data we can observe that two of these colleges and schools (the School of Public Health faculty and the School of Biomedical Engineering) expressed that the expansion of graduate programs affected both their workloads and resources.

**Q4.7.2 What impact has the expansion of graduate programs had on your academic program's faculty workloads?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time Faculty by College</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Don't know/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Information Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts &amp; Design</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing &amp; Health Professions</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University College of Medicine</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Mack School of Law</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin School of Technology and Professional Studies</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett S. LeBow College of Business</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin School of Education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When faculty was asked how effectively graduate students in their specific academic programs have been incorporated into the instructional process at Drexel University, the surveyed population across colleges and schools indicated that the process has been somewhat successfully (34.09%). Among the faculty that reported this integration as very successful, are faculty from the College of Engineering (31.4%), the School of Public Health (28.06%) and the College of Information, Science and Technology (26.09%).

For a comprehensive description of these data, please see the table below and Appendix F-VI.2011 MSCHE Self-Study Survey Faculty.

**Q4.9 How effectively have graduate students in your specific academic program been incorporated into the instructional process at Drexel University?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time Faculty by College</th>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Very Successfully</th>
<th>Somewhat Successfully</th>
<th>Not Very Successfully</th>
<th>Not At All Successfully</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Information Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoninette Westphal College of Media Arts &amp; Design</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing &amp; Health Professions</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University College of Medicine</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Mack School of Law</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin School of Technology and Professional Studies</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett S. LeBow College of Business</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin School of Education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>547</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F-9: How is evidence of faculty productivity, development, teaching, learning, and research documented and is this consistent with the academic mission of the University? How is faculty performance/teaching supervised and reviewed? How is progressive development and CQI supported?

Drexel University identifies itself as a comprehensive university. Over the years, the accomplishments of our faculty members have been significant. Faculty accomplishments in terms of research (whether externally funded or not) scholarship, creative work, and community-oriented activities have increased dramatically. In the last years, the number of publications, exhibitions, presentations, and participation in national and international conferences intensified.

Full-time faculty activities and accomplishments are documented and evaluated through the annual review process that is linked to merit raises.

These reviews are conducted by the respective department heads and advanced through the colleges and schools to the Office of the Provost. In this process, faculty provide summaries of their activities and are evaluated on their research, teaching and service activities. Within the annual review process, various forms of teaching evaluation are used across the University and reviewed annually. Additionally, development goals are developed with the department head, and these are periodically assessed in the spirit of continual improvement. Appendix F-XIX. Typical University Faculty Evaluation Form.

The breadth and effectiveness of service activities in departments, colleges and the University are also assessed in these programs. Additionally, the programming of these events is dictated by faculty feedback regarding future programs. The University and the Colleges and Schools confer annual awards for research, teaching, and service. The recipients of these awards represent true role models for their colleagues. Appendix F-XX. Awards Recipients 2002-2010.

F-10. What roles do faculty play in the development of online curricula? How has the distance education program been incorporated into faculty workload? What are the rewards and how are the related intellectual property issues addressed? How is the on-line program assessed on the basis of student learning?

While many academic units offer academic programs which are delivered fully online, other programs offer select courses that are offered fully online or in a hybrid format. Although, some courses are created for online delivery only, the majority of courses delivered online are often derived from face-to-face courses and adapted to the new online delivery platform. If derived from a face-to-face course, an online course adapts the on-ground syllabus for asynchronous online delivery with appropriate pedagogical approaches and assignments. Generally, the same faculty members who teach the face-to-face courses design and teach the online courses.

While the quality of online programs is assessed at multiple levels, one of the most important aspects of the program evaluation is student learning. Student learning is assessed using a variety of methods such as secure tests, papers, case study presentations/discussions, discussion board postings, group projects,
etc. In some instances, students are required to take certification exams. These certifying board pass rates provide important program assessment data. Appendix F-XXI, Direct Student Assessment Data.

These assessment methods mirror those used within traditional on-campus program and are also correlated with program specific-learning outcomes stemming from Drexel University's Student Learning Priorities. Appendix F-XXII, Drexel Student Learning Priorities.

New courses are reviewed according to the process established in the Senate Charter. Appendix F-XXIII, Senate Charter. Once approved, faculty develop the online content with the assistance of Information Resources and Technology staff and expert developers residing various academic units.

Each academic unit sets guidelines on how teaching in distance education programs is incorporated into faculty workload. Some programs have hired highly qualified, full-time faculty with unique expertise to teach successfully only online courses. These faculty may live at a distance but are often included in periodic faculty meetings and development activities in person or virtually.

Workload adjustments or supplemental compensation for course development is addressed/negotiated by faculty and administration in an academic unit on a case-by-case basis. In some cases, courses are taught as an overload for full-time faculty or by part-time faculty hired by the academic unit.

Faculty rewards and responsibilities related to course content development and intellectual property are addressed and protected under Drexel University's Copyright Policy. This policy was developed to "define and protect the respective rights and obligations of the University, its personnel and sponsors of scholarly pursuits relative to copyrightable material produced at or for the University, and to do so while preserving traditional University practices and privileges with respect to the publication of scholarly, instructional and artistic works." The policy clearly outlines faculty protection as well as the expectations related to 'work for hire.'

F-11. How does faculty advancement, diversity and equity fit into the Drexel University Strategic Plan? How does Drexel University address, execute and assess faculty diversity in recruiting, retaining, and advancing faculty? How does Drexel University address issues of faculty equity, including comparability in salary, academic support, and resources?

With the strategic plan calling for both the promotion of faculty diversity and the enhancement of faculty development opportunities, the Office of Faculty Development & Equity (FDE) was established in 2007. The office was created in order to incorporate national best practices for faculty recruitment, retention, and advancement, with special attention to faculty equity and diversity. Thus, the goal of the FDE is to help recruit, retain and advance outstanding faculty while creating a supportive and diverse academic environment. At that time, the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence (DCAE) was incorporated in this office. The DCAE focus is on the strategic objectives that include enhancing faculty quality and development, actively valuing faculty, and training faculty for leadership roles.

In order to increase the likelihood of finding the best candidates, broaden the applicant pool and provide strategies for successful faculty recruitment, a faculty recruiting process was implemented.
To accomplish these goals, a Handbook for Faculty Hiring was developed. Appendix F-XXIV. Handbook for Faculty Hiring.

Drexel's academic policies and practices were assessed and revised to monitor the climate for inclusiveness, equity, and support, especially for women and underrepresented minority faculty members. This resulted in a series of Subcommittee meetings and policy revisions such as the tenure policy and the emeritus faculty policy. Appendix F-XXV. All Revised Policies.

Faculty development initiatives were expanded to improve satisfaction and retention of highly promising and accomplished faculty. This include Career Development Awards for junior faculty to develop mentorship relationships outside the University, chairing a Child Care Task Force to explore establishing a campus child care center, and conducting a range of workshops on skills for advancement.

The number of underrepresented minority faculty members are especially low in STEM fields. Currently, Drexel employs five underrepresented faculty in all of the STEM fields at Drexel. In 2009-2010 Drexel added one additional underrepresented minority Associate Professor in Engineering. It is suggested that more work needs to be done to recruit and retain top-level, underrepresented faculty in these areas of study. Further, the percentage of women faculty in Drexel's STEM areas has also increased since 2007. The percentage of female full Professors in STEM fields at Drexel has nearly doubled from 6% in 2007 to 11% in 2010. The percentage of female STEM Associate Professors nearly doubled from 12% to 23%; and the percentage of STEM female Assistant Professors is 34%, more than doubling since 2007 when there were 14%. This is largely due to impressive recruitment efforts by the colleges and schools. Appendix F-XXVI. STEM Data.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND INSIGHTS FOR THE FUTURE

While there is a need for more space for classrooms and offices, in general Drexel faculty find the University a good place to work. Although, all faculty are included in invitations to a wide range of developmental opportunities, the 2010 data indicated that faculty appear to be seeking activities targeted to their needs. In terms of faculty development, new and junior faculty seem to feel that they have the most support. Mid-career tenure-track faculty are typically still invested in research, but there appears to be a desire for post-tenure guidance in terms of "what is next?"

The 2007 HERI data indicate a concern about senior faculty professional development to help redirect earlier interests in a growing and rapidly changing university. Teaching faculty have benefited by opportunities for longer contracts and better opportunities for promotion. However, care needs to be directed at maintaining a faculty that feels unified and not tiered.

While an increased number of programs from the DCAE have been well received by adjuncts, faculty teaching online courses remains a group that is generally hardest to reach. The DCAE will be bringing in an expert this spring to review that unit and make recommendations. One of our areas of interest will be obtaining recommendations about how to provide faculty development opportunities, and what kinds of opportunities are needed, for our faculty that teach online.
Increasing the number of underrepresented and female faculty in STEM areas should be a priority. Although Drexel now has one of the highest percentages of female faculty members in both Biomedical Engineering and Engineering in the entire country, given Drexel's historical and current prominence in STEM, further progress in this area—especially pertaining to underrepresented minority faculty—could greatly improve the diversity of the institution.

With the development of a new strategic plan it will be beneficial to emphasize new priorities. Through the expansion of a varied and responsive set of faculty development opportunities at the university level as well as at college and department level, these collaborative efforts will continue to develop. Moreover, these faculty development programs will continue to be enhanced and assessed.
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WORKGROUP G

THE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

1.0 STANDARDS

Standard 11 - Educational Offerings

The institution’s educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

Standard 12 - General Education

The institution’s curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency.

Standard 13 - Related Educational Activities

The institution’s programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.

2.0 OVERVIEW OF DREXEL UNIVERSITY EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Drexel University is a comprehensive research university with 13 colleges and schools, including a medical school and a law school. It serves a total student population of 24,860 with three campuses in Philadelphia, and additional locations in Burlington County, New Jersey; Malvern, Pennsylvania; Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; and Sacramento, California. In addition, there are several instructional sites.

Founded in 1891 as a technical institute, Drexel University has evolved into an institution at the cutting-edge of technology, science, the health professions, medicine, law, media, and the arts. Drexel undergraduate students come from 48 states and 95 foreign countries and graduate students come from 50 states and 83 foreign countries. Drexel offers 114 undergraduate majors and 126 graduate programs. The University also offers 34 of its programs online (see Appendix G-1, Undergraduate and Graduate Majors).

Drexel University was one of the many higher education institutions founded in the America’s most unsettling period of industrialization. The growth of the industrial economy - joined by the associated wave of immigration and urbanization - brought about fundamental shifts in the ways that Americans lived, worked, and participated in government. Drexel’s identity was established by its founder, banker Anthony J. Drexel, who developed a vision of an educational pathway for men and women who wished to rise in the midst of rapid technological and social change. “Art, Science, and Industry” were the founding emphases of the young institution - appropriate to an Institute of Technology that sought to prepare its students to engage immediately in the businesses that were rapidly reshaping the nation.
Drexel University has been transformed in many ways since its founding, but, as with most institutions of higher education, its identity has remained largely unchanged. Throughout the 20th century, Drexel kept its faculty, administration, and students focused on research, study, and teaching in engineering, business, and the sciences. More recently, Drexel expanded its focus to include computing, media arts and design, the allied health professions, medicine, and law. It is perhaps unsurprising that in America's industrial age the fastest growing programs at the University were in engineering and business - geared towards mechanical innovation and production, and the management of these enterprises.

Drexel students are drawn to programs that explore the human body and mind, globalization, environmental science, and new media. These are markers of a close fit between the character of the institution and emerging areas of economic growth. Today, as in the 19th century, the university is closely connected to the economic and social contexts in which students are preparing to work and live. Drexel students can walk right out of class and into the heart of Philadelphia - the fifth most-populated city in the country.

The hallmark of a Drexel education is the focus on the application of academic skills in practical contexts - experiential education. By participating in cooperative and other experienced-based activities, students combine core intellectual skills with the practical experiences necessary to succeed in any work environment. Exposure to these experiences allows students to become well-rounded individuals who are prepared to meaningfully and ethically contribute to society. Cooperative education, in particular, is the primary vehicle by which undergraduates are given an opportunity to apply their skills in meaningful contexts. Co-op is not simply an extended internship. It is a professional experience that develops skills in a chosen discipline as well as the attitudes and behaviors of a mature professional.

Through involvement in Drexel co-op, interdisciplinary courses and programs, cutting-edge curricula, international experiences, undergraduate research, and civic engagement, Drexel students emerge prepared with the core skills that every university graduate should attain. Additionally, through this "learning by doing" philosophy, students have the opportunity to become more active learners, and to effectively develop their career aspirations before entering the workforce.

The focus on experiential education is also prominent in the University's graduate programs. Working closely with faculty researchers, graduate students studying in doctoral and masters programs are immersed in translational research and focused on finding solutions to real-world problems. In some cases, graduate students also have the opportunity to participate in cooperative education. The experiential focus prepares Drexel's graduate students to effectively bridge rigorous academic challenges and the application of their learning in a range of contexts. During the past ten years the University has developed several new doctoral programs including one in Culture, Communication and Media; three in Public Health; and one in Education. Over the past five years, Drexel awarded over 600 doctoral degrees. Several of the Ph.D. programs are highly ranked among national programs.

The commitment to experiential learning over the years has spawned creativity in the development of interdisciplinary, civic engagement, international, and entrepreneurship programs (see Appendix G-II. Interdisciplinary Centers).
3.0 Overview of Co-op and Experiential Learning

Operating one of the largest cooperative education programs in the world, Drexel University has been a pioneer in cooperative education (co-op) since 1919. Over 1,500 businesses, industrial, governmental, and other institutions "cooperate" with Drexel in offering students the opportunity to acquire practical experience in employment related to college studies. Drexel's cooperative education program is managed by the Steinbright Career Development Center comprised of a professional staff of 50 under direction of Peter J. Franks, the Senior Associate Vice Provost for Career Education.

Cooperative education at Drexel (Appendix G-III. Overview of the Drexel University Cooperative Education Program) enables undergraduate students to balance classroom theory with practical, hands-on experience prior to graduation. Students alternate classes with full-time employment through University-approved employers. Generally, students are on co-op for a six-month period, alternating with six months of classroom study. Cooperative education at Drexel is a degree requirement for many undergraduate majors and an option for all full-time undergraduate programs. In fact, over 90% of Drexel undergraduate students participate in the co-op program.

In addition to local and national employment opportunities, Drexel provides students with the opportunity to gain international work experience through an expanding international co-op program. International co-op provides students with the opportunity to develop relevant cross-cultural skills in an increasingly global society.

Participation in Drexel's cooperative education program also benefits employers. Through participation in the co-op program, employers have access to motivated and skilled students with education in the fields of business, engineering, natural physical and social sciences, computer science, media arts and design, healthcare and the humanities. By alternating periods of classroom study with industry experience, students also bring the problem-solving skills they acquire in the classroom into the workplace, offering employers a fresh perspective. Undergraduate students typically have 18 months of cooperative work experience (3-co-ops in a five-year program of study) or 6 months of cooperative work experience (1-co-op in a four-year program of study) to complement their academic work.

