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Our Halualani & Associates team set out to provide an evaluation of a) The Pennsylvania State University’s “A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State” and b) the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity (in terms of structure, capacity, accountability, staffing, resources, and sustainability). We also benchmarked The Pennsylvania State University in relation to their peers and other identified campuses.

In this evaluation, we examined the following key questions:

“A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State”:

• What has been the productive output of the Framework as of the most recent (2010) review materials?
• Specifically, what has been achieved in each Challenge area?
• How has the Framework progressed in terms of specific stages of evolution of a diversity plan/framework?
• What is the nature of the outcomes?
• What kind of assessment data has been yielded from the Framework and what has it indicated about progress in the Challenge areas?
• What is the overall quality of the achievements of each academic college, unit, or campus in relation to the Framework?
• Which Challenge areas are farther along in terms of goal achievement?

Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity:

• How effective is the internal/external structure of the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity in achieving its key goals?
• How successful is the operational capacity of the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity in terms of the following:
  • Administration and staff in relation to assigned workload
  • Coordination
  • Budget and allocated resources
  • Capacity to meet the present and future diversity demands of The Pennsylvania State University.
  • Structure, accountability, and assessment process of the Framework for all academic colleges, units, and campuses
• How does The Pennsylvania State University’s Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity compare in relation to other diversity infrastructures at its peer institutions?

In order to conduct the evaluation, our team made a campus/site visit in late February 2013 during which we met with President Erickson, Interim Provost Pangborn, Vice Provost Jones, Assistant Vice Provost Sanchez, Assistant Vice Provost Whitehurst, Director of Development Del Pilar, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Bowen, Vice President for Administration Poole, Vice Provost for Affirmative Action Lehrman, Executive Director of Planning and Institutional Assessment Dooris, and multiple campus committees and constituencies (President’s Equity Commissions, Administrative Council on Multicultural Affairs, Senior Diversity Planning Analysts, Multicultural Resource Center, Educational Equity Programs Directors, and the representatives from among the college deans, campus chancellors, and previous Framework review team chairs and participants). We also spoke individually to at least 25-30 campus members (administrators, faculty, staff, students) in the spring. We then examined all of the collected Unit Final Progress Feedback Reports from “A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State: 2004-2009.”
Our team collected and utilized multiple sources of data in order to conduct the evaluation of “A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State” and the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity. More specifically, the following forms of data were collected and utilized:

“A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State”:

• Notes and observations made during the February site visit
• Data and documentation regarding the Framework (historical framings, main sections, review reports and appendices) that are provided on the web
• 43 Unit Final Progress Update Reports from the academic colleges, academic support units, and campuses for the 2004-2009 Framework (note: we used these reports because these represented the most recent formal reports submitted by these units for the Framework and highlighted key outcomes)
• Comparison information as delineated in our Atlas database (a data source that contains all information regarding diversity, inclusion, and equity infrastructures, initiatives, and operations at all accredited institutions in the United States)

Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity:

• Data and documentation regarding the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity’s structures and operations that are provided on the web
• Comparison information as delineated in our Atlas database (a data source that contains all information regarding diversity, inclusion, and equity infrastructures, initiatives, and operations at all accredited institutions in the United States)

We applied analytics to all of the above data sources in terms of quantitative and qualitative analysis (SPSS, NVIVO, and QDA Miner). Two research associates coded each of the 43 Unit Final Progress Update Reports (totaling over 3,000 text pages) in relation to the following scales and formulas:

• Total Amount of 2004-2009 Framework Efforts (as indicated by the Unit Final Progress Update Reports): Total Sum, Percentages of Total Efforts for Each Challenge Area

• Change Order/Diversity Evolution Score: Summation of Change Order Values for all Efforts By Challenge Area divided by the Number of Grouped Entries, Average Change Order Score Per Challenge Area

• Resulting Processes and Products: Number of Processes and Products by Challenge Area, Percentage of Total

• Halualani & Associates’ DELTA (Diversity Engagement Learning Taxonomy Assessment) Frequencies: Summation of Efforts By Challenge Area in terms of DELTA Levels, Percentages of Total

• Prospective Reach: Summation of Efforts Per Challenge Area by Prospective Reach Level

• Endurance Factor: Summation of Efforts Per Challenge Area by Endurance Factor Level

• Assessment/Outcomes: Summation of the Number of Indirect and Direct Assessment Measures By Challenge Area
H&A has developed a unique numbering sequencing designation that indicates the degree of evolution of a diversity effort/practice in terms of the following:

1. **First order -**
   Declarative efforts and practices establishing a commitment to diversity.

