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Drexel University – Historical and Current Perspectives

History

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 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, 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. Through co-op, Drexel students are currently employed by more than 1,500 businesses and organizations in 27 states and 25 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 April 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 enjoys 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.

Guided by a renewed mission and a strategic plan launched in 2007 that reaffirms its commitment to education and research, the University has continued on strong academics with cooperative education as a centerpiece of a strategy to 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 2010, 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. On 10 March 2010, John A. Fry was named Drexel’s 14th President. He will take office on 1 August 2010.

Under the leadership of Interim President Pennoni, the senior leadership of Drexel University along with the faculty and staff of the institution have maintained remarkable momentum through the passing of President Papadakis and in the midst of a major national economic downturn. Enrollment has remained steady, co-op job availability has been maintained, and international outreach continues to expand. The University is remarkably stable financially, with faculty and staff receiving merit raises in both 2008 and 2009.

The current organizational chart of reports to Interim President Pennoni is presented in Figure 1.
Drexel’s Mission and Strategic Plan: *The Future is Drexel*

Drexel University’s current Strategic Plan, *The Future is Drexel* is 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, will be replaced in 2013, the year following 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* (Appendix I) 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 Drexel’s heritage, reads 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 have been coordinated between the Strategic Plan and the Campus Master Plan.

Interactions with MSCHE since 2002

Since the 2002 MSCHE Decennial visit and reaffirmation of accreditation in March 2002, several contacts with MCSHE 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 and in Sacramento, CA.

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 schools and colleges, adhering to the same high standards as Drexel’s on-campus programs.

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. 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, over 70 Bachelor of Science degrees have been awarded at Drexel@BCC program over two graduation years.

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 is currently provisionally accredited by the ABA with expectation of full accreditation in 2010.

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.

**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. Appendix II provides maps of Drexel’s Philadelphia campuses encompassing Drexel owned and leased instructional buildings, administrative buildings, research buildings, and other facilities. Two new dormitories were put into service over the last three years: Race Street Residence (2007) and Millenium 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), and Recreation Center (2010). Buildings under construction or renovation include: Constantine Papadakis Integrated Sciences Building (to be occupied in 2011) and URBN Center for the Westphal College of Media Arts and Design at 3501 Market Street (to be occupied in 2012). Buildings under design include: Earle Mack School of Law building expansion and LeBow College of Business Building.
Nature and Scope of the Self Study

Intended Outcomes

The 2011/2012 Middles 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 2013-2018 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 model selected for the self-study is the Comprehensive Report Reordering Standards to Reflect an Institution. A Steering Committee has been seated and charged to oversee the work of eight groups, reflecting the eight groupings of standards. The co-chairs, along with a few other key personnel comprise the Steering Committee.

The working groups are structured as follows:

GROUP A. Mission and Goals (Standard 1)
GROUP B. Planning, Resources and Institutional Assessment (Standards 2, 3, and 7)
GROUP C. Leadership and Governance (Standard 4)
GROUP D. Administration and Integrity (Standards 5 and 6)
GROUP E. Student Enrollment and Support (Standards 8 and 9)
GROUP F. Faculty (Standard 10)
GROUP G. The Educational Experience (Standards 11, 12, and 13)
GROUP H. Learning Outcomes Assessment (Standard 14)
Each working group 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 working group co-chairs will select additional members with input from the Steering Committee, and may as appropriate, identify additional resources and consultants to support and inform the group. As much as possible, the working group reports will be completed in bulleted format (rather than narrative) with minimal formatting along with comprehensive data sets to support the findings.

The Steering Committee

Charge
The Steering Committee is responsible for leading and overseeing the successful and timely completion of the self-study document. This responsibility includes:

1. Determining key issues to be addressed in the self-study
2. Identifying the intended outcomes of the self-study
3. Establishing and charging working groups focused on individual or groups of the MSCHE standards
4. Supporting and coordinating the efforts of the working groups
5. Ensuring the timetable is implemented as planned
6. Communicating with the institution’s stakeholders on a regular basis
7. Arranging for institution-wide and appropriate stakeholder review of self-study findings
8. Overseeing the completion of the self-study, an online (SharePoint) resource room, and any other documents required for a successful self-study visit
9. Representing Drexel University at the self-study visit

Membership

N. John DiNardo  
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Professor, Physics - Steering Committee Co-Chair

Bruce Eisenstein  
Arthur J Rowland Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering - Steering Committee Co-Chair

Gloria Donnelly  
Dean, College of Nursing and Health Professions - Mission and Goals (A), Co-Chair

Peter Lelkes  
Calhoun Chair Professor of Cellular Tissue Engineering, School of Biomedical Engineering, Science and Health Systems - Mission and Goals (A), Co-Chair

James Tucker  
Senior Vice President, Student Life and Administrative Services - Planning and Institutional Assessment (B), Co-Chair

Anthony Curatola  
Joseph F. Ford Professor, Accounting - Planning and Institutional Assessment (B), Co-Chair
Michael Exler  
Vice President and General Counsel - *Leadership and Governance (C), Co-Chair*

Michael Kennedy  
Professor, Health Sciences and Health Administration, and Chair of the Faculty Senate - *Leadership and Governance (C), Co-Chair*

Janice Biros  
Vice Provost for Budget, Planning, and Administration - *Administration and Integrity (D), Co-Chair*

Jacques Catudal  
Associate Professor, English and Philosophy - *Administration and Integrity (D), Co-Chair*

Joan McDonald  
Senior Vice President, Enrollment Management - *Student Enrollment and Support (E), Co-Chair*

Patricia Russell  
Teaching Professor, Mathematics - *Student Enrollment and Support (E), Co-Chair*

Barbara Hornum  
Associate Professor, Culture and Communication and Director, Drexel Center for Academic Excellence - *Faculty (F), Co-Chair*

Bahram Nabet  
Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering - *Faculty (F), Co-Chair*

Donna Murasko  
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences - *The Educational Experience (G), Co-Chair*

Mary Ellen Glasgow  
Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs, College of Nursing and Health Professions - *The Educational Experience (G), Co-Chair*

Craig Bach  
Associate Vice Provost for Curriculum and Assessment - *Learning Assessment (H), Co-Chair*

Donald McEachron  
Senior Lecturer and Associate Director, School of Biomedical Engineering, Science, and Health Systems - *Learning Assessment (H), Co-Chair*

Bernard Lentz  
Vice Provost, Institutional Research, *Member*

Elizabeth Dale  
Senior Vice President, Institutional Advancement, *Member*

Barry Waterhouse  
Professor, Neurobiology and Anatomy; Vice-Dean, Biomedical Graduate and Postgraduate Studies, *Member*

Thomas J. Elzey  
Senior Vice President, Finance, Treasurer and CFO, *Member*

Peter Franks  
Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, Steinbright Career Development Center Associate, *Member*

## Working Groups

The charges, research questions and data sets that working groups are to consider, fully encompass the broad range of programs offered by Drexel University, including undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. The following lists the current membership of each working group – some changes may occur over the next two years to complement these robust groups.
WORKING GROUP A: Mission and Goals

Membership

Co-Chair: Gloria Donnelly, Dean, College of Nursing and Health Professions
Co-Chair: Peter Lelkes, Calhoun Chair Professor of Cellular Tissue Engineering, School of Biomedical Engineering, Science and Health Systems

Faculty

- Dennis Gallagher, School of Public Health
- Margo Orlin, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Terry Seligmann, Earle Mack School of Law
- Kevin Scoles, Electrical and Computer Engineering
- Rachel Reynolds, Culture and Communication
- Prudence Dalrymple, College of Information Science and Technology
- Julie Mostov, History and Politics
- Susan Wilmer, Comptroller
- John Houle, College of Medicine
- E. June Roberts, Graphic Design
- Scott Knowles, History and Politics

Administration:

- Kenneth Goldman, Associate Vice President, Development Research
- Larry Keiser, Director of Special Projects, School of Education
- Barbara Schindler, Vice Dean, Education and Academic Affairs, College of Medicine
- Kathleen Neary, Associate Director, Global Business, Career Development Center
- Lenore Hardy, Academic Director, Center City Library
- Shannon Finning, Associate Dean of Students

Students:

- Raha Dastgheyb, Biomedical Engineering

Additional Membership:

- John M. Fontaine, College of Medicine
- Patricia Gerrity, Associate Dean, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Kevin Oates, Earle Mack School of Law

Charge

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

**Research Questions**

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?
WORKING GROUP B: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Assessment

Membership

Co-Chair: James Tucker, Senior Vice President, Student Life and Administrative Services
Co-Chair: Anthony Curatola, Joseph F. Ford Professor, Accounting

Faculty:
- Eva Thury, English and Philosophy
- Guiseppe Palmese, Chemical Engineering
- Michelle Marcolongo, Materials Engineering

Administration:
- Patricia Mahon, Executive Assistant, Human Resources
- Stacey Kara, Assistant Vice President, Student Life and Administrative Services
- Mary Moran, Associate Dean, College of Medicine

Students:
- Akef Ergin, Finance

Subgroup on Standard 2
- Robert Francis, Vice President, Facilities
- Adele Varenas, Information Resources and Technology
- Donna DeCarolis, Associate Dean, Strategic Initiatives (LCOB) and Head, Management
- Richard Rosen, Associate Professor, History and Politics

Subgroup on Standard 3
- Fred House, Professor, Physics
- Melissa Englund, Assistant Vice President, Financial Aid
- Joseph Salomone, Registrar
- Cecilie Goodrich, Professor, Biology
- Anthony Lowman, Professor, Chemical Engineering
- Amy Bosio, Associate Vice President, Financial Planning
- Kenneth Blackney, Associate Vice President, Information Resources and Technology

Subgroup on Standard 7:
- Joe Campbell, Associate Vice President, University Procurement
- Anita Reece, Associate Director, Institutional Research
- Mark Bernstein, Adjunct, Earle Mack School of Law
- Frank Ferrone, Professor, Physics
- James Seaman, Vice President, Internal Audit
- Antoinette Torres, Associate Vice Provost
- Paul Hirshorn, Professor, Architecture and Interior Design
- Kris Risi, Director, Office of the Dean of LeBow College of Business
**Charge**

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

**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.

**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, 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?
WORKING GROUP C: Leadership and Governance

Membership

Co-Chair: Michael Exler, Vice President and General Counsel
Co-Chair: Michael Kennedy, Professor, Health Sciences and Health Administration and Chair, Faculty Senate

Faculty:
- Barry Furrow, Earle Mack School of Law
- Frank Linnehan, LeBow College of Business
- Faye Meloy, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Joseph Martin, Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering
- Vincent Zarro, College of Medicine

Administration:
- Rita O’Donnell, Administrative Coordinator, Health Sciences and Administration
- Claire Tillman, Chief of Staff, Dean’s Office, College of Medicine

Charge

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

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.

Research Questions

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; 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, respectively)? Once established, have these ventures and initiatives been effectively integrated into the governance structure of Drexel University?
WORKING GROUP D: Administration and Institutional Integrity

Membership

Co-Chair: Janice Biros, Vice Provost, Vice Provost for Budget, Planning, and Administration
Co-Chair: Jacques Catudal, Associate Professor, English and Philosophy

Faculty:
- Ludo Scheffer, Psychology
- Richard Rest, College of Medicine
- Susan Smith, College of Nursing and Health Professions

Administration:
- Deborah Glenn, Vice President, Human Resources
- Laure Bachich Ergin, Deputy General Counsel
- Adele Varenas, Assistant Vice President, Information Resources and Technology
- Melissa Englund, Assistant Vice President, Financial Aid
- Joseph Salomone, Registrar
- Laura White, Associate Director, Athletics
- Eric Olson, Associate Vice President and Associate Treasurer
- Stephen Rupprecht, Assistant Dean of Students

Charge:

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

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.
Research Questions

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?

D-7. What evidence is there that the institution follows through on its policies, initiatives and plans as they relate to its academic mission?
WORKING GROUP E: Student Enrollment and Support

Membership

Co-Chair: Joan McDonald, Senior Vice President, Enrollment Management
Co-Chair: Patricia Russell, Teaching Professor, Mathematics

Faculty:
- Flossie Ierardi, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Mary Gordon-Gallagher, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Nancy Minguh-Purvis, College of Medicine
- Jonathan Cheng, Associate Professor, Engineering
- David Goldberg, Associate Professor, Physics

Administration:
- Linda Hartman, Online Advisor, College of Arts and Sciences
- David Ruth, Dean of Students
- Esmeralda Nava, Director, Operations and Analysis, Academic Advising, Retention and Diversity

Subcommittees:
- Larry Keiser, Director of Special Projects, School of Education
- Michele Morales, Academic Director, College of Medicine
- Kelli Kennedy, Academic Director, Student Admissions
- Rachael Switalski, Associate Director of Student Services, College of Engineering
- David Miller, Director of Recruitment, Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts and Design
- Lynne Hickle, Associate Dean, College of Information Science and Technology
- Ian Sladen, Associate Dean, Lebow College of Business

Charge

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

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.

Research Questions

E-1. How do the profiles of Drexel applicants, admits, matriculants (include new and transfer, Full time and Part time, graduate and undergraduate, main campus, online, and other locations) align with aspects of the mission and the increasing comprehensiveness of the institution (profiles over time) 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?

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 “resimuters” (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?
WORKING GROUP F: Faculty

Membership

Co-Chair: Barbara Hornum, Associate Professor, Culture and Communication and Director, Drexel Center for Academic Excellence
Co-Chair: Bahram Nabet, Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Faculty:
- Thomas Hindelang, LeBow College of Business
- Terry Seligmann, Earle Mack School of Law
- Frances Cornelius, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Fernand Cohen, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Administration:
- Janet Fleetwood, Associate Vice Provost
- Mary Moran, Associate Dean, College of Medicine

Charge

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

Standard

Standard 10: Faculty

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

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?
WORKING GROUP G: The Educational Experience

Membership

Co-Chair: Donna Murasko, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Co-Chair: Mary Ellen Smith-Glasgow, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs, College of Nursing and Health Professions

Faculty:
- Adam Fontecchio, College of Engineering
- Donna Russo, College of Medicine
- Natalie Bartle, School of Public Health
- Karin Kuenstler, Architecture and Interior Design
- Brad Jameson, College of Medicine
- Edward Nelling, LeBow College of Business
- Kathy Anselmi, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Stephen Gambesia, College of Nursing and Health Professions

Administration:
- Abioseh Porter, Dean, English and Philosophy

Students:
- Oliva McDonnell, LeBow College of Business

Charge

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

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.

Research Questions

G-1. How is Drexel University’s mission reflected in its majors? Consider the bolded items in your response:

   University Mission Statement: 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.

