

**Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees and Students
of the**

**University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware**

By

**An Evaluation Team representing the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education**

**Prepared after review of the Self-Study Report and a
visit to the campus on April 3-6, 2011**

Members of the Team

Jared L. Cohon, Chair
President

Carnegie Mellon University
5000 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Billy K. Cannaday, Jr.
Dean, School of Continuing
and Professional Studies
University of Virginia
P.O. Box 400764
Zehner Hall
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Eric F. Spina
Vice Chancellor and Provost
Syracuse University
Suite 500, Crouse Hinds Hall
900 S. Crouse Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13244-2140

Eduardo D. Glandt
Dean, School of Engineering and Applied Science
University of Pennsylvania
Room 311A Towne Building
220 South 33rd Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6391

James F. Trainer
Director of Planning & Assessment
Villanova University
800 E. Lancaster Ave
Villanova, PA 19085

Michael R. Halleran
Provost
College of William and Mary
P.O. Box 8795
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795

Working with the Team
Catherine M. Davidson
Carnegie Mellon University
5000 Forbes Ave.
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

AT THE TIME OF THE VISIT

President of the University:

Patrick T. Harker

Chief Academic Officer

Tom Apple

Chairman of the Board of Trustees

A. Gilchrist Sparks III, Esq.
Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell
1201 N. Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

Table of Contents

Section I. Context and Nature of the Visit	4
A. Institutional Overview	4
B. Scope of Institution at the Time of the Visit	4
Section II. Affirmation of Continued Compliance with Requirements of Affiliation	5
Section III. Compliance with Federal Requirements; Issues Relative to State Regulatory or Other Accrediting Agency Requirements	5
Section IV. Evaluation Overview	5
A. Cross-Cutting Findings and Recommendations	6
B. “A Diverse and Stimulating Undergraduate Experience”	9
C. “A Premier Research and Graduate University”	11
D. “Excellence in Professional Education”	14
E. Supplementary Observations on Selected Standards	17
Section V. Compliance with Accreditation Standards	18
Section VI. Summary Recommendations Requiring Follow Up Action	29

Section I. Context and Nature of the Visit

A. Institutional Overview

The University of Delaware (UD) is an interesting and unusual, perhaps unique, institution in American higher education. One of the oldest universities in the country, tracing its origins to 1743 prior to its formal charter in 1833, UD is a self-described “private university with a public mission.”

UD is privately chartered but state-assisted. Yet, it is Delaware’s flagship university—and by far the largest educational institution in a very small state—as well as a land-grant, sea-grant, and space-grant university. It receives about 15 percent of its annual operating budget through a state appropriation.

Over the last several years, UD has earned a reputation for its strong undergraduate programs and national prominence for selected graduate and research programs. With the arrival of President Patrick T. Harker in 2007, UD entered a new chapter of its history, one marked by new initiatives and deep and widespread cultural change. The “Path to Prominence” is an ambitious strategic plan that has been widely embraced by all of UD’s constituencies. In less than four years, the university has accomplished a great deal, and there is a sense of momentum and excitement on campus.

UD opted for a selected topics review with a focus on three main themes in its strategic plan. We organized our review and evaluation accordingly, reflected in the narrative presented in Section IV.

A review, based primarily on the documentation roadmap provided by the institution, of all 14 standards for accreditation was conducted by two generalist reviewers, one of whom (James Trainer) was also a member of the site visit team. That review was completed prior to the site visit, and the report is included as Section V of this document. In the course of the site visit, we had interviews that allowed us to augment the observations of the generalist reviewers with regard to some of the standards. These additional observations are included in Section IV.

B. Scope of Institution at the Time of the Evaluation

- i. **Degree Levels:** Associate’s, Bachelor’s, Master’s, and Doctor’s
- ii. **Branch Campuses:** None
- iii. **Active Additional Locations:**

Location	Degree	Headcount	Visited
Astra Zeneca Wilmington, DE	Master’s	35	No
Dover, DE	Associate in Arts	146	No
Georgetown, DE	Associate in Arts	156	No
Wilmington, DE	Associate in Arts	462	Yes

iv. Distance Learning

There are no programs in which 50 percent or more of a program is offered by distance learning.

v. Self-Study Process and Report

The self-study was shaped by the university's strategic plan, completed prior to the self-study process. The strategic planning effort was itself very comprehensive. The self-study, taking the plan as its point of departure, was also very inclusive. The Self-study Steering Committee and its working groups held numerous meetings on campus in assembling their reports.

The institution opted for a selected topics review with a focus on the strategic plan. Standards 2, 3, 7, and 14 are most relevant for the self-study and our review.

Section II. Affirmation of Continued Compliance with Requirements of Affiliation

Based on a review of the self-study, interviews, the certification statement supplied by the institution and a review of other institutional documents, the team affirms that the institution continues to meet the requirements of affiliation in "Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education."

Section III. Compliance with Federal Requirements; Issues Relative to State Regulatory or Other Accrediting Agency Requirements

Based on a review of the self-study, certification by the institution, and other institutional documents and interviews, the team affirms that the institution has an acceptable plan in place to address federal compliance issues. The team also affirms the institution's compliance with relevant requirements of the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008. The team is not aware of any issues relative to state regulatory requirements or the institution's status with other accrediting organizations.

Section IV. Evaluation Overview

The team organized its review and evaluation to match the structure of the Self-study. The Self-study focused on three main themes drawn from the university's strategic plan, *Path to Prominence* (P2P):

- A diverse and stimulating undergraduate academic environment
- A premier research and graduate university
- Excellence in professional education

This section of our report is also organized around these three themes. Before turning to them, we summarize and discuss in this subsection some findings and recommendations that cut across these themes.

A. Cross Cutting Findings and Recommendations

The University of Delaware (UD) has undergone rapid and significant change since the arrival of President Patrick T. Harker four years ago, creating a sense of excitement and momentum. The blueprint for this change, the “Path to Prominence,” (P2P) was created in an open and inclusive process that engaged faculty, staff, students, community members, and the Board of Trustees. There is an almost universal belief that this is the right plan at the right time for UD. In particular, strengthening research and graduate education, building on the university’s already strong undergraduate programs, is seen as the right emphasis for the next chapter in UD’s history. The creation of such a bold plan, embraced by the university, is surely a significant achievement of the university and its new administration.

1. Changing UD’s Culture (Standards 2, 3, and 7)

More than just a plan, P2P and its implementation have begun to change UD’s culture. The new emphasis on research and graduate education has caused re-evaluation and some stress in those parts of the university that have not been as research-intensive as others. There is a natural tendency for many to view research as a competitor for the time and attention of excellent teachers of undergraduates. This is especially so at UD where undergraduate education has been strongly emphasized for so long. While understandable, this is usually a false choice and must be viewed as such if UD is to achieve its aspirations. Colleges and departments should be encouraged to see this as an opportunity to enhance scholarship—and teaching—not as a threat to strong undergraduate programs.

