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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lincoln University, the nation’s oldest continuously operating Historically Black College, was chartered in 1854 as Ashmun Institute, with the goal of providing higher education in the arts and sciences for youth of African descent. Nationally acclaimed, the University offers a liberal arts and science-based undergraduate core curriculum with selected graduate programs to meet the needs of students living in a highly technological and global society. It is the newest of the state-related universities, having joined the Pennsylvania Commonwealth System of Higher Education in 1972. In 2002, 95 full-time faculty, including librarians, served close to 2000 undergraduate and graduate students on its campus in Southern Chester County and its Urban Center in Philadelphia.

As Lincoln University begins its yearlong sesquicentennial celebration, it looks back on its rich and distinguished history with pride while looking ahead with confidence. The University is entering its 150th year having reaffirmed, in new mission, vision, goals and philosophy statements, its commitment to those principles on which it was founded, principles of academic excellence and leadership development for descendents of those historically denied the liberation of learning. It began as, and remains, a place where dedicated teachers and inspired learners meet in an atmosphere of high expectations, intellectual openness, and active inquiry. The main theme that has emerged from this periodic review is how little the University has changed its founding vision but how greatly the University itself has changed.
In the short period following its Self Study of 1997-98, Lincoln University has appointed a new president and an entirely new executive officer team: Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Fiscal Affairs, Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, and Vice President for Development and External Relations. Along with the new leadership have come new mission and vision statements, followed by a new strategic plan with a focus on assessment. A final major change is a revised organizational structure dividing the University into three schools, Humanities, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and Social Sciences and Behavioral Studies, each led by a full-time academic dean. Given the number of changes, the process of assembling this Periodic Review Report (PRR) has provided the entire Lincoln community with a welcome opportunity to step back, contemplate the implications of the new mission, appreciate the distance covered in the past five years, assess present strengths and weaknesses, and develop a clear and specific plan of action for the future.

The review process began in April 2002 with the appointment of two co-chairs, one from the undergraduate and the other from the graduate faculty. Working with the deans and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the co-chairs assembled a 21-member Steering Committee and eight task forces, coinciding with the seven sections of the last decennial report and an additional group focusing on assessment. The Steering Committee met monthly from August 2002 through April 2003, two of those times in joint meetings with task force co-chairs, to review charges, assess progress, read task force reports, make recommendations, and adopt the final PRR, which was presented in draft form to faculty, students, administration, staff and trustees in April, 2003, and revised on the basis of feedback.
Despite limited resources and difficult external events during the period following the last self study, the task forces found that Lincoln University has been able to address past problems successfully while continuing day-to-day operations and developing a comprehensive strategic plan for the future. Significant progress has been observed in all segments of the university.

In fall 2001 Lincoln University enrolled the second largest new student class in its history. Additional student support services are available, including a Women’s Center, a Minority Men’s Health Project, an enhanced Academic Advising Center, a reorganized Act101/TIME Program, and a restructured Counseling and Career Services. The University’s present graduation rate of 47.6% after six years remains above the national average of 41.9% for African Americans.

Many classrooms and laboratories have been updated, and new resources such as a TV studio and a graphics arts computer laboratory are available. A new focus on instructional technology and professional development has enhanced teaching and learning; new promotion and tenure guidelines created by faculty and approved by trustees have clarified the standards for professional growth; new educational programs such as a pre-law curriculum and an environmental science major have been developed in response to demand, and a review of the core curriculum and major requirements has begun. The premiere issue of the Lincoln Journal of Social and Political Thought (see appendix) was published in the fall of 2002. There has been an improvement in faculty salaries, especially at lower salary ranks, encouraging promising young scholars to remain at the University.
Administratively, within a more decentralized management style and improved communication, past audit problems have been solved and books balanced, and difficulties with financial aid have been settled. The decision by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to carry out $29.3 million worth of improvements to Lincoln’s infrastructure serves as an important endorsement of the management changes begun in 1999. More people at more levels are involved in the budgeting process, with funds now being allocated according to priorities from the University’s strategic plan. A newly structured Office of Marketing and Communication has captured the University’s new look in its website, professional brochures, and bulletins. Although Lincoln’s $100 million capital campaign is still in its silent phase, contributions between 1999/2000 and 2001/2002 have almost tripled, and a $1 million grant from the neighboring Oxford Foundation was recently announced to upgrade the Ware Center.

Of all the major changes that this report highlights, the most important is the University’s heightened attention to planning and assessment activities, since it is only through careful planning and assessment that change can be managed. Middle States’ response to the University’s 2000 Follow-up Report noted assessment efforts as a weakness, requesting that the PRR “document further progress in the implementation of a comprehensive outcomes assessment plan.” As the following document shows, such a plan has been put in place, and a series of carefully planned university-wide assessment initiatives have begun.

Academic departments and programs have begun the arduous task of identifying discipline-specific knowledge, skills and attitudes that majors are expected to possess or master by the end of their program; identifying and describing specific assessment
measures used to determine whether those cognitive, affective and behavioral outcomes were achieved; describing the extent to which desired outcomes were attained when compared to assessment results; and discussing how assessment data influence departmental decisions about program goals, curricular content and instructional methods. While the task is by no means complete, significant progress has been made since the 2000 Follow-up Study. Thirteen of 16 major programs of academic departments have articulated desired student learner outcomes in measurable terms, and 11 of 16 major programs have taken the next step and compared actual outcomes to desired outcomes.

Non-academic units are equally committed to systematic assessment. Because many of these assessment practices have recently been established, not all of the data have been gathered or analyzed. Nevertheless, the University is doing more with assessment now than at any other time in recent history.

While acknowledging the significant achievements since the last self study, this report also identifies important challenges to be addressed before the next Middle States visit in 2007. A review of the core curriculum and majors will likely result in a new configuration of majors and minors. Assessment practices across the University will need to be standardized, and data collected from assessment must begin to inform changes. The new governance structure of schools and deans should be evaluated and changed as needed. The increasing number of part-time faculty is a growing cause for concern, as is the rise in class size, especially in developmental courses. Women continue to be underrepresented at all levels of faculty rank. The commitment to technology expressed in the mission statement will require continued fiscal and personnel support.
Significant resources will also be needed to improve the physical environment and
campus life. The 49 university buildings constructed between 1850 and 1973 have had no
extensive upgrading since the seventies. Many of the facilities suffer from major
deferred maintenance, including the Langston Hughes Memorial Library and its special
collections. These challenges are formidable.

If a periodic review report is not to be a misnomer, it must provide an opportunity
to record, examine, and reflect on achievements and challenges over a time span. This
report has given the Lincoln University community the opportunity to do just that.
Whatever the problems and progress noted, the point, it would seem, is to make
recommendations and seek improvement. This report attempts to do both.
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

Lincoln University, the nation’s oldest continuously operating historically black college/university, was chartered in 1854 as Ashmun Institute, with the goal of providing higher education in the arts and sciences for youth of African descent. A nationally acclaimed institution of higher learning, Lincoln University provides the best elements of a liberal arts and sciences-based undergraduate core curriculum and selected graduate programs to meet the needs of students living in a highly technological and global society. It is the newest of the state-related universities, having joined the Commonwealth System of Higher Education in 1972. The university is governed by a 39-member Board of Trustees. On August 15, 1999, the Trustees appointed Dr. Ivory Nelson as the University’s 12th president.

Lincoln University employs 89 full-time faculty members at the undergraduate level (including four full-time administrators and seven librarians) and six full-time faculty at the graduate level. Each of the University’s three schools—Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Social Sciences and Behavioral Studies, and Humanities—is led by an academic dean. At the start of the 2002-2003 academic year, the Dean of Humanities also assumed authority for all Urban Center-based graduate programs. The combined undergraduate/graduate enrollment is approximately 1,850 annually. Undergraduates experience a 17:1 student/faculty ratio, as calculated by dividing the total number of enrolled full-time undergraduate students by the total number of full-time faculty excluding librarians, full-time administrators with faculty rank and faculty who teach only graduate level courses. Excluding librarians, 77% of the faculty hold doctorate
degrees. The faculty, with members from Europe, Asia, Africa and the Caribbean as well as many regions of the United States, reflect the diversity necessary for a university which emphasizes globalization through multi-cultural and international education.

Gender equity, however, is more problematic. Women made up only 33% of the full-time faculty in 2002, down from 39% at the time of the previous self study; this is a special concern on a campus where female undergraduate students outnumber males 61% to 39%.

Lincoln University’s main campus in rural Chester County, in the southeastern corner of the state, is augmented by an Urban Center in West Philadelphia that is home to four graduate programs and also offers a variety of affiliated educational, continuing education and community service programs. In 2002, over 400 adult students consisting of human service professionals, teachers, and administrators attended graduate programs focusing on education, human services, and the sciences. Additionally, adults and senior citizens from the community are involved daily in grant funded and affiliated partnership programs housed at the Urban Center.

As a liberal arts institution, Lincoln University seeks to graduate students who can look beyond a narrow technical understanding of one limited field and understand the rapidly changing world and the tools and events that shape it. The University offers a curriculum requiring all students, whatever their major, to be proficient in eight integrative themes in the liberal arts: communication skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking), critical thinking (problem solving), values and ethics, science and technology, numerical data/computers, intercultural experience, historical perspective, and art and aesthetics. According to the latest edition of the Lincoln University Factbook, published
in November 2002, the top six undergraduate majors for students graduating in 2001 were criminal justice, elementary education, computer science, business administration/management, biology, and chemistry. One-fourth of Lincoln’s baccalaureate graduates in May 2002 received B.S. degrees in biology, chemistry, physics, computer science, general science, or mathematics. The University’s present graduation rate is 47.6% after six years. This is above the national average of 41.9% for African Americans.


The years since Lincoln University’s 1997-98 self study have been ones of tremendous change, much of which has already been documented in Lincoln’s April 2000 follow-up report to the Middle States Commission. The president and all four vice presidents (for academic affairs, student affairs and enrollment management, fiscal affairs, and development) are new, as are many staff at the middle management level. This sweeping change, which could easily have led to fragmentation and low morale, has instead led to increasing stability and organization. Policies and procedures have been reviewed, revised and communicated. Important issues, such as promotion and tenure guidelines, have been discussed and adopted. The university has reorganized its governance structure, with three schools, each of which is led by a full-time dean; this new structure is a direct result of a 1998 Middle States recommendation that the University strengthen the ineffective position of Division Chairperson.

Most importantly, change is now occurring in an atmosphere of careful planning and assessment. As the Periodic Review Report (PRR) Task Force on Institutional Assessment concluded in their final report, “The university is probably doing more now
with respect to assessment of institutional outcomes than at any time in the institution’s history.”

The single focus guiding these myriad changes is Lincoln’s new mission statement, revised through a comprehensive strategic planning process and adopted by the Board of Trustees in April, 2000. It affirms the University’s commitment to providing the highest quality liberal arts education to descendents of those historically denied the liberation of learning and to preparing those students for global leadership. All budgetary and programmatic decisions made by the University rest on the foundation of 13 specific goals derived from the new mission and vision statements. The mission statement, the strategic plan for 2003—2006, and all other important planning documents (see appendix) are readily available on Lincoln’s website as part of the president’s Information Exchange.

The process of assembling this PRR report has provided the entire Lincoln community with a welcome opportunity to step back, consider the new mission, appreciate the distance covered in the past five years, assess present strengths and weaknesses, and develop a clear and specific plan of action for the future.

B. Approach to Preparation of PRR

Two co-chairs, one from the undergraduate and one from the graduate faculty, were appointed in the spring of 2002 to guide the PRR activities. With the assistance of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the deans, they first assembled a Steering Committee consisting of 21 members representing the three schools, the graduate programs, all major administrative divisions, and students (see appendix). Next, eight
working task forces, coinciding with the seven sections of the last decennial report plus
an additional working group on assessment, were constituted. Each of the eight task
forces was charged with gathering data, conducting analyses and making
recommendations for change and improvement using a comprehensive model involving
an in-depth inquiry in each area of the characteristics of excellence. The 16 task force co-
chairs paired more senior faculty members with newer faculty members where possible,
with the aim of providing both a useful mentoring/faculty development experience and a
variety of perspectives. At least one person from every academic department was
represented either on the Steering Committee or as a task force co-chair, so that
leadership functions were spread evenly across the curriculum. All full-time faculty
members who were not on the steering committee or part of the task force co-chair group
were assigned to work on one of the eight task forces. The Student Government
Association assigned two student representatives to each of the eight task forces.