G-2. 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-3. What is the academic fidelity of off-site programs and how do these enhance or detract from educational programs (e.g. Study Abroad, Sacramento, BCC, DeL, 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-4. 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-5. How effectively has technology been used to support and enhance teaching and learning at Drexel?

G-6. How well do students and graduates achieve the required knowledge, skills, and professional values (outcomes) as defined by academic programs, colleges, schools, and the University?

G-7. How supportive is advising and academic services to students, within and across academic programs, and across instructional modalities, campuses, and student types in enhancing students’ experiences?
WORKING GROUP H: Learning Outcomes Assessment

Membership

Co-Chair: Craig Bach, Associate Vice Provost for Curriculum and Assessment
Co-Chair: Don McEachron, Senior Lecturer and Associate Director, School of Biomedical Engineering, Science, and Health Systems

Faculty:
- Kevin Owens, Chemistry
- Emily Zimmerman, Earle Mack School of Law
- Douglas Michele Turco, Goodwin College
- Leonard Finegold, Physics
- Ramesh Ragupathi, College of Medicine
- Burton Landau, College of Medicine
- Gregory Hislop, College of Information Science and Technology
- Sheila Vaidya, School of Education

Administration:
- Kevin Scoles, Associate Dean, College of Engineering
- Danuta Nitecki, Dean of Libraries
- Abieyuwa Aghayere, Associate Dean, Goodwin College

Students:
- Chirag Patel

Charge

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

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.

Research Questions

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

H-2  How effectively has the institution identified and implemented the courses, pedagogies
and co-curricular experiences that support key student learning outcomes?

H-3 How well are assessment processes measuring student achievement of expected learning outcomes?

H-4 How well are assessment processes informing teaching, learning, planning and budgeting?

H-5 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-6 How well does technology support the institution’s efforts to assess and understand student learning?
# MSCHE SELF-STUDY and EVALUATION VISIT

## Schedule | Short Version

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSCHE Self Study Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 10-11, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee and Working Group Chairs Seated, Convened, and Charged</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 1, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group Members Seated, Convened, and Charged</td>
<td></td>
<td>February 15, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study Design Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 15, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCHE Liaison Visit and Self-Study Design Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of the Committee and Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2010 to Winter 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Team Chair Selected</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Team Selection / Working Group Drafts Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Reviewed, Completed and Community Feedback / Chair Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report Sent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Team Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCHE Repsonse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions to Workgroups

Formatting and templates

In order to facilitate the integration of the work of all eight groups into a single cohesive self-study, each working group should adhere to the following guidelines as they develop their responses to the research questions.

- **RESEARCH QUESTION:** Clearly identify the research question being addressed
- **METHODOLOGY:** Provide a detailed methodology for each research question that clearly articulates the processes and data used to address the question
- **SUMMARY:** Provide a summary response to each question that outlines the most salient aspects of the response in a couple short paragraphs
- **BULLETED RESPONSES:** Use bulleted responses below the summary that to provide detail and evidence for each question (bullets could be short 2 – 3 sentence paragraphs)
- **SHORT NARRATIVE:** Keep narrative to minimum
- **REFERENCE:** Reference evidence for each response (e.g., state the filename – we will hyperlink to it in the final draft)
- **FORMATTING RESTRICTIONS:** Do not overly format the response (e.g., all formatting for printing and distribution will be done centrally)

A template is provided in the appendices that can be used to develop responses to the research questions.

**Naming conventions**

As the data and file archive is developed, it is essential that the teams adhere to a set of common naming conventions. The purpose of the naming conventions is to allow colleagues to easily and efficiently locate and reference the stored files. This purpose is underscored by noting that the archive being developed for the self-study also will serve subsequent accreditation efforts and provide an historical record.

Files should be named, as closely as possible, based on the following convention:

```
RESEARCHQUESTION YEAR-MO-DAY TITLE.EXT
```

For example, if an Excel retention file were developed to evidence a response to research question B-3 on April 1, 2010, the file would be named:

```
B-3 2010-04-01 Retention.xls
```

As the self-study effort moves forward, the Steering Committee will review the naming convention and suggest changes as needed.
# Preliminary Matrix of Data Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Report Name</th>
<th>GROUP A</th>
<th>GROUP B</th>
<th>GROUP C</th>
<th>GROUP D</th>
<th>GROUP E</th>
<th>GROUP F</th>
<th>GROUP G</th>
<th>GROUP H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-0001</td>
<td>SCDC Employer Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0002</td>
<td>SCDC Student Employment Summary &amp; Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0003</td>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0004</td>
<td>Research Co-op Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0005</td>
<td>Hyperion - Co-op - At Work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0006</td>
<td>Hyperion - Co-op - Classes on Co-op</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0007</td>
<td>Old Mission Statements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0008</td>
<td>STU-Active Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0009</td>
<td>Lipman-Hearne Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0010</td>
<td>Budget Goals and Objection Metrics?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0011</td>
<td>HR Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0012</td>
<td>Student demographic and geographic distribution</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0013</td>
<td>Costs of Education by Department Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0014</td>
<td>Budget planning documents over time</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0015</td>
<td>Senior Exit Survey Data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0016</td>
<td>Admissions Meta Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0017</td>
<td>Retention data sets and reports 2001-2008 entering cohorts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0018</td>
<td>Graduation data sets and reports 2001-2008 entering cohorts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0019</td>
<td>Faculty Salary merit Increases Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0020</td>
<td>Strategic Metrics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0021</td>
<td>Headcount Reports (01-09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0022</td>
<td>OrgPlus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0023</td>
<td>Syllabi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-0024</td>
<td>TracDat Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data and file storage

A SharePoint site has been developed that will support the activities of the Self-Study Steering Committee and the Working Groups. The tool will allow the teams to develop an online data and file archive, as well as capture discussions, that can be used to evidence responses to each of the research questions.

The use of the SharePoint site will be focused on capturing the collaborative processes and data collection efforts that are an important part of the self-study process.

Integrating Assessment and Planning

The timing of Drexel University’s decennial reaffirmation of MSCHE accreditation comes at a particularly interesting time. Not only does the self-study overlap with the beginning of a new institutional strategic planning cycle, but the institution is now under the leadership of a new president. In addition, many programs across the institution are beginning their own strategic planning processes. The development of the self-study will not only support a successful accreditation visit, but it also will inform strategic planning and provide the new president with an opportunity to better understand where the institution has been and support his vision for moving the institution forward.

There is also a renewed energy and focus on learning assessment. The work that is currently being done to better understand student learning and used to improve teaching, learning, and co-curricular support also will inform strategic planning processes and the development of the
self-study. The convergence of these activities provides Drexel with a unique opportunity to benefit from the self-study process.

**Suggested Profile of Visiting Team**

Drexel University is employing this Self Study as a means to be critically evaluated internally and externally to continue to advance the realization of its mission. A profile of proposed visiting team members is being provided to assist in the selection of the individuals comprising the team. A list of peer institutions, including several aspirants, is also provided, although it is expected that MSCHE may select from an expanded list of regional and non-regional institutions. Drexel’s expectation is that team members will be selected from institutions that have demonstrated a higher level of overall excellence while recognizing that various programs and expertise may come from individuals at other institutions.

**Selected Peer Institutions**

- University of Southern California (CA)
- Tufts University (MA)
- New York University (NY)
- Lehigh University (PA)
- University of Rochester (NY)
- Case Western Reserve University (OH)
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (NY)
- University of Miami (FL)
- George Washington University (DC)
- Boston University (MA)
- Syracuse University (NY)
- Northeastern University (MA)
- Pennsylvania State University, University Park (PA)
- Georgia Institute of Technology (GA)
- University of Pittsburgh (PA)
- University of Cincinnati (OH)

**Visiting Team Structure by Area**

The visiting team should be comprised of representatives from each of the following areas. It is expected in many cases that one individual will represent two or more areas.

- Chair - President or Provost from a private institution with significant graduate education and includes schools of medicine and law
- Enrollment Management (private institution)
- Student Services (private institution)
- Academic Support Services (including Information Technology)
- Finance (private institution)
- Facilities (private institution)
- Cooperative Education (institution with cooperative education spanning virtually the entire undergraduate program)
- Online Learning
- Science/Engineering (ABET accredited, cooperative education)
- Business (AACSB accredited)
- Computer Science / Information Science (ABET accredited)
- Medicine/Health Sciences (Private with emphasis on clinical training)
- Arts/Humanities/Social Sciences/Law
- General Education
Appendix I

The 2007-2012 Strategic Plan:

*The Future is Drexel*
Consistent with the mission of the University’s founder, A.J. Drexel, Drexel’s mission is:

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 Future is Drexel: 2007–2012 Strategic Plan

In 1892, Drexel’s founder, Anthony J. Drexel, defined the purpose of the Drexel Institute as providing “industrial education as a means of opening better and wider avenues of employment to young men and women.” An unflagging commitment to this guiding purpose, along with the belief that there is great benefit to blending actual work experiences with formal teaching, is what differentiates Drexel from other great national universities. Over our history of more than a century, this principle of learning both to know and to do has led to our evolution from the Drexel Institute of Art, Science, and Industry into a comprehensive research university focused on the rapidly changing needs of the 21st Century. Drexel’s founder anticipated such change by stating “I know the world is going to change, and, therefore the [University] must change with it …”

Yesterday’s opportunities in the manufacturing and heavy industries have been supplanted by new opportunities in health care, engineering, digital technologies, law, business, media, education, humanities, and the arts. Our students face a post-industrial economy that is global, competitive, increasingly dependent on innovation, and subject to unrelenting market forces. Today, “millennial” students are more demanding consumers of educational services, and as a consequence, their learning styles have changed.

As we evolve, our reputation changes as well. Our traditional standing as a regional university must grow to match the increasing depth and breadth of our students, our faculty and our contributions to the world. We aspire to provide our students with the best a large comprehensive university has to offer with the personal touch of a small college.

Our current challenge therefore is to continue our evolution, focusing on the issues of the day and capitalizing on the benefits of Drexel’s emergence as a comprehensive research university. By doing so, Drexel will move from being an outstanding regional university into the ranks of the most distinguished research universities. The Future is Drexel Strategic Plan elaborates on the ways in which Drexel University will achieve this status. Keeping our traditional focus on the power of experiential learning combined with an increased emphasis on “use-inspired” research along with selective targeting of areas of research and innovation will enable Drexel to become pre-eminent.
The following five objectives address the critical steps Drexel must take in order to fully realize the great potential offered by our growth, by our expansion to the health sciences and law, and by our research accomplishments. Two other documents, the Master Plan and the Medical School’s Strategic Plan, complement this document and its objectives.

- **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

This Plan was developed through intensive conversations and collaborative, recursive writing involving the academic and Student Life leadership of the University followed by review by the broader University community and resulting in further revision and refinement. It represents the collective thinking of those entrusted with the University’s core mission, while also benefiting from the combined wisdom of our faculty, staff, and trustees. It also builds on the plans and aspirations articulated by the individual schools and colleges in their own strategic plans.

*The Future is Drexel Strategic Plan* incorporates enrollment growth assumptions from the 2004 Strategic Plan, namely that Drexel’s full time undergraduate enrollment will reach 12,000 by 2010, that undergraduate part-time enrollment will continue to grow, and that Drexel’s full time graduate and professional student enrollment (excluding the College of Medicine) will approach 6,000 by 2012.

---

**Anthony Drexel**

Drexel University has its roots in the ambitious vision of Anthony J. Drexel, one of the great financiers of the 19th century. At a time when college graduates accounted for less than one percent of the nation’s population, Anthony Drexel envisioned an institute that would empower young urban working-class men and women to improve their station in life.

“Education at Drexel should not only be good, but good for something,” he once remarked. Today, more than a century later, Drexel University continues this bold vision and looks to a bright future.
Looking Back: Accomplishments

Drexel has witnessed a remarkable decade-long growth in the size and quality of its student body, research, scholarship, and faculty. We have seen the development of innovative, attractive academic programs—on campus and online—including expansion into medical, nursing, public health, and legal education. We have also seen significant improvements to existing programs and colleges, and enhancements to our campus have produced a comprehensive research university that benefits from its diversity and our distinctive fundamental commitment to experiential education. For example:

- The inaugural class of the College of Law entered Fall 2006. This is the first law school to open in 30 years at a nationally-ranked private doctoral university, and it has been integrated into the Drexel community from its inception.
- The College of Medicine, the College of Nursing and Health Professions, and the School of Public Health have been integrated successfully into the University and are working collaboratively with all Drexel disciplines. Such integration has given rise to a myriad of innovative research and education collaborations.
- Drexel has seen significant growth in our doctoral programs. Two new doctoral programs have been added in the last five years, and the number of incoming doctoral students has increased by almost 40 percent. In addition, 24 new professional master’s degree programs have been developed over this same period of time. We are now awarding about 130 doctoral degrees and more than 1500 master’s degrees per year.
- Our nationally-recognized approach to cooperative education has been revitalized with new leadership and funding. The real life experiences gained from co-op continues to be the single most important reason why most students come to Drexel, and our experiential approach to learning is a key Drexel differentiator which derives from our rich co-op tradition.
- Since 1996, Drexel has managed to increase full-time undergraduate enrollment from 4,500 to more than 11,000 today, freshman applications from 3,500 to 22,000, endowment from $90 million to $600 million and grow research funding to $105 million, including the College of Medicine.
- The academic quality of students enrolling at Drexel is exceptionally strong, with the average SAT score at 1200 and the high school grade point average at 3.4.
- Undergraduates from an increasingly larger geographic area, most notably Texas, Florida and California, are selecting Drexel. Internationally, students hail from 110 countries.
- Today, Drexel educates 20,000 graduate and undergraduate students, is the tenth largest employer in Philadelphia, employing 5,300 people, and has an annual budget of more than $550 million.
- Seventy-five new faculty members, drawn from the world’s finest universities or having exceptional professional credentials, have joined Drexel over the past three years. These new faculty are being held to the highest standards of professional achievement. Their presence will inevitably lead to greater numbers of students competing to pursue their undergraduate and graduate degrees at Drexel, in addition to further enhancing the University’s reputation.
Yesterday’s opportunities in the manufacturing and heavy industries have been supplanted by a world of new opportunities in health care, engineering, digital technologies, law, business, media, education, humanities, and the arts. Our students face a post-industrial economy that is global, competitive, increasingly dependent on innovation, and subject to unrelenting market forces.

Today, “millennial” students are more demanding consumers of educational services; their learning styles have changed, and to respond to those changes, curricula and methods of educational delivery must change.

Those young women and men seeking “better and wider avenues of employment” must necessarily partake in a rich array of academic and social experiences designed to ensure their success. To accomplish this goal, we must further our students’ abilities to reason, to innovate, and to lead while working in purposeful, collaborative settings. A Drexel education must teach more than just specific knowledge and the use of technologies. It must also teach about the world, its history, and its cultures. It must do so by integrating research and creative activities into its undergraduate and graduate curricula.