A companion to P2P is the new Responsibility-Based Budget (RBB) system. If anything, RBB and its implementation have catalyzed even more profound change in UD’s culture than the other elements of the plan. RBB is more than just a system for allocating resources (Standard 2); it creates processes and incentives that empower deans, chairs, and faculty, and pushes decision making out and down throughout the institution. This is a very significant departure from the previous, highly centralized approach to decision making and resource allocation that was in place when President Harker arrived.

The implementation of RBB is challenging at any institution at any time, but it has been especially so at UD. The distance that had to be travelled was particularly great, starting as it did from such a highly centralized system and the culture it created. The timing for the implementation could hardly have been worse, falling in the midst of an historic economic downturn and its financial impact on the university. The challenge was further exacerbated by inadequate data and information systems to support RBB. Not surprisingly, there is considerable uncertainty and anxiety about RBB and its implications for individual colleges and departments. Our meetings with administrators and faculty gave us confidence that the system has stabilized and that continuing issues are understood.

RBB, by its nature, can lead to a tension between expenditures that enhance the entire university and those that are focused on a particular college or other unit. Indeed, over time, those who are generators of revenue tend to start thinking of these revenues as “theirs.” This can create serious political difficulties in funding essential university services. At this early stage in the life of RBB at UD, it is important to establish and institutionalize a clear understanding about the requirement for funds to support university operations.

While faculty research leaders are highly supportive of the President and the high ambitions expressed in the strategic plan, there is a strong sentiment that communication about the plan, and implementation steps taken to advance the plan, needs to be made more routine. An increased degree of communication—and associated transparency—will enable these and other very strong faculty to better understand key decisions and to play an important peer leadership role on and off campus. The implementation of RBB has also led many on campus to perceive inherent tradeoffs between “making money” on the one hand, and sustaining quality or providing public service on the other. Clarifying the role of resource allocation in this regard is important.

The non-tenure track (NTT) faculty seem to feel particularly anxious, based on comments we heard in meetings with administrators. This is understandable given the increased emphasis on research. Clarity about expectations for faculty is especially important at times of profound change like these.

We found it notable that there was a very limited response by the UD community to opportunities to meet with the visiting team. For example, we held an open forum to which the entire UD community was invited (though we do not know how this was advertised). Only 16 attended, 11 of whom were staff members from offices that do assessment or institutional research; two others were graduate students doing a research project on the Middle States accreditation process. Most of our other meetings with students, faculty, and staff were also relatively poorly attended. Team members had experienced much stronger responses at their own institutions and others where they had served on site visit teams. Without attaching too much significance to the UD community’s response—we note that our visit occurred on the first three days after the UD spring break—we nevertheless were inclined to interpret this as an indication of a community which defers to its administration rather than thinking of themselves as owners of the institution. We believe this underscores the importance of the cultural changes that have been initiated by P2P and RBB.

Recommendations:

The P2P is an exciting plan that has energized UD. It should be viewed as an opportunity for all units of the university to enhance scholarship and raise the profile of UD nationally and globally. Leadership from Deans and Department Chairs will be very important if the opportunities are to be fully realized.

We believe that the UD administration has a firm grasp of the RBB system and the remaining challenges of refining the system. It has added key staff and has identified system improvements. Continuing careful attention to these issues will be needed to assure lasting effectiveness of RBB.

It is very important that the UD leadership institutionalize broad-based understanding that a portion of revenues is necessary to fund general university operations. This should include funds controlled by the Provost's office for university-wide initiatives, such as key interdisciplinary institutes. This is discussed further in subsection C ("Research and Graduate Education").

The cultural change afoot and the implementation of RBB have led some to wonder if the administration is moving away from UD's commitment to teaching. A clear and visible commitment to quality outcomes—in all that UD does—and clarity of expectations of faculty, especially NTT faculty, will greatly build confidence in the value of the cultural shift and help all constituencies find their place in the plan.

2. The Pace of Change

The creation of an ambitious comprehensive strategic plan; implementing a radically different resource allocation system; detailed consideration of a new law school; acquiring land that would dramatically expand the campus footprint and planning its use—doing just one of these in less than four years would be considered a lot at any university. UD has done all four—and more. This is a breathtaking pace of change, and some people at UD wonder if it's just too much and too fast.

Suggestion: We support the university's decision to enter a period where the community can focus on implementation and execution of new ideas and systems.

3. Resource Limitations (Standard 3)

With an endowment greater than its annual operating budget and relatively stable and substantial state support, UD is in an enviable financial position. Still, state support has declined, albeit less so than in many states, and the university's ambitions are great—and expensive.

Realizing its ambitions will require UD to develop greater financial resources. The best path to doing this is through fundraising from alumni and other donors, an area where UD lags behind its peers.

Recommendation: UD should invest as necessary to build a first-rate development and alumni relations infrastructure. It should work to raise the sights of its alumni when it comes to giving back to the university. The opportunities for increased fundraising are substantial, but it will take many years to realize the potential.

4. Diversity (Standards 1,, 8, 9, and 10)

Becoming a diverse community will be an important ingredient of UD's future success. We applaud the university for embracing diversity as a strategic priority.

UD is not diverse in either absolute or relative terms. With few exceptions, we believe that the university trails its peers in every measure of diversity in every constituency of the institution.

While the specifics of diversity are discussed further in two of the following subsections, here we point out that real progress in diversity requires a strong and long-term institutional commitment.

Recommendation: The institution should commit itself forcefully and visibly to improving its diversity. The leaders of the university—Deans and Chairs, as well as the President and Vice Presidents—have a particularly important role to play.

B. “A Diverse and Stimulating Undergraduate Experience”

The University of Delaware has a long and distinguished history in undergraduate education and has been well served by this historical emphasis. The data presented and interactions with students and faculty, albeit limited, underscored this as a distinctive characteristic and important recruitment tool. Students choose to attend UD in part because of this focus on undergraduate education and while matriculating they enjoy positive interactions with a caring faculty dedicated to undergraduate instruction and success. Hallmarks of the undergraduate student experience at the university include, but are not limited to, a well-known and well-regarded University Honors Program, robust study abroad, undergraduate research, and experiential and service learning opportunities. Indeed, the university’s continued commitment to undergraduate education is reflected in placing it as one of the six milestones of the *Path to Prominence* – “A Diverse and Stimulating Undergraduate Experience.”

Increasingly talented students are attracted to the University of Delaware. The average combined SAT scores (verbal and math) for first-time students entering in the Fall of 2009 stood at 1195 for all students and 1222 for students from outside the state of Delaware, who now account for two-thirds of all undergraduate students. The fall-to-fall retention rate for first to second year students was 91.2 percent in 2009, and the overall six-year graduation rate for students who entered as new first-time students in 2005 was 76 percent.