At an organizational meeting in April 2002, Steering Committee members and
task force co-chairs were provided with Resource Manuals containing:

- Goals and Objectives of PRR
- Overview and summary section of 1998 Evaluation Team Response to
  Lincoln Self Study (task forces also received relevant section);
- Lincoln 2000 Follow-up Report
- June 30, 2000 Middle States Response to Follow Up Report
- Summary of the 2002 Characteristics of Excellence, and
- Preliminary charges based on 1998 Self Study response recommendations and
  suggestions.
During the summer, two websites were established for additional document sharing. One was set up as a WebCT “course,” with the dual objectives of sharing PRR information and encouraging faculty to explore this new course management tool. A mirror site was also established on the Internet outside of WebCT. (As of March 2003, there had been over 150 “visits” to the WebCT site, and 85 to the mirror site on the Internet.) The Steering Committee met monthly from August 2002 through April 2003, two of those times in joint meetings with task force co-chairs, to review charges, assess progress, read task force reports, make recommendations, and adopt the final report, which was presented in draft form to faculty/students/administration/trustees in March and April, 2003, and revised based on feedback.

C. Brief Highlights of the Narrative

Since its last self-study, the University has caught up with many past problems, maintained control over day-to-day operations and formulated a strategic plan for the future, which will be updated yearly using the Planning and Assessment Worksheet (PAWS) process. All this has been done despite limited resources. The president has set an example of decentralized management, and this system has encouraged creativity and productivity. Channels of communication are clear, and information flows freely, as evidenced by the President’s Information Exchange on Lincoln’s newly designed website. The University has begun an ambitious $100 million capital campaign, already marked by increased alumni giving and a $1 million grant from the nearby Oxford Foundation.
The first of the University’s 13 operational goals derived from the mission statement asserts that Lincoln will be student-centered. This goal is reflected in the Enrollment Management Model implemented by the new Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (SAEM), which places as much attention on retention efforts as it does on the recruitment of a specific class size and seeks to involve all offices and departments in order to improve student satisfaction and be in a better position to “shape” a new student class.

Accompanying its student life improvements, Lincoln has experienced an improvement and redefinition of academic programs, department by department. Exciting new programs have been developed, and faculty are beginning a second year of review of core curriculum and majors. Smaller departments have merged into larger working units. New standards for teaching effectiveness have been developed and agreed upon in a new Promotion/Tenure document. Classrooms are friendlier, technology— for students, faculty and administrative use— is improved, and a wider variety of student learning styles are being accommodated. Additional student support services have been provided, including an Advising Center, a Women’s Center, and a restructured Counseling and Career Services.

Fiscal management has also improved. Problems with Financial Aid and Fiscal Affairs have been greatly reduced over the past two years, and the University, despite the uncertain economy, is operating in the black. The extraordinary decision by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to carry out $29.3 million worth of improvements to Lincoln’s infrastructure serves as an important endorsement of the management changes that were begun in 1999. Lincoln’s improved financial stewardship is clearly shown by
the fact that, over the past three years, audit findings have been reduced from 27 to 1. Additional achievements in fiscal management include the renegotiation of contracts with key suppliers, a switch from deferred to preventive maintenance in the physical plan, and a decentralized budgeting process, with each of the four VPs “owning” their own budgets.

Problems remain, of course. Lincoln’s buildings are aging and in need of substantial repair. One issue of particular concern in the next five years will be the Langston Hughes Memorial Library’s physical renovation, especially climate control and storage conditions, and the on-going upgrading of library technology. Years of deferred maintenance have put its special collections at risk of destruction through mold and decay; stopping any further deterioration and reversing that trend is now first priority. Additionally, enhanced internet-based library access will be essential to the growth and development of Lincoln’s off-campus, non-residential graduate programs. There is also general concern over the growing number of adjunct faculty at both undergraduate and graduate levels, discussion of rising enrollment caps in developmental and other courses, and calls for increased academic technology support for faculty eager to use new instructional methods. Finally, there is the need to standardize assessment practices across the university and to begin to make changes based on assessment data.

Nevertheless, this Periodic Review Report will show that Lincoln has made much progress since the 1997-98 self study. It is now using its limited resources more effectively and prudently, not trying to be all things to all people but continuing to do well what its mission dictates and making changes based on accurate data derived from valid and ongoing assessment.
SECTION 2: SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS AND/OR CHANGES SINCE THE 1997-98 SELF STUDY

A. Overview

The period since the last self study in 1997-98 has been one of sweeping change at Lincoln University. In its March 30, 2000, follow-up report to the Middle States Association, the institution acknowledged the change in its leadership since the last comprehensive evaluation of 1998, with the appointment of Dr. James Donaldson as Interim President in October 1998, a new Vice President for Fiscal Affairs in January 1999 and a new controller in February 1999. In June 1999, the Board of Trustees appointed Dr. Ivory Nelson as Lincoln University's 12th President. Since then, the University has also appointed new vice presidents for student affairs and enrollment management, development, and academic affairs.

Section 2 of the Periodic Review Report presents major accomplishments that have flourished in this atmosphere of change, analyzes the institutional response to all Middle States recommendations, and acknowledges issues that will need to be addressed prior to the 2007/8 self-study visit. A brief overview of major changes is presented first, followed by summaries of the specific findings from each of the eight individual task forces. The narrative section is followed by a grid showing Lincoln University’s response to all Middle States recommendations and suggestions.
B. Major Achievements/Changes Since 1998

- A new Strategic Plan with new mission, vision, goals (replacing Blueprint 2000) and a process for annual updates;
- The reorganization of the University into three schools, each headed by a full-time dean, replacing the previous structure of three divisions headed by faculty members with no release time and no clearly defined division chairperson responsibilities;
- Easier access to information
- Improvement in the academic environment, including a new television studio, new computer laboratories for departmental and general student use, a retooled radio station, a significant increase in number and kinds of academic technology, a Faculty Development lab for training and productions, renovated science and art laboratories, and new graphic arts computer lab;
- New emphasis on instructional technology, infrastructure, and faculty development, including expansion of the Instructional Media Center (IMC) as a faculty development center;
- Start of a comprehensive review of the undergraduate core curriculum and major requirements;
- Closer integration of the Urban Center with the rest of the university's programs and personnel and focused growth of selective graduate offerings
- New Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (SAEM) approach to recruitment and retention;
• New, enhanced or restructured student support services including an Academic Advising Center, the Counseling Center, Act 101/TIME Learning Resources Center, Women's Center and Minority Male Health Project;

• Improved fiscal oversight;

• More efficient and decentralized management;

• Standardization of policies and procedures across the university;

• A new $100 million capital campaign;

• Increased attention to outcomes assessment including review of core curriculum and majors; departmental control of assessment of students' general reading, writing, critical thinking, speaking and technology skills; new and/or revised forms for faculty and chairperson evaluations; 4/5 of academic departments with articulated desired students learner outcomes in measurable terms, and over 2/3 of the departments having compared actual outcomes to desired outcomes;

These achievements took place despite such challenges and obstacles as a worsening external economic environment and less state support; an aging physical plant, with infrastructure and deferred maintenance problems; difficulties inherent in adjusting to so many major changes in university structure and personnel; growth in the number of part-time faculty at both undergraduate and graduate levels; and time and resource demands occasioned by the increasing need to move beyond the initial stages of assessment, standardize evaluation procedures across the university, and begin to demonstrate resulting changes.
C. Review Process

Each of the eight task forces conducted an in-depth inquiry into the relevant areas of the characteristics of excellence while gathering data, conducting analyses and making recommendations for change and improvement. These task forces, constituted to correspond to the seven chapters of Lincoln University’s 1997-98 self-study document supplemented by an additional task force on outcomes assessment, were charged with examining issues of relevance to the University Mission and Integrity, Students and Student Services, the Faculty, Academic Programs and Resources, Teaching and Learning Outcomes, Institutional Outcomes, Fiscal Planning and Physical Plant, and Governance. (See appendix for membership and charges.)

D. Findings from Task Force 1: University

Summary

In 1998, the Middle States Association offered three major recommendations regarding Mission, Goals and Objectives:

1. The University should initiate a campus-wide forum on the objectives of Blueprint 2000 and should involve faculty and students in making these objectives a reality;

2. The University should consider including its emphases in international and global education within its mission statement;

3. The University should correct immediately false and misleading information on courses and faculty listed in the University Bulletin.

The university has addressed each of the recommendations.
The mission of Lincoln University continues to be shaped by the institution’s unique history. However, in April of 2000 the Board of Trustees approved a new mission statement, goals and objectives which had been carefully developed by a wide range of individuals from virtually every aspect of the University community. Each department then produced its own strategic plan document based on the University’s strategic plan. Technology, including the university website, has allowed more constituents to view and therefore become aware of Lincoln's mission. An analysis of the information included in the mission document shows that most of statements are consistent with university practices and objectives. In addition, the statements serve to support the long range planning, growth, and viability of the institution.

**Narrative (Reference: Charges #1 – 5)**

The current mission statement reflects the University's desired and actual emphases. It notes, “*Admission opportunities in education and leadership development are offered to the descendants of those historically denied the liberation of learning and who have demonstrated a potential for academic success.*” It is clear that the university continues to operate under this distinction as evidenced by its historic and current status as well as its student enrollment trends. (See appendix.) The emphasis on "an international focus" is operationalized in several ways. Undergraduate students are required to take a global studies course as part of their core curriculum. In addition, students have the opportunity to participate in the University's Study Abroad program offered under the direction of the Office of International Programs and Services. (See appendix: OIP description and annual report) Additionally, in August of 2002, President Nelson announced the restructuring of several university components (See appendix:
August 19, 2002 memorandum: “International Programmatic Activities at Lincoln University). Such activities underscore Lincoln’s commitment to that section of the mission that reads: "To foster in students an appreciation for competition and coexistence in the global marketplace, Lincoln University seeks to infuse its curricula with modules of instruction that require its students to recognize an international community of people."

Implementation of the mission statement’s technology emphases “With a commitment to promoting technological sophistication for its students in all academic programs" and “[aiding] students to understand moral and ethical issues, human dimensions, and leadership challenges posed by technology,” is evident. Residential students now have the capability to access the Internet from their dormitory rooms. In addition there are new computer laboratories, two of which are available 24 hours/day. The Langston Hughes Memorial Library offers a wide range of electronic resources, most of which can be accessed directly from the library web page. The psychology, biology, physics, math, business, and education departments also have their own computer laboratories with special software related to their discipline. There are three computer-equipped teaching classrooms at the Urban Center, along with two open computer laboratories. Faculty also have access to 19 multimedia carts that include LCD data/video projector, computer, DVD player, VCR, speakers, Internet and network connections. These “smart carts” are heavily utilized and have promoted the use of technology-based teaching/learning activities in the classroom. In 2002, secured state funds were earmarked to "complete the development of an integrated system of
computer, telephony and cable networks that will be designed for the student, faculty and administrator in a user-friendly environment." (See appendix.)

Lincoln University's mission statement indicates that it "offers a liberal arts and sciences-based undergraduate core curriculum and selected professional graduate programs." Several key university components substantiate this claim. Lincoln is ranked 6th in the nation and 1st in Pennsylvania in graduating African Americans with baccalaureate degrees in the physical sciences. The undergraduate core curriculum (see appendix) is designed to expose all Lincoln students to every area of liberal arts. The revision of the core curriculum, begun in 2002 and continuing, has sparked a useful campus-wide debate on the meaning of liberal arts. Increasing attention is being paid to assuring the quality of both graduate and undergraduate programs, with a renewed emphasis on outcomes assessment at all levels. On August 19, 2002, the re-structuring of the Urban Center under the direction of the Dean of Humanities and Graduate Studies was announced.