Nations and peoples seek to address major societal issues such as disease, hunger, economic and health disparities, the need for sustainable sources of energy, the state of the environment, terrorism, and violence. Drexel’s programs in engineering, science, healthcare, business, humanities, the arts, and education have the interdisciplinary potential to address these largest problems from both individual and collaborative perspectives.

By selectively targeting those areas of research and innovation in which we can become pre-eminent, we enhance the education the University offers, while enhancing our reputation.
Drexel’s transformation will take place as the result of two broad, mutually-reinforcing strategic principles: striving for excellence, conceived and measured globally, and building upon our emergence as a comprehensive research university.

The first principle requires that every decision, every judgment, and every commitment we make is based upon our desire to achieve excellence in the creation and transmission of knowledge to serve the critical needs of society. Whatever the element — world class faculty, experiential education, advancing faculty support and development, stimulating student leadership, and executing the plan — excellence will shape everything we do.

The second principle is to build upon our emergence as a comprehensive research university, realizing the benefits that accrue from intellectual and professional diversity, resulting in a Drexel that looks outward and engages globally.

By following these principles during the coming years, and by building upon recent rapid and successful changes in our portfolio of academic offerings, in the caliber of the faculty and students we are attracting, in the breadth and depth of our research, in our financial stability and aggressive building programs, and in our commitment to the highest standards of achievement throughout the University — the Drexel of the 21st Century will assume its place among the distinguished research universities of the world.

When students and parents think of a private, practical, and experience-based higher education institution in an urban setting, with a community of inspired faculty and exceptional students who reach their potential as scholars and citizens, we want them to think of Drexel University.

It is our vision that Drexel will become an institution that engages globally in innovative education, research, and service by continuing to build a campus that encourages innovative thinking and learning and productive collaborations that can help meet the critical needs of the world. Drexel will continue to develop our unique approach to higher education by expanding experiential opportunities without boundaries, renewing our curricula and increasing our research in service to the world. The Future is Drexel Strategic Plan addresses the critical steps Drexel must take in order to fully realize the great potential offered by its growth, enhanced diversity, and accomplishments.
The Future is Drexel Strategic Plan builds on our tradition as an excellent regional university and addresses the critical steps Drexel must take in order to fully realize the great potential offered by our growth, our expansion to the health sciences and law, and by our research accomplishments. This Plan proposes strategic initiatives that support five major objectives.
Five Strategic Objectives

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

Drexel will build on our unique approach to higher education by expanding experiential opportunities without boundaries, renewing our curricula and increasing our research in service to the world.

We will foster use-inspired research in a meaningful way that leads to new scientific discovery. By instituting a culture of collaboration, scholarship through innovation will be a priority for all.

Drexel will engage and mentor our students meaningfully, treating them with a level of care and concern for their intellectual and emotional growth found at the finest colleges and universities. We will use Philadelphia as a real-life laboratory to teach our students good citizenship.

Drexel will continue to increase its investment in a diverse, exceptionally well-qualified faculty and staff, in its infrastructure, and in efficient, rational business, with academic and human capital processes to support them.

This Plan was developed through intensive conversations and collaboration involving the academic and student leadership followed by review by the broader University community. It represents the collective thinking of those entrusted with the University’s core mission, while also benefiting from the combined wisdom of our faculty and staff. All parties involved in the development of The Future is Drexel Strategic Plan will be called on the future to help to support and implement it.

Use-Inspired Research

As described by Donald Stokes in Pasteur’s Quadrant, “use-inspired” research implies that the choice of problems being worked on are inspired by societal needs, while the research itself will continue to contribute to basic knowledge and understanding. Translational research and technology commercialization naturally grow out of such an environment.
Objective 1: Enriching the Educational Experience

In our increasingly interconnected global community or “flat world,” Drexel is working hard to create a high-quality, comprehensive, urban university that educates experientially and engages and mentors our students meaningfully, treating them with a level of care and concern found at the finest colleges and universities. The diversity of disciplines and variety of students now attending the University create a rich culture heretofore unrealized at Drexel.

The distinctive Drexel education described in this plan advances through four interconnected, inter-animating approaches. Each derives from and contributes to the culture of experiential education; each rests upon a foundation of quality; and each will be subject to an assessment of its outcomes. While not every student will participate in each expression of experiential education, ample opportunities for most students to be engaged will characterize a Drexel education supported by four approaches:

- **Cooperative education**, re-imagined for a global economy, flexible, available in a variety of formats, and increasingly connecting students in their co-op workplace to Drexel and their academic programs.
- **Research intensive education**, in which the best principles of graduate research and mentored creative work will be available to graduate students and adapted to permeate the undergraduate experience.
- **Civic engagement** to introduce our students to the myriad opportunities in Philadelphia and beyond as a living laboratory to teach them citizenship, leadership, and social responsibility.
- **Global learning and research experiences** involving enhanced study and co-op abroad for undergraduates and graduate students; enhanced global research and creative collaborations; and enhanced language instruction and opportunities to engage in culturally diverse learning.

We will build the Drexel education upon principles that derive from our founding, yet find their expression in approaches that will distinguish the best of 21st century education.

Using Technology to Enhance Clinical Education

In 2002, the College of Nursing and Health Professions implemented the use handheld personal digital assistant (PDA) technology in the undergraduate Nursing Program to improve geriatric patient care through accessing clinical information at the point of care to reduce errors and improve patient outcomes. Drexel University was among the first to require nursing and health professions’ students to use the PDA to access and record information at the point of care. The use of technology in education now extends to the wide use of simulation in the College’s new digital, video simulation lab where students have access to web based video clips of their performance with patients and health care team members. This virtual, web based clinical portfolio enhances student confidence, skill and appreciation of their progression to a rewarding career in the service of others.

Use of the PDA was so successful in executing students’ clinical education, it was introduced as a requirement for all undergraduate and graduate nursing students. The PDA is now a College-wide requirement in all clinical programs; the Physician Assistant Program, the Doctor in Physical Therapy Program, the Pathways to Health Professions Program and the Mental Health Sciences Programs.
The principles embodied in these approaches to education permeate all our curricula. Taken together, they produce a rush and flow of students engaged within courses, from classrooms to laboratories, from campus to community, from Philadelphia to countries all over the globe—and back again. We strive to enhance student learning by teaching for understanding.

Students seeking challenges beyond our campus return energized and enlightened. Their movements and growing enlightenment constitute the dynamics of a great comprehensive research university.

Our challenge, and the objective addressed specifically in the strategic objectives elaborated below, is to cement this intellectual diversity into excellence, developing programs and pedagogies that produce in our students both deep understanding and a passion to learn more.

Drexel’s 5 primary strategies for Enriching the Educational Experience include:

- Enhance cooperative education
- Re-imagine the curricula
- Enhance retention and persistence
- Support the non-traditional student
- Expand online education

The Drexel Great Works Symposia

Interdisciplinary learning is a powerful tool that helps our students explore issues and events from diverse approaches. Based on this principle, Drexel faculty have developed the Great Works Symposia in which faculty teams from across the campus with different fields of expertise come together to identify great works that serve as the foci of novel, interdisciplinary, multi-dimensional courses that address each work from multiple perspectives. Recognized experts join the class as guides; and students truly experience the subject through various media or by actually traveling to its site.

Our students read Mary Shelly’s Frankenstein and discussed the social issues raised in this great novel with scientists, attorneys, historians and literary scholars. When we offered “The Atomic Bomb,” students viewed the first test on film guided by a scientist who witnessed it at Trinity Site, while a week later Freeman Dyson, the distinguished physicist who has written extensively upon the bomb’s development, elaborated some of its implications. We discussed the Internet with Lawrence Lessig, one of its foremost interpreters and an expert on Internet law; and when we studied the Brooklyn Bridge, the course culminated with our students walking across it.

We have engaged “The Underground Railroad,” and the “Statue of Liberty and Liberty Itself,” “The Automobile,” “Musical Theater” and “Oil.” For faculty and students alike, this unique, Drexel trans-disciplinary approach to Great Works yields great rewards.
Experiential learning through cooperative education has been a core value at Drexel since our founding. Cooperative education encompasses virtually all undergraduate programs and many graduate and professional programs such as the College of Law, where considerable interest exists. Our co-op program joins theory and practice and links education and industry through knowledge and experience. Experiential learning in general is of growing interest among many other universities, employers and students who recognize how it contributes to the development of communication, interpersonal and team skills, and professional orientation.

**Strategic Initiatives**
- Integrate experiential learning into traditional curricula so as to provide a context for understanding the co-op experience and to make it more intellectually rewarding and more meaningful for students in planning their careers.
- Develop instructional strategies to keep students better connected to Drexel while they are on co-op assignments.
- Expand the research focused co-op assignments as a way to increase the number of Drexel undergraduates attending graduate school.
- Increase participation in national (outside of the Philadelphia region) and international co-op opportunities from the current level of approximately ten percent of the total students employed during the academic year to 20 percent.
- Enhance the co-op program to respond to the growing desire of entering students for a choice of options for meeting co-op requirements. Possibilities include four-year programs with either two 6-month or two 3-month co-op assignments.
- Position the College of Law as a national leader in experiential legal education by placing at least 80 percent of students in each class in a co-op assignment and ensuring that 100 percent of all graduating third year students complete at least 50 hours of pro bono service.

The University’s curricula must constantly test our approaches and relevance against our fundamental objectives in teaching and learning, our understanding of emerging knowledge and new modes of learning, and the requirements of accrediting agencies.

A broad consensus has developed nationally regarding the characteristics of a university education for the 21st Century. As students’ interests, learning styles, and backgrounds change, so too must our modes of instruction — and so must our means of assessing the effectiveness of a Drexel education.

In order to realize the kind of broad educational experience we envision for Drexel graduates, we need to develop a flexible curriculum and employ a variety of modes of delivery.

**Strategic Initiatives**
- Review existing curricula with an eye to streamlining them and enhancing flexibility, thereby providing additional opportunities for students to choose electives, foreign language study, or courses simply for enrichment.
- Continue to create a culture of assessment: design and implement assessment tools that can be used formatively to improve our curricula and pedagogy, and summatively, to demonstrate that a high degree of the outcomes we desire are being met.
- Integrate research and creative activities into the undergraduate curriculum for all interested students.
- Provide all Drexel students with opportunities for cultural enrichment and increased civic engagement.
- Eliminate redundant teaching and courses that do not support the achievement of a diploma or certificate.
- Enhance research and creative opportunities for students by growing the Students Tackling Advanced Research (STAR) Program.
**Strategic Initiatives (continued)**

- Foster demonstrable—and measurable—improvements in undergraduate communications skills.
- Expand the global awareness of all students regardless of discipline by incorporating global issues thematically into various curricula.
- Exploit new educational technologies, (e.g., smart classrooms, hybrid curriculum) that combine online with in-person courses, video conferencing, etc.
- Receive provisional and full ABA accreditation for our new College of Law at the earliest possible time. The College also will seek to become an AALS member school as soon as it is eligible.
- Develop concentrations in the College of Law that are linked to other schools and colleges beginning with Health Law, Entrepreneurial Business, and Intellectual Property.
- Develop concentrations in our colleges that link to our College of Medicine.

---

**The Drexel Graduate**

All students graduating from Drexel should be:

- Technologically literate and well grounded in the humanities and social sciences; possessing demonstrable skills in effective communication.
- In command of the technical knowledge required of a competent professional and also able to progress into leadership in their respective fields.
- Able to form and work well in teams and to negotiate differences among diverse peoples and opinions.
- Aware of global issues and attuned to cultural customs.
- Able to demonstrate, through standardized assessment tools and capstone projects, that they have mastered their curriculum.
Drexel aspires to be a leader among American institutions of higher education with regard to the retention and graduation rates for the students it enrolls. Many strategies need to be deployed to achieve this goal. Drexel’s Pennoni Honors College is one of the University’s key competitive advantages in achieving the goal of retention.

**Strategic Initiatives**

- Increase retention of all undergraduate students by one percent each year for the next five years.
- Encourage the Pennoni Honors College to work with other units to improve retention across the campus by engaging members of the Honors community in mentorship, tutoring of non-Honors students and in creating student-led objectives that forge bonds among students.
- Increase standards for joining the Pennoni Honors College community, thus driving student quality higher.

Providing educational opportunities for the non-traditional student has always been a strength of Drexel’s. In particular, the Goodwin College of Professional Studies promotes, supports, and extends curricular offerings from Drexel’s many academic units to those that require extraordinary flexibility. We thereby provide services that complement the core missions of the other colleges and schools to the Philadelphia community.

**Strategic Initiatives**

- Increase the number of programs for non-traditional learners by providing content from across the University in accessible and effective delivery formats including alternative time/space frames.
- Develop special or emerging industry career programs aimed at full-time and part-time undergraduate students that are not covered by the other academic units.
- Enhance continuing and professional development programs of study offered in credit and non-credit formats for career-oriented skill enhancement and personal growth.
- Identify, evaluate, and pursue new business ventures for special degree and certificate programs to serve the local community.
Drexel University’s outwardly oriented e-learning initiative has grown a significant off-campus constituency through the intellectual and instructional efforts of our colleges and schools and the effective marketing and customer service provided by Drexel e-Learning, Inc. The continued development of this offering will be challenged by newer, for-profit and non-for-profit entities that enter the market.

Our on-campus e-learning initiative has grown in recent years; first as supplemental experiences for classroom instruction and more recently, as stand-alone e-learning course experiences bringing greater flexibility and access to on-campus learners.

Success in e-learning depends on being able to attract large numbers of qualified learners, each of whom requires individualized attention. We must not only compete on the quality of the content but also on the quality of the learning process — including design and delivery.

**Strategic Initiatives**

- Continue to develop online course and program offerings, as well as state-of-the-art modes of communication and interactivity.
- Work towards a target of providing 10 percent of undergraduate credit hours via on-line delivery.
- Develop standards of best practice across and within disciplines, departments, and programs of study for distributed learning (online learning).
- Create a training program for Drexel faculty to prepare them for high quality participation in distributed learning environments as part of their faculty development.
Objective 2: Promoting a Culture of Research and Scholarship

Over the past ten years, Drexel has experienced significant growth in our research enterprise. We have built our research base by performing use-inspired, solutions-based, and translational research as well as generating new knowledge through basic research programs. This approach has also led to an increase in commercialization of Drexel technologies that has resulted in their transfer into the public sector to the benefit of society and economic development in Greater Philadelphia.

University research has undergone a transformation in recent years to focus on complex, multidisciplinary topics that address significant issues having broad societal impact. The era of a single researcher working alone on a narrowly focused issue is no longer appropriate or sufficient to address increasingly multifaceted issues of a complex society.

