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The Context for Strategic Planning at Penn State

These are challenging times for higher education across the nation, and Penn State is no exception. Nearly every aspect of higher education is being impacted as we face global, national, and state economic recession. In many ways, the current recession has brought into sharper focus the myriad of challenges facing the University. Shifting demographics, rising costs of operation, a changing competitive landscape, reductions in state appropriations, pressures for accountability, and widespread economic downturn characterize the environment in which Penn State currently operates. These pressures will clearly necessitate changes, and require the University to find new ways to improve teaching and learning, advance discovery and creativity, and serve our many constituents—while becoming a more efficient and effective institution.

Despite the obvious challenges, these are also times of opportunity in which we must move forward strategically, recognizing that we always have finite resources. We must innovate. We must prioritize. We must continue to think boldly. Penn State can do more than withstand the current challenges; it can emerge as an even stronger institution that is highly competitive among its peers. A key to emerging a stronger university will be creating a sustainable university, not just in conventional environmental terms, but sustainable in a wide array of resource dimensions, including fiscal sustainability.

Penn State, with its roots in the modest Farmers’ High School, has grown into a large and tremendously diverse university. It is today among the most complex universities in the nation, with a broad array of responsibilities, physical locations, and stakeholders. Penn State has blossomed, especially in recent decades, and is ranked among the top tier of universities in the world.

Penn State is a research university of great accomplishment, by any measure nationally and globally, with a faculty of great distinction that contributes enormously to the body of knowledge and creativity for social and economic betterment. Penn State exists fundamentally to educate and serve our students—a commitment we must always remember—but what makes us different from most of the other 4,000 higher education institutions in the nation is our quest for discovery of the knowledge and creativity that we disseminate to our students and, in many cases, they help us to accomplish. This quest for discovery reaches across every campus of the University, and our standing as a major research institution is a critically important reason why students, both graduate and undergraduate, choose to study at Penn State. The translation of research and knowledge to the public is the basis for most of the outreach services the University provides.

The University will clearly rise and thrive on the ingenuity and commitment of all of its stakeholders, as it always has. Yet good will, commitment, and hard work are not enough. If there is a single linchpin in our consideration of what Penn State must do in the coming years, it is that priorities must be set in the ongoing pursuit of excellence. Penn State is already a very efficient institution that has accomplished great things with limited resources, but the University needs to think very deliberately now about the choices that it makes—including, perhaps, to shrink, consolidate, or eliminate some programs and activities—in order to build on areas of existing strength and invest in promising new ideas.
Penn State has relied on ongoing, University-wide, participative strategic planning for twenty-five years. This process can continue to help us establish priorities, make choices, and enhance excellence amidst changes that are bringing both increased challenges and greater opportunities.

Looking ahead to the next five years and beyond, University faculty members, trustees, students, staff, and administrators have engaged in a planning process through which they have deliberated about both short- and long-term issues and choices. They have drawn extensively on the various strategic plans that have been created by each of Penn State’s major administrative and academic units, and have also brought their experiences and expertise to bear upon information about the external environment for higher education and a wealth of data and reports based on the University’s internal analyses and metrics.

Looking forward at both challenges and opportunities, we highlight serious and difficult questions:

- What does academic excellence require, how is that changing, and how can Penn State continue on the path toward excellence?

- What are the keys to attracting and supporting top graduate and undergraduate students, and achieving greater student-centeredness, enhancing teaching and learning, and promoting interdisciplinarity?

- How can the University prepare for substantial demographic shifts as the traditional pool of four-year college-bound 18-21 year olds in the U.S. and Pennsylvania shrinks, immigrant and minority populations grow, the population ages, and labor force expectations and demands change?

- In a highly competitive national and international market, how can the University continue and extend its ability to hire and retain outstanding faculty and staff while balancing resources among multiple demands and responsibilities?

- How can the University continue to grow its global presence, and work toward meaningful and important objectives with international partners?

- How can strategic planning and decision-making best contribute to the University’s ability to enhance diversity?

- For many years, the Commonwealth has lagged behind other states in indicators relevant to higher education, as in its rank near the bottom in per capita appropriation of state tax funds to higher education. In a time of reduced flexibility for federal and state support for higher education, how can the University cope with such funding realities while protecting quality, access, and affordability?

- How will Penn State cover its essential expenses, with rapidly increasing costs for energy, health care, technology, facilities, and more, particularly in the face of an economic downturn?
What does it mean to be a land-grant university in the 21st century? In all that we do—including outreach, extension, and service—how can Penn State maintain the fundamental connection to its academic core and to academic excellence?

Many of these questions clearly implicate the University’s campuses in different ways, which leads us to ask: in what ways should Penn State’s multi-campus structure and individual campus missions evolve to better serve their communities?

Research universities possess enormous strengths, including the ability to solve problems, address societal needs, provide a hotbed for technological advances, sustain the nation’s inventive capacity, promote creativity and artistic accomplishment, contribute to economic development, and educate the workforce of the future. Penn State certainly fits this set of attributes. Nonetheless, potential undergraduate and graduate students may choose from a vast array of colleges, universities and delivery modes. Top faculty members have many options about where to work. Funding agencies, foundations, and donors have many choices about where to direct grants, contracts, and charitable contributions. Our goal in the planning process is to help the University address such challenges, and to make Penn State ever stronger, more responsive, and more relevant to state, national, and international needs.

In this strategic plan, the dominant theme is finding ways to enable the University to continue on its trajectory of excellence. Some strategies that have been identified are cost-saving in nature, and will serve to make resources available for other uses, including reductions in the rate of tuition growth. Some strategies are cost neutral and mainly require shifting emphasis or changing the ways in which we go about doing our work. But it must also be understood that many strategies for excellence require new sources of funding, and that funding will obviously be in short supply during the next few years. Many of the more costly strategies will not be possible to effectuate in the near term, but will nonetheless retain a high priority for investment as economic conditions improve. The resources to fund other high priority strategies must be made available by doing less of something else, or doing it more efficiently and effectively, and we must always be ready to seize opportunities to leverage University resources during what will likely be a period of substantial federal and state stimulus programs during the next few years. We must balance current fiscal realities with continued optimism and our vision for the future, all with an eye toward sustainability.