2. **Second order -**
   Commitment is demonstrated by an action, effort, or program. “1st wave” efforts in evolution of diversity practices.

3. **Third order -**
   Sustained action and practices emanating from 1st to 2nd order. Positive gains on impact/outcome need to be evident.

4. **Fourth order -**
   Transformative & culture changing practices. Indicates sustained and prioritized efforts evolving from 1st to 2nd to 3rd order. Reflects major impact and outcomes on diversity engagement in campus community.

* These categories remake the notion of “business as usual.”
* The goal is to have all diversity efforts, practices, and processes working together in a coordinated progression with balanced proportions of each change order.
* Ideally, lower order efforts feed into higher order efforts.
### Diversity Efforts Impact, Reach, & Evolution Assessment

#### Change Order/Diversity Evolution

#### Number of indirect, direct, and undefined measures by Challenge Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge Area</th>
<th>Efforts</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Change Order Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge 1: Developing a Shared and Inclusive Understanding of Diversity</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge 2: Creating a Welcoming Campus Climate</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge 3: Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Student Body</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge 4: Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Workforce</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge 5: Developing a Curriculum that Fosters Intercultural and International Competencies</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge 6: Diversifying University Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge 7: Coordinating Organizational Change to Support Our Diversity Goals</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First order - Declarative efforts
Second order - Demonstrated by action
Third order - Sustained practices
Fourth order - Transformative practices

*Challenges 3 & 4 have the most concrete assessment measures/outcomes reported; the other Challenges need improvement in the design and execution of impact assessment. Although Challenge 5 features a 6 credit hour requirement and mostly permanent courses, thereby making it a sustained, institutionalized practice, there needs to be more rigorous summative and outcome assessment for these courses.
### Diversity Efforts Impact, Reach, & Evolution Assessment

#### Resulting Processes and Products:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge 1</th>
<th>Challenge 2</th>
<th>Challenge 3</th>
<th>Challenge 4</th>
<th>Challenge 5</th>
<th>Challenge 6</th>
<th>Challenge 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing a Shared and Inclusive Understanding of Diversity</td>
<td>Creating a Welcoming Campus Climate</td>
<td>Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Student Body</td>
<td>Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Workforce</td>
<td>Developing a Curriculum that Fosters Intercultural and International Competencies</td>
<td>Diversifying University Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>Coordinating Organizational Change to Support Our Diversity Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596 efforts</td>
<td>383 efforts</td>
<td>801 efforts</td>
<td>356 efforts</td>
<td>562 efforts</td>
<td>265 efforts</td>
<td>293 efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% of total</td>
<td>12% of total</td>
<td>25% of total</td>
<td>11% of total</td>
<td>17% of total</td>
<td>8% of total</td>
<td>9% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 processes</td>
<td>77 processes</td>
<td>136 processes</td>
<td>69 processes</td>
<td>18 processes</td>
<td>53 processes</td>
<td>79 processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 products</td>
<td>314 products</td>
<td>659 products</td>
<td>213 products</td>
<td>714 products</td>
<td>193 products</td>
<td>156 products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This measure examines the type of outcome created through the effort. One outcome - process - refers to a structured pathway of actions/steps created to achieve a particular end. For example, a process may be created to hire diverse faculty and such a process may involve several steps and policies, thereby ensuring the continual diversification of faculty. Another outcome - product - refers to those concrete ends such as a scholarship fund, event, and retention rates that are visible with measurable effects.