Even though Drexel co-op offers substantial educational and career-development benefits, in order to fully achieve the maximum benefit of the co-op program, increased programming is needed for optimal incorporation into the academic experience. The preparation afforded students by the academic programs is directly evaluated by the employers through co-op performance evaluations at the end of each work experience (see section H); the next step will be to evaluate the impact of co-op experiences on the curriculum and how curricular revisions may be informed by student co-op experiences.

Historically, the lack of alignment between explicit learning goals and the co-op evaluation instruments and the lack of a broad distribution of the resulting data to the program level has limited the potential of these data for assessment purposes. However, with recent changes to the evaluation instruments (i.e., the evaluation is now aligned to the Drexel Student Learning Priorities and college-specific goals) and improvements in reporting (e.g., data is now easily available at the program level), it is expected that student performance during co-op will be used more frequently for curricular and program review. The
goal is to bring the results of experiential education into more direct relationship with the academic programs.

Another issue that has impacted positive outcomes is the disconnect with the University that students often experience while on co-op. Maintaining a connection to students during their co-ops is a difficult task, particularly in majors that do not have a uniform co-op experiences for their majors (e.g. English majors may be working at a newspaper, a publishing house, or at a non-profit organization). This need for integration has been recognized, and some elements have been developed to maintain an academic connection to the students while they are on co-op in addition to the connections which the Steinbright Career Development Center maintain with students and employers during work periods. This has been partially addressed by offering courses during co-op (face-to-face for local students and online on a limited basis for distant students). However, one program that has systematically successfully achieved this connection by cohort is the College of Nursing and Health Professions (see Appendix G-IV, College of Nursing and Health Professions Co-op Strategy).

Besides the College of Nursing and Health Professions, no academic component is consistently threaded through co-op for any other majors. As the co-op positions become more varied, the relevance of a specific course to all students becomes more challenging; this has been partially addressed by providing courses during co-op. Maintaining an academic connection to students during their co-op experience continues as a major focus moving forward.

While the LeBow College of Business has not developed a mechanism to remain connected to students during co-op, the college has successfully incorporated the co-op experience into the classroom upon return to campus. LeBow utilizes a student reflection of the co-op to focus the experience. This reflection is entered into student portfolios and is reviewed with the student and their academic advisor. This model has been extended to all co-op students. Starting in the Fall of 2011, all students must complete a 400 word reflective analysis at the completion of their co-op. The analysis provides students the opportunity to reflect on how their co-op experience supports (or detracts) from their academic, personal, and career goals. Initial vetting of the first round of reflective analyses shows them to be a valuable exercise. These co-op reflections are also being used to assess student writing skills. (See Section H.)

While off-campus experiences are the cornerstone of the co-op enterprise, the university's robust and expanding research enterprise features an array of use-inspired, applied research programs making Drexel itself a valuable co-op opportunity. Research co-ops, partially funded by the University, have been implemented to grow opportunities for students to participated in cutting-edge research as they consider graduate school. With that in mind, going forward the definition of co-op should be broadened to include faculty-led experiential experiences, professional volunteerism, and other experiential activities. Additionally, Steinbright and the academic departments need to more creatively bridge the experiences of students in order to allow for students to more fully integrate the classroom and the co-op experiences irrespective of major.
Given the central role that co-op plays to a Drexel education and its importance to fulfilling Drexel's mission, the Workgroup developed the following insights:

- Relevant online or companion courses should be encouraged during the co-op to strengthen the academic experience as well as to keep students on track for graduation.
- A closer communication between co-op employers and academic departments should be encouraged to maximize student experience in both venues.
- Success of the various aspects of experiential learning should be monitored through a "Drexel Experience Portfolio" - integrating co-op, globalized learning, and undergraduate research.

4.0 METHODOLOGY

Workgroup G was charged to analyze the institution's educational offerings, the institution's curricula and the institution's programs or activities. In order to do so, Workgroup G addressed the following research questions:

G-1. How do majors address core competencies of general education; which include, but are not limited to: oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analogies and reasoning, information literacy and technological competency?

G-2. What is the academic fidelity of off-site programs and how do these enhance or detract from educational programs (e.g. study abroad, online, Sacramento, BCC, Malvern)? Academic fidelity is the extent or level to which university leaders have considered, involved, and entrusted the current academic assets to produce the new educational program offering. Academic fidelity measures the nature and extent of integrity or equivalency between existing campus programs with the new program offering.

G-3. How well are the School of Public Health, the College of Nursing and Health Professions, the College of Medicine and the Earle Mack School of Law integrated with other academic programs across the institution? In what ways have they influenced each other?

G-4. How effectively has technology been used to support and enhance teaching and learning at Drexel?

G-5. How well do academic programs clearly define goals and objectives and the knowledge, skills and professional values required to meet them?

G-6. How well do we provide appropriate advising and academic support to students, within and across academic programs, and across instructional modalities, campuses, and student types?

G-7. What are the criteria used to define a viable academic program? Do these criteria adequately support the development, implementation, and success of new programs?

These questions are addressed throughout this document.
5.0 DISCUSSION OF DREXEL STUDENT LEARNING PRIORITIES (DSLP)

The Drexel University community recently reviewed undergraduate education across the University. Two task forces were formed that sequentially addressed undergraduate education. The first, the Task Force on Enhancing the Undergraduate Curriculum (2009), made multiple recommendations, including the implementation of a more flexible curriculum by mandating 18 credits of totally free electives for every student. It also defined in very broad terms a list of characteristics and skills that all graduates of Drexel University should acquire. The initial committee recognized that while Drexel has been doing an excellent job of educating a professional workforce, the primary goal of the University should extend to the training of leaders within each of the professions. With the change in the University to a more research intensive and comprehensive University, it was decided to continue to build on the strengths of well-trained individuals in all the professions and to expand upon their skill sets to more intentionally advance broader skills that are essential for the leaders in each of the professions in the 21st century.

This initial list of characteristics and skills was the basis for discussion of the University Committee on Learning Assessment about a set of key learning goals that every Drexel student should achieve. After intensive deliberation with the Council of Deans, the Associate Deans for Undergraduate Education, and the faculty as a whole, this committee developed a list of eleven learning goals. The purpose of these learning goals was to have a set of learning priorities that align to the Drexel University mission and current strategic plan; and that capture knowledge areas, competencies, and skills considered essential to a broad education.

As part of this self-study, these eleven learning goals received further comment. A survey was developed that asked key constituencies (including faculty, students, advisors, administrators, co-op employers) of the University to assess both the importance of these learning objectives for their particular discipline and their perception of the quality of the education that is being provided to students in support of these objectives (Appendix G-V. 2011 Drexel MSCHE Self-Study Survey).

In this section, we discuss each of the 11 Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) and responses to the survey related to these learning objectives. This survey was distributed to the entire Drexel University population. The students' response rate was 15.04%, full-time faculty 48.44%, part-time faculty 23.99%, employers 22.71%, and academic administrators 53.43%. Individuals were asked to grade each of the 11 learning goals as essential, important, somewhat important, not important or irrelevant for the Drexel graduate. They were similarly asked their opinion of the quality of the skills that had been developed by graduates rated as excellent, good, adequate, poor, very poor, or no opinion.

Communication

Communication is the ability of an individual to employ an understanding of audience, purpose and context to communicate effectively in a range of situations using appropriate media. It also relates to the level of sophistication of the oral or written presentation and the success in presenting one's ideas at a level that demonstrates not only knowledge of the material, but knowledge of the audience. 93% of all respondents indicated that communication skills were either essential or important. In contrast, only 75% of respondents indicated that the quality of teaching of communication skills were
excellent or good, with administrators and employers indicating 64-67% of students demonstrating this level of skill. However, an important consideration is the congruence of the rated importance of this skill and the success in mastering the skill indicated by the different constituencies. Employers felt communication was the most important skill, with faculty considering it the second most important. Students themselves only considered it the fourth most important skill. A disconcerting result, however, is that based on the achievement of our students, the faculty rate this as fourth in terms of quality, students rated it sixth, and employers tenth. It is obvious that we need to work more diligently in improving the skill set of our students in the area of communication.

Recognizing the importance of communication skills, multiple units of the University have been actively engaged in carefully evaluating and revising our current programs and developing comprehensive mechanisms of assessment (see Section H of the Self-Study). A major emphasis has been on written communication skills.

In 2002 the University instituted a Writing Across the Curriculum program that was directed by the Pennoni Honors College. The Pennoni Honors College sponsors a range of interdisciplinary academic programs serving both the Honors Program. During the last two years, the Writing Across the Curriculum program has been reviewed and is now under the auspices of the Department of English and Philosophy. Since the courses designated as "Writing Intensive" are suggested by each major, the English Department has been working with each college/major to tailor the program to the needs of the discipline. The most developed program exists in the LeBow College of Business. Assessment of the Writing Across the Curriculum occurs not only by the professors in the college, but also by employers through their co-op positions. An e-portfolio is developed by each student to document their progress throughout their training at Drexel.

The Department of English and Philosophy redesigned the Freshman Writing Program in 2009, developing a process that resulted in more consistency in both content and grading across the hundred sections of freshmen English. Training for all new English faculty occurs each Summer and quality circles are held during the year to maximize consistency and to work as a group on continual quality improvement. This work has not been done in isolation; they have worked with the Writing Center to more carefully align the goals of the Freshman Writing Program with what is being emphasized in the Writing Center. Reciprocally, the Writing Center informs the English Department about the most consistent deficiencies that are apparent in student writing across Drexel. This close collaboration between the Freshman Writing Program and the Writing Center has allowed a more comprehensive development programs to improve our students' writing skills.

Beginning in the 2009-10 academic year, the principles and mechanics of creating e-portfolios were incorporated into the Freshman Writing Program with the goal of becoming a standard document for progressive evaluation of writing of all students in the University. Emphasis has been shifted from training peer tutors to training discipline-based faculty in how to design appropriate assignments and to consistently evaluate them. The faculty continues to use peer tutors to assist in the writing intensive courses. In addition, student writing assignments are submitted to the Director of Writing Assessment, in order to be further evaluated. Through continuity of writing, evaluation across the curriculum, and
integration with the Freshmen Writing Program, the University is striving to further improve our students' written communications skill.

While oral communication programs have not been structured as extensively as the writing program, the opportunities for students to enhance speaking skills have increased in the last five years. Most majors require an oral communications course (Appendix G-VI. Oral Communications Requirement in Undergraduate Majors). In addition, there are multiple opportunities for students to make presentations with structured feedback not only in classes but also in larger venues, such as symposia within the colleges or at the University Research Day. While many universities focus only on research in the most traditional sense (e.g., biology chemistry, engineering), at their research days, Drexel University Research Day showcases all forms of scholarship with students presenting interior designs, choreography, or short stories in the same venue as students explaining particle physics or mechanical engineering. Although considerable progress is being made, there is still a gap between the level of communication that students should attain based on the learning objectives and the experience of all undergraduates.

**Ethical Reasoning**

*Ethical reasoning is the ability of students to assess their own ethical values and the social context of ethical problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to an ethical problem, and consider consequences of alternative solutions.* Once given a framework or a set of frameworks in which to identify, analyze, and apply alternative actions to ethical problems, students should be able to consider ethical issues in four domains: individual, professional, organizational, and community.

The MSCHE Self-Study survey indicated that ethical reasoning was recognized by almost all constituents to be either essential or important. Academic administrators had the highest percentage (95%) among stakeholders rating this learning priority as important, while students viewed ethical reasoning as least important. In evaluating the quality of ethical reasoning provided in student learning, only 50% of administrators and faculty perceived success as excellent or good; however, more than 70% of students rated the quality of learning about ethical reasoning either excellent or good. Comparing ethical reasoning with the other eleven learning priorities, employers believed that it was the second most important, behind communication, but ninth in perception of quality. Students found ethical reasoning to rank eighth in importance and eighth in quality. Full time faculty found this learning priority to be fourth in importance but eighth in quality. Academic administrators saw ethical reasoning as the fourth highest in importance but ranked the quality of teaching/learning with students as the last of the eleven learning priorities. Clearly there is variance between the rating of the importance of ethical reasoning (generally high among all constituents as a learning priority at Drexel) and the job Drexel is doing (much lower among all constituents) in teaching ethical reasoning.

Developing ethical reasoning knowledge and skills among students can be accomplished in a variety of ways. While there is no specific general education or core curriculum requirement for students at Drexel to take an ethics course, students in most of the majors are required to take an ethics course. Ethics
courses at the University have become more specialized to respond to changing needs in society, such as computer ethics and information ethics (see Appendix G-VI, Ethics Courses at Drexel University).

Developing knowledge and skills in ethical reasoning can also be accomplished, at least in part, in co-curricular activities and student life activities. Drexel has an Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards. One of the five goals of the student conduct process is to foster ethical values and civic virtues. An online academic integrity tutorial with assessment has recently become a mandatory assignment for all incoming freshman, and this will be expanded to other student cohorts in the future.

Many occupations have a professional code of ethics such as law, medicine, nursing, and accounting. These professional codes are taught in the curricula of most majors and students are expected to abide by these codes, even during their studies at Drexel. Additionally, while in co-op, employers assess students on their achievement of this outcome.

Given that all constituencies at Drexel believe that ethical reasoning is essential or important to students' learning, the Workgroup developed the following insights:

- Students should be expected to know and have some interpretive practice in the formal code of ethics adopted by the profession or occupation they choose to enter.
- A general ethics course at the appropriate level of academic formation should be required.
- Co-curricular activities involving ethical reasoning should be more widespread and available to Drexel students via Office of Student Life.

**Information Literacy**

Information literacy is the ability to access, evaluate and use information effectively, competently, and creatively. To be successful not only at the University but also in their careers, students must understand how to appropriately navigate the vast amount of information available today. Interestingly, faculty, students and employers rated this as the third most important skill to possess and all three groups ranked this as the third highest skill acquired. There is very little variation in the evaluation of this skill among the constituency groups, with 95% of all groups indicating that this skill is essential or important (range between 93% -100%). As with most of the skill sets, the perception of whether Drexel graduates have achieved information literacy is lower than the expected importance. Overall, 80% of the respondents felt that Drexel graduates demonstrated information literacy that was excellent or good (range from 70% to 81%). Interestingly, faculty felt that students had not mastered this skill sufficiently (70%), while both employers and students felt they had accomplished this skill, rating success as good or excellent (81%). The discrepancy between the faculty, students, and employers may be the result of more stringent evaluations by the faculty. When employers ask them to utilize these skills, in many instances, it is at a more intermittent level - using it at times within their position but not as a basis for most evaluations. It is, therefore, felt that Drexel's seems to be successful in maintaining the high level of information literacy that students already have or are improving.
Creative and Critical Thinking

Creative and critical thinking is the use of divergent and convergent thinking to generate novel and relevant ideas, strategies, approaches or products. Critical thinking could be the most popular student expectation that a faculty member desires in the teaching/learning process. Critical thinking appears frequently as an overall goal of a degree program and as one of the learning objectives for a particular course. However, it may not be clear to students what is meant by “critical thinking,” even though this is a characteristic that students hear throughout their schooling. Most faculty (78%) and academic administrators (73%) saw this as an essential learning priority; whereas only 65% of students believed it was an essential skill. When compared with the 11 learning priorities, faculty, academic administrators, and students believed that this was the most important. Employers rated this fourth. In looking at the rating of the quality of the Drexel education in this area, all constituent groups ranked creative and critical thinking in the middle of the 11 learning priorities.