By setting priorities wisely and making smart choices, Penn State can continue to accomplish great things.

The Process for Creating the University Strategic Plan

Planning at the Academic and Administrative Unit Level

The University Strategic Planning process is both top down and bottom up, and planning occurs across departments, academic colleges, and administrative units. Penn State has had a continuous institution-wide strategic planning process since 1983 in which all budget executives have submitted strategic plans to the Provost every three to five years. Although the length of the
planning cycle has varied, what has remained constant is the University’s commitment to ongoing planning, improvement, and assessment. The current planning cycle began in June 2007 when Executive Vice President and Provost Rodney Erickson sent a memo to budget executives outlining strategic planning guidelines for the 2008/09 – 2012/13 strategic plans. Provost Erickson asked each budget executive to develop a five-year strategic plan which would include a vision of where the unit would be in the next five to ten years, a discussion of specific strategies for achieving the vision, strategic performance indicators appropriate to unit level goals, and an indication of how elements of the *Framework to Foster Diversity* would be incorporated into the strategic plan. For academic units, a discussion of progress and initiatives in learning outcomes assessment was to be included in the plan. The Provost’s guidelines are included as Appendix 1. Five-year plans from 46 budget units were submitted July 1, 2008. Unit strategic plans are available online at [http://www.psu.edu/president/pia/plans](http://www.psu.edu/president/pia/plans).

The University continues to rely upon an important, parallel planning and improvement process through which Penn State defines and works toward its diversity goals. In brief, *A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State*, under the leadership of the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity, encompasses a combination of unit-based and institution-wide initiatives. The objective is to advance educational equity within Penn State while reaching out to under-represented/under-served communities and populations. Penn State has made considerable strides toward building a more diverse, inclusive and equitable institution, and establishing effective diversity planning, implementation and reporting processes to continue to drive progress. The close relationship between the two strategic planning processes has encouraged Penn State’s academic and administrative units to position their diversity goals within the context of their strategic planning goals for a more integrated overall approach. Fostering diversity must continue to be recognized as a value at the heart of the institution.

**Development of the University’s Strategic Plan**

In the 2008/09 – 2012/13 planning guidelines, Provost Erickson indicated that President Spanier would appoint a University Strategic Planning Council (USPC) to develop the University’s overall strategic plan, and that USPC could draw extensively from the unit plans to be submitted by July 1, 2008. In November 2007, President Spanier appointed this group, asking USPC to think strategically and be far reaching in discussions of the many challenges and opportunities facing Penn State. Although USPC was representative of many of the University’s constituents, the President and Provost encouraged the Council to seek additional input from faculty, staff, and students as well as trustees, alumni, and others who care about, and contribute to, defining the vision of the future. USPC was charged with developing a Penn State Strategic Plan for 2009/10 through 2013/14. The University Strategic Planning Council charge letter is included as Appendix 2, and a list of USPC members is included as Appendix 3.

The Council began meeting in January 2008. At an early meeting, USPC determined the strategic themes that would help Penn State realize its promise and its vision. The themes included: achieving academic excellence; ensuring student success; positioning of the campuses; realizing Penn State’s potential as a global university; adapting the 19th century land-grant mission to the 21st century; utilizing information resources, technologies and services; and managing resources and enhancing non-tuition revenue. In March 2008, task forces were charged to address each of
these themes and were asked to submit reports with recommendations to the Provost by October 1, 2008. Members of the task forces were drawn from the University Faculty Senate, the Academic Leadership Council, the Board of Trustees, administrators, faculty, students, and staff. A list of the task forces and their members can be found in Appendix 4.

The Foundation for Planning

Following considerable discussion, the University Strategic Planning Council has agreed upon the following statements of Vision, Mission, and Values. We believe these elements provide a strong foundation for addressing the challenges that lie before the University.

VISION

Penn State will be a global university, committed to excellence, with a passion for creating knowledge and educating students to be leaders for a better tomorrow.

MISSION

Penn State is a multi-campus public research university that educates students from Pennsylvania, the nation and the world, and improves the well-being and health of individuals and communities through integrated programs of teaching, research, and service.

Our instructional mission includes undergraduate, graduate, professional, and continuing education offered through both resident instruction and online delivery. Our educational programs are enriched by the cutting edge knowledge, diversity, and creativity of our faculty, students, and staff.

Our research, scholarship, and creative activity promote human and economic development, global understanding, and progress in professional practice through the expansion of knowledge and its applications in the natural and applied sciences, social sciences, arts, humanities, and the professions.

As Pennsylvania’s land-grant university, we provide unparalleled access, and public service to support the citizens of the Commonwealth. We engage in collaborative activities with industrial, educational, and agricultural partners here and abroad to generate, disseminate, integrate, and apply knowledge that is valuable to society.

VALUES

- Education is the foundation of an enlightened, productive, and prosperous society.
- The best education produces knowledgeable, critical, creative, and ethical students.
- The quality of the intellectual life of the University is fundamental to success.
• The integration of teaching, research, and service enhances all three and the capacity of the University to serve the needs of communities—local, national, and global.

• The dignity of all individuals is affirmed, equality of opportunity is pursued, and diversity is fostered.

• Tradition is honored, innovation is embraced, and positive change is valued.

• The efficient and effective use of limited University resources benefits everyone associated with Penn State and those we serve.

• Environmental sustainability is researched, taught, promoted and practiced.

• The safety and security of all members of the University community are essential to a positive educational, workplace, and residential environment.

• Faculty, staff, students, and administration working together create a foundation for greater accomplishment, including our commitment to the concept of “one university, geographically dispersed.”

A Summary of Goals and Strategies

This plan builds on the theme of prioritization for excellence, offering strategies for each of seven goals. Achieving these goals will require collaboration among administrators, faculty, staff, and students from academic and administrative units across Penn State.

• **Enhance student success.** Penn State’s commitment to students is at the core of the University’s mission. The University should work to expand faculty-driven and administratively supported assessments of teaching and learning, provide more opportunities for student participation in research, internships and other forms of active learning, improve key student transitions (such as from one campus to another), strengthen advising for undergraduate and graduate students, and promote the highest possible quality of graduate education.