*Overall, every Challenge has more products created than processes. It should be noted that Challenge 3 has the most processes created; this is significant in that long-term, sustainable, formal/structured processes to address the recruitment and retention of diverse students, have been created as a result of the Framework. In terms of products, Challenge 5 (which focuses on intercultural/international competency-related curricula) had the most resulting products (in terms of actual courses). Challenge 3 also had the second highest number of products created.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 7 - Innovative Problem Solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Innovative thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses multiple perspectives to develop new, original, unique, impactful strategies &amp; solutions to problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relies on multiple heuristics (from all cultures, contexts, arenas of life)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 6 - Social Agency &amp; Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Designing Actions, Personal-Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Able to see connections across differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Problem-solving, Responsive decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Constructive-Resistive (from the marginalized side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Action, Advocacy, Allies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sharing with/Teaching Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation/Critique of Power Differences, Positionality/Compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Posing Complex Questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4 - Advanced Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Perspective-Taking/Reflection/Analysis, Self-Other Dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personally invested in diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unscripted/Off the Beaten Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Free-flying among concepts, areas to ferret out the big, difficult questions and major problematics, stakes, urgencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3 - Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Active Involvement in Intercultural Interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Motivation, Seeking Out, Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2 - Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Application/Intercultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competence/Skills-based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 - Knowledge-Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge, Awareness, Appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Touches on Social Approvability Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges 2, 3, 4, and 7 employ the DELTA Level 4 of Advanced Analysis while Challenges 1 and 2 remain at the DELTA Level 1 of Knowledge Awareness. This latter finding is suitable in that Challenges 1 and 2 are framing and awareness-focused strategic goals of the Framework. We noted that Challenge 5 (Developing a Curriculum with Intercultural/International Competencies) mostly had evidence of DELTA Level 1 - Knowledge Awareness of various intercultural topics. There was a lack of evidence with regard to these courses in terms of any of the higher levels (Levels 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7) of diversity engagement. We suspect that these levels are occurring; however, there needs to be systematic evidence provided regarding these levels in the next review period. Challenge 6 (Diversifying University Leadership and Management) is appropriately positioned at Level 2 given the nature of its goal/objective in terms of diversifying leadership and developing its diversity competencies.
# Diversity Efforts

## Impact, Reach, & Evolution Assessment

### Prospective Reach Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Efforts</th>
<th>Prospective Reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge 1</strong></td>
<td>Developing a Shared and Inclusive Understanding of Diversity</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>18% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge 2</strong></td>
<td>Creating a Welcoming Campus Climate</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>12% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge 3</strong></td>
<td>Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Student Body</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>25% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge 4</strong></td>
<td>Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Workforce</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>11% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge 5</strong></td>
<td>Developing a Curriculum that Fosters Intercultural and International Competencies</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>17% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge 6</strong></td>
<td>Diversifying University Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>8% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge 7</strong></td>
<td>Coordinating Organizational Change to Support Our Diversity Goals</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>9% of total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Immediate Group Reach Level** - affects only the immediate (50-100) participants in that diversity effort  
**Climate Reach Level** - affects the climate/environment of an entire unit  
**Faculty Reach Level** - impacts faculty, which imparts to students (25-300 reached)  
**Student Reach Level** - affects primarily diverse students and students in unit (25-300 reached)

---

**Prospective Reach** measures the primary targeted and actualized reach level of the effort for each Challenge. The reach levels do not subsume one another; instead, the efforts in each Challenge specifically “touched” a certain “reach level.” All of the efforts in each of the Challenges impacted the intended reach level. More specifically, Challenges 1, 2, and 7 are making the **Climate Reach Level** which indicates that the entire climate of the unit is being touched and impacted. Thus, the scope of who is being impacted is quite wide and large - a desirable outcome for these Challenges that intended to make a significant influence on a larger division. Challenges 3 and 5 make the **Student Reach Level** and directly impact students by way of diversifying the student body and creating intercultural/international curricula. Challenge 6 touches the **Immediate Group Reach Level** in that the diversification of the leadership directly impacts that group/unit underneath that leadership. Ultimately, the Challenges are meeting the reach levels framed in their goals/objectives. Challenge 4 is the only one that makes the **Faculty Reach Level** but only in terms of hiring and retention and not in terms of professional development or other diversity competencies. We recommend that the campus identify the specific spheres of influence desired for each Challenge (units, immediate participants, entire climate, faculty, students, community members, and beyond).
## Endurance Factor

### Challenge 1
**Developing a Shared and Inclusive Understanding of Diversity**
- 596 efforts (18% of total)
- Endurance Factor 1: 0
- Endurance Factor 2: 596
- Endurance Factor 3: 0
- Endurance Factor 4: 0

### Challenge 2
**Creating a Welcoming Campus Climate**
- 383 efforts (12% of total)
- Endurance Factor 1: 0
- Endurance Factor 2: 383
- Endurance Factor 3: 0
- Endurance Factor 4: 0

### Challenge 3
**Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Student Body**
- 801 efforts (25% of total)
- Endurance Factor 1: 0
- Endurance Factor 2: 801
- Endurance Factor 3: 0
- Endurance Factor 4: 0

### Challenge 4
**Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Workforce**
- 356 efforts (11% of total)
- Endurance Factor 1: 0
- Endurance Factor 2: 356
- Endurance Factor 3: 0
- Endurance Factor 4: 0