Remaining Areas of Concern

Based on the review of the University’s mission and integrity issues, the following recommendations for actions to be taken between 2003-2007 are made:

- Define and assess the concept of "distance learning" included in the mission statement;
- Clarify the university’s assessment process for ongoing outcomes assessment;
- Continue to analyze and define the 13 university goals that were derived from the mission statement, and correct all remaining inaccuracies in printed documents sent to prospective students;
Establish a policy governing the standards for all university publications and establish departmental timetables for the review and revision of print and web publications;

- Develop a process by which the university website is evaluated periodically and updated promptly, requiring departments and programs to report changes in staff and program options to the web manager;

- Clarify the navigational system of the present website;

- Eliminate remaining errors or inconsistencies in print and online documents.

E. Findings from Task Force 2: Students and Student Services

Summary

All Middle States charges with respect to students and student life have been addressed, and for the most part, the required tasks have been completed. Additional attention is still needed with respect to undergraduate student discipline. General graduate student issues also need to be addressed, but with the appointment of a graduate dean in August 2002 this work has begun, and much progress has been made toward needs assessment and standardization of policies at the Graduate Center

Narrative (Reference: Charges #6 – 19)

Undergraduate and graduate application materials, as well as information on scholarships, financial aid and refund policies, are available on Lincoln's website and are updated annually. The Counseling and Career Services Centers have been re-structured, although
both centers meet periodically to discuss common issues of interest. The Advising Center, opened in 1997, advises incoming freshmen and continues to work with them until the end of their sophomore year when they are expected to work with faculty in their chosen major. Fourteen faculty and five staff advisors work with students advising them on course selection. The Counseling Center, now separated from Career Services, is under the Office of Student Development. The Center offers counseling services and is able to refer students to outside support as needed. Students who are already diagnosed with a problem and are seeking relief or stabilization have access to a licensed psychologist. The Act 101/TIME Program, which provides low-income Pennsylvania residents with financial assistance and counseling, offers additional support through its reading, writing, and mathematics laboratories which are now under the supervision of the relevant academic departments and their respective deans. Graduate students have no specific resources for academic counseling or tutorial help at the Urban Center, nor is there counseling for personal or academic needs, although graduate students may use main campus facilities as needed.

The Library provides a variety of databases available on both the Lincoln University campus and at the Graduate Center. Students on campus have direct access to these resources both from campus computer laboratories and from dormitory rooms. The library catalog is now accessible online, through the Voyager system.

The undergraduate retention rate 44.6% after six years is above the national average for minority students and has remained consistent over the last six years. Data on graduate recruitment, admission, retention and graduation are in the process of being collected and analyzed under the auspices of the new graduate dean.
Presently, the programs at the Graduate Center rely primarily on adjuncts; there are only 5 full-time graduate faculty, all of whom teach in the Master of Human Services Program. This problem has been given priority in the 2003--2006 Strategic Plan.

Remaining Areas of Concern

Based on their review of student-related issues, the task force made the following recommendations for actions to be taken between 2003-2007:

- Increase library services for the Graduate Center with physical space made available for reading and library resources;
- Hire more full-time faculty for Graduate Center programs;
- Establish support services as needed for students at Graduate Center;
- Clarify process for delivering psychological counseling of students if needed;
- Vigorously recruit students with higher SAT scores;
- Lower enrollment cap on developmental classes;
- Reduce friction among students and enrich the extracurricular activities, especially on the weekend;
- Objectively assess the changes in the administration of the Advising and Counseling Centers and of the mathematics, reading and writing laboratories within the next two years.

F. Findings from Task Force 3: Faculty

Summary
Over the past five years, Lincoln University has tried to improve the hiring process and salary structure of its faculty. Despite inequities in gender distribution, Lincoln's faculty is diverse; the full-time faculty is composed of 49% African descendants, 29% Caucasian, 16% Asians/Middle Eastern, 1% Hispanics. In its attempt to fulfill its teaching mission, the University has acted on its growing awareness of the central importance of technology to both faculty and students by providing equipment and workshops. However, improvement still needs to be made in technology, in reducing the number of part-time faculty (in 2002, 83 part-time compared to 95 full-time faculty), and in maintaining the University's physical environment.

The main faculty-related achievements since 1997-98 include the following:

- Equipping faculty offices with updated computers;
- Offering computer and technology training to faculty, such as WebCT and other computer competence courses;
- Revising and adopting new Promotion and Tenure Guidelines;
- Improving the student evaluation process.

**Narrative** *(Reference: Charges #20-26)*

Improvement has been made in documenting procedures for the recruitment, selection and appointment of new faculty since the 1998 self-study. Two documents of particular relevance, "Search Strategy for Faculty" and "Procedures for Hiring Tenure Track Faculty," are on file in the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Lincoln University also has on file and distributes to all faculty members upon their hiring the "Collective Bargaining Agreement" and the "Guidelines Related to the
Committee on Promotion, Tenure and Sabbaticals at Lincoln University" which was most recently revised in 2003. The current Collective Bargaining Agreement has been in effect since September 1, 2000 and will expire on August 31, 2003. These documents set forth procedures which detail the various roles the faculty, departments and administration play in addressing faculty hiring.

Currently at Lincoln, non-tenured University faculty are evaluated regularly, according to the stated procedures. This evaluation is useful for alerting faculty to areas that may need adjustment and for encouraging professional growth that will match the University's mission. The evaluation process incorporates a number of steps, including student evaluations. The chairpersons’ evaluations of non-tenured faculty are kept on file in the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**Quality Control in Faculty Appointments and Re-appointments:** Quality control is exercised at three levels: on a personal level by faculty, at the departmental level by chairpersons, and at the administrative level by the University administration. Quality control at the personal level is variable, based on each faculty member's perceptions of the effectiveness of his or her teaching. At the chairpersons and administration levels, this process is seen through the annual reporting process in which chairpersons must evaluate faculty.

Department Chairperson reviews of non-tenured faculty are conducted annually, and the chairpersons are required to submit a summary of their findings to the Office of Academic Affairs each spring. A further evaluation of all faculty occurs at the time of application for tenure and promotion, when faculty must present a portfolio to support their request. This portfolio must include letters of support from both department
chairpersons and internal and external peers. There is, at present, no standard procedure or form to guide the peer evaluation process. Student evaluations are collected in all classes for all faculty, whether tenured or non-tenured, near the end of each semester and are tabulated in a central office of the administration. The collected data are not always shared in a timely manner.

Once faculty are tenured, which may occur at any level from instructor to professor, the evaluation process is less standard. Some department chairpersons provide yearly, formal post-tenure evaluations; others do not or do so less formally. There is no standard procedure for evaluating tenured faculty, although the faculty has voted in principle to approve post-tenure review and the current Promotion/Tenure/Sabbatical Committee has been charged with bringing an implementation plan to the faculty for discussion. The procedures in place for faculty evaluation vary from department to department and are candidates for standardization. The 3-year plan, developed by each new faculty member and discussed with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, provides an excellent model for future faculty growth.

In 1993 the University began a study of equity in faculty salaries that resulted in adjustments totaling more than $150,000. Equity was again addressed in 2000. The past two Collective Bargaining agreements have also included money for faculty development grants: $55,000, 2000-01; $60,000, 2000-02; and $65,000, 2002-03. A significant number of faculty have applied for the funding of projects that enhance both their scholarship and teaching activities.

Remaining Areas of Concern
Based on the review of faculty issues, the following recommendations are made for actions to be taken between 2003-2007:

- Reduce the ratio of part-timers to full-timers, providing enough teaching staff to keep core courses to an acceptable cap;
- Continue to provide adequate technological support for academic technology initiatives;
- Improve the conditions of work-regulated heating in library and Ware center especially, and complete other building renovations in University Hall;
- Review and streamline the process by which faculty are hired.

G. Findings from Task Force 4: Academic Programs and Resources

Summary

As Lincoln University’s March 30, 2000, follow-up report to the Middle States Association explained in detail, problems pointed out with respect to Blueprint 2000 have been addressed by the adoption of a new mission statement and the development of a new strategic plan. The task force on academic programs, therefore, concentrated on assessing the status of present curricular and programmatic issues. It found that the Langston Hughes Memorial Library is a significant resource of the University in support of teaching, research, and learning. The depth of the library's Special Collections is nationally recognized. The Instructional Media Center (IMC) plays an appropriate role in encouraging the use of educational technology. There is evidence to suggest that centers such as the IMC and the Academic Advising Center are closely connected to the
curriculum, as are other organizations such as the Global Studies Institute and the newly reconstituted Center on Banking. An additional academic resource explored was the Barnes Foundation; the university appears to be utilizing its connection to the Barnes Foundation appropriately, with art and biology classes presently using the facilities, despite some logistical problems with regard to transportation.

Significant improvements made to the academic learning environment include the following:

- New television studio opened September 2001 enabling English-Communication majors to fulfill their requirements for television production courses on campus;
- New computer laboratories for departmental and general student uses;
- Retooled radio station that increases the University's broadcast power from 3 to 10 watts in stereo;
- Mobile computer laboratory containing 16 notebook or laptop computers for faculty use in the classroom;
- Renovated science and art laboratories;
- New graphic arts computer lab established.

Narrative  *(Reference: Charges #27-33)*

**International Cultural Center.** The International Cultural Center was designated to serve as the main hub of activity for students and faculty interested in international and cross-cultural activities. It will house a state-of-the-art auditorium, conference rooms, a language lab, a gallery to display some of the University's African art collection, a multipurpose room, faculty and administrative offices, and will serve as the focal point
for music, theater, dance, and the visual arts. Because of the innovative programming the Center will offer, this facility will not only be an asset to Lincoln, but will also serve as a cultural resource for the rapidly growing community in Southern Chester County. In cooperation with Lower Oxford Township officials and neighbors, Lincoln University has relocated the proposed International Cultural Center from the West side of Baltimore Pike to a site on the East side of Baltimore Pike. The funds authorized for this project are $10,389,000 and the University's commitment is $3,315,342 of this amount. The design phase of the project (at the original location) was completed. The revised estimated cost to furnish and equip the main auditorium, classroom space, reception and exhibition is $3.1 million and is in addition to the design and construction cost of $10,389,000. This project has been placed on the list of "Second Priority" projects for the University.

Langston Hughes Memorial Library. The Langston Hughes Memorial Library online catalog is available through the library web site. Additionally, access to the library's online databases is available at the Urban Center through this web site. Interlibrary Loan Services are available only through the Interlibrary Loan Office at the Langston Hughes Memorial Library, but this office is accessible through e-mail or fax. A reciprocal borrowing agreement with Palinet allows our students, faculty and staff to borrow materials from over 60 participating institutions with an "Academic Library Reciprocal Borrowing Form" available from the Interlibrary Loan Office. Graduate students may avail themselves of borrowing privileges at an additional 40 Tri-state College Library Cooperative (TCLC) institutions by obtaining a "TCLC Letter Of Introduction" from the Interlibrary Loan Office. Also, through Drexel University's
Library, a special borrowing arrangement is available for graduate students in the last year of the program for completing their final master's project document.

Updating and expanding the Langston Hughes Memorial Library is an on-going need. The Langston Hughes Memorial Library houses a collection of more than 170,000 volumes and annually subscribes to approximately 700 periodicals. It also possesses an extensive collection of materials representing all aspects of the Black experience, including African-American and African materials. Since the last self-study, the library’s catalog has been put online and is searchable via the Internet, as are selected electronic data bases available on the campus network. Based on a survey of similar academic libraries, the library's current acquisitions budget appears to be inadequate. (See appendix.) The situation is further exacerbated when one considers that current budgetary allocations have not kept up with the skyrocketing costs of most library materials. The Conservation Center for Art and Historic Artifacts (CCAHA) made recommendations in 1998 for the Special Collections Department. (See appendix.) The Library needs to implement any of the CCAHA's recommendations that have not already been addressed. This includes complete environmental control for the entire building, monitoring temperature and relative humidity.