• **Advance academic excellence and research prominence.** Academic excellence is the essential attribute of a world-class research university. The attraction and development of outstanding faculty, staff, and students will continue to be a high priority. As we consider setting priorities that will drive decision-making, we need to build on the University’s strengths, investing in boundary-spanning fields of great societal importance. A rigorous and targeted review process for both academic and administrative programs can identify possible mergers and re-alignments to provide critical mass, greater focus, and operating efficiencies. Increasing private philanthropy must continue to be a priority for advancing academic excellence and research prominence.
• **Realize Penn State’s potential as a global university.** We expect that over the next ten to twenty years, the top tier of research universities will be those able to work effectively in a global context. Penn State must maximize the return on its investment in international programs, encourage globally oriented partnerships within the University, focus on a more limited and selective set of overseas partnerships, and expand internationally focused opportunities, course offerings and experiences.

• **Maintain access and affordability and enhance diversity.** With 24 campuses, Penn State plays an important role in providing higher education access to the Commonwealth’s diverse citizenry. The University should continue to re-emphasize its 2+2 enrollment model, allow the campus tuition differential to grow, and evaluate student housing options, critical facilities needs, and student services availability at our Commonwealth Campuses. The identification of new sources of need-based student financial aid is critically important to the mission of the University. And, we must build on the Framework to Foster Diversity.

• **Serve the people of the Commonwealth and beyond.** The University should continue to selectively pursue advanced delivery technologies and strategic alliances among multiple units and programs—including Cooperative Extension, continuing education, the World Campus, conferences and institutes, public broadcasting, and the colleges and campuses—to position the University to serve Pennsylvania and the world. Strategies will include using the campuses as key delivery nodes, sharing faculty, staff, and programs, expanding programming for non-traditional students, re-missioning some campuses if necessary, consolidating specialized services, taking a more entrepreneurial approach to service delivery, and developing a more internationally oriented concept of service. We know that the trend toward globalization in all areas—economic, political, social and cultural—will continue; service will increasingly involve local, national, and international dimensions as more of life is influenced by global-scale events and interactions.

• **Use Technology to Expand Access and Opportunities.** Penn State’s information technology (IT) infrastructure is now the foundation for almost every aspect of teaching, research, service, and outreach. As the University sets priorities for excellence, smart and effective decisions about (and investments in) technology will continue to be crucial. The University will grow the World Campus, invest in a robust and flexible IT infrastructure, support open educational resource initiatives, rebalance centralized/dispersed services, protect the integrity and security of the IT system, and continue to support the central role of University Libraries in the educational enterprise.

• **Control costs and generate additional efficiencies.** Penn State is one of the most efficient universities in the nation and remains strongly committed to maintaining excellence in a time of limited resources. This commitment will involve innovative and flexible steps, such as requiring academic units to develop transparent workload policies, reducing the number of under-enrolled sections and highly specialized courses, better using Summer Sessions capacity, moving to an “investment model” for internal funding of new initiatives, expanding the base for central recycling and modifying the approach for
future recycling, addressing the rate of increase of health care costs, and embracing sustainability.

**Goal 1: Enhance Student Success**

Student success is paramount at Penn State and the structure, policies, and practices of the institution must facilitate student success. The University offers countless avenues through which students can progress toward their educational, personal, and career goals, and strengthening those opportunities will remain a central driver for Penn State.

The profile of our students will change considerably over the next planning cycle and beyond. Changes will be reflective of state and national trends and will include demographic shifts, decreasing numbers of high school graduates, and increasingly prevalent characteristics of the Millennial Generation. Given these shifts, the range of student characteristics and student needs will be broad. These shifts represent an important opportunity to strengthen our infrastructure and resources to enhance the quality of the educational experience to meet the needs of a dynamic and diverse student body.

Students from many backgrounds bring varied perspectives and skill sets to the institution, including first-generation students, returning adults, students with disabilities, and international students. Countless examples exist of ways in which the University recognizes the heterogeneity of its student population and the multiple dimensions of student support and student success. For instance, in its strategic plan, Intercollegiate Athletics defines its purpose to include helping develop “meaningful standards of scholarship, athletic performance, leadership, community service, ethics and sportsmanship within the institution’s educational and social environments,” and describes specific strategies toward that end. For Athletics, those strategies include (but are not limited to) informing all student-athletes of University academic expectations and the personal code of conduct; providing comprehensive academic and life skills programming; encouraging student-athletes to participate in campus and community service; and fostering an environment of diversity and inclusion through numerous communication avenues and educational opportunities for both staff members and student-athletes.

In short, regardless of their individual abilities and aspirations, undergraduate and graduate students who come to Penn State need support to achieve their goals and be successful. They may require differing types and amounts of support during different stages of their academic careers. This is especially true for undergraduates. First generation students, low-income students, students unsure of their choice of major, and students with disabilities may require extra services to ensure their success. We should be attuned to the needs of students who, with some additional academic assistance, can develop the social and cultural knowledge and skills necessary for success and leadership in today’s global world. Transitional times, especially those critical times such as first year, change of campus, and transfer into Penn State, require additional resources for student success.

Addressing diverse student needs and providing multiple entry points in the creation of programs and services are key factors in supporting student success. Just as scaffolding is used to enable
work on a building during construction, but then removed when no longer needed, scaffolding in an academic context provides support to students when needed. As students learn, as they build on their previous learning, and as they internalize and integrate their learning, scaffolding can be removed. Penn State will provide this scaffolding, but will also ensure that students are actively engaged in their academic careers and take ownership of their decision-making.

In addition to providing learning opportunities and support services, another critical component is integrating the curriculum and co-curriculum and making these connections matter to students. Presenting—and enabling students to recognize—the curricular and co-curricular educational experience as a coherent whole is essential. Similarly, skills, competencies and knowledge can be better transferred and applied across courses and built upon in progressive sequences. Overarching themes such as diversity, internationalization, citizenship, ethical leadership, contextualization, and other fundamental principles that are interwoven throughout the curriculum and co-curriculum can be better recognized through an emphasis on continuity within education, rather than by focusing on each class and activity in isolation.