Over the past few years, the university has taken steps to enhance the integrative nature of the undergraduate student experience. A First Year Experience (FYE) has been initiated and all students enroll in a First Year Seminar (FYS) as a part of this program (either college or university-based offerings). FYS’s are designed to help ensure students’ academic success, to develop and enhance critical analytical and synthesis skills, and to promote mentoring relations between faculty and staff and first-year students. The student life area has been reinvigorated and close linkages have been drawn between academic affairs and student life. The Vice President for Student Life reports to the Provost, an arrangement that further emphasizes the importance of ties between students’ academic and co-curricular experiences. Residence life staff bring an intentionality to their work in creating living-learning environments.

Based on our meeting with administrators and students at the Wilmington campus and the data presented, we were impressed with the Associate in Arts (AA) program and UD’s success in incorporating this program into the university. The AA program’s main obstacle to greater impact is the need for larger facilities, since Delaware Tech, with which it shares space, is also pressed for space.

Recommendations:

As noted, critical to the successful implementation of the strategic plan is creating a “diverse and stimulating undergraduate experience.”

Diversity refers to many aspects of education and the term seems pointedly used in the P2P to capture this semantic range, including race/ethnicity, socio-economic factors, and intellectual differences. Most particularly, however, diversity in such contexts and in American higher education discourse in general refers to racial/ethnic diversity. In this regard, UD comes up short. We heard several times that the campus community does not reasonably reflect the diversity of the larger society. More importantly, it was also observed that this relative lack of diversity disadvantaged students in their educational experience, which is enriched by studying, working, and living with students from varied backgrounds.

The five-year graduation rates for some underrepresented minorities are also worrisome. Looking at the last two years for which data are available, for 2004 the rates for Whites, African Americans, Asians and Hispanics were 77.3, 52.8, 67.7 and 67.5 percent respectively; for 2005 the rates were 78.0, 60.1, 70.8 and 69.4. As the university's admissions standards continue to rise, matriculating African American and Latino students are likely to be better prepared to succeed at Delaware but enrollment of underrepresented minority students may decline. In any event, continued attention to graduation rates is called for. A recent increase in the number of international students is a positive development and, if a trend, will require more attention and resources to help acclimate these students to life in the U.S. and at UD. The organizational arrangement that links the student life staff to the provost's office offers a special opportunity to understand the pressures on underrepresented minority students across the entire undergraduate experience. **We recommend that the university develop plans for increasing the racial/ethnic diversity of its student body.**

We also recommend that the university study the reasons for the significantly lower graduation rate for students from underrepresented minorities, especially African American students, and develop concrete steps for improvement.

The university's new budgeting resource allocation system (RBB) wove its way into many discussions. We applaud UD for undertaking such a major initiative in order to align resources with the university's strategic priorities and incentivize innovation and attention to student demand. That said, we express concern (already raised on p. 32 of the self-study) about *possible* unintended consequences on undergraduate programs, especially when combined with the revision of the university's Mission Statement, which gives greater prominence to research and graduate education (Standard 1). There are indeed many ways in which undergraduate education, graduate and professional education and research can work in mutually reinforcing synergies, and excellence in research can by itself lend luster that supports the ambitions for excellence at the undergraduate level. But we are all aware of numerous universities where these synergies occur only in rare instances, and the research engine overwhelms excellence in student learning and in the student experience. The University of Delaware, however, may be in a position to avoid some of the unintended consequences in this regard experienced elsewhere. Indeed, some of the measures present at UD which may add necessary balance to resource allocation

decisions in undergraduate programs include clear faculty ownership of the curriculum and the curriculum change process; robust collaboration between faculty and administration on student learning outcomes assessment; and the strong leadership of Deans. **We recommend that the university, especially through the Office of the Provost, ensure that the new budget system's metrics are leavened with judgments about educational quality.**

Suggestions:

The Honors Program serves about 13 percent of the undergraduate students. The program provides an attractive curricular option for some of the university's more academically capable students and helps in the recruitment of these students. Concerns were raised in several quarters about the richness of the program at the upper levels, where, because of the dearth of offerings, an honors course often consists of an "add on" (an extra assignment, for example) to an existing course. The program also seems to be less coherent than it could be. **We suggest that the university revisit its current honors program, its role in the curriculum, and the particular issue of upper-level offerings.**

Advising is an increasingly important aspect of student success, as more students receive academic credit in multiple settings (AP, study-abroad, transfer credits, internships, etc.) and are increasingly interested in combining courses to better achieve their career aspirations. It seems that the quality of advising is very uneven across the campus and is a source of student dissatisfaction. Addressing this issue should also increase graduation rates. **We encourage the university to act on the self-study's recommendation (p. 25) that the university assess its advising system and make it an "exemplar for other institutions of higher education."**

The FYE program serves several valuable functions: It provides an introduction to both academic and student life, and helps with community building (through the common reader). At this point, the program seems diffuse, perhaps seeking to do too much. It was also clear that the program is uneven, in part because the nature of the FYS's that are offered (some are centralized, some school-/department-based) and the variability in the intended common features of the syllabus and even whether the common book is discussed. Student satisfaction is reported to be modest at best, and the fact that the FYS is only a one-credit pass/fail course implies that it is considered a lower priority. **We suggest that the university work to make the FYE a more integrated experience and expand a more uniform model across the university.**

In addition to its focus on the FYE, the university is also engaged in examining the overall goals and intended outcomes of its general education program and has expressed a desire to strengthen the writing component of students' educational experience beyond the freshman year. In turn, the team concurs with the recommendations on page 26 of the self-study regarding continued analysis in support of the development of a plan "to enhance undergraduate writing skills beyond English 110."

Finally, at several meetings, we heard concerns about non-tenured teaching faculty and the criteria for promotion. We do not claim to understand all the implications of this issue—and we know that the Faculty Senate is discussing it—but these comments occurred with enough frequency that we suggest

that care be taken in successfully resolving this matter.

C. “A Premier Research and Graduate University”

Under the leadership of President Harker, the University of Delaware has made an unequivocal shift in its vision, with increased emphasis on research and graduate programs, embodied in its strategic plan, “Path to Prominence” (P2P). Faculty and other on- and off-campus constituencies were heavily engaged in the drafting of P2P, with over 100+ constituent meetings, and there seems to be broad support for it across the campus.

The University of Delaware takes seriously its mission as a driver for the economy of the state of Delaware, and its research thrusts and graduate programs are well positioned to support the state’s ambitions. More than just being the state’s anchor educational institution, though, the university itself has both global ambitions and global capabilities, and as the *Path to Prominence* is fully implemented, the university and the state must understand that while an essential element of UD’s vision is “Delaware First,” national and international connections and opportunities will become increasingly valuable. These must be pursued for the ultimate success of the university and the state.