Creative thinking is defined as a process of sequential interaction of divergent and convergent thinking. Divergent thinking is the process of generating multiple solutions to a problem and elaborating on a diverse set of ideas with fluency and speed (e.g., brainstorming). Convergent thinking involves narrowing ideas through analysis and evaluation (e.g., critical thinking). Figure 1 provides an image of the iterative nature of the process.

![Figure 1. The Iterative Process of Divergent and Convergent Thinking](image)

What is important is that students learn to develop a system, practice the system, and improve the system of choice regardless of major or discipline to move from a novice to an accomplished thinker. Most majors indicate that this skill is incorporated into all their courses, particularly upper level courses through in interactive classroom discussions and essay exams and papers that require critical analysis.

Technology Use

The goal of the learning objective is to guarantee that the students are able to use technology to communicate, collaborate, solve problems, make decisions, and conduct research, as well as to foster creativity in life-long learning.

Drexel University has a legacy of being at the forefront of use of technology in its academic programs. Drexel was the first University to require all students to purchase their own computers (ca. 1984). Since that time the University has continued to incorporate technology as it becomes appropriate.
entire world functions with technology, this continuing commitment to technology is both valid and necessary. While simple utilization of the computer for word processing packages is a skill that most students have when they enter any university, the curriculum at Drexel emphasizes these skills by having most communications between faculty and students, as well as among students in a class, occur through electronic means. Over the course of the last ten years multiple platforms have been utilized. The University currently uses Blackboard Vista for technology associated with most in-classroom activities, while Blackboard Classic is the platform for our online students. During 2012, a migration of both platforms to a single platform – the new Blackboard Learn system fully integrated with the Banner system – will occur. The system is currently being piloted and training of faculty for the new platform will begin in January 2012 with the entire conversion completed by September 2012.

To maximize pedagogical advantages of online learning systems, students not only use the Bb Vista platform for syllabi, submission of assignments, and evaluation of courses, it is also a form of communication for asynchronous conversation in many of the classes. In addition, a number of departments utilize a hybrid format for classes: for example, one 90 minute class being held face-to-face and an additional 90 minute class occurring online with asynchronous chat. This occurs not only in the science courses but also in English courses where peer review utilizing online technology is very effective (Appendix G-VIII, Number of Online Courses at Drexel University).

In addition to the online platforms, the students also use multiple software packages such as statistical, mathematical, scientific, and design packages, to prepare them for future careers. Many courses are enhanced through the use of technology: classes will have excerpts of movies or music; some language courses utilize audio transmissions of radio shows from France, Spain, or Germany to enhance the in-class activities of students. While the University has done extremely well in keeping pace with the current technologies, it cannot rest on previous successes. The University is constantly looking for more effective formats in which to engage our students in the learning process.

Both students and employers rated technology use as the fifth most important of the skills, while faculty rated it as the seventh. Interestingly, employers rated this as the skill with which the majority of our students demonstrate excellence or good mastery, while both students and faculty felt this was the second highest acquired skill of the eleven that were outlined. Overall, 91% of all respondents felt that technology use was an essential or important skill. The range was fairly limited from 90% to 95%. Therefore, there is little discrepancy in recognition of the importance of the skill to the success of a career. Similar to the other skill sets, a lower percentage of respondents felt that the students had an excellent or good mastery of this particular skill, with 82% of respondents rating excellent skills in this area. The range of responses was 77% (which was obtained from advisors) to 84% as seen by administrators and employers. Therefore, it appears that Drexel has developed a formula that either maintains the high ability of technical proficiency that students have when they enter Drexel, or imparts these skills to them during their education so that upon graduation they are proficient in the use of technology for a broad and important range of purposes.
**Professional Practice**

Professional practice is the ability to apply knowledge and skills gained from their program of study to the achievement of goals in a work, clinical, or professional setting. This particular skill resonates with the core focus of experiential learning, particularly in cooperative education. Students at Drexel are imbued with a professional ethic from their freshman year. Before securing a co-op, each student takes a COOP 101 course that not only helps them with resume writing and interviewing, but also impresses upon them the manner in which an individual functions as an employee and as part of a team. Not surprisingly, students who come to Drexel rate this as the number two skill that they hope to acquire while at Drexel, with 93% of all students saying that this is an essential or important characteristic (specifically 63% saying it is essential). Interestingly, faculty only rate this as the fifth most important skill set with employers rating this as the sixth. Overall, 93% of all respondents felt that this was essential or important. In terms of achievement, success was slightly lower than would have been expected given the rated importance of the skill, with 82% of all respondents saying that students demonstrate excellent or good skill in this particular area (with the range from 79% to 91%). Interestingly, however, students rated this area as the highest in the achievement of success; similarly both the faculty and employers rate success in this area as second highest. It is, therefore, quite clear that the University is consistent in developing a curriculum that not only reflects their emphasis on cooperative education but also the success with which the curriculum achieves this particular learning objective.

**Self-Directed Learning**

Self-directed learning is the ability to establish goals and monitor progress toward them by developing an awareness of the personal, environmental and task-specific factors that affect attainment of the goals. The educational curriculum helps to develop these skills by raising an awareness of the personal, environmental, and past factors that affect attainment of goals. 90% of all student and faculty respondents rated self-directed learning as the sixth most important skill, while employers rated this as the seventh most important skill. While students felt that their success in achieving this goal was the fourth highest of the skill sets that they developed, employers felt that this was the sixth highest, while faculty thought it was seventh out of eleven. Overall, 74% of respondents said that Drexel students demonstrate the skills associated with self-directed learning that are excellent or at the level of excellent or good. This ranges from 57% of the faculty who feel that students do this at this level of success to 78% of students who feel that they do a good job in this area.

Much of the activity both inside and outside of the classroom focuses on helping students define their personal learning goals within the context of their curricula (e.g., intentional learning). Students not only strive for high grades in classes, but also are encouraged to and rewarded for owning the course objectives and modifying them to include a component that specifically relates to their own lives and curriculum.
Leadership

Leadership is the ability to develop a vision, translate that vision into shared goals, and effectively work with others to achieve these goals. Leadership can be exercised within a profession, organization, or in a community. Leadership was rated by 86% of the constituents as essential (46%) or important (40%). The majority of constituents (67%) perceived the quality of preparing students in leadership as either excellent (25%) or good (42%).

Leadership development can be seen across the curricula in most programs at Drexel and may even be a distinguishing character or focus of a degree program. For example the LeBow College of Business uses as its slogan “Learn here. Lead anywhere” and promotes its social networking site as “Follow. Lead.” The School of Education offers several degrees in educational leadership. The College of Nursing and Health Professions offers several degree programs in nursing leadership. The Goodwin College has programs in professional studies that emphasize leadership. The College of Engineering provides courses in engineering leadership. The BS in health services administration offers a senior course in health care leadership and lists as one of its program objectives that students “recognize the characteristics of good healthcare leadership.”

Leadership development plays a major role in both the mission and objectives of Drexel’s Office of Student Life. Specifically one of the services provided by the Office of Student Life’s Office of Campus Activities is leadership development that “provides opportunities and resources for students to develop and enhance personal and professional skills.” The programmatic effort has become known as the CEO Leadership Development Program which “provides the skills needed to succeed personally and professionally.” Programs undergo careful review before given approval as a CEO workshop. These workshops are offered throughout the academic year and address enduring and contemporary issues in student and professional leadership development. Some of the most well known political, business, organizational, and higher education leaders in the region and nationally have been speakers in these workshops. Students can earn a CEO Leadership Certificate after attending a number of workshops. Appendix G-IX. CEO LEAD Launches—OCA’s Revamped & Rebranded Leadership Development Program summarizes the number of students who have participated in this program.

As with any comprehensive research university there is a myriad of co-curricular activities offered to students at the undergraduate and graduate levels that addresses the importance of leadership. The Provost’s Task Force on Enhancing the Undergraduate Curriculum (June 2009), however, made the observation that while the Drexel students are well prepared to work in their fields and receive excellent evaluations as beginning professionals, there are far too few playing the role of leaders in their field, or that Drexel Alumni may not be perceived as leaders compared with graduates from other peer universities. This could be a result of the intense focus on “occupation driven” curricula and the high profile of cooperative education.

This historically “occupation driven” focus is changing with an eye toward Drexel, as a university, becoming a “leader” as well as the faculty and staff being recognized for their leadership in higher
education. This leadership focus will extend to students. Drexel has emerged to receive several accolades for leadership such as:

- Ranked last 9 years by U.S. News as “Best National Universities;” ranked 88th overall
- Ranked #6 on the US News Up-and-Coming schools (among National universities)
- Ranked by Times Higher Education among top 250 universities in the world

This goal to lead is not limited by traditional standards. While scholarship in the traditional disciplines is applauded, interdisciplinary, translational and discipline-based educational research are the focus areas of the University. We are challenged to set the standards for application of university creativity to our surrounding community by a process of shared decision making for defining the goals of our programs. In addition, Drexel administration, students and faculty are being called to create a “civically engaged” university. These challenges call for significant increases in the role of faculty as leaders in their discipline-based education. To accomplish these leadership objectives the Workgroup developed the following insights:

- Ensure that undergraduate students have some exposure to the art and science of leadership via formal course work and/or experiential learning.
- Ensure that the Office of Student Life has adequate resources to continue and expand programming in the CEO Leadership Development Program.
- Conduct a thorough review for how leadership development is integrated in the graduate studies curriculum.

Global Competence

Global competence is the ability to engage in, reflect upon, and demonstrate open mindedness toward all issues of diversity at local, national and international levels. Global competence was rated as important (37%) or essential (41%) by 78% of all respondents. Academic administrators had the highest percentage evaluating global competence as “essential” (41%) compared with faculty (34%), students (38%), and employers (21%). 63% of respondents indicated that students achieved an excellent or good level of competence in this area, with students and employers rating success the highest (63% and 61% respectively) and faculty rating success the lowest (44%).

The Office of International Programs and the Study Abroad Office are committed to enhancing the student experience at Drexel through an increasing number and variety of international experiences for students on and off campus. While it would be ideal for all Drexel students to travel abroad on short or long-term educational programs, this option is not possible for all of our students, due to financial or programmatic constraints. Thus, a number of programming opportunities for students have been designed to address global challenges on the Drexel campus. Some examples of successful programs include our Cross-Country Conversations, exchange student activities, and annual Student Conference on Global Challenges. The university is also working to provide funding for graduate students to present papers at international conferences through the International Travel Award (ITA) program.
Drexel faculty firmly believe that study abroad is a life-changing experience and Drexel's Study Abroad Office is committed to increasing these opportunities for our students (Appendix G-X, Study Abroad Activities at Drexel University). The Office serves both Drexel undergraduate and graduate students and supports all Drexel Colleges and Schools. During AY 2010-11 over 260 students participated in study abroad programs going to such diverse locations as Equatorial Guinea, Egypt, Singapore, and Costa Rica as well as more traditional locations in Western Europe and Asia such as Japan, China, France, Germany and the UK.

The Study Abroad office has also developed several short study tours through which faculty bring their students overseas for seven to ten days. The short-term study tour opportunities that are available to our students are as diverse as our students themselves. Students interested in Design can spend their spring break studying in Iceland; students majoring in Culinary Arts, Culinary Science and Nutrition were able to spend two weeks studying the culinary traditions of Korea; Honors Students were able to spend ten days in Shanghai with students from our partner university Shanghai Jiao Tong, experiencing the World's Fair first hand; Sport Management students were able to go to South Africa to witness the energy and extravaganza that is World Cup and to participate in service projects; and LeBow College of Business students can spend their spring break in Chile learning about emerging economies.

At the other end of the spectrum, students can extend their global experience by combining both study and co-op abroad. Students took advantage of our new relationship with Nanyang Technological University in Singapore to study and do a co-op abroad.

During the past year graduate student study abroad opportunities that encompass dual degree programs, short-term study tours and more traditional study abroad opportunities have been developed. Of note is the EAGLES (Engineers as Global Leaders in Energy Sustainability) program, an EU-ATLANTIS funded program that will allow Drexel Engineering students to earn two Master's degrees—one from Drexel and one from Politecnico di Milano in Italy.

Short-term study tours aimed specifically at graduate students are also being developed. Of note is a program entitled Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland, aimed at on-line School of Education graduate students earning their MS degrees in Higher Education. This unique program provides the opportunity for on-line graduate students not only to meet in person but also to spend two intensive weeks studying one of the longest standing conflicts of the past century and learn how Northern Ireland has moved to peace and reconciliation. Other examples are the LeBow College of Business one-week study abroad program and College of Nursing & Health Professions Doctor of Nursing Practice two-week abroad program.

As Study Abroad moves from a “perk” for a few students, to an experience that is more clearly integrated into the Drexel curriculum, the Study Abroad office is working to further develop major specific programs such as our Conservation Biology/Environmental Science opportunity on Bioko Island, Equatorial Guinea. In this unique program, students focus on independent research, community outreach and coursework, allowing them to understand the complex relationship between public policy, conservation and the immediate needs of a developing nation. More international programs are also
being developed on campus, e.g. Café Latino is a monthly program that brings native Spanish speakers and students learning Spanish together to experience and discuss Spanish culture through speakers, movies and food.

To accomplish these global competence objectives in the future, the Workgroup developed the following insights:

- Expansion of the International Co-op
- Expansion of Travel-Integrated Courses
- Graduate – Mini Study Abroad Requirement
- Transforming the university culture to enhance global awareness and competence through a required global experience for undergraduates—this would include options such as Study Abroad, International Co-op, language education, and/or a Global Area Studies Requirement

**Responsible Citizenship**

*Responsible citizenship is the ability to create and sustain a healthy, engaged, public life.* Interestingly, the proposed importance of this learning goal and the perceived success in learning this goal were closer than other goals. However, this was due to a smaller percentage of all constituencies evaluating this goal as essential (37-51%). Further, employers ranked this learning priority as second to last in importance among the 11 rated, with students rating it last in importance. With Drexel University’s enhanced commitment to the community, it is expected that both the evaluation of the importance of this learning priority and our success in developing this skill in our students will increase.

President John Fry, in both his first convocation address in October 2010 and in his Presidential Inaugural address in April 2011, vowed to make Drexel one of the most civically engaged universities in the country. That engagement, according to President Fry, should come from all of the University’s enterprises: research, teaching, and community service. While remarkable examples of civic engagement from faculty and students abound throughout Drexel’s history, the new initiative calls for more planned, systematic, and pervasive contributions from the Drexel community (economically, educationally, and culturally), starting with investing in several ways in the two West Philadelphia neighborhoods in which Drexel resides.