Instructional Media Center The Instructional Media Center (IMC) supports and enhances overall educational process and specific faculty effectiveness in learning and teaching. The IMC works collaboratively with faculty, students, and academic support units to provide services that facilitate learning, teaching, and scholarship, sustain projects related to the University's mission, and remain responsive to the University needs and concerns. The mission of the IMC, as stated in its 2003-2007 Strategic Plan, is
to promote and support the application of instructional technologies in learning and teaching at Lincoln University. To meet those goals, the IMC has established and supports a faculty training program in technology integration, technology choices, materials creation. It has developed web pages for all university offices and departments. Additionally, it has established an Academic Technology laboratory for faculty that is open daily from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., with four workstations, two scanners, one document and additional digital cameras. It has provided and supervised training for faculty in the use of technology and multimedia tools, including training for 109 faculty participating in 18 workshops in 2001 – 2002; sponsored training sessions by outside trainers on campus; received a Pennsylvania Link-to-Learn Grant used to establish a WebCT training and mentorship program in 2002, which enabled 15 WebCT users to receive introductory WebCT training in May and August 2002 and 42 additional faculty to participate in a four day WebCT training program in August, 2002; and has also established an assessment plan for WebCT use.

**Academic Advising Center.** The Academic Advising Center is responsible for implementing a “total intake system” for advising. Since the Academic Advising Center opened in 1997, it has been responsible for advising all first-time entering students. Under the Total Intake System, students must satisfy a pre-determined set of conditions before they can declare their major. These conditions are that they earn a minimum of 2.00 GPA, and complete a minimum of 24 credits or maximum of 45 credits before declaring their major. The Academic Advising Center is responsible for alerting students to the need to declare their major and for transferring their records to the departments. It is also responsible for providing each department with names of students who have
indicated an interest in a specific major. For the past five years, the Academic Advising Center has been responsible for training new and returning faculty and staff advisors to advise all first-time entering students (including transfer students). The center has established a formal academic advisor training program for faculty and staff assigned as advisors for freshmen and transfer students, including training in counseling with advisees, University core and majors curricula, use of University registration software, and training in relevant laws such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. It has produced an advisor handbook updated annually which includes information on all academic majors, policies regarding academic probation, and core curriculum requirements; developed and implemented a questionnaire for advisees administered annually to assess the success of the advising process; held biweekly meetings with faculty and staff; and maintained annual statistics on student retention and attrition rates, number of students admitted each year, and advisor/advisee ratios.

Global Studies Institute (GSI). The mission of the GSI is to enrich the University's effort to provide its students with a global perspective that will position Lincoln University graduates for optimal use of their skills and knowledge in the emerging global environment of the new millennium. The institute seeks to provide opportunities for Lincoln University students and faculty to pursue international education, research and training. During the 2001-02 academic year, the Global Studies Institute provided financial assistance to 18 students and 8 faculty members to study abroad or to conduct research, including hosting the 22nd Annual Mid-Atlantic Social Research Conference on April 18, 2002, working with the Learning Center in Kennett Square, Pennsylvania, to develop additional programs at Lincoln University for the
Hispanic community, and providing financial support to faculty members to engage in academic activity abroad. (See appendix.)

Center for Banking, Finance & Entrepreneurship (CBFE). The CBFE was established in 1994. For the past several years, much of the Center's efforts have been devoted to entrepreneurial activities. Together with its partner, BASE, INC, a community development organization in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, the Center secured $100,000 funding to promote minority business ventures in Lancaster and its contiguous counties. (See appendix.) While the Center has focused on entrepreneurship and will continue to do so, it is contemplated that a strategic initiative that incorporates the banking and finance components will be developed and executed.

Remaining Areas of Concern

Based on the review of academic programs and resource centers, the following recommendations for actions to be taken between 2003-2007 are made:

- The most critical issues for the library are adequate budget for acquisitions, operations and basic staff additions, correction of the HVAC system, and adequate furniture for all areas of the library. These issues need immediate attention;
- Special Collections and each of the other levels should have functioning PCs that are dedicated to the on-line catalog, independent of the server, so that they are usable when the server is down;
- Library staff should explore options for making the library more "user friendly" in the 21st century, evaluating such ideas, for example, as providing the capability
for students to connect their notebook or laptop computers in carrels and study rooms (possibly with internet connectivity), and providing a paperback or light reading area;

- Additional electronic library resources should be made available at the Graduate Center, because these resources do not need human supervision, and can be housed in secure accessible spaces. Specifically, the Graduate Center should have electronic access to dictionaries, encyclopedias and general reference works;

- The recent acquisition and upgrading of the interlibrary loan computer has rendered the Ariel software incompatible with the computer system. This issue needs to be addressed;

- A reliable intra-library loan service at the Graduate Center and a password system to allow the Graduate Center students to have access to all Lincoln University databases from any computer needs to be developed;

- The process by which the Advising Center assessment data are gathered should be improved;

- A system of advising for students after they have chosen their academic major should be developed;

- Assessment instruments which demonstrate the connection between academic advising and student retention and performance should be created;

- All classrooms should be accessible to computer technology;

- The University should objectively assess the new administrative structure of the Advising and Counseling Centers and of the mathematics, reading and writing laboratories within the next two years;
• The University should take immediate measures to create a functional bookstore that is sensitive and responsive to the needs of students and faculty and is sufficiently knowledgeable about the dynamics of buying and selling college textbooks as operate successfully in a university environment. In spite of its best efforts, most of the complaints about dishonoring book orders, dating as far back as the September 8, 1998 faculty meeting, have not been successfully addressed by the management of the current university bookstore.

H. Findings from Task Force 5: Outcomes: Teaching and Learning

Summary (Reference: Charges #34-38)

The individual reports of the 15 academic departments were evaluated in their attempt to do the following:

1. identify discipline-specific knowledge, skills and attitudes department majors were expected to possess/master by the end of their program (desired learner outcomes);

2. identify/describe specific assessment measures deployed to determine if those outcomes were realized (cognitive, affective and behavioral domains);

3. describe the extent to which desired outcomes were attained when compared to assessment results, or actual outcomes; and

4. discuss how assessment data guided departmental decision-making with regard to modifying program goals, curricular content and instructional methods.
Departments have made significant progress towards establishing and implementing assessment plans. With the help of the Faculty Committee on Assessment, each department has created an inventory of information literacy skills for its major programs, 13 of 16 major programs have articulated desired students learner outcomes in measurable terms, and 11 of 16 programs have compared actual outcomes to desired outcomes.

Core curricular competencies, placement exam efficacy, assessment of affective development and the impact of faculty development efforts on teaching effectiveness are areas of remaining concern. See Section 4 (Evidence of Continuous Institutional Self-Study and Planning) for a detailed explanation of these items.

Remaining Areas of Concern

Based on the review of student outcome assessment issues, the following recommendations for actions to be taken between 2003-2007 are made:

- Update departmental reports of assessment initiatives;
- Update departmental inventories of computer skills;
- Identify and isolate specific critical thinking skills deemed important for each major program and develop plan to assess;
- Develop assessment plan to address the affective component in the curricular/extracurricular experience;
- Review core courses where a significant number of students perform poorly (as indicated by final grades) and implement course(s) of action to improve student learning;
- Evaluate the use of placement exams.
I. Findings from Task Force 6: Outcomes: Institutional

Summary: (Reference: Charges #39-49)

While all 13 goals in the university strategic plan are subject to periodic assessment to determine whether they are being achieved, the sixth goal directly addresses assessment: “The University faculty will design and implement effective student assessment methodologies to document mastery of skills and competencies in the undergraduate and graduate programs.” Therefore, it is crucial that assessment practices be developed, implemented and regularly reviewed. Because many of these assessment practices have been recently established, much the data are yet to be gathered or analyzed. Academic as well as other departments are following a strategic plan that covers the period 2002-2007, and therefore, are still in the implementation stage.

Assessment will increase and improve as 2007 approaches. Nevertheless, the University is doing more with assessment than at any time in recent history. It is a cornerstone of the strategic plan that was developed after President Nelson's arrival at Lincoln University. See Section 4 (Evidence of Continuous Institutional Self-Study and Planning) for a detailed explanation of these items.

Remaining Area of Concern

Based on the review of university outcomes assessment issues, the following recommendation for actions to be taken between 2003-2007 is made:
Create a stand-alone document that specifically addresses assessment of institutional outcomes which would, in a single location, contain all the plans, practices and processes related to institutional assessment.

J. Findings from Task Force 7. Fiscal Planning, Resource Allocation and Physical Plant

Summary

The central question with regard to fiscal planning, resource allocation and the physical plant is whether Lincoln University has a management structure and system in place to enable academic areas to maximize educational objectives. A more detailed set of questions that guided the analysis is contained primarily in Standards 2, 3, and 5 of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.

The Middle States evaluation team’s report following Lincoln’s 1997-98 Self-Study included seven suggestions and two recommendations dealing with specific issues that an effective management system would handle well, such as obtaining long term financing for its capital needs, doing multi-year budgeting, developing a long term program for renewal of campus facilities, stopping deferring maintenance, and improving the budgetary control over purchases.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania’s decision to spend $29.3 million to improve the infrastructure of Lincoln University serves as an important endorsement of the management changes that were begun in 1999. The capital improvements will not
only improve the environment within which student learning occurs but also remove the financial and human burden of constantly repairing the deteriorated infrastructure.

**Narrative** (Reference: Charges #50-61)

Development of Managerial Capability. The process of developing Lincoln’s managerial capacity began with the decentralization of decision-making authority that was previously concentrated in the Office of the President. This significant shift in management style was first reported to Middle States in the Follow-up Report in April of 2000. Both the authority to make decisions and accountability for the results of those decisions have been shifted downward to the appropriate levels of the administration.

A second major shift in management style can be characterized as a move to open access to information combined with a responsibility to keep everybody informed on important issues, also known as transparency in decision making. The minutes of the weekly Cabinet Meetings are available on the university’s website for everyone to see. Both operating and capital budgets are disseminated. The President frequently informs the faculty of the problems facing the other units of the university during his reports at the monthly faculty meetings. A third major shift in management style has been the creation and approval of formal policy statements and their dissemination across the university in the form of policy manuals which are made available on the university’s web site.

The position of internal auditor has been created and filled. The internal auditor has direct reporting responsibility to both the President and the Board of Trustees.
Managerial Systems and Processes Instituted in the Units of Fiscal Affairs

Physical Plant

- Implemented computer-based work order management system. This allows improved use of the workforce, analysis of trends and costs, and quick information on job status. It also allows assigning priorities for both current needs and the backlog of deferred maintenance jobs.

- Improved tools and organization in managing capital projects. The system begins with initial project design planning with end-users, estimating costs, value engineering, and ends with project completion. A “Project Priority Tracking List” is regularly presented at the President’s Cabinet Meeting (See appendix).

- Begin work toward a campus master plan with the assistance of an outside consulting firm. This planning process includes consideration of building space, campus flow, technology, student life, and capital forecasting.

- Made physical plant director a member of the Space Planning Committee that considers assignment of all building space and presents recommendations to the President’s cabinet.

- Restructured Department of Housekeeping into teams in order to better address the needs of the campus. This includes the assignment of responsibility for specific areas and results in a greater sense of ownership and responsibility for the areas assigned to each team.

- Is using preventive maintenance contracts to maintain physical plant systems before they experience failure.
Business Office

- Redesigned and formalized the purchasing process to improve overall control and service;
- Posts RFP’s (Requests for Proposals) on the website;
- Introduced monthly and annual financial statement processes to provide timely information to top management;
- Introduced budgets for operational and capital spending to better control expenses and the capital acquisition process;
- Automated the exchange of financial information between the Development Office and the Business Office;
- Refined a system of levels of authorization for the approval of expenditures by amount and category.

Information Technology (IT)

- Developed, with the assistance of professional facilitators, a comprehensive IT Strategic Plan with the participation of over 25 senior level managers (Available at http://www.lincoln.edu/it);
- Established standards for procurement of both computer hardware and software;
- Established centralized budgeting, decision-making, and purchasing for all information technology issues;
• Instituted a program of scheduled equipment replacement and software upgrades to minimize obsolescence;

• Instituted on-going IT staff training toward industry-recognized certifications

• Increased support contracts for key systems and equipment;

• Re-focused the use of student workers on more highly-skilled activities;

• Reorganized staff positions to provide for a full-time computer laboratory manager, allowing much greater knowledge of, and attention to, student computing issues;

• Included the chief information technology officer in the membership of the Space Planning Committee to provide input on IT issues related to space usage changes;

• Began an IT “report card” for submission to the Board of Trustees and senior management to report regularly on progress and concerns in IT;

• Strengthened the relationship between IT and academic technology support functions.