In support of their vision, the President and Provost have appointed other highly effective leaders who are collaborating well in implementation of the plan. Prominent among them are the Senior Vice Provost for Research and the Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education, whose roles are to elevate the importance of the university’s research and doctoral education efforts. Both appointees are long-time and highly respected faculty leaders at UD, and both were involved in the strategic planning efforts. Their activities are well aligned with the vision of the President and Provost and the strategic plan. In spite of the economic climate, the timing is actually propitious for a renewed emphasis on research, as UD now ranks in the top 100 of research expenditures for the first time.

The Office of Economic Innovation and Partnerships, which includes Technology Transfer, appears to be a powerful instrument in further support of the university’s research enterprise, as demonstrated through its leadership of the successful Delaware Biotechnology Institute and its early efforts in several new initiatives. This office reports to the Executive Vice President but maintains a close connection to the Senior Vice Provost for Research and the Associate Provost for Research Development. The offices of research and of sponsored programs appear to be well led and staffed, they understand that their mission is in support of the activities of the faculty, and they have in place all the structural elements to maintain good compliance, including robust training programs. It will be important to continue to monitor staffing and structure of these functions to ensure that they scale up appropriately with increased sponsored activity.

The university has taken major steps to build infrastructure in step with its increased research emphasis and has already made real strides (leading to \$65M in federal stimulus funding). A major Interdisciplinary Science and Engineering Laboratory is scheduled to open in 2013. Furthermore, the planned development of the former Chrysler 272-acre site into a science-and-technology campus offers unbounded possibilities for future growth in facilities.

The administration has taken a leadership role in the development of research clusters that wisely play off the university's core strengths and strategic partnerships.

- UD's long-time stature in Chemical Engineering and Chemistry now nurtures initiatives in energy and in the environment. An innovation team is working in this area and it is hoped that a federal laboratory might be attracted to the south campus.
- A thrust in Life and Health Sciences is being built around the success of the Delaware Biotechnology Institute. A deliberate and apparently very successful strategy is in place to drive up NIH funding despite not having a medical school. Resources have been drawn from a variety of sources, including the state of Delaware, corporate partners, the federal government, and the university itself. A result is that NIH has become the largest funder of research at UD. The Delaware Health Sciences Initiative involves a promising major partnership with Thomas Jefferson University and with two major Delaware hospitals, and this promises to drive NIH funding higher, including for translational research.
- An educational and research focus on Defense and National Security is being planned to establish a research partnership with the U.S. Army site in Aberdeen, Maryland.

The past four years seem to have been transformative for research and graduate education at UD. A clear and widely supported vision, a strategic focus on areas of strength and of promise, and partnerships and collaborations with other educational institutions, corporations, and government have been critical in enabling UD to make progress without overextending itself in a period of fiscal restraint.

Recommendations:

The ambitious research and graduate education agenda that Delaware is pursuing and the degree of change from its previous directions require the university to pay special attention in the coming years to a number of areas that could hinder ultimate success. Several of these areas are described below.

The RBB model clearly has very substantial consequences for the research and graduate education enterprise at Delaware, and while the upside potential is quite clear, administrative leaders will need to carefully monitor the continued implementation to ensure that budgetary incentives are well aligned with the desire for larger, higher-quality doctoral programs and higher-volume, higher-impact funded research programs. This will require careful consideration and perhaps refinement of some of the elements of the RBB model itself, wise decisions about how subvention will be allocated, and strong leadership from the Provost and Deans to ensure that decisions are made that first and foremost advance quality. A college's share of total sponsored expenditures is a major factor in the current RBB allocation model, and we applaud this alignment of incentives with the research vision.

To further advance the vision, we recommend that the designation of funding for interdisciplinary research and interdisciplinary centers be "institutionalized" in the RBB model and that these allocations to the provost's office be made each year as a high priority. The values and ambitions of

Deans are critical to the success of any RBB system and thus both transparency and their deep involvement in the continued evolution of the Delaware system is critically important to ensure broad ownership and ultimate success.

The greater emphasis being placed on interdisciplinary research—including key cluster hires at both the junior and senior level that span departments and colleges—dictates that a careful review of tenure and promotion processes and criteria be done to ensure that these critical faculty rewards are aligned with university directions. It will be important in recruiting faculty, especially junior faculty, that the language in tenure and promotion documents be consistent with the expectations that are set for them; this will also help Deans and the Provost in encouraging senior faculty to understand the changes in the landscape that strong interdisciplinary research brings. **We understand that discussion of this matter has begun in the colleges and in the Faculty Senate, and we recommend that this be carefully tracked and completed as soon as possible.**

Everyone from President Harker to undergraduate students agree that enhanced diversity among faculty, staff, and students is essential for achieving the university's goals. This is certainly true for the graduate education and research functions, as diversity of perspectives can lead to improved approaches and greater impact in research projects and in an enhanced relevance in the classroom. The university has properly focused on growing the percentage of women faculty in science and engineering, and through a number of distributed efforts—one of them funded by an NSF ADVANCE grant—has begun to make progress. **We recommend that a coherent plan be developed to further enhance gender diversity among the science and engineering faculty and to make what appears to be even more important progress in racial diversity among the entire faculty.**

Suggestion

The establishment of the Interdisciplinary Center for Humanities is a promising development, and the initial programming is creating meaningful opportunities for faculty and for cross-university partnerships. The University of Delaware clearly has both strengths and aspirations in the humanities, social sciences, and the arts, and we believe that the community can use the same strategy in these key disciplines as it is using to great effect in technical areas where opportunities for external funding is greater: leverage existing strengths, select key areas of opportunity, and form external partnerships to develop world-class doctoral and research programs in areas that make the most sense for Delaware. Some of these areas of emphasis will likely be connected to the broader clusters such as environment and energy, which are being well served through connections to disciplines such as public policy and the social sciences, but some may not have any connection at all to the technology strengths of the institution. Attending to the value of such intellectual diversity as well as utilizing a strategy that builds on Delaware's strengths in this organic way will enable external funding from organizations such as National Endowment for the Humanities and national foundations; it is promising that some of these successes are already in sight.

D. “Excellence in Professional Education”

The University of Delaware’s strategic plan focused on the need to expand professional education programs, to fulfill their mission of service to Delaware and the region, and to keep pace with the reality that an undergraduate degree is no longer enough to be competitive in a rapidly changing global economy. Professional education, especially at the graduate level, is seen as another way for the university to gain visibility and prestige and expand service to new constituencies.