### Challenge 5
**Developing a Curriculum that Fosters Intercultural and International Competencies**
- 562 efforts (17% of total)
- Endurance Factor 1: 0
- Endurance Factor 2: 562
- Endurance Factor 3: 0
- Endurance Factor 4: 0

### Challenge 6
**Diversifying University Leadership & Management**
- 265 efforts (8% of total)
- Endurance Factor 1: 0
- Endurance Factor 2: 265
- Endurance Factor 3: 0
- Endurance Factor 4: 0

### Challenge 7
**Coordinating Organizational Change to Support Our Diversity Goals**
- 293 efforts (9% of total)
- Endurance Factor 1: 0
- Endurance Factor 2: 293
- Endurance Factor 3: 0
- Endurance Factor 4: 0

---

Endurance Factor measures the sustainability and longevity of the efforts for each Challenge. According to the graphic below, the majority of the efforts for Challenges 1-6 seem to be designed and implemented to last for the next 1-2 years (much of this is intended in terms of continual assessment and revision). Only Challenge 7 carries the scope, design, and execution to endure until the next diversity strategy cycle. The majority of the Challenges are geared for a one to two year diversity life. Challenges 1 and 2, while impacting an entire climate in terms of reach level, will only last 1-2 years in terms of endurance. Challenges 3, 4, 5, and 6 touch students, faculty, and the immediate participants in terms of reach level but also are framed to last only 1-2 years. These Challenges may have set up an experimental phase for their efforts and activities to see if the desired impacts and outcomes are being met. If so, then these actions may continue and be sustained. Only Challenge 7 which is already built around long-lasting policies, structures, and strategies for the future, will extend into the next diversity strategic plan cycle and beyond. We pose the following questions in terms of the longevity of the Challenges: Is the Framework meant to be a continual cycle of experimental efforts (Endurance Factors 1 through 2)? At what point is the testing complete and based on what? How does the action become strategic and sustainable? To what extent has The Pennsylvania State University defined criteria for which elements of the Challenges should be solidified and sustained for the future and the assurances that these will?
The following aspects of the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity were rated based on a key scale from 1 to 10, with 1 representing “Needing Improvement/Weak” to 10 representing “Operating at the Highest Level/Strong/Successful”

**How effective is the structure (both internal structure and structure in relation to the larger University) of the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity in achieving its key goals?** OVERALL RATING: 8/10

The Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity’s internal structure is grounded, robust, and works well to include and prioritize all of the major diversity and inclusion programs, sectors, and processes. We see that the core leadership team of a Vice Provost with two Assistant Vice Provosts (with each one representing different aspects of the diversity mission at The Pennsylvania State University - Equity Commissions, Climate, and Assessment and Academic Student Support and Outcomes) as extremely effective and successful. The balance and integration among the a) proactive diversity and inclusion factors and programs with b) educational achievement and academic support of students is absolutely necessary in higher education. We find that the majority (85%) of institutions separate and disconnect these two areas which does not allow for a strategic planning approach and delineation of the larger concept of inclusive excellence (that is, diversity efforts that are embedded within academic achievement). The Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity can be proud of its internal structure in this regard as it has created an organized, focused, and action-oriented mission. The larger structure of the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity as embedded in The Pennsylvania State University’s organization is also positively situated. Vice Provost Jones reports to the Provost and is connected to the President. This enables the linkage of diversity and inclusion efforts to The Pennsylvania State University’s central leadership. We highly recommend the continuation of this reporting structure with a more pronounced emphasis on the President and Provost working together to support and promote the mission of the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity.

**How successful is the operational capacity of the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity in terms of the following:**

**Administration and staff in relation to assigned workload and responsibilities - Rating: 9/10**

Our team was impressed at the amount of work conducted by the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity’s administration and staff in relation to the delineated mission and goals and especially in terms of the number of staff assigned to each task/goal area. All of the administration and staff members had a clear sense of work duties and worked together to accomplish the demanding work of diversity and inclusion at The Pennsylvania State University. We highlight, however, that The Pennsylvania State University will need to put more emphasis on building capacity for rigorous assessment that is necessary for achieving diversity, equity, and inclusive excellence. This will include ensuring adequate resources and staff dedicated to diversity and inclusion work within all units of the The Pennsylvania State University,

- Time
- Fiscal resources
- Staffing
more training on how to conduct rigorous assessment of outcomes and impacts at unit, division, and University levels, greater capacity for central units to support and advance diversity and inclusion and to gauge progress, and more synergies and collaboration across units such as Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment, Undergraduate Education that focus on assessment and outcomes. Assessment and outcome analysis is fast becoming a major function of all diversity infrastructures; this Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity will need to be better equipped with the quantitative and qualitative analytics needed to manage high-quality assessment.