In recognizing this trend, Drexel has been developing collaborative, interdisciplinary research across the University combining faculty research interests and skills in our comprehensive array of schools and colleges. In developing these programs, we have preserved our distinction among universities by continuing to stress use-inspired research. In our transition to the future since the implementation of our previous strategic plan, Drexel has leveraged our base of exceptional researchers to hire new outstanding faculty who will contribute to building novel research programs in a substantive manner.

Drexel’s graduate programs have also undergone a transformation appropriate to a comprehensive research university. The status of our graduate programs is particularly important since outstanding research programs require exceptional graduate programs that attract the best possible graduate students to work on research projects with our faculty.

With these successes of the past firmly in place throughout the University, Drexel is poised to develop new and novel cross-disciplinary research and graduate programs that will position the University to become a national leader in addressing critical challenges facing the world.
### 2.1 A Strategy for Growing the Research Enterprise

In order to gain broad recognition for our research programs, Drexel must carefully support and recognize those current objectives that already have achieved success while continuing to identify, invest in, and develop new research programs in promising areas in which we have or can develop significant strength. In implementing these programs, there should be a reasonable probability that Drexel will become a leader in the research area over the next five years. Current successful major research programs, e.g., nanotechnology and applied communications and information networking, can serve as models for future objectives.

In developing new major research programs, we have instituted a competitive process for evaluating programs to assure that the university will invest in programs that will have a significant impact on the research environment at Drexel. Specific criteria have been developed that must be addressed by faculty proposing a new program, and all proposals are reviewed and prioritized by a faculty/administrator committee. Using this process, three new interdisciplinary major research objectives have been identified: Engineering Cities; Plasma Biology and Medicine; and Neuroengineering: Brain-Machine Interface.

#### Strategic Initiatives
- Increase awareness/appreciation of all forms of research, scholarship and creative activity that characterize a research-intensive university.
- Continue the process of identifying additional major areas of research in which Drexel should invest.
- Develop milestones and deliverables for each potential major research initiative.
- Provide seed funding to the most promising objectives to encourage the growth of self-sustaining research centers that can be designated NSF Engineering Research Centers, Materials Science and Engineering Research Center, etc.
- Continue to expand use-inspired research in all schools and colleges.
- Develop shared core facilities or Pinnacles of Excellence that can support the needs of multiple programs in a cost-effective manner such as the Bossone Research Center.
- Develop policies and an environment that will attract and retain high quality graduate students.

#### The Promise of Use-Inspired Research

Researchers at Drexel have developed a potential solution to lower back pain by developing a minimally invasive device that will replace a portion of the intervertebral disc by mimicking the function of the normal disc. This work was initially funded through a seed grant by Drexel University, which was leveraged by the researchers to produce data that led to external funding by NSF.

The technology was patented by Drexel University and a company formed (Geliflex) to commercialize the intellectual property. Two years later, the company was sold to a major orthopaedic device company, Synthes, in West Chester, PA.

#### Criteria for Major New Research Areas:
- Match between pressing scientific and societal needs and Drexel's strengths.
- Ability to take advantage of our comparative advantages and resources.
- Probability of Drexel becoming a leader in the specific research areas over the next five years.
- Possibility of developing intellectual property that may lead to commercialization in order to maximize the benefit of the research to society and provide support for the university.
- Opportunity to integrate research with teaching.
- Ability to attract high quality undergraduate and graduate students and postdoctoral fellows.
- Ability to attract and retain exceptional faculty.
- Ability to sustain the program through external funding.
Neuroengineering Program: Brain-Machine Interface for Restoration of Sensory and Motor Function

The goal of this program is to develop a brain-machine interface that can restore motor and sensory function to the lower limbs after spinal cord injury. Drexel University is in a unique position to be a leader in this field because it is one of the few universities with expertise in 1) motor systems, 2) sensory systems, 3) spinal cord injury, and 4) development of microelectrode devices to both record from and stimulate neural tissue. Furthermore, Drexel is also pursuing the development of portable, non-invasive brain scanning devices that can augment or even supplant the need for invasive devices. The academic units involved in this program are the College of Medicine, the School of Biomedical Engineering, the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Nursing and Health Professions, and the LeBow College of Business.

Plasma Biology and Medicine Program

Recent breakthrough inventions at Drexel University in electron plasma science and engineering have resulted in the opportunity for novel research and application of non-thermal plasma interactions with living organisms from viruses and bacteria to human tissue. The goal of this program is to examine the use of non-thermal plasmas in areas of clinical practice where electron plasma can be a more effective medical tool than existing procedures or in cases where no treatment presently exists. Research in this area will include the continued development and characterization of novel non-thermal plasma discharges to provide clinically important treatments. In addition, studies will identify the major electron plasma components (e.g., charged particles, free radicals, ozone) that are responsible for the desired clinical effects of plasma treatments. The academic units involved in this research program include the College of Engineering, the College of Medicine, the School of Biomedical Engineering, and the College of Arts and Science.

Program in Engineering Cities

The Engineering Cities Program will be devoted to multidisciplinary collaborative research in managing the growth and development of large urban areas and their infrastructure. Drexel University, as an urban academic center, is particularly suited to use its research capabilities to address the challenges posed by the projection that within the next several years, more than half the world's population will be living in urban centers for the first time in history. It is projected that by 2015 over 20 megacities each with a population in excess of 10 million will exist worldwide. The purpose of this program is to develop new and innovative methods to maintain the quality of life for urban dwellers. Participating academic units include the College of Engineering, the School of Public Health, the College of Nursing and Health Professions, the College of Arts and Science, the Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts and Design, the School of Education, the LeBow College of Business, and the College of Law.

New Major Research Initiatives
Objective 3: Advancing Faculty Support and Development

Our progress towards becoming a comprehensive research university has been accomplished through the contributions of a broad range of faculty who have been hired in line with past strategic plans. Drexel’s current reputation has been achieved by a faculty that variously focuses on teaching, research, scholarship, creative works, and clinical practice. Drexel must now not only continue to invest in its faculty but to invest in associated faculty development programs as well.

Towards this end, we seek to expand our approaches for recruiting and developing a continuously improving faculty. We will do this by utilizing the following four strategies:

- Enhance faculty quality and development
- Promote faculty diversity
- Actively value faculty
- Train faculty for leadership roles
3.1 Enhance Faculty Quality and Development

In order to achieve the type of faculty quality we envision for the University and to realize our academic goals, we must continue to raise our standards for hiring faculty—a faculty who demonstrates strong achievements is our greatest asset. Opportunities and resources for faculty to develop skills and expertise throughout their careers provide a means both to fulfill the mission of the University and to increase our intellectual vitality.

While many faculty development activities reach across disciplines, others are likely to be more focused within academic units or even in specific disciplines.

**Strategic Initiatives**

- Align new faculty positions with the strategic goals of each academic unit, with the University’s research initiatives, and with Drexel’s larger goal of achieving increased excellence and significant recognition.
- Improve the tenure and promotion process, emphasizing clarity of the process and criteria and consistency in the application.
- Create a “Faculty Investment Fund” to enhance the development of faculty through various programs and activities and to “reinvest” in faculty members who have demonstrated particular excellence.
- Empower schools and colleges to develop a “one term off from teaching” program for pre-tenure/tenure-track faculty for the purpose of accelerating their scholarship. The program will also be available to a limited number of deserving senior tenure-track faculty in order to enhance the dissemination of their research or creative work, or senior non-tenure-track faculty to further develop their professional skills.
- Develop tools and formal processes (e.g., mentoring, peer evaluation of teaching, virtual resource center, “teaching grand rounds”) for assisting faculty in the development of teaching and research skills.
It is to be expected that the University’s faculty reflect the diversity of our student body and our society. While the absolute number of women and underrepresented minority faculty members at Drexel and other U.S. universities has increased in recent years, there is still more to be done. Drexel University will improve the diversity profile of our faculty over the next five years, particularly in the areas of engineering and science—fields in which the diversity profiles have traditionally been skewed.

### Strategic Initiatives

- Following the recommendations of the Faculty Task Force on Diversity, the Provost will:
  - Appoint an Associate Vice Provost for Diversity.
  - Conduct an institutional audit to provide a baseline for diversity objectives.
  - Ensure that Drexel provides a supportive environment for minority faculty by reviewing and revising current policies as necessary to provide for flexibility in career development.
- Enhance our existing culture of respect and value for those from diverse backgrounds by attending to issues, processes, and procedures that encourage them to feel that they belong at Drexel.

Over the past several years, Drexel’s excellent senior faculty have been joined by a group of outstanding junior faculty who are contributing in very significant ways to the research and educational environment across the University. As one measure of the success of our recruiting efforts, 15 NSF CAREER awards have been awarded to young faculty since 2002. These highly competitive grants are awarded to junior faculty with exceptional promise in performing research at the highest levels. These and other young faculty members have immersed themselves in cutting edge research in such fields as nanotechnology, biotechnology, engineering, and information technology.

While excelling in their research activities, junior faculty members have also been instrumental in developing advanced undergraduate and graduate courses in their areas of research that range from computer-aided tissue engineering and fuel-cell technologies to communications and information networking, biotechnology, and nanotechnology. They have also been committed to mentoring Ph.D. students as well as engaging undergraduate students in experiential learning through successful NSF-funded projects including Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU), Course Curriculum Laboratory Innovation (CCLI), and Nanotechnology for Undergraduate Education (NUE). Junior faculty members have served as enthusiastic participants in the NSF Research Experiences for Teachers (RET) to provide K-12 teachers from the Philadelphia region with support and guidance to improve the delivery of science/mathematics education.
3.3 Actively Value Faculty

Drexel has traditionally employed many dedicated, non-tenure track, full-time faculty to meet its teaching needs. Many non-tenure track faculty members have not only demonstrated excellence in teaching but also in research, scholarship, creative works, clinical practice, leadership, and true commitment to the institution.

The use of adjunct faculty has allowed the University to offer specialized courses that are best taught by practicing professionals. In order to maintain and enhance the quality of our educational programs, we should not only ensure that these faculty are performing to our standards, but also formally recognize their contributions, reward their excellence, and provide them with professional development opportunities.

**Strategic Initiatives**

- Secure funding for endowed professorships to be used in recognizing and rewarding or to recruit outstanding faculty.
- Ensure that non-tenure-track faculty are appropriately recognized for their contributions to our mission by developing a set of ranks, titles, and criteria for their promotion in rank.
- Seek within each college and school an appropriate balance between tenure and tenure track faculty and non-tenure track full-time faculty.
- Adjust the pay rate for summer teaching, and increase pay rates for adjuncts to be more competitive in the local market.

3.4 Train Faculty for Leadership Roles

An excellent comprehensive research university benefits directly from recognizing and developing academic administrative talent. Therefore, Drexel will develop ways of identifying faculty with such abilities, to train them and to encourage them to consider rotating through administrative positions, perhaps even committing to a career in academic administration.

**Strategic Initiatives**

- Develop programs to train academic administrators and the future leaders of the University,
- Develop administrative “Fellowships” in which faculty will rotate annually in a significant administrative position, thus growing a cadre of administrators from within,
- Review methods and means of evaluating academic administrators in partnership with the Human Resources Office to provide constructive feedback in order to improve performance and further career growth.
Objective 4: Promoting a Culture of Student Engagement

Students develop through the vibrant intellectual engagement that exists both inside and outside Drexel classrooms. The greatest effects on students’ education result from the creation of complementary academic and student life policies and practices — true co-curricular offerings.

Drexel’s student body comprises a diverse group of individuals seeking strong and relevant academic offerings that provide them with the foundation to pursue successful careers. Experiential learning begins with a classroom experience built on a strong contextual focus and extends to research experiences, creative work, and community engagement guided by faculty who are expert in their professions. The key component of experiential learning is cooperative education that places students in meaningful, real-world professional environments worldwide.

Students thrive when they live in a university culture of respect and involvement and have authentic opportunities to lead and develop as responsible citizens in the global community. Towards this end, we will:

- Enhance the culture of connection and engagement
- Develop leadership and responsible citizenship
- Engage the student community

Student Entrepreneurship at Drexel University

Drexel University provides an abundance of opportunities for students to discover and experience the entrepreneurial drive. Our entrepreneurship curriculum at LeBow College of Business is interdisciplinary and provides opportunities for experiential learning with new ventures and also with Drexel University scientists and engineers. Members of our faculty partner with other scholars and the business community to provide the state of the art instruction and guidance in entrepreneurship to students.

The Baiada Center for Entrepreneurship in Technology offers all Drexel University students the benefits of experiencing entrepreneurship through its various programs such as hands-on workshops with entrepreneurs and seasoned executives; an incubator for student businesses that provides in addition to physical space and facilities, mentoring and collaborations; a Mentor Group available to advise all students on business plan development; and the annual Business Plan Competition. The Business Plan Competition supports Drexel students in turning great ideas into great businesses. The Competition encourages students to form interdisciplinary teams that receive feedback throughout the process.

Dinner and Discussion at Drexel (the D3 Program)

The College of Arts and Sciences D3 Program is designed to enhance courses in different disciplines that are being taught during the same term but in different departments of the College. Students from selected courses participate in an evening program followed by discussion of the program topic in small groups with a faculty facilitator over dinner. Through the D3 Program, student participants of varied backgrounds and perspectives can share their insights on a specific topic with students from other disciplines. For example, one D3 event brought students in Creative Writing, Physics and Mathematics together to watch the movie “The Day After Tomorrow,” which deals with the topic of severe climate change, as a basis for small-group discussions. Other D3 programs have include panel discussions, authors, and plays.

“Education is not the filling of a pail, but the lighting of a fire.”

—William Butler Yeats
4.1 Enhance the Culture of Connection and Engagement

Student Life creates a culture of connection through partnerships across campus, spaces and opportunities for different cultural identities, environments for active academic inquiries, and programs that create pride and tradition at the University.

Retention experts cite student life-related functions as key contributors to freshman persistence to the sophomore year. Furthermore, research shows that student persistence and degree completion are directly affected by student engagement, support systems, and social structures.

Drexel University must continue to work deliberately to create strong social structures that allow for opportunities for all students to have a true campus experience beyond the first year when students are no longer required to reside in the dormitories.

Strategic Initiatives

- Create objectives for greater student engagement in, and connections to, the University.
- Continue to incorporate faculty research and scholarship into the academic experience to foster one-on-one interactions between students and faculty and forge new horizons of thought and creativity among students.
- Establish more residential and commuter learning communities to allow for increased academic dialogue and connection outside of the classroom experience.
- Create opportunities for all students to form lifelong interpersonal relationships which create a deeper understanding of self and others.
- Implement tools, including the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), as consistent, annual assessments to measure student engagement and satisfaction.
- Develop community building utilizing new technologies in which Millennial students are already immersed to provide a network of connectivity whether students are studying on campus or online, or are working on co-op anywhere in the world.