Human Resources

• Institutionalized the use of formal job descriptions to better manage the hiring processes and the assignment of employees;

• Institutionalized annual employee evaluations for all non-faculty positions;

• Lists all employment opportunities, both faculty and non-faculty, on the website.
MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Overall

- Reduction in audit findings from 27, three years ago, to 1 in the most recent audit.

Resulting from the improvements in management processes

Physical Plant

- Installed new art studios and a new TV/Video studio;
- Renovated lighting, ceiling, and carpets in the library;
- Put in new flooring for the main gymnasium and the auxiliary gymnasium;
- Relocated and refitted classroom computer laboratories;
- Remodeled student activity space and renovated space for fraternities and sororities;
- Installed new flooring, blinds and lights, and repainted science laboratories;
- Totally renovated Lucy Laney Hall with enlarged bathrooms, compliance with ADA, student lounges, and updated services;
- Negotiated changes in implementation plans for the state infrastructure project to significantly reduce the disruption to university operations during the construction phases.
Business Office

- Renegotiated contracts with key suppliers to reduce overall costs.

Information Technology

- Embarked upon a redesign of physical and logical infrastructure to improve functionality and information security;
- Implemented network monitoring to assist with capacity planning and security issues;
- Embarked upon long-delayed upgrades of key information systems;
- Upgraded server environment to stabilize support of mission-critical systems, including the primary administrative information system;
- Installed WebCT for faculty use and permitted the development of distance learning courses;
- Installed Microsoft Exchange to permit migration of current staff email, issuance of email accounts to students, and adoption of a central calendar and other features of Microsoft Exchange.

Human Resources

- Upgraded benefits package including a range of choices (cafeteria) among benefits to better attract and maintain the University’s workforce;
- Changed vendors for payroll processing process;
- Improved controls on payroll processing;
- Placed all administrative policies in binders in administrative offices and on the website (http://www.lincoln.edu/hr/hrpolicies.htm).

Major Project For The Future: Additional Residence Halls

The University is beginning the process of designing a building or buildings for student (dormitory) housing. The architectural design will be for approximately 400 beds. This design process will address the current housing shortage at the University and will provide modern amenities for students. The University has requested qualifications for the provision of financial advisory services in identifying sources of finance.

Remaining Areas Of Concern

Based on the review of fiscal planning, resource allocation and physical plant issues, the following recommendations for actions to be taken between 2003-2007 are made:

- Improve the administrative systems for managing grant funds;
- Improve communication and coordination with funding sources and end-users;
- Improve the reporting on the status of physical plant projects to the university community

K. Findings from Task Force 8: Governance

Summary
Although no specific recommendations with respect to governance issues were made by the Middle States evaluation team in 1998, governance-related questions arising since the previous self study as a result of the restructuring of the university and the growth of graduate programs at the Urban Center were raised by the Steering Committee. The main recommendation concerning governance issues is that the new University governance structure be thoroughly and objectively evaluated. Although faculty voted for the change from divisions and division chairperson to schools and deans, they did so with the expectation that it would be implemented on a trial basis with an early evaluation of its effectiveness and efficiency to take place. That evaluation has yet to be conducted.

**Narrative** *(Reference: Charges #62-66)*

The following issues, resulting from the change in university structure, were examined.

**University Committees.** The University Bylaws identify a total of 24 standing committees or position appointments, 94 slots to be filled by faculty. All except the Promotion, Tenure and Sabbatical committee require student representation. In addition to the standing committees, four ad hoc committees are operating during the 2002-2003 academic year. Ad hoc committees are not appointed by the faculty, nor are their roles and responsibilities generally documented. While faculty survey responses indicated that sufficient committees exist to represent faculty input into the governance process and committee structures and procedures are adequate, the following observation was made:

- There are too many committees at the university, and too little accountability with respect to what those committees are expected to produce.
Faculty Meetings. General faculty meetings are held the first Tuesday of each month, with one final meeting in April for the approval of May graduates. Meetings are generally chaired by the President, with the agenda set by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. While the number and structure of the meetings are adequate, there are limitations to the scope of issues and policies that can effectively be considered in this venue. The faculty has considered and rejected the idea of establishing a faculty senate.

Board of Trustees: The Board consists of 39 voting members, including the PA Governor and Secretary of Education, the University President, ex officio, and one student. One faculty member serves in a non-voting capacity. The Board meets at least 4 times each academic year, on the third Saturday of February, April, September and November. All meetings are open to the public except for executive sessions addressing personnel issues, and all meeting minutes and resolutions are available on the University website. However, the perception exists among faculty that there is not enough two-way communication between the Trustees and the general university community; it’s not clear that the Board has an accurate understanding of the concerns of the university or that the faculty and students have a clear understanding of the role of the Board.

Graduate Council. The graduate council was established in August 2002, and is composed of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean of Humanities and Graduate Programs, the director of the Urban Center, the directors of the three present graduate programs, and two graduate students. There is a need to define this Council’s specific role and authority, and to differentiate its duties from those of the standing Faculty Committee on Graduate Studies. The Council, in the period since August 28, 2002, has addressed many challenging issues, including the roles and responsibilities of
Urban Center staff, the graduate student recruitment, application, admission and matriculation process; graduate faculty qualifications and compensation; graduate course offerings and schedule; textbook use, ordering and bookstores services; graduate end-of-year celebrations, and graduate program revisions.

Student Government Association. The Student Government Association (SGA) consists of an executive branch, a legislative branch, and a judicial branch. All full-time registered students are members of the Student Government Association. All the members of the executive branch, legislative branch, and judicial branch of the Student Government Association are elected or appointed according to the provisions of the constitution of the Student Government Association. The Executive Board of the Student Government Association is made up of five voting members and one non-voting member (President Pro-temp). It appoints students to all standing committees except Judicial and Promotion/Tenure/Sabbatical, approves and selects the President Pro-temp from the nominations of the General Assembly of the SGA Senate, presents or proposes legislation or any other action to the SGA Senate, attends faculty and Board of Trustee meetings, and approves all expenditures of the Student Government Association. The president of the Student Government Association is the chief executive officer and chairperson of the association, also serving as a voting member of the Lincoln University Board of Trustees as well as acting as a liaison between the student body and the Board of Trustees, the university administration and the faculty.

Personnel Policies. The Lincoln University Policies Manual contains most of the documents that address general administrative, Board, faculty and student policies. One aspect missing in many of these policies, however, is the process or procedures to be
followed when members violate or fail to meet the expectations spelled out in the collective agreements. An additional issue of concern is potential overlap and/or contradiction in policies that are addressed in more than place.

Remaining Areas of Concern

Based on the review of governance issues, the following recommendations for action to be taken between 2003-2007 are made:

- Document the roles and responsibilities of each standing committee or other faculty-appointed position, perhaps in a faculty handbook;
- Once roles and responsibilities have been documented, undertake a systematic review of each committee’s role and responsibility, with careful attention to redundancy between school and university-wide committee charges;
- Base faculty appointments to ad hoc committees on faculty recommendations;
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the structure of general faculty meetings and make changes as needed;
- Clarify the role and responsibilities of the two committees with graduate oversight;
- Standardize the graduate programs’ administrative procedures and policies so that they are consistent with those of other programs, except when the nature of the academic programs makes this inappropriate;
- Assure that graduate faculty compensation and other conditions of employment are in line with the Lincoln University Chapter of the American Association of
University Professors (LUC-AAUP) Collective Bargaining Agreement currently in force;

- Define due process procedures in all written policies for each potential offense, to include an appeal process and definition of likely punitive actions;

- Review the three major documents dealing with personnel issues (Faculty By-laws, Collective Bargaining Agreement, and University Policy Guidance) to eliminate any overlap or contradiction.
### PROGRESS MADE