The cornerstone of this “milestone” of the *Path to Prominence* is the creation of a new law school to take advantage of the Delaware Chancery Court’s unique role in American corporate governance. That Delaware does not already have a major law school already is both surprising and suggestive of an unusual opportunity. UD’s leadership recognizes, however, that creating a law school of the necessary intellectual quality and strength in corporate law will be a very expensive undertaking. UD acknowledges that it may take some time for this goal to be achieved.

Other established professional education programs remain vitally important for UD’s role in the state and in the region, and UD has been responsive to needs in creating programs in business, education, health care, marine studies, and other fields. As the state’s flagship university, UD has an obligation to provide professional training for teachers, nurses, and others; this element of the strategic plan commits UD to offer programs that meet very high standards. The university’s leadership is also aiming to integrate professional education into major new interdisciplinary directions, and to use professional education to build their partnerships with industry and government. There is, finally, the expectation that professional programs may also provide departments and colleges with additional discretionary income.

UD is committed to offering professional education programs of high quality, and this commitment was reflected in one way or another in almost every conversation at every level. There is a well-established process for approval at the department-, faculty senate-, and trustee-levels for new offerings to insuring high standards and academic rigor and integration with the university’s larger objectives.

UD leadership is also thinking creatively and expansively about the opportunities for professional education created by collaboration and through research and education partnerships:

- The Delaware Health Alliance: This is a joint project with Thomas Jefferson University (“The next best thing to having our own medical school” as one administrator described the partnership). This partnership builds on UD’s Health Sciences programs (nursing, physical therapy, occupational therapy), its strength in biotechnology and bioinformatics.
- The new Delaware Rehabilitation Institute: This has been recently created with a major Department of Defense grant, and provides an opportunity to have professional training programs that grow out of the core research mission.
- Aberdeen Proving Ground: UD professional programs are among the offerings requested by The Department of the Army for its staff at this base.
- The Delaware Environmental Institute and other programs in the environmental and energy area have huge potential for professional education in the future.

- UD's Education faculty developed the Master of Arts in Teaching degree program as part of the collaborative effort for Delaware's Race to the Top program to improve K-12 learning outcomes.

There are several topics which recurred during the team visit which reflect some areas of concern as UD moves forward in professional education.

a. Uncertainty about the implications of RBB for Professional Education

While the RBB model is creating appropriate financial incentives that reward departments to advance scholarship and grow successful programs, it also could create some unintended consequences. Certain professional education programs have more attractive market potential for growth than do more public service oriented offerings. Changes are being implemented in the RBB to create a better balance between rewarding efforts to generate additional revenue on the one hand, and to support the public service mission of the university on the other (especially in areas like health sciences and education). There is some apparent uncertainty, however, about how best to strike this balance. For example, the theme of "Delaware First" is viewed differently across the university. Some define the public service mission primarily as supporting the economic growth and prosperity of the region and state. Others define public service as meeting needs of communities in schools, health-care facilities, and social service agencies. While these perspectives are not mutually exclusive, there is currently a good deal of concern about how to factor all of these issues into planning and decision making.

The central administration staff clearly understands and acknowledges current imperfections in the implementation of RBB and has plans to address the need for modifications and for training across campus. This should go a long way to providing more clarity for decision making about these professional programs.

b. Sensitivity to Changing Burdens on Faculty

The promise of financial benefits to departments for running professional education programs can present some risks. We would underline the concern expressed in the self-study about the burden on faculty members who are charged with designing and teaching courses, and supervising practicums or capstone projects. This can be especially problematic if RBB-based incentives lead to increased class sizes. In combination with the pressure to compete for external research grants and contribute to economic growth through commercialization of research, professional education could be seen as yet another burden on faculty time. Sensitivity to those increased demands on faculty members will be important to sustaining high-quality programs.

c. Need for Improved Infrastructure

It was noted in several conversations and in the self-study that in many ways the university's infrastructure is not suited to the needs of adult part-time learners. In some cases, the facilities need updating to be competitive in admissions. Those involved in planning for the new Science and Technology Campus seem to recognize these needs and are planning accordingly, but updating facilities was often mentioned as an ongoing need.

Beyond facilities, however, the self-study recommended that the university should examine the role of its career services office in providing some placement assistance. Effective advising for such students is another area that may need to be developed for this population.

Suggestions:

The self-study pointed out the need to develop internal metrics and external benchmarks of quality in professional education programs, a suggestion we endorse. Programs should be encouraged to gain national accreditation when possible or to meet other kinds of recognized professional standards. Collaborations with outside agencies will provide some quality control (e.g., the partnership with the Department of the Army for professional management education programs at Aberdeen). All of these efforts are essential if the university is to leverage the professional programs to strengthen its reputation for the excellence that it seeks.

Related to that, it seems important for the university community to articulate as soon as possible the dimensions of quality and value which, along with revenue generation, are important for professional education at UD. Many we spoke to felt that the value placed on making money or generating research grants may be crowding out other values that have been points of pride throughout UD's history. We found administrators who are taking a thoughtful approach to planning future programs but who were unsure about how to define and assess less tangible contributions, such as service to the community (e.g., professional masters programs in teaching, public policy, or health care), and "fame" or tradition for the university (e.g., professional programs in art conservation or marine studies). A community discussion about these and other values could play an important role supporting RBB and decision making at the department and college level.

E. Supplementary Observations on Selected Standards

The report of the generalist reviewers is included in Section V. The site visit team reviewed this report and concurs with the report's findings and conclusions. Nevertheless, in the course of our review, we made additional observations, which we record here to supplement the report in Section V.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

The University of Delaware is in a strong financial position, which is reflected in its AA+ credit rating. UD's endowment is more than \$1.1 billion, substantially more than its annual operating budget, and it has little, if any, debt. The annual state appropriation has declined over the last two years, but the size of the decline is consistently smaller than in many other states.

While UD enjoys strong and stable finances, realizing its ambitions will require much more money. Fundraising will be essential, and this will require substantial investment in development and alumni relations, areas that have not historically received significant support at UD. Making these investments and managing expectations will be tricky, since building a fundraising infrastructure takes many years, and changing alumni attitudes toward giving can take a generation or more.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

The chair of the site visit team met once with the Chair of the Board of Trustees, and three times with the President. President Pat Harker is a dynamic, energetic, and effective leader. He has built an impressive and experienced senior team that works well together. UD enjoys very strong leadership.

Eight members of the Board of Trustees are appointed by the Governor of Delaware. Twenty are appointed by the board itself, subject to confirmation by the State Senate. Among the 20 successor trustees, there must be at least five from each of the three counties of Delaware. Thus, there are relatively few trustees from outside the state.

One of the successor trustees is an alumnus who graduated the prior year. This is an effective way for the voice of students and young alumni to be represented.

The Board recently completed a comprehensive review and revision of its bylaws, including committee responsibilities. The revised bylaws are slated for final approval at the upcoming Board meeting in May.