To achieve this goal, resources and attention to Drexel’s Center for Civic Engagement (established in 2003) will be increased as the Center aims to promote the ideals of social responsibility and public service by facilitating community based experiential learning for students, faculty, and staff. The Center provides meaningful and high-quality civic engagement opportunities for every Drexel student. Soon after President Fry arrived at Drexel, he appointed a Vice Provost for University and Community Partnerships to ensure that Drexel be involved at the local as well as the regional level for civic engagement.

Drexel freshman have been required to take a course (UNIV 101) designed to maximize a student’s potential to succeed in the classroom and manage the many challenges presented in college and professional life. Civic Engagement has been a core feature of the UNIV 101 course. Students are introduced to the objectives of civic engagement, tips on making the most of experiential learning (5-
hour service requirement), and shown how to select an organization and activity in which to contribute. The Center for Civic Engagement maintains partnerships with many community organizations that provide volunteer placements for Drexel students. Students may also create a self-designed community service project. Recently an intercollegiate task force convened by the Office of the Provost has recommended that the civic engagement component of this course be separated and enhanced to clearly identify for students the importance of community service. To support these activities will be Lindy Center for Civic Engagement was created. The intensified administrative commitment to civic involvement coupled with increased resources creates a situation for continued and expanded success in this area.

**Research, Scholarship & Creative Expression**

Research, Scholarship & Creative Expression is the ability to make meaningful contributions in a chosen field, participating in use-inspired research, scholarship or creative activity as an individual or in a collaborative effort. Students from any field of study and interest and at any level of academic formation at Drexel can work to meet this learning priority.

In aggregate, 80% of respondents indicated that research, scholarship and creative expression was either “essential” or “important.” Interestingly more students, compared with the other groups, rated this as “essential,” followed by full-time faculty. However, less than a third of all constituent groups rated the quality of meeting this learning priority as “excellent.” In comparison with other learning priorities, employers found this to be the least important as did academic administrators. Students viewed this as ninth out of the 11; the same as full-time faculty.

Opportunities abound in academic programs to meet this objective. For example, most undergraduate students complete some type of capstone such as a senior seminar, summative research project, portfolio (creative or e-portfolio), or senior design projects. Most majors have an “independent study” course in which students carry out a research project or work of creative expression. The Pennoni Honors College gives students opportunities to begin experiences in this area early in their academic career through the STAR program. The STAR (Students Tackling Advanced Research) Program matches about 100 students with faculty-mentored research or creative projects in the summer between their first and second years and provides a stipend and free housing for these students (Appendix G-XI. The STAR Program at Drexel University). Many of these students continue these projects throughout their time at Drexel. In addition, Drexel has a number of creative expression outlets, e.g. the anthology 33rd, the student newspaper and many performance opportunities each year. However, much more needs to be done to develop these avenues of creative expression, especially given the expanding opportunities in communication venues.

The University and most colleges sponsor a research poster presentation day. These activities not only provide students with the opportunity to create a product from their creative experiences, but also provide an additional forum for improving oral and written communication skills.

While student involvement in research and creative endeavors has increased over the past ten years, not all students have the opportunity to be involved in these activities either due to limited number of
positions available or lack of funds to support them while pursuing these activities. The Workgroup developed the following insights:

- Additional resources be secured to support student research activities, and
- Expansion of the STAR (Students Tackling Advanced Research) program.

6.0 BRANCH CAMPUS/ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS/OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL SITES

Regardless of the type of expansion from branch campus to additional location to other instructional site to distance education, two characteristics are important to quality assurance: academic fidelity and academic integrity. Academic fidelity is the extent or level to which university leaders have considered, involved, and entrusted the current academic assets to produce the new or expanded educational program offering and had the appropriate shared governance review of the process taken place. Assessing academic fidelity calls for a review of the extent to which the university has included its academic assets into the makeup of the newly offered educational service. Academic integrity is the level of consistency and quality of the new or expanded program offering with the college’s historical “main campus” offering. Academic integrity exists when the educational program offering is truly equivalent to the quality and standards of the institution.

Drexel University has had relatively few expansion initiatives. There are no “branch campuses” according to the MSCHE definition. For the purposes of this section of the Self-Study the Hahnemann Center City Campus and the Medical College’s Queen Lane Campus will not be discussed, since they are part of the core of the University although they are additional locations. Other additional locations are described as follows.

Drexel began offering undergraduate degree completion programs at Burlington County College in Mount Laurel, NJ in 2006. This has been approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Education and the New Jersey Department of Education and acknowledged by MSCHE. Drexel University established a strong affiliation with Burlington County College to improve access for a sizeable student body that wished to continue their education in state for a reasonable cost but still gain a bachelor’s degree. “Drexel@BCC” offers upper-division courses leading to the Bachelor of Science degree. After students complete 24 credits of coursework at any regionally accredited college or university they are eligible to apply to Drexel at BCC. Once they have completed all 100- and 200-level courses and any prerequisites required by the intended Drexel major, they may enroll in Drexel courses at BCC to complete their bachelor’s degree. There are nine majors currently offered at BCC: biological sciences, computing engineering, computer science, computing and security technology, construction management, electrical engineering, engineering technology, hospitality management, and mechanical engineering. Students have clear and adequate information on plans of study, academic advising, academic resources and library resources. They participate in many main campus activities, e.g. University Research Day. To date almost 200 students have completed a degree through this location. There are currently approximately 350 of students studying in the BCC program over the lifetime of the program. Drexel and Burlington County College officials expect this affiliation to continue and grow.
The Sacramento Center for Graduate Studies (Sacramento CA) began offering courses in January 2009 and graduated its first students in June 2011. The rationale for opening a graduate center stems from the opportunity to increase recognition of Drexel for future undergraduate programs in Sacramento and Philadelphia, and the intense interest by local economic developers in the Sacramento area to “bring Drexel to the West Coast.” Sacramento offers master’s degrees in business administration, finance, human resources development, higher education, and an executive program in public health. There is a special master’s certificate in interdisciplinary medical science. A doctoral degree in educational leadership and management starts in fall 2011. The Center has an appointed Dean and close liaison to the academic majors and colleges. Currently there are over 300 students enrolled at the Sacramento Center for Graduate Studies.

The LeBow College of Business offers an MBA in an accelerated, evening format at an “additional location” in Malvern, Pennsylvania. This MBA is a cohorted, 24-month evening program combining on-campus and online classes. The program is geared toward the working professional who is proficient in team working environments, and wants to complete their MBA in a set timeline. The MBA program integrates leadership and ethics, technology management and industry perspectives with valuable co-curricular skills-building program. The average work experience of students is eight years. The average age of the student is 30. The rationale for offering the program is to give business professionals - who are at a relatively far distance from where they lived or worked - access to the Drexel MBA.

The Goodwin College of Professional Studies School of Education offers the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership and Management degree program in a blended format. This was moved from an instructional site to an additional location in Harrisburg, PA in 2011 to achieve more flexibility in the delivery of this program. In order to advance opportunities and increase on-site content Drexel may expand its offerings at this site.

During the last ten years, Drexel University has had several “other instructional sites” defined by MSCHE as “a location, other than a branch campus or additional locations, at which the institution offers one or more courses for credit.” These sites have expanded or contracted according to the needs and strategic plan of a college or program. The Goodwin College of Professional Studies has had the most involvement with these sites, given their role in meeting the needs of the adult continuing education student and select industries, such as construction management and communication and applied technology.

Each of these programs was developed by full time faculty from the main campus. Importantly, these programs not only receive continual oversight from the main campus, but also instruction by full time faculty who also teach at the main campus. This close integration allows the maintenance of the integrity and fidelity of these programs.

In summary, Drexel University has begun activity in the area of establishing additional locations and other instructional sites. However, it is expected these activities will grow in the coming years so it is incumbent upon the University to conduct rigorous evaluations of the academic integrity and fidelity of these sites.
7.0 INTERDISCIPLINARY LEARNING & PROJECTS

The Boyer Commission report (1998) challenged American universities to "remove barriers to interdisciplinary education." Interdisciplinary education is recognized today among higher education leaders as a way to interest students in thinking about problems that cut across the often arbitrary boundaries that structure the university research and teaching enterprise. Breaking these boundaries requires both pedagogical and administrative creativity. Drexel University has moved diligently towards the creation and implementation of new interdisciplinary programs, as well as working to foster a culture of interdisciplinarity within existing departments and colleges.

In 2000 Drexel created the Great Works Symposium. Housed in the Pennoni Honors College, the Great Works Symposium is an interdisciplinary course focused on exploring subjects of the broadest possible interest and greatest societal impact and designed to bring Drexel University students, teachers, and visiting expert lecturers into collaboration. The Great Works Symposium strives to avoid the "textbook approach," with an emphasis on developing in students the active skills of interdisciplinary inquiry: reading, writing, critical thinking, methodological creativity, and argument. Through an intense examination of one topic, students are encouraged to see the University as an interconnected enterprise, and to imagine the University as one part of a larger spectrum of scholars in the communities of the city, the nation, and the world. Recent year-long themes have included Democracy, Health and Society, Energy, and The City.

The College of Arts and Sciences houses a Center for Interdisciplinary Programs. The Center for Interdisciplinary Programs provides a collaborative and administrative structure for five academic programs—International Area Studies, Africana Studies, Greek Studies, Judaic Studies, and Women's Studies. The Center's primary aim is to maintain and develop the mission of each program while also encouraging shared interests across these disciplines and within the College. Students from all colleges participate in and complete minors in these programs.

In 2010 the College of Engineering launched The Bachelor of Science in Engineering (BSE), a degree program for those high ability students seeking flexibility and customizability. In consultation with an academic advisor, each student develops a curriculum plan tailored to his or her individual interests. The flexibility inherent in the program allows students to obtain a broad, interdisciplinary education that is rooted in engineering. The curriculum combines a fundamental overview of engineering with other areas of emphasis, which may include studies in business, medicine, law, or even an engineering program in depth in a cross-disciplinary field that is motivated by the student's interest.

In 2011 Drexel launched a Custom-Designed Major. This program, consistent with other individualized major programs across the nation, is built on the notion that students should have the opportunity to develop programs of study that cut across disciplinary boundaries. With close mentorship, students in this program will pursue majors that are by design interdisciplinary and are strongly focused on skills acquisition in critical thinking and research.
In 2011 the Pennoni Honors College initiated a Center for Interdisciplinary Inquiry that administers the Custom-Designed Major and the Great Works Symposium. Strategically, the Center will work to pilot interdisciplinary courses that individual colleges will then be able to implement into their more individualized curricula.

To continue to emphasize and promote interdisciplinary learning in the future, the Workgroup developed the following insights:

- Enhance undergraduate exposure to the Great Works Symposium or similar program that enables University-wide interdisciplinary inquiry
- Establish a mechanism to support development of interdisciplinary courses in the university

8.0 ONLINE LEARNING

Drexel University embraced online education in 1996, when it became one of the SLOAN-Consortium (SLOAN-C) founding institutions. SLOAN-C, an institutional and professional leadership organization, is dedicated to integrating online education into the mainstream of higher education. In 1996, the University, under the leadership of the late President Constantine Papadakis, was awarded a grant by SLOAN-C to build an online degree program based on what developed as the SLOAN-C Five Pillars of Quality Online Education.

In 2001, President Papadakis proposed and the Board of Trustees approved, establishing a new wholly-owned for-profit subsidiary called Drexel eLearning (DeL) to operate the marketing arm for today’s Drexel University Online. Its goal is to attract qualified student candidates and assist them in the application process. Del. itself does not teach or set curriculum or accept students. It is the responsibility of the University’s Office of Enrollment Management to decide who is admitted, using the same criteria applied to all other Drexel students. Drexel’s colleges and schools are responsible for developing, updating and offering the necessary courses online.

Since 2001, Drexel University has grown from under five online degree programs, to offering over 100 Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees and Certificates in disciplines including: education, engineering, engineering technology, information systems, nursing, health services, health informatics, clinical research, computer science, library science, game-based learning, psychology, communications, criminal justice, human resource development, sports management, project management, property management, construction management, hospitality management, business, including the MBA (Appendix G-XII. Online Programs and Enrollments). Drexel University enrollments have grown to roughly 7,000 students in 2010 from all 50 states (plus DC and Puerto Rico) and in multiple countries.

Drexel University also reaches students online through its robust channel partner program, which currently encompasses over 300 corporations, health systems, school districts and professional associations to market to the working professional.

Evaluation Process
In 2009, Drexel's Provost established an Online Learning Council (OLC) to provide recommendations on best practices to quantitatively and qualitatively assess four specific areas impacting online learning: student retention, quality of course delivery and instruction, scalability of online programs, and student support services for online students. A senior level faculty member and an expert in online education were chosen to lead the OLC effort to implement the recommendations and activities designed to improve the quality of the online learning experience, the persistence of online learners, the services available to online students, and to look at ways of increasing the economies and scalability of online programs.

Currently, the OLC is comprised of over 80 university-wide administrators, faculty, staff and technical support personnel meeting monthly to address academic and administrative issues surrounding the online learning environment within Drexel University. The OLC is organized to 1) determine ways to retain our online students and improve their persistence, 2) determine minimal standards for course quality and richness, 3) develop plans for assessing and evaluating online learning outcomes, 4) identify support services required by online students and develop them accordingly, and 5) identify new initiatives that will strengthen and improve the quality of our programs and expand services to our online community.

To accomplish these goals, the following sub-committees were formed 1) Quality Subcommittee: focusing on the quality of the overall learning environment; 2) Quality Matters Subcommittee: focusing on the development of a Drexel University version of quality core design elements for online courses, 3) Student Services Subcommittee: focusing on improving and centralizing online student services, 4) Scalability Subcommittee: focusing on improvement of the scalability of online programs and courses and developing efficiencies of scale of online programs and courses, 5) Retention Subcommittee: focusing on identifying and addressing factors influencing student retention and 6) Accessibility Committee: focusing on development of Accessibility Guidelines and Checklist as well as increasing awareness of accessibility issues among the Drexel University community.

The Quality Matters Subcommittee is developing rubrics to examine online faculty courses. Over 30 faculty and instructional support staff have been trained to review online courses to determine if courses are constructed and organized effectively to optimize learning. Ten faculty members have been trained as master reviewers and have reviewed several courses from other institutions for quality organization and existence of key elements.

The Scalability committee is collecting methods and techniques used both at Drexel and elsewhere to facilitate scaling online courses and accommodating additional students while maintaining quality and engagement.

The Student Support Services subcommittee has created a one-stop-shop site for online students to find answers to all their questions and help with all of their needs. This site gives online students one place to find help with tutoring, billing, or anything they may require. Initial online student response has been very positive, and the site will grow and evolve over time.
Accessibility has become an important focus for the OLC as higher education is increasingly expected to meet the needs of all students. The committee is developing Accessibility Guidelines and Checklists. To increase awareness of accessibility issues among the Drexel University community, the committee will sponsor several workshops this summer showing faculty how to design web-based materials which are in compliance with ADA standards and improve the student experience for all students. Tips and tricks will be posted online helping us all to implement Universal Design in the creation of quality digital materials for students.