**Coordination - Rating: 9/10**

The Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity displays an excellent and streamlined practice of coordination among its foci among diversity and inclusion in The Pennsylvania State University environment as well as the academic achievement of historically underrepresented groups. The organization and infrastructure built around these major areas are of the highest quality. We recommend for the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity to continue its focus in these areas.

**Budget and allocated resources - Rating: 7/10**

With the focus in higher education increasingly on closing the achievement gaps and shaping an inclusive and supportive academic environment for students of all identity backgrounds, colleges and universities around the country are investing more fiscal resources into their diversity infrastructure. While The Pennsylvania State University has afforded the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity with stable operational budgets, we recommend a strategic increase in the amount of fiscal resources and campus resources (space, professional development training) across all colleges, campuses, and academic and administrative support units to support the success of diverse students, faculty, staff, and leaders within these areas, which in turn advances The Pennsylvania State University’s diversity and inclusion goals. Because student success of historically underrepresented groups is one of the key national initiatives in higher education, a strategic evaluation and review of current resources is needed among senior leadership and Dr. Jones that is centered on the question: To what extent are the resources sufficient to carry out the work of the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity in creating conditions for academic achievement? Too often, universities focus on the question of resources for diversity and inclusion offices in relation to the budget allocations of all other major divisions. This focus can then stunt and obfuscate the clear needs and unfulfilled gaps for a diversity mission.

**Capacity to meet the present and future diversity demands of The Pennsylvania State University, at all The Pennsylvania State University campuses - Rating: 7/10**

As noted in the above areas, the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity’s capacity to meet the present and future diversity demands of The Pennsylvania State University needs to be monitored. Carrying out the diversity mission of The Pennsylvania State University is a massive undertaking. In our evaluation, we have noted the inconsistent fulfillment of the diversity mission and Framework in some
Assessment: Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity

Structure, accountability, and assessment process of the Framework for all academic colleges, units, and campuses - Rating: 7/10

The Framework and its structure with its Challenges is an excellent and well-defined strategic outline and planning document. We applaud the continued focus on these areas through the last several strategic planning cycles. However, the de-centralized organizational structure underpinning the Framework in relation to The Pennsylvania State University’s size makes it more challenging to have consistent rigor when evaluating the outcomes of the Framework. We ask: How might all academic colleges, support units, and campuses reach the same level of excellence when carrying out the Framework? This will require more coordination and a stronger sense of accountability built into the Framework. The Pennsylvania State University earns a 7/10 rating because, while the overall Framework review process is considerably more than what its peers engage in, The Pennsylvania State University still needs to execute a rigorous outcome-based assessment system with built-in accountability. We have a similar conclusion for The Pennsylvania State University’s peers (Ohio State University, Cornell University, Princeton University, and University of Michigan). While the current review process is quite impressive (and with the Provost and meeting with all campus participants on their Framework performance), it is not clear how results and excellence can be ensured. For example, would it be more effective to reduce a unit’s budget or highlight its lack of Challenge activity if a unit is not fulfilling a Challenge Area? Or is it more appropriate to motivate all units to achieve excellence in the Framework through the awarding of incentives? Such accountability needs to be built into the system more to ensure that the work of the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity and the Framework is met and taken seriously. If not, the Framework can take on an “diversity as an additional task” type of logic. The key weakness of the Framework is the assessment and outcome process. While the review teams and analysts engage in excellent and time-consuming work, our team was overwhelmed with the large volume of data that was based off of activities and processes as opposed to outcomes and measures (although processes are often just as significant given the specific Challenge area). How does The Pennsylvania State University and the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity know where it really is in relation to its Framework’s Challenges and goals? What happens to a unit or division that does NOT meet or fulfill a Challenge? Or what if the bare minimum is achieved as opposed to a standard of...
excellence? What are the standards of excellence and criteria for meeting a Challenge? Thus, we highlight the need to build more specific assessment models, measures, and metrics with key outcomes as well as provide more training and meeting time for the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity to have strategic conversations around what a process should look like.