In large part, student achievements depend on how well Penn State’s mission, vision, goals, policies and practices advocate for and adhere to basic tenets of student learning and development. In this, Penn State will continue its practice of self-assessment and continuous improvement through review of programs, and services and assessment of learning outcomes. For most of the actions outlined below, faculty, staff, and student participation (via their respective departments, colleges, and campuses as well as through administrative and governance roles, such as the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education [ACUE] and the University Faculty Senate) is essential.

### 1.1 Strategy: Expand Learning Outcomes Assessment

**Actions:** The general public wants colleges and universities to become more accountable for what students learn. This is unmistakably reflected in federal legislation such as the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008. Similarly, many professional organizations are increasingly incorporating learning outcomes assessment into accreditation standards. In 2008, Penn State agreed to participate in the Voluntary System of Accountability. This is a compact among most of the nation’s public universities to provide additional Web site information about graduation rates, costs of attendance, descriptors of the educational services available, and assessment of student engagement and learning outcomes.

Penn State has long been a leader in providing considerable information on its Public Accountability Web site, using survey instruments such as the National Survey of Student Engagement to provide concrete data on student involvement with their own education, and the success of our faculty in inspiring and facilitating student learning. In 2005, Penn State was reviewed by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education for its 10-year re-accreditation. That review focused on undergraduate education and learning assessment (graduate education is quite different in nature and has strong mechanisms for program
review and for learning assessment, such as proposal review, candidacy, comprehensive exams, and thesis defenses). The review concluded that Penn State was a leader in its commitment to and assessment of student learning. Prior to that review, the University had appointed a broadly constituted task force that continues working with individual programs. Progress has been seen in student learning outcomes assessment at the degree program level and faculty are increasingly including explicit learning goals and objectives in their courses. Penn State must build on the successful learning outcome assessment models in the resident and online curriculum and co-curriculum that have already been implemented, and sharpen our best practices in this important arena.

Learning outcomes associated with specific academic programs, however, represent only a part, albeit a very significant one, of students’ overall educational experiences at Penn State. Fully a third of baccalaureate students’ program of study is comprised of General Education courses, which play a critically important role in shaping the educational outcomes of our undergraduate students.

Penn State’s General Education curriculum was designed to enable students to acquire broad knowledge, analyze and evaluate it, integrate it, and communicate it both orally and in writing, through both independent and collaborative inquiry, while gaining an understanding of international interdependence, cultural diversity, and an appreciation of the role of aesthetics and creative activities. This program of study consists of 45 semester credits in major blocs of skills and knowledge domain courses.

The University takes General Education seriously, and has several mechanisms—especially through departments, colleges, and the University Faculty Senate—for periodic monitoring of and changes to facets of the General Education curriculum. Nonetheless, it has now been over a decade since Penn State conducted a comprehensive review and restructuring of General Education (the final report of the Special Committee on General Education was presented to and accepted by the Senate in Fall 1997). It is appropriate at this time to determine if General Education continues to meet our learning goals under its current configuration. This review must deeply involve the University Faculty Senate, re-examining both the goals of General Education and the programmatic ways in which these learning outcomes can be attained.

Leadership:  
Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education - Primary  
University Faculty Senate - Secondary  
Academic Leadership Council  
Senior Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School  
Vice President for Student Affairs
1.2 Strategy: Expand and Promote Opportunities for Students to Engage in Research and Active Learning

Actions: It is widely recognized that students who actively participate in research tend to be more fully involved in their educational experience, and those experiences are often life-changing and/or career-modifying. This is especially relevant for undergraduate students who are in the formative stages of career exploration and discovery. Penn State annually has several thousand undergraduate students engaged in research—some working as paid employees in research labs/institutes/centers, others volunteering their time to participate with faculty and graduate students on a wide variety of projects, and still others who engage in research in capstone experiences as part of their academic majors. Faculty members who have included undergraduates in research activities are nearly always surprised at the level of contribution these students can make. Although many more students would willingly participate in research, and more faculty members would be delighted to accommodate them, the process by which such faculty-student connections are made often tends to be very ad hoc. Penn State must expand current efforts to disseminate information about research opportunities for students and provide additional incentives for faculty to participate with undergraduate students, as well as foster more capstone experiences for students.

Students who participate in professional internship and co-op experiences are also aided significantly in their career decision making and workforce readiness. Internships and co-ops also represent important opportunities for prospective employers to evaluate students as future employees, and job offers often follow from organizations in which students have interned. Students are increasingly interested in pursuing internships and co-ops.

Such experiences are one way in which nonacademic careers for graduate students can be encouraged and supported. This approach is embraced in some fields (e.g., engineering and math) but it is unfortunately discouraged in others. Penn State should strive to provide graduate students with skills that will serve them well should they explore careers outside the academy.

There are currently many exemplary internship/co-op programs arranged through various colleges and campuses where faculty and staff match students with opportunities, oversee their internship/co-op experiences, and help students adjust to their academic schedules and remain on track toward graduation. Yet there remains much more to be done. Academic units must introduce greater program flexibility to accommodate better the internship experience, while we actively seek to arrange more internships and co-ops for undergraduate and graduate students. Insufficient financial resources can be a barrier to participation in unpaid or low-paying opportunities for students who could benefit greatly from such experiences but must earn enough to maintain their enrollment. In addition, there is little communication or coordination among internship and co-op programs across units;
better communication could benefit students beyond the confines of any individual program, college, or campus. Information about current programs must be gathered, analyzed, and more widely disseminated and Career Services in the Division of Student Affairs could be an important partner in coordinating and publicizing such opportunities.

Finally, there is a considerable body of research indicating that students who are more engaged in public scholarship and service learning are more successful in their college experiences and upon graduation are more likely to be engaged citizens in their communities. Opportunities to participate in public scholarship, service learning, and co-curricular experiences encourage the development of leadership and decision making skills. These learning opportunities help to reinforce connections across the curriculum and co-curriculum and encourage application of learning to communities that may not be otherwise encountered in the educational experience. Penn State’s own surveys indicate that students are very interested and wish to participate in such activities. The University must provide more opportunities to engage graduate and undergraduate students.