Drexel continues to take a proactive approach to implement the SLOAN-C Five Pillar areas. In fact, a key recommendation by the OLC was the integration of all Five Pillars and adhering to those pillars to ensure university-wide compliance in order to enhance the quality of the student academic experience at Drexel University with approaches and tools that support assessment and continuous improvement in student learning.

Promotion and Recognition

More recently, Drexel University has recognized university officials, academic leaders, government representatives, and US military personnel who contribute to and enhance the field of distance learning and online teaching. For the past four years, Drexel University has recognized and rewarded outstanding online faculty and leaders who have made an impact in the field of distance learning both locally and nationally. National Distance Learning Week (NDLW) was created by Drexel University in 2007 and is now sponsored by the United States Distance Learning Association (USDLA). This annual initiative seeks to promote and celebrate the tremendous growth and accomplishments occurring today in distance learning programs offered in K-12 education, higher education, military and governmental departments.

In addition, external recognition of Drexel University’s online degree programs is numerous. Drexel’s MBA program is ranked among the best 25 Online MBA programs by the US News & World Report, and an MS program in library and information science ranked among the Top 10 nationally by US News & World Report (May 2010), with the specialization in Information Systems ranked #1.

Three online Nurse Practitioner Programs had a 100% national certification pass rate in 2010. These programs share the same 100% certification pass rate results as the traditional in-person nurse practitioner programs. The three online Nurse Practitioner Programs with 100% pass rates are Acute Nurse Practitioner, Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner, and Women’s Health Nurse Practitioner.

It should be noted that the three online nurse practitioner programs also require students to attend clinical simulation residency weeks once per quarter in addition to the clinical requirements. Students take the same objective exams as in-person practitioner students and tests are proctored via a remote proctor system. Students learn via a combination of synchronous and asynchronous approaches.

Additionally, Drexel University was the recipient of the 2010 Sloan-Consortium Award for Excellence in Institution-Wide Online Education. The excellence award recognizes an institution that has designed and implemented an outstanding and comprehensive online learning curriculum. Selection of the award
winner is done by a committee comprised of individuals from peer institutions of online learning. Drexel University's adherence and adoption of the Sloan-C pillars, along with its innovative outreach to students has resulted in a successful model of online learning often cited by its peer institutions.

To continue to inform, influence, and enhance learning that is taking place online, in face-to-face and hybrid/blended classes, the Workgroup developed the following insights:

- Expand the faculty development and quality control aspects of the online learning enterprise.
- Examine student evaluation methods in online courses.
- Offer robust in-person and online training for faculty who teach online, as they need ongoing exposure to best-practices in this ever-changing pedagogy.
- Continue to explore online platforms and pedagogies to maximize student engagement.
- Utilize lessons learned in developing pedagogy in the online learning experience for hybrid and face-to-face courses.

9.0 ADVISING AND LEARNING SUPPORT

Advising at Drexel encompasses academic program advising, co-op/career advising, and non-academic advising. The majority of academic advising takes place in the appropriate college, school, or academic program. Career and cooperative education advising take place in the Steinbright Career Development Center (SCDC). Non-academic advising is carried out by the Office of Student Life.

Colleges and schools have adopted advising models using full-time, professional advisors and faculty to complement the academic structures and offerings of the particular academic unit. Advising structures have been created to address the needs of a range of student cohorts including undergraduate and graduate on-campus students, online students, and students at off-campus sites.

The Office of Academic Advising, Retention, and Diversity (AARD) in the Office of the Provost provides central office support to undergraduate advising managers. The goal of the AARD is to promote student performance, progress, and graduation supported by the use of assessment data, survey findings, student record audits, and the support of high impact practices. Through this structure students are supported locally in their college, or school, and through the SCDC. The AARD supports these efforts by coordinating the implementation of advising policies and procedures and by guiding best practices in advising. One challenge facing the AARD is how to best support the transition from transactional advising (e.g., focused on easing transactions like registering for the right classes) to a developmental model (e.g., working with students to help them achieve learning goals). AARD has accomplished much against this goal by working closely with advisors to use assessment data and align their work to the Drexel Student Learning Priorities. While graduate advising is somewhat more college- or school-based, the Office of Graduate Studies provides support for policy and procedures and coordinates advising across units.

Learning support is provided to students through tutoring resources offered by departments and through the Drexel Learning Center. Most tutoring is focused on helping students in their freshman year. Skills to be developed are identified by monitoring student progress through audits during the quarter.
and from interactions with advisors. As subpopulations of students in need of academic support are identified, plans are developed to obtain successful outcomes including facilitation of access to academic/department-based resources and appropriate mediating services (i.e., counseling, disability accommodation).

10. INTEGRATION OF NEW ACADEMIC UNITS

The incorporation of new academic units within Drexel through the merger with MCP/Hahnemann University and the opening of the Earle Mack School of Law have clearly increased the comprehensiveness of the University. An underlying goal of the increased breadth of the University is to increase connections in research and in education. Cutting-edge research typically involves faculty working across disciplines, and the availability of expertise in related disciplines provides a strong advantage for research advances through collaboration. Similarly, the educational vision at Drexel is to have students model and engage in cross-disciplinary thought and work in the classroom, laboratory, or studio. Notably, cross-disciplinary practice may be even more apparent to students in a co-op experience. Increased breadth of thought has become an intentional aspect of new program creation.

The School of Biomedical Engineering, Science, and Health Systems (Biomed) grew out of the Biomedical Engineering program offered out of the Department of Electrical Engineering. Biomed was conceived as an interdisciplinary school and was a precursor to this interdisciplinary model at Drexel and as such the Biomed has served as a model for research and educational innovation. In recent years, cross-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary academic programs have either begun or been enhanced by the existence of these new units and the faculty expertise residing therein. Examples of academic initiatives that have benefitted from cross-college interaction include Neuroscience/Neuroengineering, Healthcare Informatics, Public Policy, Public Health, and Environmental Studies. Moving forward, it is expected that centers or institutes will house some of these and other interdisciplinary programs. In addition, accelerated programs (e.g., BS/MS) have taken advantage of cross-unit programs. Clearly, the presence of the College of Medicine has increased the ranks of undergraduate students directed towards medicine and the School of Law has increased enrollments in majors that prepare students for law.

11.0 CONCLUSIONS AND INSIGHTS FOR THE FUTURE

As the data indicates, Drexel University students learn best through a creative integration of three key educational practices: i) rigorous grounding in core intellectual and practical skills as well as experiential and applied learning competencies; ii) integration of experiential learning across the curriculum and throughout the degree from freshman year to graduation; and iii) establishment of a prevailing civic and global engagement culture.

Core intellectual skills are those most closely associated with the mastery of subject-area specialties, and include: critical reading and textual analysis, critical reasoning and argument, logic, numeracy and technical analysis, scientific literacy, and writing across multiple disciplines and in variable genres. Experiential learning goals are those most associated with success in settings outside of the traditional lecture, including: cultural awareness, ethics, public speaking, project design, group organization,
leadership, entrepreneurship, and creativity in problem-solving. These core intellectual skills and experiential learning goals are reflected in the Drexel Student Learning Priorities.

The Drexel education experience is still aligned closely to the University mission. Faculty members, across the university, continue to bring state-of-the-art knowledge, skills, research experience, experiential learning expertise, international experience, a global outlook, interdisciplinary backgrounds, pedagogical expertise, and curricular innovations to Drexel students. For the ninth consecutive year, Drexel has been ranked in the category of Best National Universities in "America's Best Colleges" by U.S. News & World Report.

Drexel is ranked sixth among national universities in the U.S. News list of "Up-and-Comers," those schools most often cited by university administrators nationwide as making "the most promising and innovative changes in the areas of academics, faculty, student life, campus, or facilities." Drexel offers a practical, experiential education coupled with innovative and technological advances to create a unique educational experience for its students. True to its experiential roots, Drexel believes that learning is not only about theory; it is about practice as well.

We believe that the future of Drexel University hinges on the ability of its administrative leadership and faculty to successfully integrate experiential learning creatively across the curriculum and throughout a student's degree program. Experiential learning must not be separate from a student's curriculum and must not serve only a narrow career track. Rather, building on the University's strong "learning-by-doing" culture—best evidenced by the longevity and success of the co-op—we suggest experimentation with several augmentations and alternatives to co-op that would allow students to learn-by-doing at research sites, through service learning, and through travel-integrated courses and study abroad experiences. Online courses or seminars should be offered while students are on co-op to connect the work experience with academic content—truly supporting experiential and applied learning. Academic departments must creatively partner with industry to transform the co-op experience—both in terms of obtaining feedback on what competencies will be needed for the future as well as working together to solve problems and address opportunities in their respective fields.

We propose a bold and innovative strategy to help shape the future of Drexel University by implementing a model of education focused on the achievement of a relevant, practical education, global citizenship skills, an interdisciplinary mindset, a thirst for knowledge, as well as a recognition system for innovations in and dedication to teaching. We can create and offer a quality education by pioneering a set of shared experiences that are uniquely Drexel.

We propose that each Drexel undergraduate complete a rigorous core curriculum. Through exposure to cross-disciplinary courses and global experiences, the Drexel graduate will also be an intentional learner, by which he/she formulates systematic inquiry and masterfully identifies and uses information, communication, and critical thinking to create new insights and knowledge for practical solutions. By establishing a core curricular experience in Global Citizenship, we will turn our university's focus outward. Drexel can establish itself as a transformative force for 1) positive change in a world challenged by multiple, simultaneous crises 2) redefine what it means to be part of the Drexel family -
unite our students and emerging alumni in common purpose and 3) move towards realizing President Fry's vision of Drexel becoming a top-flight global, community-aware university.
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1.0 STANDARD

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.

2.0 OVERVIEW

As Drexel University proceeds with its self-study in support of Drexel University's decennial Middle States reaffirmation of accreditation, the University is also engaged in an institutional strategic planning cycle and in the master planning for campus's physical environments. This fortuitous circumstance has supported a growing energy and focus on learning assessment as evidenced by its inclusion in both the current and the 2012-2017 strategic planning processes.

Teaching and learning are at the heart of Drexel University's mission and the quality of our teaching and learning is widely considered to be a key driver of the University's success. However, such quality is not always easy to identify and its impact on student performance is difficult to measure accurately. Therefore, a focused effort has been undertaken to better understand these activities and how they affect student achievement within courses, across degree programs, and at the University as a whole. To that end, Drexel University has embarked on a renewed and comprehensive institution-wide program for assessing student learning and evaluating those environments that support student academic achievement. These activities are outlined in Appendix H-1. The Drexel University Assessment of Student Learning Plan.

Several programs and units have been identified as models for growing the culture of assessment across the University: they have clearly articulated goals, have gathered evidence, and have used that evidence to inform improvements. For example, the LeBow College of Business has over five years of well-documented use of learning data to inform educational improvements – the College of Nursing and Health Professions also has a long history of learning assessment successes. While most of these best practices across campus are found in programs with specialized accreditations, there are also well-developed assessment efforts in the Steinbright Career Development Center, the Office of Student Life, the Office of Academic Advising, Retention and Diversity, and elsewhere.

In addition, innovative new technologies are being designed and implemented at the University to support student learning, curriculum design and integration, and instructional delivery. Although important, these technologies can function only in support of initiatives that come from the University community. Thus, it is critical that faculty and administrators across the University are participating in conversations and projects to better understand student learning more clearly, develop discipline-appropriate methods to measure and think about student learning, and to create processes to help better use learning data to make meaningful decisions. All these efforts point to a high-level of creative engagement in the development of a sustainable culture of evidence-based learning enhancement at Drexel University.
2.1 Guiding Principles

The University Committee on Learning Assessment adopted the Middle States general principles on learning assessment while developing its own set of guidelines specifically addressing assessment and quality improvement at Drexel University. These principles, listed below, have guided the implementation of learning assessment at the University.

**MSCHE Principles**¹

- **USEFUL** assessment processes help faculty and staff make appropriate decisions about improving programs and services, developing goals and plans, and making resource allocations;
- **COST-EFFECTIVE** assessment processes yield dividends that justify the institution’s investment in them, particularly in terms of faculty and staff time;
- **REASONABLY ACCURATE AND TRUTHFUL** assessment processes yield results that can be used with confidence to make appropriate decisions;
- **PLANNED** assessment processes that are purposefully linked to institutional goals promote attention to those goals and plans and ensure that disappointing outcomes are appropriately addressed; and
- **ORGANIZED, SYSTEMATIZED, AND SUSTAINED** assessment processes are ongoing, not once-and-done.

**Drexel University Principles**

- **FACULTY-DRIVEN** assessment processes form the core of learning assessment, taking advantage of the unique role of the instructor in the learning process (both to understand learning, and identify the best ways to use assessment results to improve learning);
- **METHODOLOGICALLY DIVERSE** assessment processes support better understanding of student learning and respect the unique contributions to student learning across disciplines;
- **FACULTY-LED** assessment underscores that the responsibility for developing, conducting and evaluating learning assessments sits with the faculty and unit/school/college leadership—supported and coordinated (as appropriate) by central administration;
- **TARGETED** efforts to create and implement a manageable set of full-circle assessment projects helps focus resources and better support assessment;
- **STUDENT-CENTERED** assessment seeks to gain from student input into processes and encourages them to use learning data to manage their own education; and
- **BALANCED** assessment attends to progress toward programmatic goals and the need to assess individual, diverse, and unpredictable forms of excellence.

2.2 Institution-Level Assessment

The initial stage in the development of a system of University-wide learning assessment was to identify those student learning goals that are relevant and important across the institution. The subsequent action was to determine the extent to which University activities support students in achieving those goals. This level of assessment is coordinated through the Office of the Provost by the Vice Provost for Institutional Research, Assessment, and Effectiveness and the University Committee on Learning Assessment.

Assessment (UCA) (see Appendix H-II. Membership of the University Committee on Learning Assessment and Appendix H-III Charge of the University Committee on Learning Assessment).

2.2.1 Drexel University Student Learning Priorities

Through a collaborative process involving stakeholders from across the institution, a set of Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) have been identified. The DSLPs consist of six core intellectual and practical skills and five experiential and applied learning goals (see Appendix H-IV. The Drexel Student Learning Priorities). The DSLPs are aligned to the University mission and both the current and the 2012-2017 strategic plans.

To set and communicate institutional student learning outcomes is never easy given the number of different constituencies that comprise the university. However, it is far more difficult when the institution itself is undergoing a period of dynamic change. Drexel University in the past 15 years has been just such an evolving institution—undergoing several major changes, including the addition of a medical school, a college of nursing and health professions, a school of public health and a school of law. Under such circumstances, the definition of what it actually means to be a Drexel graduate has taken time to coalesce.

As the rate of growth leveled off, Drexel began to take stock of its growth and ask that question: What is a Drexel graduate? In some sense, this question was difficult to address prior to 2009—too much was going on and too many changes impacting academic processes were occurring. The question, however, is a vital one to define academic quality—it is not possible to assess and evaluate success if there are no accepted goals against which to measure that success. With the creation of the Drexel University Committee on Learning Assessment, the process of articulating what kinds of students we are graduating at Drexel University was undertaken in 2009-10.