Based on comments from the chair, it appears that the Board has a clear understanding of its role and respect for the line separating oversight and management. The Board was significantly engaged in the strategic planning process, and they have remained engaged in oversight of the plan's implementation. As a general matter, the Board believes the administration is open and frank in its dealings with the Board and does a good job of keeping the Board informed.

Standard 5: Administration

The visiting team, in various numbers and combinations, met with all members of the senior administration and with most of the Deans. The members of the administration are experienced and appear to be strong. They work well together.

The interactions between the central administration and the colleges are positive and constructive. We did hear from some that even more communication would be desirable.

As UD moves toward development of the newly acquired Chrysler site, attention to administrative capacity will be called for. Expertise in development, real estate law, and other areas not ordinarily well represented in university administration will be needed.

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

The P2P and the self-study lay out a large number of metrics to measure progress in each priority. This is commendable, but it is likely that only subsets of the criteria will factor significantly into decision making. So far as the team knows, these subsets have not yet been identified; it would be desirable to do so.

V. Compliance with Accreditation Standards

We include here, starting on the next page, the Summary Certification Report prepared by the generalist reviewers. The team endorses this report which supports the conclusion that the University of Delaware is in compliance with all 14 standards.

Summary Certification Report

Institution Name: University of Delaware

Team Chair: Jared L. Cohon, Carnegie Mellon University, President

Generalist Evaluators: John J. Convey, Catholic University of America, Professor/Commissioner
James F. Trainer, Villanova University, Director of Planning and Assessment

Document Review: February 10 and 11, 2011 (on-site) and electronically prior to February 10

Summary Overview

- The University of Delaware is in compliance with all of the standards.
- The documents were very complete and well organized.
- The computerized indexes, documents and annotated roadmaps were especially helpful.
- James Trainer will serve as a member of the Visiting Team during the April 3-6 site visit and will gladly assist any of the other team members regarding questions they may have about the documentation related to any standard.

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

YES, the documentation demonstrates compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

- The University of Delaware's Mission Statement, refined following the appointment of President Patrick Harker in 2007 and approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2008, focuses on the traditional goals of a major research university. The refined mission statement reflects the major changes in Delaware's graduate programs and research from the previous Mission Statement.
- Institutional goals are consistent with the mission of The University of Delaware and support scholarly and creative activity.
- The mission and goals are publicized and widely known.
- The university's strategic plan, *Path to Prominence*, approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2008, contains specific goals and initiatives in program development and resource allocation that describe how the university continues to fulfill its mission.
- The development of *Path to Prominence* involved collaboration between the Board of Trustees and the faculty.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal

YES, the documentation demonstrates compliance.

Comments/Explanations:

- The strategic plan was updated in 2008 following the arrival of the new president, Patrick Harker. The plan's guiding principles are Delaware First, Diversity, Partnership, Engagement, and Impact, three of which are accompanied by an immediate recommendation to assist with implementation. Action steps with timelines also are associated with each strategic initiative, called Strategic Milestones, in the plan.
- The University of Delaware's planning processes are data-based, collaborative, reflect the institution's goals, and guide resource allocation.
- Planning is clearly communicated and well-defined decision-making processes are in place.
- The Planning process involved faculty, students, staff, alumni, community members, and state leadership.
- The university has a detailed implementation plan with timelines and responsibilities in place.
- The university has moved away from a centralized block budget resource allocation model to a responsibility based budget (RBB) model, which provides incentives to the university's seven colleges to develop resources and to use them more effectively in support of strategic initiatives.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

YES, the documentation demonstrates compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

- The university has adequate human, financial, technical, physical and other resources necessary to achieve its mission and goals.
- The number of faculty, staff, and administration is adequate to support the institution's mission and outcomes expectations.
- The university's budget is aligned with the institution's mission, goals, and strategic plan.
- The university had an operating surplus between FY06 and FY08 from 2% and 3%, which is slightly below its stated target range of 3% to 5%.
- The ratio of assets to liabilities from FY06 to FY08 has been greater than 1.0 but less than the university's target of 1.5.
- Clear internal auditing rules and guidelines are present that include a compliance hotline for reporting abuses anonymously.
- The state appropriation to the university of \$129.7 million to \$131.8 million between FY07 to FY09 reduced to \$120.8 million in 2010.
- The university's substantial endowment of \$1.09 billion in FY10 is strategically used to support operations.
- The university facilities master plan includes a new Science and Technology Campus in Newark, an Interdisciplinary Science and Engineering Laboratory, and an addition to the Bob Carpenter Convocation Center.

- Information technology replacement policies and schedules are in place.
- The independent audits confirm financial responsibility.
- We did have the opportunity during our visit to review the management letters from the university's recent audits.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

YES, the documentation supports compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

- The Board of Trustees consists of 31 members (Charter last revised in 1989 states 28 members) and includes *ex officio* the Governor of Delaware, President of the State Board of Education, Master of the State Grange, and President of the University.
- The university has well-defined governance procedures with appropriate opportunities for input from faculty, students, and Trustees as well as other public stakeholders.
- Ample evidence exists that Trustees are active, involved in, and supportive of the various aspects of university life.
- Board committees are active and keep detailed minutes of discussions and actions.
- The By-laws of Board of Trustees were last revised in August 1999. The Board has additional committees or subcommittees, for example Audit and Compensation, that are not included in the By-laws. The By-laws are currently under review.
- Faculty Senate is involved in academic governance. The Faculty Senate meets monthly and holds a general faculty meeting each semester. The 2010-2011 Faculty Senate includes 61 elected faculty and 11 non-elected senators, including the President, Provost, Deputy Provost, Senior Vice Provost for Research, and Deans. The agendas, minutes of meetings, and reports are available on the Web.
- A Graduate Student Senate holds monthly meetings that are open to all graduate students.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Standard 5: Administration

YES, the documentation supports compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

- The university has a qualified senior administrative staff with clear commitment to the institution.
- Clear lines of authority present.
- The university's administrative structure is well defined and appropriate for the institution and its priorities.
- Information and decision making systems are appropriate.
- The Board Committee on Compensation sets the compensation of the President. The Compensation Committee conducts an evaluation of the President and the senior administrators.
- The President also conducts an annual evaluation of the Vice Presidents and other senior administrators.