Leadership:  
Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education - Primary  
Vice President for Student Affairs - Primary  
Academic Leadership Council  
Senior Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School  
University Faculty Senate  
Vice President for Outreach

1.3 Strategy: Improve Key Student Transition Experiences

Actions: Higher education research and our own analysis of Penn State data indicate that students encounter some of the greatest difficulties of their educational experiences during key transitions: beginning their college studies; beginning or returning to college as adult learners; entrance to the major; change from one campus to another; and the launch of their careers. We should continue working to improve our understanding of student transitions from campuses to University Park. Recent initiatives to address key transitions include revisions to the First-Year Testing Consulting and Advising Program (FTCAP) including a parent involvement program. New initiatives will include the introduction of a writing component for composition placement; an online Early Progress Report for the early identification of students in academic and college adjustment distress; enhanced first-year engagement programming; the identification of and revisions to common “stumbling block” courses and transition to major courses; an iLEAP (Learning Edge Academic Program) for international students; and a similar program offered during the Summer Session for students changing campuses to ease the transition. There may be opportunities to assess the effectiveness of online placement testing.
1.4 Strategy: Encourage Better Advising and Student Ownership of Education

Actions: Students who take responsibility for a direct and active role in charting their own education will ultimately be more successful students and graduates. The University has occasionally used the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data to assess the extent of undergraduate student involvement in and experience with their educational process. Penn State will increase its use of the NSSE instrument, along with our own studies using Penn State Pulse to more directly confront aspects of our educational programming where we fall short of expectations.

Sound decision-making is clearly essential to students’ ownership of their own education and its progress. Opportunities to participate in decision-making processes are valuable learning experiences for students. There are extensive opportunities at Penn State to participate on search committees, task forces, the University Faculty Senate, student government, clubs, and the like. Such participation should be encouraged.

Students continue to have uneven experiences with advising, and the University must revisit—program by program—the ways in which we provide relevant information, the involvement of the faculty in the advising process, and how to best engage students and encourage them to take ownership of their educational experience. All First-Year Seminars or related first-year experiences should assist students to articulate their own statements of personal academic goals. The scaffolding that enables students to take on the responsibility of charting their own education also helps them build the necessary social, cultural, and academic skills and understanding that will be the foundation for their success upon graduation.

Effective advising and mentoring are equally important for graduate students. Excellent advising can reduce time-to-degree by helping graduate students focus early on key coursework and research topics that will best prepare them for their professional futures.
1.5 Strategy: Promote and Support High Quality Graduate Education

Actions: Penn State works toward its goals for graduate education through efforts of the Graduate School, the colleges, and degree programs, acting both individually and collaboratively. High quality graduate education will be enhanced through continued review of graduate programs, improving the diversity of the graduate student population, and improved financial support for graduate students. Support of the infrastructure will allow for more effective management of programs and services and increase student satisfaction.

Total graduate student enrollments peaked in 2003; since then, total resident graduate enrollments have dropped slightly and the University has experienced declining numbers of master’s degree students, African American graduate students, and international students. However, much texture is lost in such aggregate summations. Doctoral degree enrollments have been quite stable for a number of years. Resident master’s degree numbers have declined most, and that decline is largely due to the falling numbers of part-time students at Penn State’s Great Valley Campus. Online master’s degree student numbers are increasing and this may well be the market of the future, especially for professional master’s degrees. Also, the University has been more selective in the admission of graduate students and more successful in recruiting doctoral students.

Leadership: Senior Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School - Primary
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Graduate Council
Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations

1.6 Strategy: Assist Students to Explore Ethical Issues in Their Professional and Personal Lives

Actions: Every day brings news coverage of situations that involved professional and personal ethics and ethical dilemmas. Many of these situations are complex, and graduate and undergraduate students should have opportunities to confront the issues while they are enrolled at Penn State. The University should ensure that no student graduates from Penn State without having had the opportunity to confront issues of ethics and ethical dilemmas, both theoretical and applied, which can be incorporated into General Education courses, those specific to a student’s major or the co-curriculum. Issues of ethics should extend to personal academic integrity and the University should continue to explore the adoption of an Honor Code, building on the experience of the pilot implementation in the Smeal College of Business. Recent actions by the Graduate School to provide improved training in the ethical responsibilities for research should be continued and, if appropriate, further expanded.
Goal 2: Advance Academic Excellence and Research Prominence

Academic excellence is the essential attribute of a great university. Academic excellence is the quality of being outstanding in discovery and learning, in the creation and dissemination of knowledge, in creativity and artistic accomplishment, in open inquiry into and appreciation of tradition and human history. An academically excellent institution provides the environments in which these pursuits are most productively and positively carried out in the creative arts, the sciences, the professions, and the humanities. An academically excellent institution is active at the frontiers of knowledge and always forward looking. The major indicators of academic excellence are student success, faculty productivity and stature, program research performance and recognition, and societal impact.

At Penn State, we have fostered a climate of collaboration, a system of lean operational efficiency, and a culture of interdisciplinarity. As we consider ways to set priorities that will drive decision-making and investment, we need to build on the University’s great attributes and incorporate a culture of adaptability—of positive, forward-looking change. To accomplish this we need to pursue ongoing evaluation and improvement; enhancement of the teaching and learning environment; and the attraction and development of outstanding and diverse faculty, staff, and students.

2.1 Strategy: Focus on Faculty Recruitment and Retention for Excellence

Actions: Faculty members are the heart and soul of any great university; Penn State is no exception. Although the current financial difficulties affecting the nation and the global economy will undoubtedly continue to impact the University for some time to come, the next decade presents an unprecedented opportunity to change the face of the faculty, and in the process develop an even more talented cadre of teacher scholars for the future. At Penn State, 15 percent of the tenured faculty is now aged 60 years or over, a figure that has increased significantly over the past decade. Also, on average, about five percent of the tenure-line faculty turns over annually. Given such figures, the potential to significantly impact the character of a campus, college, or department in a relatively short time is clear.

In the coming five years and beyond, academic colleges and campuses must focus on replacing current faculty—assuming little additional net growth in numbers—with even more outstanding faculty who will carry on the responsibilities and traditions of excellence as teacher-scholars. Given the financial stresses in higher
education, more of the faculty vacancies will need to be filled by more junior colleagues. These faculty members must have adequate mentoring and support systems within their respective units to ensure that they have abundant opportunities to succeed in an environment with high expectations.