4.2 Develop Leadership and Responsible Citizenship

Alumni consistently report that their involvement in co-curricular activities during their student days, particularly in leadership roles, significantly enhanced their interpersonal and leadership skills and have been important factors in their success after leaving Drexel. Thus, we provide opportunities for students to develop their leadership skills through co-curricular offerings.

While skill and competency development are critical for effective leadership, students must also examine the deeper underlining mission and purpose behind decision making. And as Drexel University and other campuses across America become increasingly diverse, institutions must experiment with ways of encouraging students to think and act inclusively.

Strategic Initiatives

- Expand a Student Development Competency Model which provides student leaders with lifelong leadership skills to positively impact a diverse and professional environment and promote student engagement.
- Ensure that all students have ample leadership opportunities.
- Partner across campus units to engage alumni and community executives who can provide unique learning and membership opportunities for programming objectives (e.g., CEO program, Business Learning Community, paraprofessional development).
- Encourage Student Life to work with the academic units of the University to formalize resources, expand programming objectives, and promote an environment of inclusion to support and build upon all aspects of diversity including, but not limited to, race, religion, sexual preference, ability, and gender.
- Challenge all faculty, staff, and students to apply ethical practices, take responsibility for themselves and others, and strive to match personal values with socially responsible behavior through daily interactions with students.
4.3 Engage the Student Community

Drexel is an institution of higher learning committed to being engaged with surrounding communities. Engagement helps educate students in problem solving, understanding diversity, good citizenship, and leadership. We have a strong conviction that universities have an obligation to serve their community directly by sharing knowledge, energy, human capital, and collective imagination.

Ten years ago, Drexel had little connection with its neighboring schools, community service agencies, cultural institutions or civic government. Today, virtually every college and school sponsors programs that serve area teachers, students, school administrators, community service agencies, health centers, and civic, cultural, and arts institutions.

Strategic Initiatives

- Sponsor more practica and service learning courses spanning the range of Drexel curricula: the arts to the law, engineering to healthcare, information science to hospitality.
- Develop a cadre of Drexel Community Scholars-students deeply committed to civic engagements.
- Improve the health of our neighboring communities through the delivery of health services and the conduct of community participatory research that also involve and help educate Drexel students.
- Coordinate and publicize our significant commitments to civic engagement. We may realize economies of scale and benefit the University by creating a central repository of programs, data related to them, and the ability to publicize our achievements.

Drexel Freshman Experience

Some 2,500 freshmen are engaged in the following ways:

- Service in schools
- Community service organizations
- Cultural and civic agencies
- Connections with area theaters and music performance venues through the Cultural Passport
- Healthcare outreach including Drexel’s Health Services Center on 11th Street

Twenty-two Drexel fraternities and sororities participate in over 10,000 hours of community service each year.
Objective 5: Executing the Plan

Achieving the ambitious goal of The Future is Drexel Strategic Plan to move Drexel into the top ranks of America’s comprehensive research universities, depends upon certain fundamental improvements and objectives in order to be realized fully. More effective use of resources, higher academic and administrative standards, higher quality space in support of our academic mission, appropriately sized and compensated support staff, and more effective publicity and “branding” to reflect the new directions to which this Plan commits us, are the key areas that must be addressed.

We will embark on developing support for The Future is Drexel Strategic Plan through:

- Create quality space in support of Drexel’s academic mission
- Project Drexel as a comprehensive research university
- Ensure access
- Support globalization
- Provide skilled support staff and enable staff engagement
- Foster collaboration across administrative units

Construction of a landmark academic building at the corner of 33rd and Chestnut will begin in Spring of 2008. This 140,000 GSF building, designed by Diamond and Schmitt Architects, Toronto, in partnership with Philadelphia-based H2L2 Architects, will house the Department of Bioscience and Biotechnology as well as the Steinbright Career Development Center and will provide 10 new state of the art classrooms and lecture halls. Modular, flexible research and instructional labs and shared prep space are planned for maximum efficiency; the new instructional labs in this building will be used by Biomedical Engineering and Chemistry as well as Biology. An interior atrium, including a connective circular stair, will facilitate interaction between students, faculty and staff. The target for building occupancy is Fall of 2009.
5.1 Create Quality Space in Support of Drexel's Academic Mission

A first-rate comprehensive research University requires first-rate spaces, not only to facilitate learning, research, and administration, but also to project a sense of seriousness about the enterprise. High-quality, intelligently designed spaces can improve engagement, prompt conversations, and help create an atmosphere in which people feel valued, empowered, even energized to accomplish their best work, and that is the key to achieving the goals in this Plan. The physical environment matters, and when done well, it can aid in the University’s achieving our desire to rank among America’s best.

Strategic Initiatives
- Ensure that the quality and quantity of offices, labs, studios, classrooms and other administrative space on both the West Philadelphia and Center City campuses are sufficient to support our academic programs.
- Build new academic facilities and develop space reallocation plans enabled by moves into new buildings. In a number of instances we lack a central physical presence for some departments and colleges.
- Develop space to meet with students and to foster student-led activities and mentored programs—spaces designed around academically-focused and mentored student activities that will aid in building a sense of community.
- Remodel Hagerty Library to maximize utilization of space and create an atmosphere that is more attractive and welcoming to students.

5.2 Project Drexel as a Comprehensive Research University

The Drexel brand now is centered on the pervasive use of technology, experiential learning principally through cooperative education, in the process of learning, and using our urban environment as a “laboratory” as well as for its cultural offerings. While maintaining our traditional values and strengths, we need to expand this list to include in equal measure the new principles elaborated in this Plan.

Strategic Initiatives
- Clearly identify, agree upon, and publicize our academic strengths. This is important in our effort to project accurately what Drexel is becoming and is crucial in recruiting high quality faculty and students, as well as in becoming increasingly successful in securing research funding.
- Refine and update Drexel’s clearly delineated brand attributes to incorporate the changes detailed in this plan, such as being the locus of research that informs and shapes the world around us.
- Develop a more uniform approach to marketing to a range of audiences. Recognize and realize the mission of each College/School in marketing. Currently, LeBow, Law, Medicine and Goodwin have the largest marketing efforts and we will leverage their recognition to serve the entire University.
- Recognize and take advantage of the strong positive correlation between outstanding graduate programs and outstanding undergraduate rankings and promote seamless links between these programs.
5.3 Ensure Access

As the cost of a university education continues to increase, we must develop alternative ways by which low and middle income students can continue to access Drexel's education. Providing sufficient financial aid to insure student success is critical, but there are other objectives that should be considered, including partnerships with feeder institutions which are often first choice for admission.

Strategic Initiatives
- Support the new Drexel at Burlington County College initiative and assess it as a model to be used with other community colleges.
- Fundraise for more endowed scholarships.

5.4 Support Globalization

While a number of “international” objectives have developed throughout Drexel in recent years, there has been a distinct lack of coordination. We are in danger of being unprepared to take full advantage of the opportunities and challenges that will arise in this era of globalization. In order to have the greatest benefit to our faculty and students, it is important that we carefully develop and maintain substantive relationships with a few carefully selected, high-quality international universities.

Strategic Initiatives
- Create a centralized Office of International Programs to provide the organizational infrastructure necessary to move Drexel’s overall international efforts forward.

5.5 Provide Adequate Support Staff and Enable Staff Engagement

An important consideration relative to the University’s new strategic plan is determining the adequacy of skilled academic support staff in place to help move objectives forward. Adequacy is assessed not just by the number of personnel — faculty/staff ratios — but also by currency of skill sets, relevant staff job portfolios, and the appropriateness of compensation and other benefits. This is an area that requires considerable attention as indicated by the proposed objectives listed below.

Strategic Initiatives
- Work with the Human Resources Office to plan and execute an assessment of the size and structure of the academic support staff using appropriate benchmarking strategies.
- Work with the Human Resources Office to develop and evaluate new training and professional development programs for the various staff career tracks within academic administration.
Success of *The Future is Drexel Strategic Plan* will depend on close collaboration of the academic units with the other administrative and support areas of Drexel University. Toward this end, the administrative units have developed plans to support this plan. An illustration of the activities these units will undertake in this regard follows.

**Institutional Advancement**
- Create a Case for Support for the upcoming comprehensive fundraising campaign that aligns and supports all the major objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan
- Develop and implement strategies to seek support for the major objectives in the Plan
- Build a first-rate development organization that will support the deans and directors in meeting their fundraising objectives that are related to executing the Plan
- Maximize the philanthropic commitments to Drexel University with particular attention to the Plan priorities
- Expand the number and seek the commitment of fundraising volunteers at every level with an emphasis on the School/College Campaign Committees
- Mobilize and engage the Provost, the deans, the department heads, and when appropriate, individual faculty members to fully participate in the development process
- Capitalize on long-standing relationships with co-op employers and corporate research partners
- Unify the key themes and messages and development communication frameworks for the Schools/Colleges
- Ensure that all members of the IA organization have an in-depth knowledge of the plan to ensure that they can integrate its priorities into conversations with donors and prospects

**Student Life and Administrative Services**
- Implement a $400 million Master Plan for facilities that is designed to achieve an enhanced campus environment that aligns with the Strategic Plan in attracting and retaining high-quality faculty, students, and staff
- Plan facilities that will enhance the academic environment for learning, living, and working including a much-needed undergraduate lab and classroom building, student recreation center, and additional residence halls to better serve the University community
- Will continue to integrate student, faculty, and staff needs into its planning processes for all capital projects
- Strategically acquire or reposition current capital assets to meet the objectives of the Strategic Plan
- Ensure learning and living facilities are safe, clean, well-maintained, and comfortable
- Increase University exposure through advancement of NCAA Division I athletic programs, increased student population, community support in campus activities, increased financial support, and recognition by the media

**Office of General Counsel**
- Provide a team of three attorneys working to support the intellectual property, translational research, and technology transfer/commercialization interests and objectives

**Office of Human Resources**
- Transform the human resources function to a consultative, value-added organization
- Develop comprehensive recruiting and staffing solutions to include: staffing plans; sourcing for key roles (proactive identification of candidates); and a consistent offer process
- Design a market-based compensation and benefits program (e.g., titling consistency, roles, market pricing)
- Implement a talent management program (e.g., assess performance, skills, development plans, career paths, succession planning)
- Develop a Dashboard of Key Performance Indicators (human capital metrics, e.g., recruiting, performance, diversity)
The strategies and investments outlined in this Strategic Plan as well as in the plans of the individual schools and colleges are intended to help Drexel achieve significant academic improvements and thus gain ground relative to its status vis à vis its peer institutions.

As we implement the Plan, we must also carry out a rigorous assessment strategy that documents our progress on the specific objectives.

The key benchmarks and assessment strategies we will monitor for each of the five strategic areas are outlined below. The combination of data results for these metrics—the assembled data when framed together—will provide a comprehensive assessment of the Plan’s impact.

**Objective 1: Enriching the Educational Experience**
- Increase in retention of full time undergrad students by 1% each year for the next five years
- Increase in the number of national and international co-ops
- Increase in undergraduate participation in mentored research experiences
- Award of provisional ABA accreditation for the College of Law by June of 2008
- Increase in application volume, selectivity and yield for all students (undergrad, masters, doctoral, part-time and on-line)
- Improved academic performance and graduation rates for al Drexel students
- Student and alumni survey data re: satisfaction with the quality of instruction, learning, advising and post graduation success

**Objective 2: Promoting a Culture of Research and Scholarship**
- Increase in sponsored research expenditures to $105M over the next five years
- Initial Major Research Objectives make progress toward becoming self-sustaining
- Increase in number of interdisciplinary proposals submitted
- Increase in numbers of articles/citations generated by Drexel faculty
- Increase in number of disclosures/patent applications filed
- Increase in the number of GSRA appointments on sponsored projects
- Increase in honors received by Drexel faculty for scholarship and creative work (e.g., book prizes, juried shows)

**Objective 3: Advancing Faculty Support and Development**
- Alignment of faculty hiring with fields of strategic importance to the colleges/schools and the University
- The number of faculty from under-represented groups in schools/colleges/departments moves closer to their set goals re: racial and gender diversity
- Increase in faculty salaries to become more competitive with peer schools/colleges
- An increase in the percent of faculty who are elected fellows in their respective professional societies
- An increase in the rate at which Drexel faculty members are nominated for and elected to membership in national academies
- An increase in the number of editorships, society fellowships, invited papers, etc. for Drexel faculty
- Improved faculty engagement as measured by climate surveys
Objective 4: Promoting a Culture of Student Connection and Engagement
- Increase in student participation in activities related to civic engagement and services to society tracked at the school/college level
- Student engagement/satisfaction re: community involvement and extra-curricular activities as measured by surveys
- Increase in graduate student stipends/benefits to become more competitive with peer institutions
- Alumni survey results related to career and life satisfaction and civic engagements

Objective 5: Executing the Plan
- Improved instructional, research and student interaction space by completion of new instructional/laboratory building by Fall 2009
- Increase in number of major international partnerships (specific targets to be identified) and Drexel’s international reputation (measured by peers/collaborators)
- Improved staff retention and job satisfaction; use FY08 baseline
- Increase in media use of Drexel faculty as experts in national and international matters
- Increase in use of advanced technologies in classroom experience and assignments
- The performance benchmarks outlined above, together with other strategic indicators (e.g., endowment, S/F ratio, etc.) will be combined to produce an Annual Strategic Plan dashboard report.

The performance benchmarks outlined above, together with other strategic indicators (e.g., endowment, S/F ratio, student credit hours taught per full time faculty member, research expenditures per tenured and tenure track faculty, etc.), will be combined to produce an Annual Strategic Plan Dashboard Report. Improved national rankings for schools/colleges, departments and programs will be included.

On-Going Assessments
Current assessment activities will continue at all levels. Examples include accreditation reviews and self studies (e.g., ABET) and department/program reviews. Drexel’s institutional self-study and external review by the Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges, a process that occurs every 10 years, will take place during the timeframe of 2009–2012. This will include major reports on Drexel’s improvement with a new focus on graduate education activities.

Progress Reports
The Provost will:
- Report to the Trustees annually on use of funds to support the plan
- Provide an annual comprehensive assessment of progress on the plan to the Trustees and to the faculty using the metrics/data listed above
- Discuss progress on the plan as regular part of agendas of appropriate Board and faculty committees
- Maintain and promote a website that provides current information on the status of the plan
Drexel University is poised to accelerate our growth by focusing on the issues of the day and capitalizing on the benefits of Drexel’s emergence as a comprehensive research university, as laid out in The Future is Drexel Strategic Plan. The goal of those involved in formulating this plan is to propel Drexel from being an excellent regional university into the ranks of the most distinguished research universities. With the strategic objectives and metrics set forth in this plan, we believe this is possible.