The process took place under the direction of Dr. Craig Bach, Vice Provost for Institutional Research, Assessment, and Effectiveness. Faculty, students, administration, and staff were queried as to the most important learning students should achieve through a Drexel education. From an initial list of 129, eleven common and overarching learning priorities—in effect institutional student learning outcomes—were developed in 2010. The 11 learning priorities are listed below:
Figure 1. The Drexel Student Learning Priorities

**CORE INTELLECTUAL AND PRACTICAL SKILLS**

**COMMUNICATION**
Employ an understanding of audience, purpose and context to communicate effectively in a range of situations using appropriate media

**CREATIVE AND CRITICAL THINKING**
Use divergent thinking (e.g., generation of novel ideas, thinking out of the box, brainstorming) and convergent thinking (e.g., critical thinking, evaluation of ideas, quantitative/qualitative analysis, scientific reasoning) to generate novel and relevant ideas, strategies, approaches, or products

**ETHICAL REASONING**
Assess their own ethical values and the social context of ethical problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to an ethical problem, and consider the consequences of alternative actions

**INFORMATION LITERACY**
Possess the skills and knowledge to access, evaluate and use information effectively, competently, and creatively

**SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING**
Establish goals and monitor progress toward them by developing an awareness of the personal, environmental and task-specific factors that affect attainment of the goals

**TECHNOLOGY USE**
Make appropriate use of technologies to communicate, collaborate, solve problems, make decisions, and conduct research, as well as foster creativity and life-long learning

**EXPERIENTIAL AND APPLIED LEARNING OUTCOMES**

**GLOBAL COMPETENCE**
Engage in, reflect upon, and demonstrate open mindedness toward all issues of diversity at the local, national and international levels

**LEADERSHIP**
Develop a vision, translate that vision into shared goals, and effectively work with others to achieve these goals

**PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE**
Apply knowledge and skills gained from a program of study to the achievement of goals in a work, clinical, or other professional setting

**RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE EXPRESSION**
Make meaningful contributions in their chosen field, participating in use-inspired (e.g., inspired by and applied to real-world problems) research, scholarship or creative activity as an individual or in a collaborative effort

**RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP**
Create and sustain a healthy, engaged, public life
2.2.2 Assessment Frameworks

A working group comprised of faculty members and administrators who work in areas related to each learning priority developed an assessment framework for that priority (see Appendix H-V. DSLP Assessment Frameworks). The first phase of the project involved 1) articulating the learning goal, 2) drafting a rationale for the goal and how it is being approached, 3) developing assessable outcomes aligned to the goals, and 4) validating the goal by developing an annotated list of supporting research, relevant standards, and appropriate assessment instruments. In the second phase, each working group collaborated with the cooperative education team from the Steinbright Career Development Center to define a set of questions for the employer and student co-op surveys (see Appendix H-VI. Co-op Employer and Student Surveys).

2.2.3 Assessment of Learning in Application – Cooperative Education

One of the extraordinary aspects of Drexel University is its cooperative education program, managed by the Steinbright Career Development Center. The co-op experience not only provides students with an opportunity to apply their learning in a professional context related to their program of study, but also allows the institution to gain industry feedback on student performance (e.g., application of their learning in meaningful contexts).

The redevelopment of the co-op student and employer evaluations occurred over a 6-month period beginning in summer 2009. Each college and school collaborated with Steinbright to define a set of questions for the employer and student co-op evaluations to correspond with the launch of the Drexel Student Learning Priorities. Consultations were also held with other key stakeholders including co-op students, the Steinbright Employer Advisory Board, and Steinbright staff who support the co-op program. Through these sessions, 15 questions aligned to the 11 Drexel Student Learning Priorities were developed (see Appendix H-VI. Co-op Employer and Student Evaluations). In addition to the DSLP alignment, Steinbright has been able to continue support of professional accreditation for each college/school through the incorporation of student and employer evaluation questions geared discipline-specific learning. Lastly, Steinbright was able to collaborate with the Drexel Writing Center to develop and implement a 400-word reflective analysis tying the co-op experience to a student’s academic, professional, or personal goal. This analysis affords students the opportunity to better articulate the value gained from the co-op experience. It can also be added to a student’s Writing Portfolio for future use and reflection.

The evaluations are administered at the end of each co-op cycle and provide students with an opportunity to assess their own achievement of the learning priorities. Employers also directly assess student performance of the learning priorities as observed during the co-op experience. Thus, the University is able to gain both indirect and direct assessments of various learning priorities through this method. Currently, the University has completed two co-op cycles with the new evaluations. Data for the next cycle will be available during the summer term (June, 2012).

Along with the evaluation instruments, co-op reporting procedures were also updated. Historically, these college- and school-level reports were distributed to Deans and a few other stakeholders, but
their use was limited. The new reporting system distributes the results of the survey to a more appropriate range of assessment liaisons for each college and school and supports assessment at the program level. These procedural improvements have provided faculty and administrators with greater insight about student achievement of the DSLPs within specific programs. Moreover, the automation of this process through electronic distribution has also reduced the reporting timeline from six months to three months after the completion of a co-op cycle. Additionally, the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Effectiveness has distributed institution- and college-wide reports on student achievement of the DSLPs as indicated by analysis of the co-op evaluations. Use of the student learning insights gleaned from the co-op evaluations is being documented.

2.2.4 Institutional Surveys

In addition to the co-op evaluations, the University regularly conducts four other surveys: The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) freshman survey, and two internally-developed surveys, a Senior Exit Survey and a Student Self-Assessment Survey (SSA). The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Effectiveness developed a crosswalk that aligns questions on each of the surveys to the DSLPs (see Appendix H-VII, Survey Crosswalk to DSLPs) and has completed and distributed reports for each of these surveys organized around the student learning priorities. As with the co-op surveys, use of these reports is being documented in TracDat to determine the breadth and quality of use of these evaluations.

2.2.5 Drexel Student Learning Priorities Assessment Schedule

The University Committee on Learning Assessment has developed a five-year schedule for the planning, communication, and assessment of the Drexel Student Learning Priorities.

Figure 2. Drexel Student Learning Priorities Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>YEAR 6</th>
<th>YEAR 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>CREATIVELY CRITICAL THINKING</td>
<td>GLOBAL COMPETENCE</td>
<td>ETHICAL REASONING</td>
<td>RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE EXPRESSION</td>
<td>INFORMATION LITERACY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGY USE</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MSCHE Decennial Reaffirmation of Accreditation
The framework for each follows a three-year planning-to-assessment cycle:

- Year 1: Planning and Communication
- Year 2: Implementation and Assessment
- Year 3: Use of Assessment Data, Review Processes

The "Communication" and "Responsible Citizenship" learning priorities have been selected for institutional focus in the current year. While the Communication learning priority already has a robust assessment plan for written communication in place, work on the Responsible Citizenship priority is just beginning and is aligned with the new president’s stated goal of making Drexel University the most civically-engaged university in the country; however, the Communication learning priority already has a robust assessment plan for written communication in place. Work on the other nine learning priorities is proceeding through their associated working groups and identified main stakeholders.

2.2.6 Assessing the Communication DSLP: Writing Across the Curriculum

In 2009, a Director of the Drexel Writing Center and Writing Assessment was hired and charged with integrating assessment more fully into the work of the University Writing Program (see Appendix H-VII, Overview of the Writing Program). To assess and improve Drexel student writing abilities, the Director of Writing Assessment — in collaboration with the Freshman Writing Program (FWP) and several colleges and schools — has developed a portfolio-based writing approach and assessment plan (see Appendix H-IX, A Plan for the Assessment of Writing and Appendix H-X, The University Writing Task Force). The plan assumes that skills identified in the University-wide writing student learning outcomes (SLOS) are introduced at the developmental "novice" level in freshman year and reinforced through in departments and programs, leading students closer to the "professional" end of the developmental continuum by graduation.

The Writing Portfolio Assessment Plan has five main components:

- Development of University-Wide student writing outcomes and associated rubrics;
- First-year writing portfolios that introduce students to the outcomes and document progress toward meeting these goals in the FWP;
- Co-op reflections; and
- Analysis at the Department and University level of progress toward meeting SLOs at the department and University levels.

In their first year, students take a yearlong sequence of writing courses designed to help them meet the University-Wide Writing SLOs at the novice level. Students are introduced to writing as a tool for learning (e.g., critical thinking) and discipline-based communication and begin to create the writing portfolios they will build throughout their programs of study. The portfolios provide a vehicle through which students can develop reflection skills, learn to use writing rubrics to guide and evaluate their writing, build their own writing rubrics, and write reflectively about their own writing. The first-round analysis of a pre-/post-writing assessment plan implemented in the 2010-2011 school year
demonstrates that student writing abilities in several areas improved over the first-year writing program (see Appendix H-XI, Freshman Writing Program Assessment Report).

After the first year, students are expected to move from novice toward professional on the writing continuum reflected in the SLOs. Students enrolled in a co-op program include their co-op reflections to show their progress the SLOs through their work experience.

The early success of the writing portfolio project led the Provost to seat and charge a Portfolio Taskforce that will oversee the development and implementation of a University-wide portfolio plan that will eventually allow students to document their progress toward achieving all the DSLPs.

2.3 Program/Unit-Level Assessment

The goals of learning assessment at the program and unit levels are 1) to provide tools, resources and training to support each program in the development of a clear set of learning outcomes aligned with the DSLPs, and 2) to support each unit's creation and implementation of an associated continuous quality improvement (CQI) plan. In the Fall of 2010, the University Committee on Learning Assessment developed a set of assessment goals (see Appendix H-XII, Program Learning Assessment Goals) as a first step in the development of CQI plans and procedures. These goals provide a core framework that every program on campus needs to implement by the Spring of 2012.

To support achievement of these goals, an assessment coordinator has been identified for each college, school, and appropriate unit. The assessment coordinators represent their respective units on the University Committee on Learning Assessment (UCA) and they are responsible for directing and communicating the assessment efforts of their units to the committee. The UCA provides a forum to ensure clear, consistent communication among all programs and units in order to articulate and update an ongoing assessment narrative at the institution.

Some programs, particularly those that undergo specialized program accreditation, are far along in the development of their efforts to use assessment to improve program quality; other programs have only just begun the process of identifying outcomes. The Office for Institutional Research, Assessment, and Effectiveness (OIRAE) and the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence (DCAE) have organized three resource teams - an outcomes development team, a data usage team, and an assessment methods team - comprised of faculty from across the University who have been successful in implementing program assessment and learning enhancement. These individuals provide peer resources to support other programs that are initiating their processes.

2.4 Course-Level Assessment

The goals of the CQI plan at the course level are to support faculty in their efforts to understand student learning more fully and to help them evaluate the efficacy of the activities and support structures they develop and use to lead to that learning. A large part of this effort involves supporting faculty to develop assessment models that are appropriate to their disciplines and interests and that are framed by the articulation of clear learning outcomes. Three main initiatives are underway to support this effort: a Syllabus Framework, the Drexel EduApps Portal, and the Quality Matters™ program.
The Syllabus Template

To support institutional assessment goals, help faculty improve outcomes assessment practices in their classrooms, and improve communication of course content to our students, the Office for Institutional Research, Assessment, and Effectiveness in collaboration with the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence developed a syllabus framework in the form of a template (See Appendix H-XIII. The Drexel Learner-Centered Syllabus Template). The template was vetted by associate deans from all of the colleges and schools, as well as by several groups of faculty. The template also was approved by the Faculty Senate and the Deans. Additionally, several workshops have been held to help support the implementation of the new framework. Currently, work is underway to document the level of compliance within each unit to meet the new requirement to use the approved syllabus template in their courses.

Drexel EduApps Portal

The Drexel EduApps Portal currently under development will function as a Web-based clearinghouse for educational applications and resources. Originally envisioned as a method of providing a standard “app” format for instructional ideas, approaches and methodologies to be made available to instructors, it has been expanded to include concept and skill tools for direct student use as well. Thus, the Portal will serve faculty, advisors, administrators, and students by providing simple, easy-to-use, and reliable access to both instructional, operational, and curricular information. For further information on the EduApps Portal project, see Appendix H-XIV. The Drexel EduApps Portal, Appendix H-XV. The Drexel EduApps Portal Proposal, and Appendix H-XVI. The Drexel EduApps Presentation.

The Office of the Provost has charged and seated a task force to lead the development and implementation of the EduApps Portal.

Quality Matters™ Initiative

Drexel University has agreed to participate in the Quality Matters™ (QM) initiative, a program that involves a consortium of over 100 colleges and universities in an effort to establish clear quality criteria for courses, to train evaluators in the use of the rubric that defines these criteria, and to use the tool to improve the quality of courses (see Appendix H-XVII. The Quality Matters Rubric). As of November 2011, 28 Drexel University instructors and administrators have been trained as peer reviewers and eight have been trained as master reviewers. Additionally, five delegates from Drexel will be attending the QM national conference. Thus far, the reviewers have been involved in 27 external course reviews and in the review of one course from Drexel’s College of Nursing. The course received 83 out of 85 points suggesting that the college offers high-quality courses.

The implementation of the QM tool integrates three components: learning assessment goals focused on outcome and rubric development, implementing learning outcomes assessment practices in courses, and using course-level data to improve learning. Additionally, the Online Learning Council, seated by the Provost to provide a point of coordination among Drexel’s online programs, has developed a Core
Design Element Checklist to guide faculty in the development of high-quality courses (see Appendix H­-XVIII. Core Design Element Checklist)

The Online Learning Council has taken the lead in piloting the customized version of the QM and the Core Design Element Checklist quality assurance tools. If successful, and with appropriate changes, the tool will be made available broadly across all course modalities at the University.

2.5 Advising and the Office of Academic Advising, Retention and Diversity

The mission of the Office of Academic Advising, Retention and Diversity (AARD) is to align retention and learning objectives through co-curricular practices that enhance the University’s educational goals, including the DSLPs. The Office makes use of assessment information to develop data-driven strategies that enhance students’ ability to engage in the classroom and achieve learning outcomes by focusing on what are called the Five Pillars of Retention which support learning objectives central to a successful retention strategy:

1. Closing the Preparation Gap
2. Closing the Socio-Economic Gap
3. Creating Institutional Effectiveness
4. Promoting Student Development and Efficacy
5. Promoting Student Engagement

Objectives to enhance student readiness to learn and engage as well as existing best practices have been established for each Pillar and assembled in a matrix to guide project development at both the University and college and school levels. Current data regarding the composition of each entering cohort provided to each college, school, and program include: demographic information like family income, high school GPA, academic index, SAT scores, financial hold analysis and course placements. On a quarterly basis, information about critical performance, progress, and attrition data are provided. Finally, annual persistence and performance reports are distributed to colleges and schools and to key support offices. These quarterly reports — which are informed by findings from survey data, particularly the Student Self Assessment (SSA) and NSSE — frame the dialogue regarding impediments to performance, progress, and persistence, and co-curricular planning.