Penn State’s commitment to the recruitment and retention of a more diverse faculty must also be maintained. The turnover that the University will experience in the faculty ranks also creates opportunities to enhance the number of women and faculty of color in our ranks, and to ensure their success in moving through the professorial ranks and contributing to our culture of academic excellence.

Unfortunately, a disproportionate share of net new faculty appointments made at Penn State over the past decade has been fixed-term appointments. This is a trend that has characterized all sectors of higher education. At Penn State, fixed-term faculty have accounted for a progressively larger share of the teaching that is done, particularly in introductory and other lower division courses. There have also been concomitant decreases in the amount of teaching by part-time instructors and graduate assistants, while the most rapidly growing type of fixed-term appointment has been the multiple-year contract. This latter trend should help to provide greater continuity and ensure the quality of the University’s instructional programs. Many individuals on multi-year contracts have intentionally chosen career paths in which they can focus relatively more of their time on classroom instruction. Talented faculty on multi-year fixed term appointments complement the tenure-line faculty in achieving the University’s three-part mission.

Yet, there is a growing sense of concern across the University that the research and scholarship contributions of our academic programs will suffer if the number of tenure-line faculty begins to fall. The important issue is in reality one of balance. To date, the number of tenure-line faculty has not declined overall, although there are certainly some academic programs and units in which declines have occurred. Tenure-line faculty members clearly provide the long-term stability and are critical to the reputation and quality of academic departments and divisions. That said, tenure-line faculty across the University must accept additional responsibilities for instructional assignments at all levels of the curriculum rather than fostering a dual and more specialized workforce in which lower division instruction is the responsibility of fixed-term faculty. Given financial pressures and the need to set priorities that support excellence, the Executive Vice President and Provost must work closely with academic deans to develop approaches to hiring that will ensure a strong, continuing commitment to the recruitment and retention of tenure-line faculty and to maintaining and improving the infrastructure that undergirds teaching and research.

In addition, Penn State must increasingly set priorities across all of its disciplines, determining which areas we can appropriately support at a level of excellence that characterizes the University. There are simply some sub-fields within disciplines in
which we cannot hope to achieve a critical mass of faculty and students, nor support the infrastructure that is required to be outstanding.

Individual academic departments and divisions, through their own ongoing strategic planning must identify those areas in which real strength can be achieved, and be prepared to disinvest in those that cannot be appropriately supported or have inadequate demand. In the current economic climate, the University is fortunate that it can take advantage of considerable flexibility in structuring positions, identifying hires and dual career hires, and allocating workloads. Thus, efforts to prioritize for excellence can and should include concrete long-term strategies for “cluster hiring.” Cluster hiring typically involves hiring in the same field or subfield within and across academic units. The Executive Vice President and Provost must provide additional incentives, working with the academic deans, to encourage hiring in selected areas where strength exists and/or may be built in a fiscally responsible manner.

Leadership: Academic Deans/Chancellors - Primary
Executive Vice President and Provost
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2.2 Strategy: Foster Research, Instruction, and Outreach in Emerging Interdisciplinary Fields of Great Societal Importance

Actions: Much of Penn State’s current success as a global knowledge powerhouse has derived from the investments it has made in multi-disciplinary fields such as the life sciences, materials, the environment, cyber-science, and children, youth and families. These investments have been supported financially, in part, by the recycling that has occurred for the past 17 years. It is critical that the University continue to find ways to invest, even amidst periods of exceedingly scarce resources, in emerging knowledge domains if we are to retain a position of academic excellence and leadership. In addition to investment, it is necessary to identify and remove barriers to interdisciplinary research and instruction. For example, promotion and tenure committees may want to consider a wider range of publishing outlets beyond discipline-specific journals and new models of interdisciplinary instruction should be encouraged by departments and programs.

New and important fields are emerging in which Penn State must play a more aggressive leadership role. These fields have been identified by multiple colleges and campuses in their unit strategic plans. We give special attention to a few such fields here, although there are clearly other important strategic areas as well.

The concept of “sustainability” has rapidly risen to the forefront of both academic and public interest. Sustainability is a complex concept that encompasses a wide range of fields from the physical environment to natural resources to economic
processes and structures. There are even new academic colleges at other universities that are attempting to capture the growing interest in sustainability. Although we do not favor the creation of a new academic college to support such interests at Penn State, sustainability is a key area in which limited University resources should be invested. Numerous academic colleges at Penn State have identified sustainability as a strategic focus area in their newly developed strategic plans, encompassing agriculture, business, earth sciences, engineering, and the natural sciences. We must find the resources to support existing strengths and integrate these grassroots efforts toward the applications of existing knowledge and the search for new information. Student, faculty, and staff interest in sustainability issues will only increase in the coming years, and Penn State must be proactive in harnessing this growing energy.

Similarly, several other emerging areas that cross traditional colleges and disciplines are articulated in the college plans. One of these is what is known as STEM education, or Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics. Numerous studies by highly respected organizations, such as the National Academy of Sciences, have documented the critical current and future labor force shortages (particularly of women and racial/ethnic minorities) in STEM fields, which will undoubtedly impact adversely the inventive and scientific capacity of our nation. Penn State has made considerable progress in advancing the STEM fields through research collaborations. The University must build on that momentum, making key investments to strengthen our interdisciplinary focus, and to work collaboratively to foster STEM education with K-12 schools where it is imperative for interventions to start.

Another important interdisciplinary area we note here is Entrepreneurship. Many of the college/campus unit plans have identified Entrepreneurship as an area that should be supported. A recent task force appointed by the Executive Vice President and Provost identified a significant number of programs that are available in various colleges of the University, particularly in Engineering and Business. However, the interest and involvement of the colleges is widespread, and knowing that entrepreneurs often emerge from many fields including the arts and humanities, the task force is currently beginning work on a broadly based general education course on Entrepreneurship that will also be available online. It is essential that these efforts in the field of Entrepreneurship that are expanding across the University be woven into a vibrant and well-coordinated interdisciplinary field of instruction, research, and outreach.