- The Provost conducts an annual evaluation of the Deans using a prescribed format.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Standard 6: Integrity

Yes, the documentation supports compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

- The University of Delaware has a complete, comprehensive set of policies and procedures, which in conjunction with the mission statement, guide university life.
- Policies and procedures are clear and straightforward.
- Policies and procedures are readily accessible electronically via the university's website and various guides and handbook.
- The university demonstrates adherence to the highest ethical standards.
- As part of the 2007-2009 strategic planning process, a Presidentially-appointed Committee on Diversity issued a report reinforcing the university's long-held philosophy and commitment related to fair treatment and inclusion.
- While many policies and procedures were reviewed as part of our analyses related to Standard 6, we also found policies and procedures cross-referenced, as appropriate, as they related to other standards.
- The university provides timely and accurate information to prospective students, their parents, other constituencies, as well as the general public through online catalogs, fact books, and newsletters. Some of these items are also available in print form, as necessary and appropriate.
- The university participates in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) and information related to this is readily accessible through the university's website via the College Portrait.
- Both the policies and procedures, and other materials, available to the public, via the university's website, appear to be an honest reflection of the University of Delaware, university life and the university's standards.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: We noted, while visiting, that the university was still in the process of developing the webpage/information/disclosures which must be readily accessible to the public as required by the most recent Higher Education Act Reauthorization (HEA). All HEA required information exists at the university, and a webpage is being developed to share the required information with the public. We did have the opportunity to review this webpage in its current stage of development and understand that it should be open to the public by the time the Visiting Team arrives on campus in early April. **NB:** This website was in place by mid-March and is accessible from the university's homepage through an icon labeled "Your Right to Know" which takes you to a page maintained by the institutional research office where links can be found to all pertinent information. As recommended by industry standards, the required information and disclosures can be accessed by the members of the public in a minimal number of "web clicks."

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

YES, the documentation demonstrates compliance.

Comments/Explanations:

- A culture of assessment is obvious at the university. The university has been a recognized leader in assessment for a number of years. The Delaware Study is well known and highly regarded.
- The Office of Institutional Research produces a series of assessment reports that are useful and widely available.
- Electronic Dashboard shows comparison with peer institutions on a variety of assessment measures, including retention, graduation rates, student engagement, post-graduate work, and full-time employment of graduates.
- Assessment is done in conjunction with the implementation of the initiatives in the strategic plan, *Path to Prominence*.
- An implementation schedule to assess institutional effectiveness is in place through 2014-2015.
- The university frequently surveys students. Among the survey results reviewed were the Undergraduate Student Satisfaction Survey 2009, the Associate of Arts Student Satisfaction Survey 2009, the 2009 Graduate Student Survey, and the National Survey of Student Engagement. Response to surveys is generally in the range of 15% to 35%.
- Identified areas of some dissatisfaction are followed up by Campus Pulse Surveys. Topics of surveys reviewed included academic advising, diversity, and registration procedures.
- Other surveys conducted by the university include a Career Plans Survey and a Web-based survey administered to graduating undergraduate and graduate students.
- Programs are reviewed every five to ten years by external teams of faculty from peer institutions. The Office of the Provost maintains a Web site that describes the process for program reviews, a typical review schedule, and the nature of the anticipated report. Examples of reports were provided for mechanical engineering, exercise science, and computer and information science. Review teams include a faculty member from the University of Delaware.
- Assessment results are shared and discussed with Board of Trustees and the Faculty.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

YES, the documentation supports compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

- The university maintains a robust, informative, and accurate web presence related to university admissions and university admissions standards for both prospective undergraduate and graduate students.

- The university's admissions standards are clearly articulated. Data are available on admissions rates, etc.
- Information on Tuition and Fees, Room and Board (and overall costs), as well as available financial assistance, is readily accessible.
- The recently developed (2007-2009) strategic plan, *Path to Prominence*, articulates, among other things, a commitment to fostering a Diverse and Stimulating Undergraduate Environment and being a Premier Research and Graduate University.
- Through a "Commitment to Delawareans" program, the university provides access to the university for potential first-time, first-year students, from the state of Delaware, who may not be adequately prepared to begin full-time studies on the Newark campus, via a University of Delaware Associate Degree program available on the campuses of the Delaware Technical and Community College that affords students an opportunity to enroll at the university in the junior year.
- Information on the university's retention and graduation rates is available both electronically and in print format. The university's retention and graduation rates exceed those of most public flagship universities.
- Programs are available to assist students who may face academic, personal, or financial difficulties while enrolled at the university.
- The Academic Enrichment Center plays a key role in support of student achievement for those students who find that they may need such assistance.
- While graduate admissions decisions are made at the departmental level, the university provides a wealth of information on the graduate admissions process and the cost of graduate education through the university's website.
- Special attention is being paid to the needs of international students.
- The university has data available on doctoral students' "time-to-degree."

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Standard 9: Student Support Services

YES, the documentation supports compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

- The university maintains and delivers a wide array of student support services in order to foster and enhance student success. Such services begin in the admissions process, continue through a robust orientation program, the First Year Experience (FYE), and are available throughout a student's career at the university.
- Student support services include the Academic Enrichment Center, the Center for Counseling and Student Development, Career Services, Disabilities Support Services, services for Foreign Students, Health Services, Residence Life, Religious life, the Office of Student Conduct, and the Writing Center, etc.
- Information on all such services is readily available to students, parents and others via the university website.

- Information on the evaluation and use of various support services is maintained and analyzed, along with all of other university functions, through a robust institutional assessment program as outlined in the documentation related to the university's compliance with Standard 7.
- Information on university policies and procedures, as well as student conduct, is available to students electronically through the *Student Guide to University Policies*.
- An Undergraduate Student Government Association and Graduate Student Senate support students, engage students in university governance and advocate for the needs and interest of students.
- While not a part of the initial Document Roadmap that we received, we did visit the website of the Athletic Department to review policies, procedures, and support services as they relate to protecting and promoting the success of student-athletes. We found these materials to be readily accessible and at the same high level as all of the university's services.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Standard 10: Faculty

YES, the documentation demonstrates compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

- The members of the faculty are appropriately prepared and qualified.
- Faculty roles and responsibilities are clearly defined in the *Faculty Handbook*.
- The faculty is of sufficient size to support the university's academic programs.
- The faculty is active in designing and updating the curriculum.
- The published standards for faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure recognize the appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, service, and student advisement.
- The institution has a clear statement of Academic Freedom.
- In general, the faculty is publishing and active in professional organizations.
- The university subscribes to the Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index developed by SUNY Stony Brook and operated by Academic Analytics, Inc.
- The university faculty is represented for purposes of collective bargaining by the Delaware Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) went into place on July 1, 2010 and is valid through June 30, 2013. Faculty – university relations seem to be amicable and productive.
- Through *The National Study of Instructional Costs & Productivity* ("The Delaware Study"), the university is a leader in the comparative analysis of faculty teaching loads, direct instructional cost, and separately budgeted scholarly activity, all at the level of the academic discipline.
- Students have the opportunity to provide feedback on their perceptions of the quality of courses and instruction through a course evaluation system.
- Faculty teaching is supported by both the Center of Teaching and Learning and the Office of Educational Assessment.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

YES, the documentation supports compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