The Office of Academic Advising, Retention and Diversity also manages a slate of projects within each Pillar which are detailed in a PowerPoint presentation or “Deck” as a standard operating procedure. The Deck includes the problem statement and goal, methodologies and processes, stakeholders, process maps, analysis and outcomes, and future recommendations. A broad base of campus assets from Student Life, Steinbright Career Development Center, Advising, Academic Information Systems, the Office of the Registrar, the Learning Center, the Writing Center and faculty participate in project development, implementation and analysis. The dialogue among these stakeholders in and of itself frames the method by which the University can achieve greater institutional effectiveness in service to shared learning and educational goals.
2.6 Office of Student Life

Formed in 2007, the Student Life Assessment Committee (SLAC) developed a three-year plan to foster a culture of assessment across all departments in Student Life (see Appendix H-XIX. Student Life 2011 Strategic Plan). Toward the end of the three years, in 2009, SLAC assessed the uses of assessment in Student Life and made recommendations to deepen and broaden the uses of assessment across the division. Many of SLAC's recommendations have been incorporated into the Student Life Strategic Plan 2011 – 2014, including the adoption of a new mission statement, “Student Life fosters learning and development” and the objective, “Student Life departments will articulate and measure the means by which they promote optimal student learning and development and use findings to inform practice.” The Strategic Plan is now SLAC’s guiding document and their overarching charge is to support Student Life staff as they accomplish the plan’s goals.

To fulfill the goals and objectives of the plan, each department within Student Life created a Strategic Plan for their area, and those plans are mapped to the division’s plan. Departments report their progress by detailing their contributions to the division’s plan. The reporting structure maps not only the Student Life's goals and objectives but also allows for mapping to the DSLPs.

2.7 Quality Improvement Technologies

The University has sought to identify, evaluate and support a wide range of assessment technologies to help our faculty, administration and staff to understand student learning better and to collect, communicate and use learning data in the most efficient and meaningful ways possible. Accordingly, the University has developed a strategy to support learning assessment through the purchase and implementation of the following technologies:

- Academic Evaluation, Feedback, and Information System (AEFIS) | Assessment, Quality Improvement, and Curricular Support Tools
- TracDat | Documentation and Reporting of Quality Improvement Efforts
- iWebFolio | Web-Based Portfolio Tool
- Qualtrics | Web-Based Survey Tool
- Waypoint Outcomes | Rubric Tool

An outline of these technologies and their respective roles in the University’s plan for learning assessment can be found in Appendix H-XX, Learning Assessment Technologies.

Of particular note, is the AEFIS technology solution (see Appendix H-XXI. The Instructional Decision Support System and Appendix H-XXII. A New Approach to Integrating Assessment, Teaching and Learning). This new knowledge management system for assessment, evaluation and learning enhancement was originally designed by a faculty member in the School of Biomedical Engineering, Science and Health Systems in collaboration with a Drexel graduate and has evolved to become a product of Untra, LLC.

Focused on documenting student learning over time, AEFIS is an integrated web-based assessment and accreditation management solution that provides a centralized reporting platform for storing data and using it to measure the achievement of student learning outcomes across a variety of venues and levels: student, course, sections of a course, program, university-wide, and accreditation standards at the state,
regional and professional levels. Specific dashboards for administrators, faculty, students and alumni allow for a unified, web-based portal for all assessment activity.

Some of the current components that have been designed and implemented at Drexel University include:

1. Course Syllabus Management  
2. Survey Management  
3. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Performance Criteria (PCs) and Rubrics Management  
4. Academic Program Design and Development Management  
5. Direct and Embedded Assessment Measures Management  
6. Meeting Minutes and Accreditation Document Management

The AEFIS Instructional Decision Support System (described in the Appendix H-XXI. The Instructional Decision Support System) allows for the management and administration of course syllabi providing a centralized, interactive repository of all syllabi, current and past, with an ability to attach notes and recommendations based on evaluation and assessment activities depending on course SLOs, Program SLOs and more.

In addition to these technologies, the University has invested in several reporting tools to help support the dissemination, reporting, and use of data (including assessment data). These tools include a data warehouse solution called iStrategy, Microsoft’s SharePoint, and an Oracle reporting technology called Hyperion. Drexel’s Office of Information Resources and Technology (IRT) supports use of these technologies with training, service and implementation support.

### 2.8 Learning and Assessment Support

The Office of the Provost has sponsored a broad range of events and activities to inform members of the Drexel University community about assessment and the role it plays in program improvement and learning enhancement. Provided to encourage faculty members to develop and implement learning assessment in their instruction and to showcase techniques for evaluating and using the data to improve student performance, these activities included a series of webinars; support for conference attendance; a speaker series; and the development of shared resources. The activities and shared resources have come from a range of departments within the Office of the Provost, including the Office for Institutional Research, Assessment, and Effectiveness; the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence; the Office of Academic Advising, Retention and Diversity; and the Online Learning Council.

The University Committee on Learning Assessment has also worked to integrate assessment goals and quality improvement processes more centrally into academic operations and systems. The first efforts are focused on the following:

- Training new faculty so that there is an institution-wide, common understanding of assessment expectations and resources;
- Ensuring that student learning assessment forms a core part of each department’s and college/school’s strategic plan;
• Aligning program and course approval processes with the University's goals for learning assessment;
• Organizing institutional data (including learning assessment data) collection, analysis and distribution to ensure that stakeholders have access to data, e.g., through dashboards and reports;
• Integrating student learning assessment into program review procedures;
• Developing approaches for evaluating assessment data;
• Creating methodologies for using the analysis of various data sets for program improvement and learning enhancement; and
• Discussing ways that learning assessment efforts can be integrated into job descriptions and performance expectations.

The more Drexel University is able to incorporate its assessment and learning priorities into the day-to-day working of the institution, the more likely it will be that current efforts will be sustained.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

Workgroup H was charged to analyze and discuss the manner and degree to which "assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals." In order to structure the group's work, five research questions were developed:

H-1 How well has the institution articulated, communicated and prioritized expected student learning?
H-2 How well are assessment processes measuring student achievement of expected learning outcomes?
H-3 How well are assessment processes informing teaching, learning, planning, and budgeting?
H-4 How effectively does the institution encourage, recognize, and value faculty and staff efforts to assess student learning and to improve their teaching or support of student learning?
H-5 How well does technology support the institution's efforts to assess and understand student learning?

Three data collection efforts were used to answer these questions and thereby to inform the development of Section H of the self-study document:

1. MSCHE Self-Study Survey (see Appendix H-XXII, 2011 MSCHE Self-Study Survey Executive Summary)

The Drexel University Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) Self-Study survey was developed and implemented to inform Drexel's MSCHE Steering Committee and associated working groups in the development of the self-study document. The survey was distributed to the entire Drexel University community and to 317 employers who were selected either because they have a strong record of offering co-op experiences or because they are most likely to hire our students after graduation. Each of the main respondent types (see Rôles in Table 1) received a subgroup of the total set of questions.
2. 2011 Program Assessment Data Collection (see Appendix H-XXIV, MSCHE Data Collection Survey Report)

During the Spring and Summer terms of 2011, the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Effectiveness carried out a data collection effort to determine the current status of learning assessment for each program at the University. The process involved identifying appropriate contacts for each program who responded to a request for data and then completed a follow up survey. Although, the process took over four months and response rates were rather low, the effort prepared the institution to track all of the collected information in a central repository (e.g., TracDat). These data will be made available to the visiting team.

Since the response rate to the survey was relatively low, the survey cannot be relied on as the only measure of Drexel's articulation, communication, and prioritization of expected student learning. Therefore, beginning in Winter 2012, the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Effectiveness has begun to collect data related to this question in a more systematic and complete fashion. Through this, all colleges and schools will be required to document their assessment efforts in TracDat allowing efficient and accurate reporting of the current state of learning assessment across the University. Further, it will serve as a robust repository for collecting evidence of departmental assessment plans, activities, results, and action items.

3. Drexel College of Medicine Technology Survey

The survey was distributed to the Drexel University College of Medicine faculty and administration during the Summer of 2011. The results provide insights into the uses of technologies to support learning assessment.

In addition to these data collection efforts, Working Group H was informed by its members' participation over the past two years on the University Committee on Learning Assessment and by efforts to implement learning assessment within specific departments and colleges as well as across the University.

4.0 RESEARCH QUESTIONS ADDRESSED

Although available data related to the charge to Working Group H is limited, analysis of the existing data suggests some preliminary findings and patterns for each specific question. These results are discussed below.

H-1 How well has the institution articulated, communicated and prioritized expected student learning?

To support institution-wide understanding of the institution's assessment goals and the role they play in our decennial accreditation reaffirmation efforts, the Office of the Provost has developed a comprehensive communication plan. The plan includes a quarterly newsletter, official announcements of activities and events, a series of workshops hosted by the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence, the development of SharePoint sites to coordinate and organize efforts, and two web sites (i.e., an assessment/learning enhancement site and a MSCHE Decennial Site Visit web site). The DSLPs are on
one of these sites and available at www.drexel.edu/provost/dcae/SymposiumLearningPriorities.PDF and on the Drexel One portal, where they are readily available to all faculty and employees. Additionally, the Office of the Provost is working with a graphic designer to develop an iconography, poster series, and a communication plan to inform the Drexel community about the DSLPs. The communication plan will be implemented in the Winter of 2012.

Results of the campus-wide data collection effort described above suggest that the majority of respondents indicated that there is "some" to "quite a bit" of progress in aligning program outcomes to the DSLPs and in identifying outcomes for support courses. As Figure 3 displays, nearly 90% of respondents indicated that all or most course syllabi in their program have statements of expected student learning. Additionally, 36% of respondents indicated that their programs had learning outcomes. Unfortunately, 40% of respondents indicated that no learning outcomes have been developed for their programs. As a result of these findings, an institution-wide effort to insure that all programs meet minimum assessment standards was implemented.

Figure 3. Question 8 from the Spring 2011 Data Collection.

Q8. All courses offered in the program(s) of study have syllabi that contain statements (e.g., outcomes, objectives, competencies, or performance criteria) of expected student learning – N = 54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Choice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well. All syllabi in the program contain statements of expected learning</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well. Most syllabi in the program contain statements of expected learning</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Well. Few syllabi in the program contain statements of expected learning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Progress. No syllabi in the program contain statements of expected learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Question 9 from the Spring 2011 Data Collection

Q9 How efficient is the current process to evaluate progress on the following objective:

All courses offered in the selected program(s) of study have syllabi that contain statements (e.g., outcomes, objectives, competencies, or performance criteria) of expected student learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Choice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Efficient</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Efficient</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have no process in place</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5. Question 20 from the Spring 2011 Data Collection

Q.20 How much progress has your program(s) made in achieving each of the following objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No Progress</th>
<th>Very Little Progress</th>
<th>Some Progress</th>
<th>Quite a Bit of Progress</th>
<th>We are Excelling in this Area</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicate which courses and other educational experiences support each program outcome</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align program outcomes to Drexel's institution-level student learning priorities</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the figure suggests that some progress has been made in creating the expectation that learning outcomes are clearly stated at the course, program, and institution level is being built into the operations of the institution, the goal has not yet been completely achieved.

H-2 How well are assessment processes measuring student achievement of expected learning outcomes?

Institution Level

The level and quality of the assessment of expected learning outcomes is inconsistent across the University and across levels of assessment. At the institutional level, assessment of the Communication DSLP is underway per the implementation schedule and results are already being used to inform changes in the First-Year Writing Program and work on the Responsible Citizenship learning priority got underway in Fall, 2011.

Currently, the Co-op Employer Evaluation of Student Performance provides the best direct evidence of student achievement of the DSLPs, and it is notable that the evidence comes from meaningful career and experiential contexts. The Office for Institutional Research, Assessment, and Effectiveness (OIRAE) is distributing college-level reports on the achievement of the DSLPs based on these surveys and is documenting how these data are used by the colleges and schools within the TracDat system.

Program Level

As with the DSLPs, the quality of assessment of student learning outcomes at the program level is inconsistent across the University. Programs that undergo specific discipline-based or programmatic accreditation are further along in the process than other programs, as are programs in which the disciplinary culture is more accustomed to centralized curricular structures. All programs, however, are using learning assessment data from the Co-op Employer Evaluation to inform curricular, instructional, or budget decisions for their programs. The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and

---

Since the writing of this section, the College of Arts and Sciences and Goodwin College have both hired Assessment Coordinators. Currently, all programs in both colleges have identified and communicated learning outcomes.
Effectiveness is leading the effort to document these assessment efforts in TracDat.

Additionally, seven colleges and schools have implemented the AEFIS learning and assessment technology. Indirect assessment of learning is built into the tool through its integration of course syllabi and data from the required student evaluation instruments: each syllabus lists the outcome for its course, the inclusion of student evaluations in the survey include their opinions of the degree to which they have mastered these outcomes. Data from these surveys are used to inform programmatic changes. The direct assessment of student learning using the AEFIS tool has begun.

A broad view of program-level assessment can be gleaned from the 2011 Program Assessment Data Collection. According to these data, the assessment of student achievement of program outcomes is rated as being achieved at a level of “some progress” by 40% of respondents and “quite a bit of progress” by 38% of respondents (Figure 6). However, some discrepancies were identified between program director feedback on the survey and their ability to provide evidence to support their responses.

**Figure 6.** Question 20 from the Spring 2011 Data Collection

**Q.20 How much progress has your program(s) made in achieving each of the following objectives:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No Progress</th>
<th>Very Little Progress</th>
<th>Some Progress</th>
<th>Quite a Bit of Progress</th>
<th>We are Excelling in this Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess student achievement of program outcomes using both indirect and</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct methods of assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the practice of assessing of student learning using indirect methods is broadly established across units and levels of assessment. Direct assessment of student learning, however, cannot be consistently documented. While some colleges (e.g., College of Nursing and Health Professions’ simulation evaluation data) have well-established methods of direct assessment of student learning, the use of the co-op survey at both the institution and program level provides the best source of consistent learning assessment data available across the institution and serves as the core activity to move the assessment process forward at the institutional level.

**H-3 How well are assessment processes informing teaching, learning, planning and budgeting?**

This question gets to the heart of whether assessment results are being used to “close the loop” in academic delivery and in planning and allocation of program/department resources. While several of the survey questions are pertinent here, the wording of the questions did not lead the respondents to give us any strong insights on how assessment processes are being used to inform planning and budgeting decisions.

Figure 7 below provides frequencies for responses about the level of collaboration with faculty to use assessment results and the level of documentation and communication of learning assessment data. As with other aspects of learning assessment and enhancement, progress is being made; however, but there is room for considerable improvement.
Figure 7. Question 20 from the Spring 2011 Data Collection

Q.20 How much progress has your program(s) made in achieving each of the following objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No Progress</th>
<th>Very Little Progress</th>
<th>Some Progress</th>
<th>Quite a Bit of Progress</th>
<th>We are Excelling in this Area</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with faculty to use assessment results to inform decisions about the program</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly and transparently document and communicate the use of learning assessment data</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to Question 15 from the 2011 Data Collection indicate that end-of-term student evaluation surveys are being used extensively to maintain and improve the quality of programs: 40% of the 55 respondents reported that the end-of-term student evaluation data are somewhat useful and 45% indicated that they are useful – only 2% noted that the data are useless.