To achieve our goals for Drexel, we have developed five major strategic objectives that are designed to be both meaningful and actionable:

- **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

These objectives are first and foremost aimed at assisting our students in facing a post-industrial economy that is global, competitive, increasingly dependent on innovation, and subject to unrelenting market forces. They are intended to leverage our traditional focus on technology and the power of experiential learning combined with an increased emphasis on “use-inspired” research and selective targeting of areas of research and innovation in which Drexel can become pre-eminent.

The Future is Drexel Strategic Plan intends to evolve the University from what it has always been — a home for experiential learning and innovation. This is not a radical departure from Drexel as it is known. Instead, it is an ambitious attempt to realize our place in the changing educational landscape.

This plan comes with a very clear invitation to become involved with it. The achievement of the goals laid out here will take the effort and energy of more than just the hundreds of people involved in formulating it. Each of the five major strategic objectives set forth was chosen for its impact on one or more of Drexel’s key communities. Those communities will be critical in seeing the goals put forth here realized.

Over the coming years, we will report back to the Drexel community on our progress in implementing our strategic objectives and achieving our five objectives. It is critical to our success that we are held accountable for what we do.
Appendix II

Campus Maps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Engineering Labs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armory (Buckley Courts)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossone Research Enterprise Center</td>
<td>7&amp;7A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>School of Biomedical Engineering, Science, and Health Systems</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Green</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Recreational Field</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Automation Technology</td>
<td>27A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creese Student Center</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daskalakis Athletic Center</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Arts Annex</td>
<td>55A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disque Hall</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel Park</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel Police Station</td>
<td>55C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel World House</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity Houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Chi Rho</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Pi</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Pi Lambda</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pi Kappa Alpha</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pi Kappa Phi</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigma Phi Epsilon</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tau Kappa Epsilon</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theta Chi</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Building</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagerty Library</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handschumacher Dining Center</td>
<td>9C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess Engineering Research Laboratories</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Center</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korman Center</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Communication Center</td>
<td>4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Building and Library</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Mack School of Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeBow Engineering Center</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>College of Engineering</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacAlister Hall</td>
<td>9B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>College of Arts and Sciences</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR &quot;Chuck&quot; &amp; Annette Pennoni Honors College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Building</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandell Theater</td>
<td>9A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matheson Hall</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett S. LeBow College of Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesbitt Hall</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside Dining Terrace</td>
<td>19A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Drexel Plaza</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard C. Goodwin College of Professional Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papadakis Integrated Sciences Building</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Garage</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlstein Business Learning Center</td>
<td>11A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peck Academic and Innovation Building</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peck Alumni Center</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA Building</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randell Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>14A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Halls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun Hall</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caneris Hall</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Hall</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Hall</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers Hall</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hall</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Hall</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towers Hall</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Rensselaer Hall</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Commons</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>College of Information Science and Technology (School)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Building</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorority Houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Sigma Alpha</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Phi Epsilon</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Zeta</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Mu</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Sigma Sigma</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinbright Career Development Center</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratton Hall</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Crossings</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBN Center</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBN Center Annex</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidas Athletic Complex</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201 Arch Street</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3210 Cherry Street</td>
<td>55B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3210 Spring Garden Street</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 N. 31st Street</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* This document has been informed by the Interim Report of the Task Force on Innovative Teaching and Learning’s Subcommittee on Assessment and Evaluation.
1. **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this document is to outline a comprehensive plan for the assessment of student learning at Drexel University that achieves the following goals:

- Prioritizes the university’s assessment needs and goals,
- Improves our collective understanding of student learning,
- Informs improvements in instruction, curricula and co-curricular activities,
- Informs school, college and institutional strategic plans and budgets,
- Supports and complements program-specific assessment efforts and accreditation requirements,
- Supports the overall assessment of institutional effectiveness, and
- Meets Middle States Council on Higher Education (MSCHE) Standard 14 requirements.

In addition, the document provides a framework upon which resources of personnel, time and budget can be attached to ensure that the above goals are achieved.

2. **BACKGROUND**

Drexel University has undergone dramatic growth and development over the last decade resulting in documented improvements in the quality of students, faculty, research, rankings, external distinctions, and financial strength. This growth, extensive over a short period of time, is well aligned with the University’s mission.

*Figure 1. Drexel University Mission*

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.

Even though teaching and learning are at the heart of Drexel University’s mission, and improvements in teaching and learning are widely considered to be key drivers of the University’s successes, these improvements are hard to identify and their impact on the institution’s growth is difficult to evidence. As such, a focused effort is needed to better understand these activities and how they are improving within courses, across degree programs, and at the University as a whole.

At the national-level, the federal government’s renewed focus on institutional accountability in terms of student learning is providing a catalyst for increased attention on the assessment of student learning by regional, national, and specialized/program accreditors. In concept, the assessment of student learning as a full-cycle quality assurance process is straightforward – help
administration, faculty, staff, and students to better understand what they are doing, better fulfill the mission of the University, achieve more with less stress, and use available resources more effectively. However, this effort, often referred to as closing the assessment loop or strengthening an institution’s culture of evidence, is difficult and requires a sustained and dedicated effort. To meet this challenge, and to ensure that the academic experience of Drexel’s students is meeting both their expectations and the institution’s expectations, as well as those of prospective students, accrediting bodies, academic foundations and societies, regulatory agencies, and peer institutions, Drexel University is embarking on a renewed and comprehensive institution-wide project for the assessment of student learning outcomes and an evaluation of the environments that support achievement of those outcomes.

2.1 Benchmarking Current Practices

As the institution-wide coordination of college, school, program and unit assessment efforts gets underway, several programs and units have been identified that provide 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. Most of these best practices are found in programs with specialized accreditations, but there are also well-developed assessment efforts in student life, the Steinbright Career Development Center, the Academic Advising, Retention and Diversity office, and in a core set of programs from other colleges and schools.

We have other strengths to build on as well. For example, there are innovative technologies being used and developed at the University to support learning, curricula, and instruction through the collection and use of assessment data. Perhaps most importantly, faculty and administrators across the University are participating in conversations and projects to better understand student learning, develop discipline-appropriate methods to measure and think about student learning, and 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 and sustainability of a culture of evidence at Drexel University.*

3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Several principles guide work on assessment and inform the Drexel University Assessment Plan. The principles include those articulated by MSCHE as the characteristics of effective assessment, and those that specifically underscore assessment at Drexel:
MSCHE PRINCIPLES

- 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 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;

- 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;

- TARGETING efforts on a manageable set of full-circle assessment projects helps focus resources and better support assessment;

- STUDENTS form an important part of learning assessment and should be integrated into those processes; and

- BALANCE assessment of progress toward programmatic goals with the need to assess individual, diverse, and unpredictable forms of excellence.

4. INSTITUTION-LEVEL ASSESSMENT

The goal of institution-level learning assessment is to identify as broadly as possible learning goals that are relevant and important across the institution and to determine the extent to which students are achieving those goals. This level of assessment will be coordinated through the Office of the Provost by the Associate Vice Provost of Curriculum and Assessment (AVPCA) and the University Committee on Learning Assessment (UCA). In addition, the AVPCA and UCA are responsible for reporting assessment activities across the institution at other levels of analysis.

---

4.1 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 competencies and five experiential learning outcomes – the latter are aligned to the mission and strategic plan of the University (see Appendix I for details). A developmental continuum has been outlined to support and guide assessment of the DSLPs. The model captures the ability of students to apply their learning in increasingly complex and unfamiliar situations. To further support and guide assessment, working groups are developing assessment frameworks for each of the core competencies and experiential learning outcomes. In particular, the assessment frameworks are being developed to support the assessment of the DSLPs through employer and student surveys in the context of co-operative education experiences. The co-op-based assessment will form the foundation of Drexel’s assessment of the DSLPs.

Figure 2. Drexel Student Learning Priorities

4.1a Core Goals (Draft)

Students graduating from Drexel University develop a set of core competencies in the following areas:²

**Technology:** Make appropriate use of technology to support research, solve problems, communicate, collaborate, support decision-making, and enhance personal productivity

**Self-Directed Learning:** Develop a clear sense of oneself to support ongoing intellectual curiosity, self-efficacy and life-long, self-directed learning

**Creative and Critical Thinking:** Evaluate arguments and synthesize multiple perspectives in order to develop creative solutions to complex problems and well-reasoned arguments to support those solutions

---

² The learning outcome descriptions provided here are drafts and will be refined under the guidance of the University Committee on Learning Assessment.
Information Literacy: Efficiently and effectively identify, access, and critically evaluate information to accomplish a specific purpose

Communication: Communicate in a range of media to diverse audiences

Ethical Reasoning: Reason ethically in a range of circumstances

These competencies support, and are integrated into, learning in the disciplines and provide the foundation for a broad education across disciplines.

4.1b Experiential Learning Goals (Draft)

At Drexel University, students engage in experiential learning in a range of diverse contexts. These intentional experiences provide them with rich opportunities to support their achievement of outcomes and develop identified competencies.

Students graduating from Drexel University demonstrate progress in five areas that align with Drexel’s mission and its strategic plan, achieving levels of competency in each area appropriate to their program of study and their individual interests:

Global Competence: Act meaningfully and productively in global contexts by making informed decisions that engage culturally, historically and politically diverse perspectives

Leadership: Lead others, organizations or institutions in the development and achievement of a mission, vision or goal

Responsible Citizenship: Demonstrate leadership in a field of study by applying learned knowledge and skills to the betterment of society and the improvement of local communities

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Expression: Contribute to the development of innovative, use-inspired research, scholarship and creative works

Professional Practice: Apply knowledge and skills gained from a program of study to the achievement of goals in a work or clinical environment

4.1c A Developmental Model

As students progress through their program of study, develop core competencies, and apply their learning in diverse contexts, they proceed along a developmental continuum that reflects their increasing ability to apply their learning to identifying and solving complex, meaningful, real-world problems. The following scales represent boundaries of the continuum:

Controlled .................................................. Ambiguous
Novice .......................................................... Professional
Concrete ......................................................... Conceptual
Scaffolded ..................................................... Self-Directed
Simple .......................................................... Complex
Generic ......................................................... Specific
Local ............................................................. Global
These scales will guide and support discussion and assessment of student learning across the core competencies and experiential learning outcomes.

**4.1d Assessment Frameworks**

Working groups have been formed for each of the learning priorities (e.g., core competencies and experiential learning outcomes). The working groups, comprised of faculty members and administrators who work in areas related to the selected learning priorities, have been assigned the task of completing an assessment framework (see Appendix I) for each learning priority. An assessment framework consists of the following information:

a. Statement of the learning priority,
b. Rationale for the learning priority,
c. Associated, measurable learning outcomes,
d. Mapping of the outcomes into learning experiences (e.g., courses, activities),
e. An assessment plan for each of the associated learning outcomes,
f. Rubrics used to assess the associated learning outcomes,
g. Identification of key stakeholders and questions important to stakeholders that the assessment data will address,
h. Annotated bibliography, and
i. Identification of standards related to the associated learning outcomes.

The assessment frameworks will be used to guide and support assessment of the learning priorities.

**4.1e Assessment of Learning in Application | Co-operative Education**

One of the most unique aspects of Drexel University is its co-operative education program. 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 expert feedback on student performance (e.g., application of their learning).

Each working group will collaborate with the co-op team to refine a set of questions for the employer and student co-op survey derived from the assessment frameworks. The survey, deployed at the end of a co-op cycle, will provide students an opportunity to self-assess their achievement of the learning priorities and provide employers with an opportunity to directly assess student performance of the learning priorities (as appropriate to the specific co-op experience).

Additionally, a large percentage of students engage three co-op experiences during their tenure at Drexel. This provides the institution with the ability to compare achievement of the learning outcomes across a student’s program. For the small percentage of students who do not participate in co-op, other assessment strategies will be developed to measure their achievement of the learning priorities.
4.2 Assessing the Communication DSLP: Writing Across the Curriculum

One of the identified learning priorities focuses on communication and writing. In 2001, Drexel established a graduation requirement of three Writing Intensive (WI) for graduation. The University Writing Program was to manage the implementation of this requirement: certify WI courses, train and manage peer writing tutors, and evaluate the efficacy of the program.

In 2009, the Drexel Writing Center was charged with integrating Writing Assessment more fully into the work of the University Writing Program. To assess and improve Drexel student writing abilities, the Writing Center, in collaboration with the Freshman Writing Program (FWP), colleges, and schools, has developed a portfolio-based writing approach and assessment plan. 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; after which, these skills are reinforced through Writing Intensive courses, leading students closer to the “professional” end of the developmental continuum.

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;
- Writing intensive courses in the disciplines that are used to gather portfolio evidence of discipline-specific writing skills;
- Co-op reflections and senior design/capstone portfolio reflections; and
- Analysis at the Department and University level of progress toward meeting SLOs.

In their first year, students take a yearlong sequence of writing courses designed to meet the University-Wide Writing SLOs at the novice level by introducing students to writing as a tool for learning (e.g., critical thinking) and discipline-based communication. In these courses, students create writing portfolios which they build throughout their program of study, 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.

After the first year, students are expected to move from novice toward professional on the writing continuum reflected in the University-Wide Writing SLOs. Students deposit writing artifacts generated in their Writing Intensive courses and co-op reflections to show their progress toward meeting the University-Wide Writing SLOs. Discipline-focused writing is assessed by the programs using rubrics that align to the institution-wide rubric. Information from these assessments is used to drive changes to the departmental WI courses and the FWP sequence.

Writing assessment at the institution-level is anchored in the final writing portfolios that contain writing from writing intensive courses, the co-op post-experience self-reflections, and the capstone experience (if applicable). Students are expected to create a portfolio cover/reflection as part of
their final WI course requirement. In this reflection, students consider how they have met three of the University-Wide Writing SLOs. The cover reflection itself serves as writing evidence that will be evaluated for achievement of specific SLOs. Eight to ten percent of the portfolios and covers will be sampled to gauge how well the University-Wide Writing SLOs are being met; data will be fed back to all departments for action.

4.3 Targeted Institution-level Initiatives

The Office of the Provost has identified four initiatives that have institution-wide impact and that are key elements of the institution’s efforts to better understand and support teaching and learning at the university.

4.3a The Great Works Symposium

The Great Works Symposium (GWS) is an interdisciplinary course that provides students with the opportunity to explore subjects of the broadest possible interest and greatest societal impact. Each course in the GWS focuses a single topic from a range of disciplinary perspectives. Currently, the course deploys several assessment processes to evaluate the quality of the course. The goal moving forward will be to work with the director of the program to shape the work around clearly articulated learning outcomes and an assessment plan that reflects the uniqueness and creative structure of the GWS.