Finally, a very high priority must be placed on the health sciences, based on the recently completed Strategic Plan for the Health Sciences at The Pennsylvania State University (http://nursing.hmc.psu.edu/web/uhsc/healthsciences). Penn State has established itself as a national leader in many areas of the health sciences, with a growing cadre of faculty in the applied sciences and professions related to human health. Faculty at Penn State are aided in their research by the investments the University has made in such facilities as the new Cancer Institute at the Hershey
Medical Center and the future Millennium Science Complex, as well as the planned rebuilding of space for the College of Health and Human Development at University Park. The Health Sciences Council has developed a number of strategies to further collaborations across disciplines and colleges, and these efforts must be supported to the extent possible.

A closely related strategy is to build the infrastructure to support translational science and research. Penn State’s plans for a path-breaking Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute (CTSI) will provide the integrative engine that builds relationships among a wide range of academic fields, starting with traditional biomedical activities, but including the social sciences, arts, communications, education, engineering, ethics, and health care policy. The long-range goal of the CTSI is to develop, implement, and make available new methods to predict, prevent and treat human disease.

The USPC strongly endorses the goal of the University Health Sciences Council to conduct world-class biomedical sciences research by engendering greater collaboration across campuses, colleges, and research institutes, along with the increasing use of core facilities and co-location of faculty working on related research. Areas of particular interest among the wide range of prospective health sciences fields include the neurosciences, infectious disease, cancer, and improvements in health systems. Given projections of future demands for the U.S. and worldwide health care workforce, the interdisciplinary education of the next generation of health care professionals must be a strong complement to Penn State’s biomedical and related research endeavors.

The best universities of the future will increasingly be characterized not only by interdisciplinary research, but also by instructional programming that breaks down barriers to interdisciplinary inquiry. To date, Penn State has been slower than many of its peers in adopting new models of instructional collaboration between and among academic units, particularly at the undergraduate level; but the benefits of interdisciplinarity are applicable at both levels. Academic programs must expand the number of cross-listed courses between/among departments/divisions, and academic leaders—deans, chancellors, and unit heads—should encourage faculty in greater numbers to team teach courses that lend themselves to interdisciplinary inquiry. A portion of workload adjustment funds should be set aside to encourage such collaboration.
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2.3 Strategy: Enhance the College of Medicine’s Research and Clinical Capabilities in Central Pennsylvania

Actions: A key strategy is to create a College of Medicine regional “campus” at University Park/State College ("campus" is used here to mean a collection of teaching and research facilities integrated and shared to a large extent with other University programs rather than a discrete, co-existing campus). The increasingly integrated academic programs of the Hershey and University Park faculties, along with the growing collaboration of the Mt. Nittany Medical Center (MNMC) and area physicians, provide a unique opportunity to increase the quantity and level of medical care and biomedical research in the region of Pennsylvania that represents the greatest share of Penn State employees and their dependents. Already in place, the MD/Ph.D. dual degree program provides students with knowledge of the breadth of clinical science plus the ability to design experiments and conduct biomedical research with modern technology. The establishment of a regional medical campus in the State College area will benefit the University by expanding medical education, drawing upon a wider range of faculty, creating opportunities for more joint degrees, lowering the costs of health care, increasing the level of medical services at MNMC and the surrounding clinical community, and improving the attractiveness of the State College area as a place to live and work.

On the Hershey campus, a high priority must be placed on the plan to complete the financing, architectural design, and initiation of construction of a free-standing, state-of-the-art Children’s Hospital, allowing Central Pennsylvanians access to pediatric care, research, and the advantages of the latest advances in medical education without having to leave the region. The Children’s Hospital will enhance efforts to integrate community engagement activities in the Route 322 Corridor with other University programs in the health sciences, including cancer research, screening, and treatment.

Leadership: Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of the College of Medicine - Primary
Board of Directors of the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center - Secondary
President and the Board of Trustees

2.4 Strategy: Consolidate Academic and Administrative Programs through Targeted Reviews

Actions: Penn State University has long accepted the role of being “all things to all people,” if there is a university in America that can claim to have achieved that distinction. With 24 campuses (including Penn State’s affiliated technical college, the Pennsylvania College of Technology in Williamsport), more than 575 academic degree programs, well over 100 research centers and institutes, and the largest unified Outreach operation in the nation (Penn State reaches one out of every two households in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania), Penn State is indeed
characterized by its comprehensiveness and its reach. That said, and in the context of a deteriorating fiscal environment for public support of higher education, there is a growing and widespread sense that not all current programs can be sustained at a level of excellence characteristic of Penn State quality in education or service delivery.

Rigorous program review provides a vehicle for elevating the strongest academic programs and most effective administrative units of the University, an opportunity to redirect resources from weaker programs, and a way to reduce redundancies and create greater efficiencies. Program review can also help to ensure critical mass—an important determinant of academic excellence—is achieved both for students who come to study expecting to encounter the depth and breadth of academic fields and for both faculty and students who benefit greatly from the interaction and stimulation of colleagues in the same or related fields. Academic and administrative support operations have grown over the years, and there are likely to be redundancies and inefficiencies that have emerged recreating some support services in small, dispersed operations that may be better provided centrally.

A review of all academic programs and administrative/academic support units is neither necessary nor appropriate, given that the strongest programs and most effective units are often widely recognized across the University. In addition, many programs and units have already undergone various types of reviews as academic and administrative budget executives have identified potential reductions in their unit strategic plans. Therefore, the approach to program/unit review must be highly targeted. Thorough and fair reviews require an appropriate investment of faculty, staff, and administrator time, which is also a sound reason for a targeted approach.

Program and support unit reviews must take into account five principles: (1) unnecessary duplication or specialization are grounds for consolidation; (2) programs that serve regional and workforce demands must be viable; (3) appropriate facilities and resources are essential for achieving and sustaining excellence; (4) a critical mass of full-time faculty, staff and students is essential for excellence; and (5) resource efficiencies can be achieved through collaboration, consortia, interdisciplinary cooperation, and alternative modes of educational and service delivery. Program reviews must consider not only critical mass, resources, and the demand for our offerings, but also program distinctiveness, overall quality, centrality to the University’s core mission, and ability to address critical contemporary social and technological problems, as well as ability to push the intellectual frontiers and prepare graduates for lives as educated and engaged citizens. Rigorous program review also provides an opportunity for academic units to rationalize and reformulate their curricula, strengthening programs and facilitating student progress through the curricula at the same time.