**ON 1997-98 MIDDLE STATES RECOMMENDATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle States Recommendations</th>
<th>Outcome <em>(Lincoln’s Response to Recommendation)</em></th>
<th>Status <em>(C= complete  P = in progress)</em></th>
<th>Actual or Projected Date of completion</th>
<th>Remaining Action Needed (with dates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the mission statement reflect the University’s desired emphases? Does it reflect actual emphases? (How does it reflect the following emphases: liberal arts/ professional studies, undergraduate/ graduate, rural/urban, HBCU/global, etc.? )</td>
<td>New mission statement Internationally focused Technologically current Core curriculum liberal arts-based.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>April 25, 2000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are all the University’s constituencies aware of and in agreement with the stated goals of its strategic plan?</td>
<td>Campus wide strategic plan process. Mission Statement widely publicized, documents on university website, objectives re-evaluated annually</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>New mission statement adopted April 2000. 1st strategic plan completed Nov 2001</td>
<td>On-going re-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the mission of the Urban Center integrated in the mission of the main campus, and are the graduate programs clearly integrated in the University’s strategic plan?</td>
<td>Urban Center fulfills Lincoln’s mission to “offer selected professional and graduate programs in an environment marked by small classes and a demonstrated concern for each student.” Restructuring of Graduate School programs presently taking place under Dean Gladys Willis.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Graduate dean appointed Aug. 2002</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are all materials with respect to courses and faculty correct and up-to-date in the University catalog, in other published material, and on the University website?</td>
<td>Partially. Faculty Committee on Educational Policies charged to review University Catalog; info in on-line university catalog presently not consistent with info on grad program website</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Sept. 5, 2002</td>
<td>April, 2003, and then on-going monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are application materials readily available on line?</td>
<td>Yes (application, scholarships, financial aid, refund policies)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States Recommendations</td>
<td>Outcome (Lincoln’s Response to Recommendation)</td>
<td>Status (C = complete  P = in progress)</td>
<td>Actual or Projected Date of completion</td>
<td>Remaining Action Needed (with dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are present recruitment and retention policies adequate?</td>
<td>Yes Switch to Enrollment Management model puts all student services in same place, with direct focus on retention. Dean’s Form (for transfer students) Satisfactory Academic Progress form; Newsletter for 1st year students put out by Academic Advising Center Restructuring of Counseling and Career Services, with Career Services going to Development where it can make use of and add to efforts to involve alumni, corporations, and other contacts; Counseling remaining under Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (SAEM); Counseling will coordinate orientation and transition week.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ongoing review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are all potential students informed of our financial aid and refund policies?</td>
<td>Yes. Info included on applications and on line</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Booklet updated every year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are the admissions, recruitment, and retention working effectively for both undergraduate and graduate students? How do we know?</td>
<td>Undergrad yes: retention rates have remained consistent over last 6 years and are above average for minority students nationwide No retention plan for grad. students; uneven enrollment in grad programs</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Survey to provide hard retention data will be implemented. (date?)  Graduate Application Review Committee formed 1/03 (will also review scholarship programs)  Hire recruitment person for low-enrollment grad programs (Date?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is the new Advising Center functioning effectively? How do we know?</td>
<td>The performance of advisors is measured as follows: Participation in staff training and attendance at biweekly Academic Advising Center staff meetings Evaluation by their assigned advisees in the spring Documentation of their contact with advisees per biweekly contact sheets</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3 areas with negative evaluations by advisees last spring (2002); advisor availability, adequate time in scheduled sessions, and caring attitude of advisors. Director will continue to modify training and requirements to address problem areas. (See Advising Report, Appendix)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States Recommendations</td>
<td>Outcome <em>(Lincoln’s Response to Recommendation)</em></td>
<td>Status <em>(C= complete  P = in progress)</em></td>
<td>Actual or Projected Date of completion</td>
<td>Remaining Action Needed (with dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is the Counseling and Career Services area adequately staffed and funded?</td>
<td>Counseling and Career Service now separate; Not yet fully staffed but searches underway.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(Dates?)</td>
<td>Plan in place for psychological counseling of students; plan needed for dealing with LD students. New organizational structure needs to be reviewed and revised if appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do we store and archive student records safely and in such a manner as to ensure timely responses to requests?</td>
<td>Yes. Stored on main campus in fire-protected vault in registrar’s office</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Are library services adequate for undergraduates and for graduate students at the Urban Center?</td>
<td>Undergraduates: yes (online catalog, numerous databases added, laptop check-out program); Graduate: Agreement with Drexel for limited student use; online access, OCLC sharing, but no on-site presence</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>Explore feasibility of small resource room with limited periodicals and reference books at Urban Center. Expanded home access to databases needed for non-residential grad. students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are undergraduate and graduate programs regularly reviewed with respect to academic quality, course progression, and student outcomes?</td>
<td>At this time, not regularly and not with standardized format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule for graduate program reviews will be developed by Graduate Council. Each of the three schools has set a priority goal to assess and revise major curricula and to identify and reconfigure or eliminate non-productive major programs. Action Plans to be completed by April 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What is the composition and role of the graduate council? Is it functioning effectively?</td>
<td>Chaired by dean, includes 3 program directors, dir of UC, and two student representatives; VP/AA ex officio</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>New structure Aug. 2002</td>
<td>Document to be developed describing roles, limitations and relationship to Graduate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are academic support services adequate for students at the Urban Center?</td>
<td>No. No academic support labs or counseling services are available at Urban Center</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs assessment should be conducted (date?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Is there an appropriate ratio of full-time to part-time faculty in the graduate programs?</td>
<td>No. Goal #2 of Graduate Studies Strategic Plan addresses this issue</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2004 and following</td>
<td>By August, 2004: will have administrative approval of a minimum of three tenure-track positions for M.Ed., MSR, MSA and MSSA programs over a two-year period; at least one MHS tenure-track position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States Recommendations</td>
<td>Outcome (Lincoln’s Response to Recommendation)</td>
<td>Status (C= complete, P = in progress)</td>
<td>Actual or Projected Date of completion</td>
<td>Remaining Action Needed (with dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How do we know that we are providing needed co- and extra-curricular activities to assure an appropriate quality of life for the residential students? How do we know that we are doing that for the commuting students?</td>
<td>Student reactions to SAEM services baseline survey Fall 2001. Exit surveys in MHS Program.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>SAEM survey every other spring to compare data and trends; will have analysis in May. Standard graduate program exit form to be developed and distributed annually. Date?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. What is the status of Lincoln’s policy on accommodating students with disabilities (physical, psychological, learning), all the areas covered under the Americans with Disabilities Act.</td>
<td>Ongoing progress as new construction or updates happen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Assign specific person responsibility for ADA issues. Date?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Are all full-time faculty equipped with adequate technology in their offices?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>On-going upgrading</td>
<td>IT Strategic Plan: By June 2004, will establish a technology refreshment plan for the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is there adequate staff to support faculty efforts in integrating technology into their classes?</td>
<td>Faculty survey expressed need for more academic support staff</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tech Mentor system will be continued 2003-2004; to be evaluated June 2004 for viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Is faculty appropriately diverse in terms of gender, ethnicity and backgrounds?</td>
<td>Relative to many institutions, Lincoln’s faculty reflects substantial ethnic &amp; racial diversity. However, gender distribution continues to be problematic: 2002: 33% female, 67% male 1997: 39% female, 61% male</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Is the overall ratio of part-time to full-time faculty appropriate?</td>
<td>No. ‘97-98: FT 100; PT 78 (43.8%) '02-03: FT 95, PT 83 (46.7%)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Is there a formal faculty development plan, linked to the University’s strategic plan?</td>
<td>Yes. See Appendix.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Are caps set appropriately, especially with respect to developmental courses?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States Recommendations</td>
<td>Outcome (Lincoln’s Response to Recommendation)</td>
<td>Status (C= complete  P = in progress)</td>
<td>Actual or Projected Date of completion</td>
<td>Remaining Action Needed (with dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Has Lincoln developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluate the overall effectiveness of its faculty?</td>
<td>Revised PTS Guidelines. Have adopted Post Tenure Review in principle; PTS committee charged with bringing implementation plan; Assessment committee charged with developing standardized Peer Evaluation tool</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(dates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. What is the status of the International Cultural Center and its resources?</td>
<td>Design phase completed; project has been placed on the list of &quot;Second Priority&quot; projects for the University, according to 2003-2006 Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Is the acquisitions budget of the library adequate, especially in terms of primary and reference materials?</td>
<td>No, compared with comparable institutions (See library report, appendix)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>License for home access to more data bases needed for graduate students; Recommend increase in the acquisitions budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Are essential library resources and other academic and student services available at the Urban Center?</td>
<td>No physical library but online databases.; access through PALINET and TCLC. Agreement with Drexel for limited student use.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Explore possibility of small resource room; improve access via technology and intralibrary loan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Does the IMC play an appropriate role in encouraging the use of instructional technology across the curriculum?</td>
<td>Yes [IMC report in appendix]</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Are Blueprint 2000 goals with respect to globalization still appropriate and what is being done to achieve them?</td>
<td>Blueprint 2000 goals are no longer relevant; they did not resurface in the new strategic plan</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Are Center roles clearly defined and closely linked to the faculty and the academic curriculum?</td>
<td>Yes. All programs provide annual reports (See appendix for examples: IMC, Global, Banking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Is the University utilizing the Barnes Foundation appropriately?</td>
<td>Yes: art and biology classes using the facilities. Transportation has caused some logistical problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently, legal issues preclude making more specific long-range plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States Recommendations</td>
<td>Outcome <em>(Lincoln’s Response to Recommendation)</em></td>
<td>Status <em>(C=complete P=in progress)</em></td>
<td>Actual or Projected Date of completion</td>
<td>Remaining Action Needed (with dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Is our core curriculum meeting its stated goals? How do we know?</td>
<td>T-test of independent groups indicated LU seniors know significantly more than LU freshmen re: Core content knowledge (1999; 2001)</td>
<td>This analysis will be on-going (odd number years)</td>
<td>On-going analysis</td>
<td>2003 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. What have we replaced the emphasis courses with? How do we know we are preparing our students to write, think, and speak effectively?</td>
<td>Faculty charged academic departments to assess and improve these particular skills</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Plan to be developed (Spring '03)</td>
<td>1) All dept’s must submit plans for assessing writing. The plan will be approved by Committee and implemented (Fall '03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. How do we assess the relevance of our majors?</td>
<td>See Academic Departments' Reports on Assessment Initiatives</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Final Reports March '03</td>
<td>Need to revise Department Assessment Reports annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. How do we know that our curriculum is up-to-date and appropriate for our students?</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. How do we know that our students graduate with appropriate technology skills?</td>
<td>University completed an inventory of computer skills taught for all academic departments (see appendix)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Needs to be updated annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Have we developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates the overall effectiveness of student learning?</td>
<td>See Department Assessment Reports</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Spring '03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Have we developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates whether we are providing leadership and governance?</td>
<td>Elements of a plan and process are in place but more needs to be done to have a process that assesses effective leadership and governance. Within the academic realm, faculty members evaluate their chairs, and chairs evaluate the deans. It is unclear if such an assessment practice (by subordinates) exists in the non-academic units of the University.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan for comprehensive evaluation of deans and 3-school governance system is needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States Recommendations</td>
<td>Outcome (Lincoln’s Response to Recommendation)</td>
<td>Status (C= complete, P = in progress)</td>
<td>Actual or Projected Date of completion</td>
<td>Remaining Action Needed (with dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Have we developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates whether we are providing administrative structures and services?</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Have we developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates whether we are demonstrating institutional integrity?</td>
<td>The University has a Code of Conduct document that provides guidelines for appropriate professional behavior. This document was recently revised and distributed to all personnel on January 7, 2003. The document is also available on the Office of Human resources website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Have we developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates whether we are assuring that institutional processes and resources support appropriate learning and other outcomes for our students and graduates?</td>
<td>Yes to a degree. The University Strategic Plan (2003-2006) lists under University Goal #1 (student centered approach) that the work of all employees will be measured to determine how well their activities support the creation of an environment that is conducive to student learning. A specific example is the satisfaction survey that is conducted by the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Planning. This survey is done every two years and is given to graduating seniors.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(maybe mention similar things need to be done with UC?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Do we have a clear and effective policy addressing all personnel issues such as grievances, sexual harassment, etc.?</td>
<td>Yes. On University website at <a href="http://www.lincoln.edu/hr/policiesgen.htm">http://www.lincoln.edu/hr/policiesgen.htm</a></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Update as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Is there an effective capital campaign?</td>
<td>Has begun. The Capital Campaign is defined in the Strategic Plan. The campaign goal is $100,000,000. Campaign progress reports are updated monthly.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Official kickoff during Sesquicentennial celebration, April 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Are the systems under the VP for Financial Affairs effectively integrated and coordinated?</td>
<td>Yes. See organizational chart and report of task force 7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Update as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Middle States Recommendations | Outcome  
* (Lincoln’s Response to Recommendation) | Status  
* (C= complete  
P = in progress) | Actual or Projected Date of Completion | Remaining Action Needed (with dates) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47. Is the budget process clearly communicated and understood?</td>
<td>Yes. The budget process involves each unit preparing a budget for submission to Fiscal Affairs. Fiscal Affairs then returns the budget (which may contain modifications) to the unit. The overall university budget is shared openly with the entire university community.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore way to provide more opportunity for two-way discussion if budget changed from original request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Are there any remaining Y2K problems?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Have we clarified personnel and policies and procedures for secretarial support staff?</td>
<td>Yes, There is a collective bargaining agreement between the university and the secretaries’ union that describes the personnel policies that apply to secretaries. According to the secretarial union representative, all three areas are clarified and covered by the collective bargaining agreement.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Is there a clear relationship between budget planning, resource allocation, development and the University’s strategic planning process?</td>
<td>Yes. The process of integrating the plan’s goals and objectives within a system of budgetary control-limits on cost centers is in place and functioning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 51. Is there an effective, multi-year program for renewal and replacement of materials and equipment? | **GOAL 3.1 of Physical Plant strategic plan:** Develop systematic strategy for maintaining the University’s physical plant as pleasant, usable workspace for students, faculty, and staff  
Objective 1 - Develop and maintain campus master plan  
Objective 2 - Develop deferred maintenance plan  
Objective 3 - Maintain and upgrade current physical plant infrastructure (see FY02-03 Capital Plan)  
Complete scheduled phases of DGS projects | | | Further improvement needed in reporting on status of physical plant projects to the university community (dates?) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle States Recommendations</th>
<th>Outcome (Lincoln’s Response to Recommendation)</th>
<th>Status (C= complete P = in progress)</th>
<th>Actual or Projected Date of completion</th>
<th>Remaining Action Needed (with dates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52. Is the University’s insurance plan adequate to address any potential life safety issues?</td>
<td>???</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library needs to be priority: does not at present provide environmentally controlled and safe housing for the collections, or a safe environment for library users and personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Are buildings adequately maintained?</td>
<td>• Goal I of Capital Facilities Strategic Plan: Complete a Campus Master Plan Study by September 30, 2003</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Has the university conducted a safety audit of facilities &amp; grounds?</td>
<td>A University Safety Committee was established by Internal Auditor and meets regularly to bring recommendations to the President’s Cabinet on safety issues at the University.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Is there a system to link purchase orders to budget to prevent overspending?</td>
<td>The University has significantly improved its operational and capital budget cost centers for our 2002-03 budgets. This allows for better budget monitoring and feedback at the dean and departmental levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Do Development and Fiscal Affairs communicate effectively with respect to budgeting of unrestricted gifts?</td>
<td>Yes. Exchange of financial information between the Development Office and the Business Office has been automated.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Is there a clear and concise integration of planning with the budget process that addresses the future in addition to the current year?</td>
<td>Yes: See Strategic Plan 2003-2006, “Program and Budget Priorities,” p. 20 –21.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>On-going monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Is staff turnover a problem?</td>
<td>No problem has been expressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Are area organizational charts accurate and up-to-date?</td>
<td>Yes See 2003-06 strategic plan (appendix)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Has Lincoln obtained financing for the proposed $13.8 million bond issue?</td>
<td>Yes: Described in Lincoln Follow-Up report to Middle States Association, 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Middle States Recommendations | Outcome  
*(Lincoln’s Response to Recommendation)* | Status  
*(C= complete  
P = in progress)* | Actual or Projected Date of Completion | Remaining Action Needed 
*(with dates)* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61. Does Lincoln have a multi-year budget fully integrated with the Planning objectives of the institution that fully costs out future operating expenses and debt service as a result of bond financing?</td>
<td>Yes, in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 62. Is the current structure of three schools each led by a dean functioning effectively and efficiently? How do we know? | Job descriptions for deans have been developed. No systematic analysis of the overall structure has been conducted since its inception in 2000. | P  
On-going | A comprehensive assessment of the new structure should be conducted no later than fall of 2003. |  |
<p>| 63. How do the Urban Center and its programs fit into the present governance structure? | Dean of Graduate Studies appointed fall 2002, Graduate Council established, dep’t chairs charged with directing own graduate programs |  | Document describing role of Council and how Council relates to standing Graduate Committee must be developed |  |
| 64. Is the present university committee structure functioning effectively within the new system of deans and schools? | Sufficient committees exist to represent faculty and the structure and procedures are adequate, but feeling is that committees aren’t effective or efficient governance structures for dealing with issues of broad faculty concerns and there may be overlap between dept, school and university committee structure. |  | Roles and responsibilities should be documented, both for standing and ad hoc committees, and then a systematic review of each committee’s role and responsibility should be undertaken. <em>(Date and persons in charge?)</em> |  |
| 65. Are the monthly faculty meetings functioning effectively? | Functioning effectively with enough meetings and adequate structure and procedures, but are limitations on the scope of issues and policies that may be considered there; faculty meetings not considered good venues for dealing with issues of broad concern. |  |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle States Recommendations</th>
<th>Outcome (Lincoln’s Response to Recommendation)</th>
<th>Status (C= complete P= in progress)</th>
<th>Actual or Projected Date of completion</th>
<th>Remaining Action Needed (with dates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.  Is the Board of Trustees exercising appropriate oversight?</td>
<td>Yes. According to By-laws, Trustees manage, control and conduct the instructional, administrative and financial affairs of the University. Example: Recent interaction with respect to new Promotion/Tenure Guidelines Members, resolutions, meeting minutes are all available on Lincoln website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trustees must play active role in new Capital Campaign, providing support, identifying prospects, encouraging participation, and monitoring progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Overview