4.3b Course Evaluation Surveys

Across the University, colleges, schools and programs implement a wide range of end-of-term student surveys. The uses of the resulting data, policies that prescribe appropriate use of the data, and the methods of implementation vary as much as the instruments themselves vary. In order to articulate a coherent use of end-of-term surveys at Drexel University appropriately customized to respect disciplinary differences, a working group is being set up under the auspices of the University Committee on Learning assessment. The goal of the working group will be to make recommendations to the Provost, Vice Provosts, and Deans about i) instrument selection and format (e.g., should there be a set of common questions across all surveys? Should faculty have the ability to add questions to the survey just for their course?), ii) policies to cover use, analysis and reporting of data, iii) best practices to increase response rates, and iv) the best mechanisms to deliver surveys and communicate results. This group will also recommend faculty development necessary to help individual faculty and departments understand and utilize survey data.

4.3c The Syllabus Template

To support institutional assessment goals, support faculty in the implementation of outcomes assessment practices in their classrooms, and to improve communication of course content to our students, the Office of Curriculum and Assessment in collaboration with the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence is developing a syllabus template. The template has been vetted by associate
deans from all of the colleges and schools, as well as several groups of faculty. The template is currently in its penultimate form awaiting approval from the faculty senate and deans. Once finalized, a set of tools will be developed to support the development of syllabi in line with the template, as well as a set of resources to support the use and communication of syllabi content in a course.

4.3d Drexel EduApps

The university will support the development of an Educational Application (EduApps) Warehouse. Modeled after the iPhone approach, Drexel University’s EduApps Warehouse will collect, evaluate and disseminate novel approaches to educational situations. An EduApp might be an instruction set to help faculty use clickers in their classroom with appropriate resources to support the successful use of the tool and to collect information on the efficacy of its use. Another EduApp might be an easy to use tool that allows a faculty member to break students into small groups diversified by selected criteria. EduApps focus on extending current teaching, learning and assessment practices as well as making current practices more efficient. By creating a Web-based applications warehouse, Drexel University ensures that new innovations are critically evaluated and widely disseminated in a useable format that provides for ongoing feedback and continuous improvement.

4.3e Quality Matters™ Initiative

Drexel University has agreed to participate in a Quality Matters™ (QM) initiative. QM supports a consortium of over 100 colleges and universities in an effort to establish clear quality criteria for courses, train evaluators in the use of the rubric that defines these criteria, and use the tool to improve the quality of courses. Currently, the QM rubric is focused on online and hybrid courses; however, most all of the criteria in the rubric apply equally well to onground courses. Drexel University will customize the tool to better fits its purpose, goals and priorities and pilot the use of the rubric with its online programs. Additionally, Drexel will support faculty and administrators to participate in the training and certification in the use of the customized QM rubric. This training will integrate with assessment training goals focused on outcome and rubric development, implement learning outcomes assessment practices in courses, and using course-level data to improve learning.

The Online Learning Council, seated by the Provost to provide a point of coordination among Drexel’s online programs, will first pilot a customized version of the Quality Matters (QM) quality assurance tool for online courses. If successful, and with appropriate changes, the tool will be made available broadly across all course modalities at the university.

The QM structure will support our assessment efforts at several levels: 1) institutional, 2) program/department, and 3) course. At the institutional level, we will customize the QM rubric with specific criteria for each of the Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs). The DSLPs reflect the most important learning expected of students across the institution. The list of competencies and
application areas was developed through a multi-phased, collaborative effort of all the schools and colleges, as well as units that support student learning. By adding these criteria to the QM rubrics, we will support a structured conversation among our faculty about what it means to support learning of these competencies, evaluate how well curricula support them, and be able to document where they are being taught. We will eventually work to evaluate student learning of these competencies and relate that back to the QM data to better understand what works and what does not work to support student learning.

At the program level, the plan is to support program administrators in making evidence-based decisions about their curricula (self-assessments, learning outcome achievements, end-of-course surveys, faculty reflections on courses). The data collected from the Drexel customized QM rubric will provide additional meaningful data to help program administrators better understand the quality of the curricula, where various kinds of learning are taking place and how well that learning is being achieved.

At the course level, the plan is to support faculty reflection on their courses based on information collected about the course and about student performance in the course (self-assessment, learning outcome achievements, end-of-course surveys). These reflections help us demonstrate a closing of the assessment loop and provide a context for rich discussions about curricula and instruction in support of student learning. The data collected from the Drexel customized QM rubric will provide additional meaningful data for these reflections.

4.4 Co-Curricular Activities

Co-curricular units are a vital part of student learning at the University, as such assessing the impact of the programs, services and activities they provide is a key piece of the overall assessment plan.

4.4a Office of Academic Advising, Retention and Diversity | The Five Pillars of Retention

The mission of the Office of Advising, Retention and Diversity (AARD) is to align persistence and learning objectives by exploring effective co-curricular practices that will enhance the University's educational goals, including the identified Drexel Student Learning Priorities. By casting the University's persistence goal in this way – to promote student learning – the University's curricular, pedagogical, and co-curricular objectives necessarily intersect in the achievement of the educational end.

AARD makes use of assessment information to develop data driven strategies that will enhance students' ability to engage in the classroom and achieve learning outcomes. A comprehensive review of available quantitative and survey data has been conducted, the Environmental Assessment, and five fundamental areas identified for strategic intercession. These have been coined the Five Pillars of Retention because they in fact support learning objectives central to a cogent and broadly held retention strategy:
- Closing the Preparation Gap
- Closing the Socio-Economic Gap
- Creating Institutional Effectiveness
- Promoting Student Development and Efficacy
- Promoting Student Engagement

Objectives to enhance student readiness to learn and engage as well as existing best practices are established for each Pillar. These have been assembled in a matrix to guide project development at both the University and College/School level. In order to identify strategic priorities at the unit level, current data regarding the composition of each entering cohort (demographic; income; HS GPA buckets; academic index; SAT); financial hold analysis; and course placements are provided to each College/School and Program. On a quarterly basis, Dashboards of critical performance, progress, and attrition data are provided. Finally, annual persistence and performance reports are distributed to colleges/schools and key support offices as a metric. These reports frame our dialogue regarding impediments to performance, progress and persistence, and co-curricular planning at the unit level. These reports and dialogue are informed by findings from survey data, the Student Self Assessment (SSA) and NSSE in particular.

The Office of Advising, Retention and Diversity 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, SCDC, 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 will frame the method by which the University will achieve greater institutional effectiveness in service to shared learning and educational goals.

4.4b Student Life

In 2007, the Student Life Assessment Committee (SLAC) developed a three-year plan to create a culture of assessment across all departments in Student Life. The plan is currently ‘in progress’ and has four major components: 1) the articulation of learning outcomes aligned to the institutional student learning priorities, 2) benchmarking current assessment efforts for student life; 3) providing training and support to Student Life staff and streamlining assessment efforts across Student Life; and, 4) identifying and implementing assessment standards. During the current academic year (2009-2010), an annual Student Life assessment calendar was developed and efforts are underway in collaboration with the Office of Curriculum and Assessment to develop a university-wide assessment calendar to inform departmental/divisional survey efforts by preventing competition for responses from the same sample/population. Additionally, the SLAC discerned training needs of department heads and will roll out an initial workshop on writing and assessing learning outcomes in
February 2010. Finally, the assessment committee is in the process of reviewing results from nationally-normed surveys (CIRP, NSSE, EBI, etc.) and will make recommendations for how departments can use results to inform current practice.

5. PROGRAM/UNIT-LEVEL ASSESSMENT

The goal of the assessment plan at the program/unit level is to provide tools, resources and training as needed to support each program in the development of a clear set of learning outcomes aligned with the Drexel institution-level learning priorities and the creation of an associated assessment plan. An assessment coordinator has been identified for each program to coordinate departmental effort. This assessment coordinator sits on the University Committee on Learning Assessment and is responsible for communicating the assessment efforts of the department to the committee.

The UCA and the Office of Curriculum and Assessment will support learning assessment at the program/unit level by providing resources, a common structure/tool (TracDat) for reporting plans, results and actions taken, as well as integrating program and unit plans into the overall learning assessment narrative of the institution. Most importantly, the UCA provides a forum to ensure that clear, consistent communication and goal-articulation among all programs and units in order to articulate and update an ongoing assessment narrative at the institution.

As noted in the overview section, some programs, particularly those that undergo specialized program accreditation, are far along in their learning assessment efforts; other programs have only just begun the process of identifying outcomes. The Office of Curriculum and Assessment and the Drexel Center for Academic Excellence will be organizing several resource teams (e.g., outcome development team, data usage team, assessment methods team) comprised of faculty from across the university who have been successful implementing program assessment. These individuals will provide peer, expert resource to support other programs that are just starting out in the process.

6. COURSE-LEVEL ASSESSMENT

The goal of the assessment plan at the course level is to support faculty in their efforts to better understand student learning and the efficacy of the activities and support structures they develop and use to support that learning. A large part of this effort involves supporting faculty to develop assessment models appropriate to their discipline and interests framed by the articulation of clear learning outcomes.

The UCA and the Office of Curriculum and Assessment (OCA) will support learning assessment at the course-level by providing resources, professional development opportunities, and a means for communicating and sharing successful practices with other faculty at Drexel and at other institutions. The Syllabus, End-of Course Survey, QM, and EduApps projects will be key elements in supporting faculty in these areas. In addition, the Office of the Provost has hired an external consultant who will work with faculty members on a range of classroom assessment techniques. In
particular, he will help them to build question banks focused around specific instructional, curricular and learning areas, and helping faculty to use these questions to develop survey instruments that they can use to better understand what is going on in the courses they teach.

Additionally, the OCA and UCA will be piloting the use of assessment peers. Assessment peers are faculty members who have extensive experience in learning assessment who have volunteered to work with a specific faculty member over the course of a term. The assessment peer will work with the faculty member to develop a range of learning assessment activities for a course, help implement them, assist in data collection and analysis, and support the faculty in documenting post-course reflections on the impact of the assessment efforts.

The OCA will be responsible for ensuring that the efforts of faculty across the institution are integrated into the overall learning assessment narrative of the institution.

7. LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT SUPPORT

In addition to the resources provided by the targeted assessment activities, the Office of the Provost is sponsoring a broad range of events and activities to inform members of the Drexel University community about assessment and to empower and encourage faculty members to develop and implement learning assessment across their educational activities. These activities include: a series of webinars, support for conference attendance, a speaker series, as well as the development of training, tool, technology, and shared practice resources. These support resources come from a range of departments within the Office of the Provost, including: Office of Curriculum and Assessment; Drexel Center for Academic Excellence; the Academic Advising, Retention and Diversity Office; the Office of Planning and Budget, and the Online Learning Council.

The UCA also is working to integrate assessment goals and process more centrally into academic operations and systems. The first efforts are focused on the following:

- Informing new faculty training 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;
- Organize institutional data (include learning assessment data) collection, analysis and distribution to ensure that stakeholder have access to data and support using data;
- Integrate student learning assessment into program review procedures; and
- Discussing ways that learning assessment efforts can be integrated into job descriptions and performance expectations.
The more Drexel University is able to instill its assessment priorities into the day-to-day working of the institution, the more likely it will be that current efforts will be sustained.

8. COMMUNICATION

To support institution-wide understanding of the institution’s assessment goals and the role it plays in our decennial accreditation reaffirmation efforts, the Office of the Provost has developed a 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 share point sites to coordinate and organize efforts, and two web sites (e.g., an assessment site and a MSCHE Decennial Site Visit web site).

9. SHARING OUR UNDERSTANDING OF STUDENT LEARNING

One of the most important reasons to undertake an institution-wide effort to assess student learning is to increase our collective understanding of student learning. All too often the insights discovered about student learning by individuals or units are never shared. Even when the results are communicated to others, they rarely contribute a widely shared sense of how learning can work.

To address this issue, the OCA and UCA will work to develop a student learning knowledge management system that captures the best practices and insights of colleagues across the institution. In its initial phases, the effort will focus on creating ongoing and regular opportunities to hold cross-disciplinary conversations on assessment findings, best practices, and student learning. A goal of these conversations will be to draft a Drexel statement on learning assessment that reflects, as much as possible, a consensus reflection on learning assessment and student learning at the institution. The conversations will inform the later development of more formal processes and tools to capture this information.

10. ASSESSMENT TECHNOLOGIES

The University seeks to identify, evaluate and support a wide range of assessment technologies to support the effort of our faculty, administration and staff to better understand student learning and to collect, communicate and use learning data in the most efficient ways possible.

Drexel faculty members have developed several innovative technologies to support learning outcomes assessment. These tools are currently used by a selection of colleges, schools and programs:

- Andrew McCann, previously an instructor in the English and Philosophy Department, and Scott Warnock, assistant professor in the English and Philosophy Department and director of the First-Year Writing Program, developed Waypoint Outcomes;
- Donald McEachron, Associate Director for Academic Operations and Assessment in the School of Biomedical Engineering, Science and Health Systems, lead the development of the Academic Evaluation Feedback and Instruction System (AEFIS) with one of his students; and

- The LeBow College of Business has developed a robust student survey system and a faculty tracking system that is used to support their accreditation and assessment efforts.

The Office of Curriculum and Assessment in conjunction with the Office of the Provost, the Assessment Council, and the University Committee on Learning Assessment are reviewing these tools for institution-wide support.

The University has purchased Nuventive’s TracDat as its main, institution-wide technology to organize and communicate assessment at the program and institution levels. The Office of Curriculum and Assessment will develop a TracDat implementation strategy that supports and organizes program- and institution-level assessment efforts. Additionally, Drexel has adopted Nuventive’s portfolio solution, iWebFolio. The tool plays a key role in the assessment of writing and supports assessment efforts in a few colleges and schools.

There is a range of other technologies that Drexel supports and that are being used to support assessment efforts. These include: iStrategy, Sharepoint, Bb and Bb Vista (and associated tools), and the Snap survey tool. Drexel’s Office of Information Resources and Technology (IRT) supports use of these technologies with training, service and implementation support. The IRT partners with the academic programs across the University to identify, implement, and support technology solutions, including solutions focused on learning assessment. The IRT plays a key role in building a culture of assessment at the University and is represented both on the UCA and on the Assessment Council.

Flashlight Online 2.0 has also been site licensed for experimental use. A particularly interesting new feature in Flashlight Online is its combination of rubrics for assessment use with a survey engine. Experiments at Washington State have begun demonstrating how students and faculty can each use Flashlight to gather formative or summative feedback about student work from a variety of judges: peer critique, faculty judgment, and assessments from professionals in the field. The resulting data can be sorted, rubric by rubric, judge by judge, to provide a context for interpreting individual learning, course performance, and institutional programs.

11. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LEARNING ASSESSMENT

11.1 Structure

The University Committee on Learning Assessment (UCA) is comprised of members from across the institution, reflecting academic, co-curricular and administrative units. The Associate Vice Provost for Curriculum and Assessment chairs the UCA. The Assessment Council is a smaller sub-group of the UCA and serves as executive team overseeing the work of the UCA and reporting to the Provost. The MSCHE Core Group also sits on the UCA and Assessment Council and links the work of the UCA to...
the Steering Committee that supports the upcoming 2011/2012 MSCHE site visit. All appointments are for a three-year period.

![Diagram of University Committee on Learning Assessment](image)

**Figure 1. Structure of the University Committee on Learning Assessment**

### 11.2 Responsibilities

The University Committee on Learning Assessment (UCA) is charged by the Provost and serves as the coordinating resource for the assessment of student learning and program effectiveness at the University. The UCA is charged with the following responsibilities:

- **PLAN, IMPLEMENT & OVERSEE:** Plan, implement and oversee a university-wide plan for the assessment of student learning
- **REVIEW:** Review and evaluate assessment plans, processes and tools, focusing on MSCHE and program-specific accreditation requirements, and Drexel, college/school and unit strategic plans
- **ADVISE:** Advise the Provost on matters of assessment and evaluation
- **COMMUNICATE:** Communicate the university’s vision for assessment to institutional stakeholders and the larger community
- **CONNECT:** Connect resources across the university that are engaged in assessment activities
- **SUPPORT:** Support the development of a culture of learning assessment across the institution, and the assessment efforts of individual units and colleagues across the institution
- **INFORM:** Inform university stakeholders about best practices, tools, processes and other assessment-related support resources
- DEVELOP: Develop mechanisms for the reporting of assessment results and the use of these results to inform, affirm and improve the institution’s educational practices

- REPORT & ORGANIZE: Report and organize the results of assessment activities to support a coherent institution-wide narrative on student learning and the development of a student-learning knowledge management system

11.3 Integration with Institutional Research and Accreditation

To ensure that the work of the UCA informs work of institutional assessment more broadly, select members of the UCA also will serve as liaisons to the accreditation steering committee and associated working groups. In addition, the Vice Provost of Institutional Research sits on the UCA and will help develop reporting methods to secure the use of learning data in the strategic plans and evaluations of institutional, school/college and departmental effectiveness across the university.

12. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Delivery dates, responsible personnel and resource needs will be communicated for each of the assessment activities noted in this document. The dates will be determined during the winter and spring meetings of the University Committee on Learning Assessment and the Assessment Council. Updates to the schedule and progress reports will be made available through both the assessment share point site and the assessment web site.
APPENDIX I: INSTITUTION-LEVEL ASSESSMENT | Drexel Student Learning Priorities Project

OVERVIEW

A key element of our institution-wide assessment plan is to identify a set of Drexel University student learning priorities (DSLPs) aligned to the Drexel mission and strategic plan that captures knowledge areas, competencies and skills considered central to the broad education of a Drexel student by faculty, students, administrators and employers.

PROJECT GOALS

The Drexel Institution-Level Learning Priorities project was developed to meet four goals as charged by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs in support of our assessment and accreditation efforts:

- Collaboratively identify, prioritize, and build consensus around a set of the most important learning goals that define a Drexel student across colleges, schools and units;

- Develop a model that reflects the identified institution-level learning goals and can be used to structure the assessment of these goals; and;

- Integrate both the goal and the specific learning outcomes identified by the Task Force on Enhancing the Undergraduate Education (See Appendix I – EUE Task Force Recommendation #1); and

- Collaboratively identify or develop methods to assess selected learning priorities.
### METHODOLOGY AND TIMELINE | Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Brainstorming</strong></td>
<td>A first-draft list of student learning priorities was identified during the provost and deans’ retreat. The learning outcomes recommendations from the Task Force on Enhancing the Undergraduate Education report is integrated into the list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continued Brainstorming</strong></td>
<td>Members of the Council of Associate Deans, and their colleagues in each school and college, as well as staff from student life and AARD, vet the list and suggest deletions, edits, and additions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Development</strong></td>
<td>The core assessment council organizes the list around a set of themes or broadly stated learning goals aligned to the mission and strategic plan, and then develops a model that captures the breadth of identified learning goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Frameworks</strong></td>
<td>Identify working groups for each competency and application area and complete a framework document for each one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Supplements</strong></td>
<td>A specific example of how the model is articulated with specific program outcomes and core competencies is developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consensus Building</strong></td>
<td>The University Committee on Learning Assessment, the Academic Council, and the Faculty Senate through the SCAA, vet, suggest modifications and approve the model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>Communicate the model and frameworks to the schools, colleges and units and work with them to develop ways to support the model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Feedback</strong></td>
<td>A survey is distributed to Drexel stakeholders (e.g., faculty, administration, students, alumni, and employers) collect feedback on the perceived importance of the identified list of learning outcomes as well as current satisfaction with Drexel’s performance supporting learning of each of the outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis, Reporting, &amp; Communication</strong></td>
<td>The results of the survey are used to inform and prioritize outcomes assessment work. The results of the first part of the project are communicated broadly to the Drexel community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODOLOGY AND TIMELINE | Current Next Steps

- WORK GROUPS: Identify working groups for each core competency, application area, and the developmental model
- ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORKS: Support working groups in the completion of Assessment Frameworks for each core competency, application area, and the developmental model
- COMMUNICATION: Develop visual displays of the model
- PROGRAM INTEGRATION: Build out an example of how the model will play out in the context of program-level learning goals
- CONSENSUS: Continue to build consensus for model

WORKING MODEL | Framework

PROGRAM OUTCOMES: Students graduating from Drexel University achieve competency in a field of study evidenced by achievement of a set of program-specific learning outcomes.

CORE COMPETENCIES: Students graduating from Drexel University also develop a set of core competencies in the following areas:

- Technology,
- Self-Directed Learning,
- Critical and Creative Thinking,
- Information Literacy,
- Communication, and
- Ethical Reasoning.

These competencies support, and are integrated into, learning in the disciplines and provide the foundation for a broad education across disciplines.

APPLICATION OF LEARNING: At Drexel University, students engage in experiential learning in a range of diverse contexts. These intentional experiences provide them with rich opportunities to support their achievement of outcomes and develop identified competencies.

Students graduating from Drexel University demonstrate progress in six areas that align with Drexel’s mission and its strategic plan, achieving levels of competency in each area appropriate to their program of study and their individual interests:

- Global Competence;
- Leadership;
- Responsible Citizenship;
- Research, Scholarship, and Creative Expression; and
- Professional Practice.

DEVELOPMENTAL MODEL: As students progress through their program of study, develop core competencies, and apply their learning in diverse contexts, they proceed along a developmental
continuum that reflects their increasing ability to apply their learning to identifying and solving complex, meaningful, real-world problems. The following scales represent aspects of the continuum.

Controlled .............................................................. Ambiguous
Novice ................................................................. Professional
Concrete ................................................................. Conceptual
Scaffolded ............................................................ Self-Directed
Simple ................................................................. Complex
Generic ................................................................. Specific
Local ................................................................. Global
Rule-Focused .................................................... Entrepreneurial

WORKING MODEL | Detail Draft

PROGRAM OUTCOMES: Students graduating from Drexel University achieve competency in a field of study evidenced by achievement of a set of program-specific learning outcomes.

CORE COMPETENCIES: Students graduating from Drexel University also develop a set of core competencies in the following areas:

Technology: Make appropriate use of technology to support research, solve problems, communicate, collaborate, support decision-making, and enhance personal productivity

Self-Directed Learning: Develop a clear sense of oneself to support ongoing intellectual curiosity, self-efficacy and life-long, self-directed learning

Critical and Creative Thinking: Evaluate arguments and synthesize multiple perspectives in order to develop creative solutions to complex problems and well-reasoned arguments to support those solutions

Information Literacy: Efficiently and effectively identify, access, and critically evaluate information to accomplish a specific purpose

Communication: Communicate in a range of media to diverse audiences

Ethical Reasoning: Reason ethically in a range of circumstances

These competencies support, and are integrated into, learning in the disciplines and provide the foundation for a broad education across disciplines.

APPLICATION OF LEARNING: At Drexel University, students engage in experiential learning in a range of diverse contexts. These intentional experiences provide them with rich opportunities to support their achievement of outcomes and develop identified competencies.

Students graduating from Drexel University demonstrate progress in six areas that align with Drexel’s mission and its strategic plan, achieving levels of competency in each area appropriate to their program of study and their individual interests:
Global Competence: Act meaningfully and productively in global contexts by making informed decisions that engage culturally, historically and politically diverse perspectives

Leadership: Lead others, organizations or institutions in the development and achievement of a mission, vision or goal

Responsible Citizenship: Apply learned knowledge and skills to the betterment of society and the improvement of local communities

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Expression: Contribute to the development of innovative, use-inspired research, scholarship and creative works

Professional Practice: Apply knowledge and skills gained from a program of study to the achievement of goals in a work or clinical environment

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK | Overview

The goal of developing assessment frameworks is to provide a structure to support and guide the articulation and assessment of each of the Drexel University Learning Priorities. The frameworks also will be used to communicate through the assessment web site the work of the University Committee on Learning Assessment and provide a resource for colleagues interested in pursuing assessment or research in these areas.
ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK | Template

For each of the identified learning goals, the assigned working group will be responsible for the completion of the assessment framework detailed below. Work will be shared and presented to the UCA on a regular basis according to deadlines identified by the UCA.

I. Learning Goal Statement
   
   An articulation of the learning goal that captures the breadth of intended learning related to the goal

II. Rationale
   
   A clear and concise description of the learning goal that uses language appropriate for the general academic community that provides an explanatory background for the learning goal and describes the purpose and intent of identifying it as a learning goal

III. Learning Outcomes
   
   - Read through the list of learning statements that were part of the original brainstorming list developed by the Deans, Associate Deans, faculty and learning-focused co-curricular units. They will give you insight into the intention of the learning goal (see last two pages of this handout)
   - Develop a list of 5 - 10 measurable, succinct learning outcomes that demonstrate achievement of the most important elements of the learning goal
   - Select 1 – 3 that could be meaningfully assessed in the context of a co-op experience

IV. Validation of the Learning Goal

IV.i Annotated Bibliography

A short annotated reference list citing research that informs work on the learning goal

IV.ii Standards

A list of appropriate standards (or other validation methods) that support the learning goal and the methods identified to assess it (e.g., AAC&U’s work on general education)

DECISION POINTS:

- Do we prioritize a subset of these to focus on or work to move all of them forward in the process?
- Do we deploy a survey of stakeholders (students, faculty, administrators, employers) to determine their priority and how well we support them?
V. Mapping
An identification of the common (to all/significant subsets of students) learning experiences, courses, and resources that provide students (intentionally or not) an opportunity to learn the stated outcome

VI. Assessment of Learning Outcomes
A list and description of recommended learning assessment activities that would support our exploration of institution-wide achievement of the learning goal or achievement of the goal in specific activities, courses or experiences

VII. Rubrics

VII.i Visioning Learning of the Goal
In broad, widely applicable terms that provide a basic structure for investigating learning of the goal:
1) describe what student learning looks like for students who master the learning goal, 2) describe what student learning looks like for students who achieve competency of the learning goal, and 3) describe what student learning looks like for students who make no progress on the learning goal

VII.ii Rubric Development
Develop or identify broadly worded, widely applicable rubrics that describe learning of each of the identified learning outcomes

Note: Consider the scales (subset of, as appropriate) from the Developmental Model. Also, working groups may decided to articulate more than 3 levels of achievement

VIII. Closing the Loop
In preparation for the use of collected data, 1) identify key stakeholders, and 2) identify questions important to stakeholders that the assessment data will address
### APPENDIX II: The University Committee on Learning Assessment

#### MSCHE CORE TEAM
- N. John DiNardo, Chair MSCHE Steering Committee
- Eisenstein, Co-Chair MSCHE Steering Committee
- Jan Biros
- Barbara Hornum
- Craig Bach, Chair UCA

#### ASSESSMENT COUNCIL
- **MSCHE Core Team**
  - Teck Lim
- Don McEachron (Co-Chair Standard 14)
- Barney Lentz
- David Urias
- Toni Torres
- Michael Scheuermann
- Karen Nulton
- Suzanne Rocheleau
- Jonathan Spanier
- Peter Franks

#### ACADEMIC TEAM
- **College and School Liaisons**
  - Steven Powell, COMAD
  - Dan Filler, LAW
  - Frank Linnehan, LEBOW
  - Sandy Friedlander, CoAS
  - Kevin Scoles, COE
  - Delia Neuman, iSCHOOL
  - Barbara Schindler, DUCOM
  - Frank Harvey, SOE
  - Abi Aghayere, ST&PS
  - Judy Giering, ST&PS
  - Mary Ellen Glasgow, CNHP
  - Shannon Gary, HONORS
  - Fred Allen, BIOMED
  - Mary Hovinga, PUBLIC HEALTH

- **Faculty Senate**
  - Ronald Bishop, CoAS (CC)
  - Peter Wade, CoAS (Chemistry)
  - Adam Fontecchio (EECE)
  - William D’Andrea (CNHP)
  - Emily Zimmerman (Law)

- **Student Government**
  - Christopher Castillo, GSA
  - Chirag Patel, USGA

#### EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING
- Daniela Ascarelli, STUDY ABROAD
- Dan Eckrich, CO-OP
- Natalie Traher, CO-OP
- Stephanie Sullivan, CO-OP
- Frank Ferrone, RESEARCH
- Dan Dougherty, CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

#### CO-CURRICULAR LIAISONS
- Shannon Finning, STUDENT LIFE
- Jeff Bonfield, STUDENT LIFE
- Steve Chestnut, IRT
- Elizabeth Ten Have, LIBRARY
- Esmeralda Nava, ACADEMIC ADVISING, RETENTION AND DIVERSITY

#### SUPPORT RESOURCES
- Bill Rosenberg, SURVEY RESEARCH
- TBD as needed, RESEARCH METHODS
- TBD as needed, PSYCHOMETRICS
- TBD as needed, ETHONOGRAPHER
- Amy Slaton, HISTORIAN
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Glasgow, Mary Ellen Smith ............................................... ms55@drexel.edu
Harvey, Frank .................................................................. fh55@drexel.edu
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Lentz, Bernard ................................................................ bfl25@drexel.edu
Lim, Teck-Kah .................................................................. limtk@drexel.edu
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Response Template
Appendix 4. Response Template

Research Question Number:

Research Question:

Methodology
(What methods were used to answer the research question.)

Summary Response:

Detailed Response (Bullets)
(To support your points, reference evidence inline with the text for each response. Provide the filename within parentheses – we will hyperlink to it in the final draft.)