- The university provides degree programs at various levels consistent with its mission and the needs of the state of Delaware, its region, the nation, and the broader global community.
- Degrees are offered at the baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral level.
- As described in response to Standard 8, “A Commitment to Delawareans” program affords academically able students earning an Associate’s in Arts degree at the Delaware Technical and Community College an opportunity to continue their studies at the University of Delaware.
- All degree programs are adequately described in undergraduate and graduate student catalogs.
- The Institutional Research Office provides synopses of all undergraduate and graduate degree programs.
- A robust, well regarded, competitive University Honors Program is available to undergraduate students.
- Educational offerings are supported and enhanced by the Academic Enrichment Center, described in greater detail in support of compliance with Standards 8 and 9, as well as by the University Libraries, and Study Abroad and Undergraduate Research programs.
- Professional and Continuing Studies programs support the needs of continuing, part-time, online and even certain high school students.
- Professional and Continuing Studies programs are designed to meet the needs of both university students, the state of Delaware and its region, as well as students nationally and worldwide through online offerings.
- The *Path to Prominence* Strategic Plan articulates a clear commitment to Excellence in Professional Education.
- Studies are now underway investigating the possibility of the university creating and opening a law school.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Standard 12: General Education

YES, the documentation supports compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

- The university’s current general education program and requirements have been in place since 2003.
- The current program includes 10 undergraduate educational goals.
- All undergraduate students take English 110 and must complete a First Year Experience Seminar, a course with a multicultural designation, and a Discovery Learning Experience. In addition, as of the

Fall 2010, all students must complete 12 credits (one course each) in four breadth areas – creative arts and humanities; history and cultural change; social and behavioral sciences; and mathematics, natural sciences, and technology.

- As part of the *Path to Prominence's* commitment to a Diverse and Stimulating Undergraduate Environment, the current undergraduate general education goals, requirements, and assessment activities are under review with an eye toward streamlining the list of goals and taking action steps between now and 2015 to “establish a coherent and integrative program of undergraduate education and university requirements.”
- The faculty and Office of Educational Assessment have in place strategies for assessing general education competencies.
- The outcome assessment activities around general education are robust and similar to those pursued in all educational areas across the university.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

YES, the documentation supports compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

- The university has a robust set of basic skills, Pre-collegiate, Certificate, Distance, and Experiential learning programs.
- These programs help address the needs of the state of Delaware, its region, and the nation.
- The proper procedures and safeguards are in place to assure the quality and effectiveness of these programs.
- The Office of Educational Assessment, as part of the Center for Educational Effectiveness, undertakes an impressive list of assessment activities in support of and around these activities.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

YES, the documentation supports compliance.

Comments/Explanation:

The documentation demonstrates compliance with this standard relative to these areas:

- The university has a strong culture of assessment that is supported by multiple offices. There is clear collaboration of faculty and administrators to develop a culture and practice of assessment.

- The university has a Center for Teaching and Learning that supports student learning assessment by providing resources and programs for faculty members to engage effectively in assessment activities.
- The university also has an Office of Educational Assessment with a vision statement to promote and sustain a culture of continuous improvement in the university. In particular, the office supports the efforts of the academic units to measure student learning outcomes of undergraduate and graduate students.
- The Center for Educational Effectiveness, a collaboration between the Office of Educational Assessment and the Center for Teaching and Learning, produces a newsletter to assist with the university's efforts to implement an electronic portfolio assessment that is funded by a FIPSE grant.
- The Office of the Provost has provided funding to create a panel of Faculty Assessment Scholars to work with the Office of Educational Assessment and the faculty within the College of Arts and Sciences to establish best practices for assessment of student learning outcomes within the College's programs and disciplines.
- The mission statements and learning goals of academic departments are consonant with the institution's mission.
- Overall, the measures of student learning that are present are of sufficient quality that results can be used to inform decisions.
- Clearly articulated and appropriately integrated statements of expected student learning outcomes exist at all levels.

Additional documentation that should be provided at the time of the team visit: None

Additional Documents Reviewed Not Cited in the Roadmap

- Management Letter, October 27, 2010.
- Minutes of the Board of Trustees and Committees for Fall 2010, Spring 2010, and Fall 2009.
- Academic Review Reports for Mechanical Engineering, Exercise Science, and Computer and Information Science.
- Information provided by the Provost regarding the evaluation of senior staff and the Deans.
- Provost's Goals and Academic Improvement Goals.
- Description of process used by the Board of Trustees to evaluate the President.
- Sample course evaluations from Education.
- Key Performance Indicators (Dashboard) for the *Path to Prominence*.
- Presentation on "Responsibility-Based Budgeting."

Section VI: Summary Recommendations Requiring Follow Up Action

The site visit team reaffirms that the University of Delaware meets the requirements for continued accreditation. We expect that the institution will report on its progress in implementing the following recommendations in its Periodic Review Report, but we do not consider its continued satisfaction of the standards of accreditation to be contingent on that progress.

Recommendations regarding Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal and Standard 3: Institutional Resources

The cultural change afoot and the implementation of RBB have led some to wonder if the administration is moving away from UD's commitment to teaching and public service. A clear and visible commitment to quality outcomes—in all that UD does—and clarity of expectations of faculty will greatly build confidence in the value of the cultural shift and help all constituencies find their place in the plan.

We recommend that the university, especially through the Office of the Provost, ensure that the new budget system's metrics are leavened with judgments about educational quality.

We recommend that the UD leadership institutionalize broad-based understanding that a portion of revenues is necessary to fund general university operations. This should include funds controlled by the Provost's Office for university-wide initiatives, such as key interdisciplinary institutes.

We also recommend that UD invest as necessary to build a first-rate development and alumni relations infrastructure. It should work to raise the sights of its alumni when it comes to giving back to the university. The opportunities for increased fundraising are substantial, but it will take many years to realize the potential.

Recommendations regarding Standards 1 Mission and Goals, Standard 8 Student Admissions and Retention, and Standard 10 Faculty:

We recommend that the institution should commit itself forcefully and visibly to improving the diversity of its whole community—students, faculty, and staff. The leaders of the university—deans and chairs, as well as the president and vice presidents—have a particularly important role to play.

We recommend that the university study the reasons for the significantly lower graduation rate for students from underrepresented minorities, especially African American students, and develop concrete steps for improvement.

We recommend that a coherent plan be developed to further enhance gender diversity among the science and engineering faculty and to make what appears to be even more important progress in racial diversity among the entire faculty.

Recommendation regarding Standard 10: Faculty

It will be important in recruiting faculty, especially junior faculty, that the language in tenure and promotion documents be consistent with the expectations that are set for them; this will also help deans and the provost in encouraging senior faculty to understand the changes in the landscape that strong interdisciplinary research brings. We understand that discussion of this matter has begun in the colleges and in the Faculty Senate, and we recommend that this be carefully tracked and completed as soon as possible.