Lincoln University’s 1997-98 Self Study Report concluded, “Lincoln is on the brink of having institutionalized assessment” (p. 149). The report from the Middle States Evaluation Team, after their campus visit, acknowledged that beginning but stated as its first recommendation “that an institutional assessment plan be developed that promotes reflection about teaching, learning, and student growth to assure improvement in student learning and to inform decision-making about curriculum and program enhancement” (p. 28). Lincoln’s Follow-up report to the Middle States Association, submitted in April 2000, expressed some progress with its assessment efforts, explaining, “While Lincoln has not yet implemented an institution-wide outcomes assessment plan, the University is closer to that goal than it was two years ago. Given the emphasis on assessment in the proposed University goals and in the ‘Duties of the Deans,’ such a plan can be expected in the near future” (p. 26). This section of the PRR will describe the institution-wide outcome assessments plan that Lincoln University has now put in place. While much more work remains to be done, a structure has been provided from which coherent, consistent institutional assessment can grow.

B. Background

The foundation of the institution’s overall assessment is a new strategic planning process. Work on a strategic plan to replace Blueprint 2000 began in fall 1999, when President Nelson established a Strategic Planning Committee consisting of
representatives from the Board of Trustees, faculty, students, administration and alumni. The Committee realized that Lincoln University could no longer determine its future from an insular, unfocused, and subjective viewpoint. Therefore, new vision, mission, goals and philosophy statements were developed by a series of committees that brought together representatives from all constituencies at Lincoln University, including faculty, administrative and clerical staff, as well as students and maintenance and housekeeping staff. The Board of Trustees formally adopted the new statements on April 15, 2000.

On September 7, 2000, the President issued copies of Lincoln University’s Strategic Planning Process and Procedures to the Lincoln community. (See appendix.) These procedures required each academic and administrative unit to complete a five-year plan based on the newly established mission, vision, goals and philosophy statements. The plans were submitted to the dean or director of the unit, who was required to complete and submit a school or unit plan to the appropriate vice president. The vice presidents prepared a plan for the division and submitted their respective plans to the President for the development of the University’s 2001-2006 Strategic Plan.

The resulting Strategic Plan covered all operational aspects of the University and was used in the preparation of the 2002-03 Commonwealth Legislative Operational and Capital Budget Request, in the application for the University’s Federal Government Title III Funds, and in proposals sent to funding agencies. It provided a guide in the merger of the departments of Music and Art and the merger of the departments of Philosophy and Religion, as well as that of Career Services and Corporate Development. The 2001-2006 Strategic Plan was also instrumental in the decision to place the Act 101/TIME Program
under the supervision of the Vice President of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and in the creation of the office of Community Relations and Events.

A revised 2003-2006 Strategic Plan (see appendix), made on the basis of input from all sections of the University, emerged in response to events and accomplishments during the 2001-2002 academic year, current needs of the University, and current trends and developments in academia. The 2003-2006 Strategic Plan established congruent program and budget priorities.

Of the 13 goals listed in this latest plan, the sixth and thirteenth directly address assessment, while all the remaining goals are subject to periodic assessment to determine whether they are being achieved. University Goal 6 states, “The University faculty will design and implement effective student assessment methodologies to document mastery of skills and competencies in its undergraduate and graduate programs.” The following actions will be required to achieve this goal:

A. Review and redesign procedures and standards for evaluating students’ performance to ensure that they accurately measure student accomplishment.
   1. Stress and implement the need for consistent grading practices within the University's schools and departments.
   2. Encourage faculty to explore alternative assessment options.
B. Each department shall design and implement an end-of-major assessment for its graduates.
C. Each department shall develop an alumni follow-up assessment tool and survey employers on their perception of the skill level of graduates.
D. Efforts shall continue in refining an assessment tool to assess student success in Lincoln's core curriculum.

University Goal 13 reads as follows: The University will implement an integrated system to collect, rapidly access and share appropriate institutional data and management information among university units. It implies that the University is committed to the following:

A. Ensuring that accurate and critical data on budgets, students, personnel, activities, and needs will be collected in a management information system to assist internal decision-making processes at all levels.

B. Maintaining an Institutional Research Office to provide planning data for University decision making.

This following section of the Periodic Review Report will describe the progress made toward Goal 6 in Part C, Student Outcomes Assessment. Activities related to Goal 13 will be described in Part D, Institutional Outcomes.

C. Student Outcomes Assessment

Academic Strategic Planning: The Process.

In 2002, each academic department completed a PAWS (Planning and Assessment Work Shop) document (see appendix), in which departmental goals in both the graduate and undergraduate programs were noted. For each goal, the projected outcome, assessment method, assessment results, use of results to initiate change, and change or improvement obtained were defined. Implementation dates, implementation
requirements, and assessment criteria were included; priority objectives important to the quality of education at Lincoln University were then highlighted. The plans, submitted by each of the departments in each school, were subsequently compiled into the strategic plan for each school including the graduate program.

The academic part of the strategic plan will be updated annually according to the following process. The Academic Affairs Division will collect departmental strategic plan updates at the conclusion of the spring semester. The deans will meet with department chairpersons regarding strategic plan updates during the first week in May or the last week in April. Each department or unit's strategic plan update is due in the Vice President's office by the last week in May. As part of their strategic plan update, chairpersons are expected to provide data on student enrollment in each major, teacher-student ratio, activities of graduates and concerns, needs for the subsequent year (concerning office, equipment and technology), and evaluations of departmental faculty.

To ensure continuous planning and assessment, the Academic Affairs Division has established a number of goals, the seventh of which focuses most directly on assessment:

Goal 7: Improve overall quality of the educational process through effective assessment.

Objectives:

- Review and revise accordingly the projected student performance outcomes (cognitive, affective, and other skill developments);
- Review and revise accordingly the assessment methods and tools used to test for student performance;
• Include the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) data collection, processing, and dissemination processes in the annual "PAWS" Planning and Assessment.

Academic Assessment: Background

In a motion passed by the Faculty in November 2001, all departments were asked to: (1) identify discipline-specific knowledge, skills and attitudes that department majors were expected to possess or master by the end of their program (as desired learner outcomes); (2) identify and describe specific assessment measures used to determine whether those (cognitive, affective and behavioral) outcomes were achieved; (3) describe the extent to which desired outcomes were attained when compared to assessment results (as actual outcomes); and (4) discuss how assessment data influenced departmental decisions with regard to program goals, curricular content and instructional methods.

Departmental Efforts and Achievements

A series of workshops and meetings were held to introduce department chairpersons to these reports, i.e., their purpose, format, content and the basis upon which they would be judged. In addition to the formal group sessions, individual meetings were held for those chairpersons requesting discipline-specific assistance. These workshops took place in spring or summer 2002.

By late spring 2002, all but one department had submitted the first draft assessment. By summer's end 2002, all department chairpersons had received extensive feedback on these reports which were shared with the deans. (See appendix.) Throughout the summer and fall 2002, chairpersons were reminded to: (1) incorporate feedback from the evaluation into their second draft, (2) state student competencies in objective and
measurable terms, and (3) broaden assessment measures to include formative, summative, quantitative, qualitative, pre-tests and post-tests, capstone courses, and portfolios. A check-off list of nine types of assessment measures (see appendix) has been distributed to all departments. When all departments complete this task, the institution will have a snapshot of where each department stands in comparison with the others. In January 2003, the Assessment Committee reported that about 1/3 of the departments were on top of their assessment efforts, about 1/3 were well underway and the final 1/3 still had significant work to do.

University-wide Efforts

Since 1999 Lincoln University has been comparing scores on the core curriculum content and sampling the scores of students in freshman seminars and senior seminar. Both of the two comparisons done, to date, have shown significant progress. Additionally, all departments are devising plans for assessing the writing skills of their majors, to be used in fall 2003. This will take the place of the previous Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE), a 2-hour writing test which students and faculty alike found wanting in both structure and process.

Main Achievements Since 1997

- Developed/implemented an annual written evaluation of department chairpersons by department faculty (reviewed by deans and discussed with chairpersons, see appendix);
- Developed/implemented an annual checklist/evaluation form for non-tenured faculty (which addresses all three components of the professoriate: teaching, scholarship and service) (see appendix);

- Developed a classroom observation form to evaluate teaching and shared with all three Schools (see appendix);

- Developed/shared an inventory of behaviors/achievements about teaching effectiveness to be used by faculty for promotion/tenure (see appendix);

- Administered the Core Curriculum Assessment Measure bi-annually to a sample of freshmen and seniors (1999 and 2001) (see appendix);

- Distributed Senior Satisfaction Surveys in a systematic and comprehensive manner;

- Revised course/instructor evaluations and implemented a systematic procedure to maximize turn-around time between distribution of forms and sharing of results;

- Identified inventory of computer skills (information literacy component) for each major program in the departments (see appendix)

- 13 of 16 major programs (81%) of academic departments have articulated desired student/learner outcomes in measurable terms;

- 11 of 16 major programs (69%) have compared actual outcomes to desired outcomes (see appendix).

Areas of Concern and Further Actions Needed

Despite significant progress, a number of areas of concern remains. An assessment plan for the core curricular competencies (with regard to writing, speaking,
critical thinking, quantifying, and information literacy) must be developed and
implemented. The core curriculum itself is under review, and this needed assessment
process must be part of those deliberations. Additionally, the efficacy of the present
placement exams (with regard to writing, mathematics and speaking) should be assessed.
Since approximately 4/5 of Lincoln University’s freshmen test into one or more of the
developmental courses, it is essential that placement methods are appropriate and
accurate. Another area which at present is not assessed in any systematic or quantitative
manner is the students’ affective development, that is, their attitudes and values, such
issues as cultural diversity sensitivity, interpersonal skills, tolerance and lifelong learning.
Finally, given Lincoln University’s current emphasis on academic technology, it is
important to evaluate the impact of faculty development initiatives upon student learning,
to determine whether workshops on multimedia presentations such as PowerPoint and
on-line course delivery software such WebCT, for instance, are having any measurable
effect on student learning.