Figure 8. Question 20 from the Spring 2011 Data Collection

Q.15 Please indicate the usefulness of data generated from the end-of-term student evaluation surveys in helping you maintain and improve the quality of your program(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Useless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Useless</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Useful</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A. We don't use them</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General usefulness, of course, is only part of the answer. An additional component is how such data are being used to improve program quality.

The data collection also reveals that there is a broad range of applications of learning assessment data. Figure 9 details these uses.
Figure 9. Question 22 from the Spring 2011 Data Collection

Q. 22  How are learning assessment data being used by the program? If no assessment is currently happening, skip this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Used in/ by</th>
<th>Biomed</th>
<th>CoAS</th>
<th>CNHP</th>
<th>CoE</th>
<th>CoMAD</th>
<th>Earle Mack</th>
<th>SoE</th>
<th>SeoTAPS</th>
<th>Lebow</th>
<th>HSchool</th>
<th>SPH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>Improve admission rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Revision</td>
<td>Course evaluation and program updates/ revisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome measurement of student achievement/course knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refine/modify/revise curriculum content</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty development</td>
<td>Improve teaching methods/methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss grading after student evaluations are reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Identify areas that need improvement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor and assess feedback measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide feedback on academic progress and skill development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assessment</td>
<td>National learning assessment goals alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accreditation usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer and aspirant program assessment comparison</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Engage graduate students in research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, Figure 10 shows a variety of uses for these data. It is clear that administrators and faculty, including program directors, department heads, curriculum committees, assessment committees, and advisors, depending on the organization, review the assessment results. The most common response to this question is that faculty are using assessment data to make course revisions and improvements.
**Figure 10. Question 14 from the Spring 2011 Data Collection**

**Q14.** How are the data used from mid-term and/or end-of-term student evaluation surveys? Skip the question if you do not use them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Used in/by</th>
<th>Biomed</th>
<th>CNHP</th>
<th>CoAS</th>
<th>CoE</th>
<th>CoMAD</th>
<th>Ealey-Mack</th>
<th>SoE</th>
<th>SoTaPS</th>
<th>Ashby</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>SPH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>Annual Reports, Faculty Review and Performance Evaluation/Promotion</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Source of feedback and assessment of student satisfaction (course content and quality of instructor)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Admin</td>
<td>Data Reviewed by Curriculum Committee, Assessment Committee, Program Director, Advisors, Department Head</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Program accreditation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Program directors for marketing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehiring Decisions</td>
<td>Rehiring Decisions and Conversations between faculty member and Program Director</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Statistics are generated, written comments are saved</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty to make revisions/course improvement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty for goal setting and outcome data for our departmental strategic plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying well-designed assessment instruments on a regular schedule that provides sufficient data gives programs and departments valuable information that can be used for the continuous improvement of their teaching and learning. While a pattern of assessment using these instruments is in place across the University and the use of these data is documented, providing faculty and others with the data more quickly and in a more easy-to-consume format would greatly increase data use. Marked progress in this area is anticipated through the implementation of the AEFIS technology along with the TracDat repository approach.

In order to support the use of learning assessment data to inform budget decisions, the Office of the Provost included, for the first time, a new question on the college and school budget worksheets (see Appendix H-XXV. Learning Assessment Question on 2011 Budget Worksheets):
What initiatives or changes has your college undertaken to create a culture of assessment and to determine that learning outcomes are being met and significant learning is taking place? How has attention to learning outcomes informed college budgeting, planning, or decision making processes?

Feedback on this section of the budgeting forms demonstrates a broad use of learning data to support budget requests and inform units about student learning.

H-4 How effectively does the institution encourage, recognize, and value faculty and staff efforts to assess student learning and to improve their teaching or support of student learning?

The engagement of faculty in the assessment process is one of the most important, yet difficult, aspects of implementing a sustainable system of learning assessment in any university, and Drexel University is no different. The University’s approach has been to minimize simple compliance efforts and focus on encouraging faculty to find assessment solutions that are meaningful to them and their disciplines, that is, to link valid assessment approaches directly with student learning enhancement and program quality. This approach is reflected in the guiding principles adopted by the University Committee on Learning Assessment.

Even with these principles in place, the University continues to confront difficult problems related to resourcing, rewarding, and recognizing faculty efforts to assess and improve student learning. To address these problems, Drexel University stakeholders are discussing the best ways to achieve the following goals:

- Operationalize learning assessment so that it is part of our faculty and administrator’s ongoing job activities
- Find meaningful ways to build learning assessment activities into performance and tenure review processes
- Integrate learning assessment into program review process, as well as the review processes of the Faculty Senate
- Provide resource streams (time and budget) to support faculty assessment activities
- Establish methods to provide safe environments in which faculty can explore new pedagogies and assessment methods, and be rewarded and recognized for their efforts
- Document linkages between assessment results and improvements in teaching and learning
- Provide assessment data to faculty and administrators in a timely manner and format that enables them to implement enhancements to courses and programs
- Encourage faculty to integrate learning assessment into their research programs

So far progress on these goals has been limited, but recent hires of assessment officers in several colleges, along with the appointment of a full-time Director of Writing Assessment, point to the University’s commitment to increasing support for these efforts.
H-5 How well does technology support the institution's efforts to assess and understand student learning?

Considering the leadership role that Drexel University has played in the area of technology (e.g., it was one of the first fully wired campuses in the country and the very first campus to require students to own computers), it is to be expected that technology plays a significant role in assessing and understanding student learning at the University. The recurring nature of continuous learning assessment processes also lends itself readily to the use of technology tools or “assessment toolkits” that can improve the efficiency and sustainability of learning assessment processes. Across Drexel University, several technology tools are currently in use to support the institution’s efforts to assess and understand student learning. These are outlined below.

As described earlier, AEFIS (see Appendix H-XXI. The Instructional Decision Support System) is the core assessment technology being used at the University. Several faculty members have been closely involved in the development and direction of AEFIS and in collaborations with Untra, LLC (the owner of AEFIS) that have resulted in several publications, presentations, and funding proposals. The result is that Drexel University is well-positioned to take a leading role in the conceptual foundations and use of assessment technologies.

The AEFIS system was implemented during the 2010/2011 winter term and currently seven colleges/schools use the software: Biomedical Engineering, Engineering, Education, Technology and Professional Studies, Information Science and Technology, Art and Sciences, and Nursing and Health Professions. The College of Arts and Sciences will implement the technology in the Winter 2012 term, followed by most other colleges in subsequent terms. The implementation has resulted in initiatives to organize curricula across these colleges around learning assessment and improved the use and documentation of learning data.

Drexel University also recently purchased the TracDat assessment management software which is being used at the University level as a repository for assessment data. TracDat serves as the repository for all assessment results and documented use of assessment data regardless of the assessment tools and methodologies used by colleges and schools. The University-wide TracDat implementation will occur in the Winter of 2012. Evidence of student learning in myriad forms can be stored in TracDat for linkage to learning outcomes and program goals, facilitating the examination of University-wide assessment methodologies and results.

Other technology tools used for assessing student learning at Drexel include electronic portfolios, electronic surveys, and electronic response systems (clickers). These commercial products provide an organized repository for students to document their work (e.g., papers, presentations, capstone projects and other multimedia projects) and reflect on their learning experiences (e.g., courses, co-ops) as a result of these accomplishments. The LeBow College of Business, the School of Education, and some programs in the College of Nursing and Health Professions use iWebFolio to track and document student learning. Additionally, the First-Year Writing program uses iWebFolio to document and assess student writing.
Technology tools are also employed in the implementation of End-of-Term (EoT) student surveys and faculty course evaluation surveys. In a recent survey conducted by the Office of the Provost, 98% of program directors at Drexel indicated that their programs use EoT student surveys. The technology tools employed for the EoT student surveys include electronic surveys (e.g. Qualtrics, SNAP, SurveyMonkey), Blackboard Survey utility, Scantron sheets distributed in class and graded electronically, and the AEFIS system. One pervasive issue inherent with online survey tools is the perennally low response rates. Efforts to increase the response rates on campus include the following:

1. Strong and consistent initial and follow-up communication with the students from the AEFIS system and program/department administration encouraging them to complete the surveys
2. Providing incentives (e.g., a drawing for an iPad) for students who complete the surveys
3. Monitoring the response rates of the Web-based surveys during each survey period and sending target e-mails to those who have yet to complete the surveys

The Steinbright Career Development Center supports its student and employer evaluation process through SCDConline, an internally designed software product made to support Drexel’s unique co-op program. The tool is integrated with the Banner system and allows co-op personnel to provide one-on-one mentoring using the evaluations for each students going through the co-op experience. Additionally, Student Life uses SharePoint to collect and share progress on its strategic plan. It also uses SharePoint to share data and executive summaries of assessment projects.

Electronic personal response systems (i.e., clickers) have also been used in large classes— including chemistry, physics, and nursing—to assess and enhance student learning. Several faculty members have published on the pedagogical impact of these systems and their research has resulted in the improved use of clickers for formative assessment and for the understanding of in-class learning.

At the Drexel University College of Medicine (DUCOM), a variety of tools are used across the curriculum. For example, all third year written exams except for the in-house surgery exam, are scored electronically by the National Board of Medical Examiners (NBME). The data from these exams enable the DUCOM faculty to determine strengths and weaknesses of their third year courses relative to similar courses across the country. This is accomplished, in part, by an item analysis in which the percent of DUCOM students answering a particular exam question correctly is compared to the response rate of a national cohort. Here are a few examples of other technology tools used at DUCOM to support assessment of student progress:

**Pharmacology:** Student learning is enhanced and assessed by a webkinetic laboratory which offers computer simulation of pharmacokinetics, “webdog” that provides simulation of human toxicological responses to drugs using “Sim-man”. In addition, class reviews are supported by an electronic audience response system. Finally, the course provides on-line self-assessment exams

**Gross Anatomy:** Students can access self-studies through the Blackboard Vista system. Upon completion of each case review, students are given a short assessment that tests comprehension. Each
Medical Physiology: Students are provided an opportunity to work on high fidelity human simulators in the Simulation Laboratory at Drexel University College of Medicine. These simulators are used to simulate human disease and students are asked to draw graphs/curves and design therapeutic treatments. Technology, in this case, facilitates understanding of how basic physiology is incorporated into the “clinical world.” Additionally, students can access and utilize practice exams on Blackboard Vista where they are timed and scored. Faculty can view individual student performance on these exams to determine deficiencies, weaknesses, or strengths. Faculty also use a survey instrument to analyze the effectiveness of small group conferences vs. time spent using high fidelity human simulators.

While a wide range of technology tools for assessing and understanding student learning has been in use for a number of years at Drexel University and at DUCOM, these tools vary from program to program. Recently, the AEFIS system was introduced to unify assessment practices across the university while allowing for customization at various levels of instruction (e.g., program, course, section). Overall, the institution’s efforts to assess and understand student learning are well supported by technology and will become even more so in the future as the AEFIS and TracDat technologies are broadly adopted across the academic community.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND INSIGHTS FOR THE FUTURE

Drexel University has made major strides in its efforts to develop a sustainable and meaningful culture of evidence-based learning and teaching. In particular, research efforts to re-conceptualize how technologies can support learning and teaching provide the University with an opportunity to become an international leader in this field. The publication, presentation, and funding successes of several key faculty in areas focused on learning assessment provide a road map for future efforts. Many of these research efforts have supported the ongoing development and improvement of the AEFIS technology, providing the University with a real-world laboratory to test these conceptual models.

At the institutional level, two major successful efforts should be highlighted. First, the development of the Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) has created a structure within which University stakeholders can engage in an ongoing conversation about student learning in order to enhance our students’ learning and achievement. Second, the assessment of student achievement of the DSLPs through their cooperative education experiences provides Drexel with a unique opportunity to understand student learning as it occurs and is applied in the workplace. The direct assessment of student learning by employers gives Drexel unique insights into student learning in action and provides a foundation for comprehensive research in such learning environments.

While the current level and quality of learning assessment across colleges and schools is uneven, there are several colleges and schools that provide good models for how to organize and prioritize learning assessment. Additionally, across the board, colleges and schools continue to improve the ways they organize themselves to support learning assessment. Recent hires of assessment officers in two of our largest colleges, as well as the repositioning of current positions to focus on learning assessment, speak
to the University’s increased focus on these efforts. The adoption of the AEFIS platform across all colleges and schools and the use of TracDat to document assessment efforts will also help to ensure that learning assessment continues to improve and drives curricular improvements.

At the course level, the University adoption of a checklist of requirements for syllabi (including the listing of expected learning outcomes) is a good foundation for focusing on within-course learning assessment. The Drexel Center for Academic Excellence has supported the syllabus development efforts by holding a series of workshops on developing outcomes, aligning them to the DSLPs, and finding ways to integrate the assessment of outcomes into course content and student evaluation. Additionally, the implementation of AEFIS has sparked a growing focus on both using available data (e.g., EoT Surveys) and on communicating that use across courses. Ultimately, the campus wide use of these tools will enable the University to develop a broad programmatic picture of student learning.

Drexel University has established a strong infrastructure for learning assessment and will continue to develop a robust and sustainable culture of evidenced-based learning enhancement. The goals that have been well articulated by the University Committee on Learning Assessment and the results of faculty research activities in areas related to learning assessment and program improvement provide a foundation for future efforts. The support for learning assessment in the 2012-2017 strategic plan, the creation of new organizational structures to support learning enhancement, the efforts of researchers to both conceptualize and implement new technologies and processes to support learning assessment and augmentation, and the energy that key faculty and administrators have committed to a new vision for higher education, all provide strong evidence that Drexel University continues moving in the right direction in how it understands, assesses, and improves teaching and learning at the University.
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The 2011-2012 Middle States Self-Study has helped to provide the Drexel University community with an opportunity to reflect and evaluate its achievements over the past ten years. The Self-Study effort comes at an opportune time as the institution transitions to a new strategic plan and to the leadership of a new president. The final years of the current strategic plan — The Future is Drexel — serves as a basis for creating a renewed vision towards the future.

President Fry introduced several initiatives that serve as a basis for Drexel’s approach to the future. At the 2010 Convocation, just after his arrival, he announced a plan for community initiatives. Drexel could expand its positive impact in the neighborhoods where Drexel’s main campus is located and where the majority of its students live and work. At his investiture, President Fry announced a new Autism Public Health Research Institute. Soon after, a landmark affiliation with the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia was announced. Beyond Drexel, President Fry’s international trips to China, the United Kingdom, and Israel have resulted in new global partnerships and further recognition of the institution as a global University.

Beginning in 2011, the new strategic plan themes are based on understanding Drexel’s evolution since its founding to the present. The primary focus is to assert Drexel’s promise as a re-envisioned urban comprehensive research university whose actions impact positively not only its local community but regional, national, and global communities as well.

The process of developing the Drexel University Strategic Plan: 2012-2017 has been transparent and engaging for the broad Drexel community. All White Papers, as well as the new Questions for Discussion, are available to all members of the Drexel community for review and comment on the updated Strategic Planning website.
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