Between now and the next Middle States visit, the University will need to take action
on the following:

- Update annually departmental reports of assessment initiatives;
- Update annually departmental inventories of computer skills;
- Identify and isolate specific critical thinking skills deemed important for each
  major program; teach them, have students practice them and evaluate the extent to
  which students demonstrate them spontaneously and internalize as well as transfer
  learning;
• Address the affective component in the students’ curricular and extra-curricular experience;

• Review those core courses in which a significant number of students perform poorly (as indicated by final grades) and implement course(s) of action to improve student learning (such as required laboratory assignments, tutorials, concurrent developmental coursework, innovative instructional methods);

• Explore efficacy of placement exams;

• Determine to what extent departments extend the skill level of majors with regard to core curriculum competencies (e.g., with regard to written and oral communication, problem-solving, information literacy and international or multicultural perspective).

D. Institutional Outcomes

Outcomes assessment is a cornerstone of Lincoln University’s strategic plan. The following section will discuss the process and the achievements in the area of outcomes assessment for the non-academic divisions of the University. These include the divisions of Fiscal Affairs, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (SAEM), and Development and External Planning.

A task force on institutional assessment was charged with determining whether practices are in place for assessment of all areas of the university with the exception of academic assessment which was covered by a separate task force. The conclusion derived from this study is that the University is doing more with assessment now than at any time in recent history. However, because many of these assessment practices have
been recently established, the relevant data have not yet been gathered or analyzed. Also, departments, both academic and non-academic, are following a strategic plan that covers the period 2002-2007, and therefore, most assessment efforts are still in the implementation stage. Assessment will be closer to completion as 2007 approaches. While the roadmap is now clear, the journey is just beginning.

A discussion of achievements from each non-academic division (Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Fiscal Affairs and Development and External Relations) follows.

General Finding and Recommendation

A wide variety of useful and relevant information was located. The major recommendation for future action is that the President should initiate and oversee the creation of a stand-alone document that specifically addresses all aspects of institutional outcomes assessment. This document would contain, in a single location, all the plans, practices and processes related to institutional assessment, and the compilation of such a document would underscore the institution’s commitment to outcomes assessment.

Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (SAEM)

The five-year plan (2001 – 2006) for the SAEM Division, as contained in the University Strategic Plan, captures the Division's effort at long-term planning. The plan was developed by the Student Affairs Planning Team, consisting of the administrative staff and unit heads in the Division. Several analyses were conducted during the early phase of the development of the plan. They were situational (environmental scan),
strategic, risk (SWOT) and GAP analyses. From these analyses emerged nine critical areas that the team identified as imperatives to be addressed if the Division is to actualize its mission and vision: planning, evaluation and staff enhancement; campus culture; safety, security, and wellness; student life and development, residence life (student housing); judicial affairs; financial aid; admissions; and visibility and positioning. Next, planning assumptions were developed, long-term goals and objectives established, and intended outcomes identified.

The development of the 2001-02 annual operational plan was the final step in completion of the plan. This operational plan constitutes the first of the annual plans to be developed and executed over the five-year period. The annual operational plan includes short-term objectives derived from long-term ones, intended outcomes, time frames and required resources above the 2001-02 base budget allocations. It addresses assessment methods, how assessment results will be utilized to evaluate specific strategies, and activities that will be employed to achieve the short-term annual objectives. The plan also identifies specific timeframes in which the actions, steps or activities will occur. The goals and objectives for the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management were shared with division directors for review, revision and endorsement.

As the team engaged in the analytical phase of the development of the plan, it became apparent that much program and staff development, as well as foundational and resource development work and accomplishments, will be required if the division's mission and vision statements are to be realized. The plan, thus, primarily concentrates on creating (1) foundational structures, systems, processes, policies and procedures, (2)
enabling programs and services, and (3) human and capital resources and infrastructure improvements over the five years of the plan. Once the critical areas have been addressed, and long-term goals and objectives accomplished, the division can move forward with more effectively carrying out its mission and bringing its vision to life beyond the five-year period.

The operational planning process incorporates a semester review system, which assesses progress toward achievement of annual objectives. The review system identifies problems and difficulties for intervention, correction and/or revision. Operational planning requires active participation by all key personnel within the division and involves integrated planning across departmental lines, fostering teamwork and collaboration.

5-year Enrollment and Graduation Trend Data

It is expected that student enrollment in the year 2006 will consist of 1800 undergraduate and 600 graduate students. The headcount of enrollment will be distributed as follows:

- On Campus Undergraduate Headcount 1600
- Commuting On Campus Undergraduate 200
- Urban Center Graduate Enrollment 600

Total Headcount Enrollment 2400
The University will actively recruit and enroll students within a 25-mile radius who can commute and receive an undergraduate education. We will continue to adopt and work on strategies to address the number of entering students who need remediation.

[Comparative analysis to be added]

Fiscal Affairs

The Fiscal Affairs Division, comprising the Business Office, Physical Plant, Human Resources, and Information Technology, states in its mission a commitment to “providing stewardship of the financial, physical, information and human assets of the University and accountability to all University stakeholders.” Following are the significant achievements of the departments in the division, since the last self study.

**Physical Plant.** A computer-based work order management system has been implemented. This ensures improved use of the workforce, analysis of trends and costs, and quick information on job status. It also makes it easier to assign priorities to both current needs and the backlog of deferred maintenance jobs. Capital projects are now managed with better tools and organization. The system begins with the initial project design planning involving end-users; it continues by estimating costs and employing value engineering, and ends when the project is completed. A "Project Priority Tracking List" is regularly presented at the President's Cabinet Meeting. (See Appendix.)

A Campus Master Plan is under development with the assistance of an outside consulting firm. This planning process includes consideration of building space, campus flow, technology, student life, and capital forecasting. The Department of Housekeeping has been restructured into teams in order to better address the needs of the campus. This includes the assignment of responsibility for specific areas and results in a greater sense
of ownership and responsibility for the areas assigned to each team. Preventive maintenance contracts are now used to maintain physical plant systems before they experience complete failure.

**Business Office.** The Business Office is now functioning with increased efficiency. The purchasing process has been redesigned and formalized to improve overall control and service. Requests for proposals are posted on the internet. Monthly and annual financial statement processes have been introduced to provide timely information to top management. Budgets for operational and capital spending now control expenses and the capital acquisition process. The exchange of financial information between the Development Office and the Business Office has been automated. The system of levels of authorization for the approval of expenditures by amount and category has been refined.

**Information Technology.** The Information Technology (IT) department supports, educates and encourages the university community in its exploration and use of information technologies for the purposes of fulfilling the missions of other departments related to teaching, learning and managing the University. Under a new Information Technology director, great strides have been made. The following is a list of major IT achievements:

- Developed, with the assistance of professional facilitators, a comprehensive IT strategic plan with the participation of over 25 senior level managers (available at http://www.lincoln.edu/it/index.html);
- Established standards for procurement of both computer hardware and software;
• Established centralized budgeting, decision-making, and purchasing for all
  information technology issues;
• Instituted a program of scheduled equipment replacement and software upgrades
  to minimize obsolescence;
• Instituted on-going IT staff training toward industry-recognized certifications.
• Increased support contracts for key systems and equipment;
• Re-focused the use of student workers on more highly skilled activities;
• Reorganized staff positions to provide for a full-time computer laboratory
  manager, allowing much greater knowledge of and attention to student computing
  issues;
• Provided input on IT issues related to space usage changes;
• Began an IT report card for submission to the Board of Trustees and senior
  management to report regularly on progress and concerns in IT;
• Strengthened the relationship between IT and academic technology support
  functions.
  
  Human Resources. The Human Resource department (HR), under new
  leadership, spearheaded the efforts to standardize policies and procedures. The major HR
  achievements since the last self study include the following:
• Institutionalized the use of formal job descriptions to better manage the hiring
  process and the assignment of employees;
• Institutionalized annual employee evaluations for all non-faculty positions;
• Listed all employment opportunities, both faculty and non-faculty on the internet
  (see http://www.lincoln.edu/hr/index.htm).
Integration of Strategic Planning and Budgeting

The Middle States evaluation team’s response to the previous self study pointed out, “What is unclear to the team is the relationship of the strategic planning processes to budget planning, resource allocation and future University development efforts” (p. 24). This criticism was accepted and corrected. (See Strategic Plan Flow Chart, p. ---.) The budgeting system now incorporates the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan in both the operational and the capital budgets. Any initiative undertaken under the Strategic Plan is planned either as a project or program enhancement and its financial impact is evaluated at the time it is proposed. If funds are not available in the budget, then decisions are made about whether to divert funds from other activities to the proposed initiative and, if so, in what quantities. An effort is now made to explicitly list each significant strategic plan project in the budget.

The following premises, principles and imperatives are currently employed in the 2003—2006 Strategic Plan in connection with the operating and capital budgets:

**Operating Budgets**

- Commonwealth operating funding of the University will probably continue with very minimal increases;
- Enrollment is a strategic variable and directly affects the university budget;
- All units must share the responsibility of seeking external funds to enhance the university mission;
- Each unit must justify all operations in its annual budget plan. No constant level of funding will be assured;
- The strategic plan must be used as a basis for development of annual budget request and allocations.

**Capital Budgets**

- Vigorous request to the Commonwealth for funds for capital projects are a high priority;
• University must secure capital funds through debt financing of specific projects;
• University must establish within its operating budget funding mechanisms to support capital projects. Department of Audit and Control

Development and External Relations

In its long-term planning, the Division of Development and External Planning has designed and begun a $100 million capital fund drive for Lincoln University with specific emphasis on the following: (1) strengthening the University's endowment to aid in the recruitment and retention of outstanding students and faculty, (2) ensuring quality academic programs, (3) advancing the quest for quality technology, and (4) enriching the physical campus environment.

The campaign, currently in its silent phase, is emphasizing the development of the case for support, and soliciting the University's Board, alumni and closest corporate, foundation and individual constituents. It is expected that the campaign will be publicly
announced during the University's sesquicentennial celebration which is a yearlong series of events, between April 2003 and May 2004, that will raise significant resources and the following:

1. Celebrate Lincoln's 150th anniversary as a major milestone and achievement;
2. Showcase the University as a national treasure;
3. Attract positive media and external attention to the University;
4. Provide the framework to seek major support from alumni and friends; and
5. Provide the opportunity to publicly announce the University’s first major capital campaign.

Under a new Vice President for Development, the University’s efforts are already bearing fruit. In 2001-2002, alumni commitments and contributions exceeded $1 million for perhaps the first time in the University’s history, and the Chester County-based Oxford Foundation has pledged $1 million for the renovation of the Ware Center.

Department of Audit and Control

The newly instituted Department of Audit and Control is crucial to implement many of the outcomes assessments methods. This office was set up in 2001, at the request of the Board of Trustees, to provide independent and objective assurance and internal consulting services to management, administration and the Board of Trustees. As a service organization, its purpose is to assist members of the University in the effective and efficient discharge of their responsibilities by using a systematic, disciplined approach to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of risk management, internal control, and governance. Functionally and administratively, the internal auditor reports to the President. The five-year goals of this department include the following:
• Develop and implement audit plans and programs that are responsible to both risk and cost effectiveness needs;

• Utilize computer systems to conduct audits;

• Establish and improve preventive auditing techniques;

• Maximize office resources for performing departmental audits and program reviews;

• Enhance campus-wide awareness of audit issues and concerns through an internet presence at the University’s website;

• Perform auditing in compliance with the Audit and Control Charter.

STILL TO BE ADDED TO THIS SECTION:

• 5 year enrollment and fiscal projections (“In addition to describing the status and projections of enrollments and finance through a narrative, charts and diagrams, it is expected that the projections will be accompanied by appropriate assumptions or other evidence to demonstrate their plausibility.”)

• Plans for enhancing outcomes assessment in the next five years

• Discussion of the databases as well as the nature and quality of IR

• General conclusion