A five-step process for the review of academic programs, state-wide cooperative education programs, research centers and institutes will be implemented that includes (1) the identification of programs for review based upon relevant
preliminary data, (2) program evaluation by a small task force of knowledgeable faculty and administrators, (3) feedback to the relevant unit and budget executive, (4) a final report, and (5) the reallocation of resources either within the unit or centrally, depending upon original funding sources and circumstances. To the extent feasible, these reviews will draw upon clearly defined, specific measures of performance. While these metrics will be flexible enough to account for unit and program differences in disciplines and mission, they will be centrally developed, openly articulated, and mutually understood. There will be a similar process for administrative unit reviews. The academic program review task forces will also include representation from the University Faculty Senate, as this body has an advisory and consultative role regarding the academic impact of proposals that involve the establishment, reorganization, or discontinuation of academic organizational units.

Many such reviews have been carried out over the past decade, which have resulted in the consolidation or elimination of various low-performing units. But there remains much to be done across academic programs, research centers/institutes, and administrative units. Even when program/unit reviews do not result in short-term personnel reductions and large cost savings, the long-term improvements in quality, performance, and cost effectiveness, as well as the flexibility to take elements of the University in different directions, can be realized.
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2.5 Strategy:  Acquire Additional Endowments to Enhance Faculty and Student Quality

Actions:  It has become clear in recent years that the comparative advantage in attracting and retaining great faculty in many fields is the availability of endowed chairs, professorships, faculty fellowships, and program support funding. Although considerable progress has been made through past campaign fundraising, much more must be done to increase the number of endowed positions at Penn State. The current campaign, For the Future: the Campaign for Penn State Students, has significant goals for faculty and program support, and these must be attained if the University is to remain competitive with other institutions in recruiting and retaining the best faculty.
Expanding the financial support for graduate students goes hand-in-hand with growing the support for faculty. The best graduate students typically have multiple offers from competing institutions, including offers with fellowships and substantial stipends along with tuition grants-in-aid. This is particularly relevant at Penn State where a relatively high proportion of graduate students pursue doctoral degrees that take far longer to complete than the typical professional master’s degree. Inasmuch as University funding for assistantships has increased only modestly through annual increments to stipend budgets, departments are strained to compete effectively, and must cannibalize other sources of funding to put together competitive packages. Although the number of graduate fellowships, funded both through University and philanthropic sources, has risen in recent years, the increase in support has been insufficient to keep Penn State as competitive as it should be. Again, the For the Future fundraising campaign is critically important for future graduate student fellowship funding, and the University must work to identify funds internally to keep stipends competitive.
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Goal 3: Realize Penn State’s Potential as a Global University

Many American universities traditionally viewed internationalization as being of marginal benefit to the institution. Despite some individual researchers who work with international collaborators where it benefits their research, much of the faculty has had successful research programs without any international component. At the same time, education abroad is recognized as being beneficial to a student’s program, but it is usually peripheral to the primary focus on the degree requirements of a specific major. With a few exceptions, an international experience is seldom an integral part of a student’s education.

All of this is changing. In an increasing number of areas, but particularly in the sciences, international collaborations are now essential. For others, such collaborations open the door to new ideas, new resources, and additional opportunities for success. In an increasingly globalized world, global competency is now an essential component of any undergraduate’s education. For many, practical experience in collaborative work across cultural or linguistic barriers is highly valued by prospective employers. Over the next 10-20 years, the top tier of the world’s universities will be defined by those that move beyond this point and emerge as global institutions: universities whose faculty, staff and students work and study in a global context.

Universities such as Penn State are grounded in a particular place and engagement with local and State institutions and communities will always be an important part of the University’s mission. There is no doubt, however, that the local is now heavily influenced by the global, and that the trend toward globalization in all areas—economic, political, social and cultural—will continue. Whether we look at financial markets, food production and distribution, energy security, regional
conflicts, terrorism, or global climate change, what happens on the global stage has a direct impact on all of our lives. We can’t serve our local constituency without being engaged globally; as more and more of our daily life is influenced by global-scale processes and events, we can’t maintain a leadership position in higher education and research unless we take the next steps of becoming a global university.

3.1 Strategy: Establish the Office of Global Programs as the Locus of the University’s International Strategy

Actions: There are many impressive international activities taking place at Penn State currently. Yet many of these initiatives are occurring in isolation. Because there is relatively little coordination, international activities in different colleges and campuses are sometimes not fully leveraged. There is currently no central repository for information on college and departmentally based activities, or on individual faculty member collaborations overseas, so it is very difficult to know what the extent of Penn State’s involvement in other countries with other partner universities and faculties might be. It is necessary that the situation be changed if Penn State is to maximize its investments in international activities.

The University Office of Global Programs (UOGP) must have the mandate and the necessary resources to provide real leadership for a wide range of activities. It can be a clearinghouse for current and comprehensive information on the full spectrum of international activities and engagements. An enhanced communication and technology infrastructure can assist in moving the global agenda forward.

UOGP must engage, support, and partner with the academic colleges, administrative units, and campuses and should be given leadership responsibility to serve them as the locus of Penn State’s international activities and initiatives if we are to achieve the successes to which we aspire. The UOGP can be much more than an international student processing center, an education abroad program, and a facilitating unit for visiting foreign scholars. UOGP could lead development of adequate and flexible processes that would enable transfer of credits and degrees, facilitating global education partnerships and allowing students to obtain collaborative degrees across the world. Although it should not be a unit that engages in research directly, UOGP needs to be aware of the key international research linkages that exist within the University. It must be forward-looking in providing information and seeding initiatives that will produce valuable outcomes in research, teaching, and outreach international collaborations.
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3.2 Strategy: Build International Partnerships at Home and Abroad

Actions: International activities involving collaborations with other universities must be based on a strong faculty engagement or the activities will not survive for long or contribute much to the long-term internationalization goals of the University. There must be effective partnerships between UOGP and the academic colleges and campuses, especially on key initiatives that are broad and deep and meant to be building blocks for programming that will benefit both faculty and students. Most academic colleges and campuses have a faculty or staff member who is assigned responsibility for furthering internationalization within the unit itself, and these individuals must be knit into an effective coordinating body to assist in creating an outstanding, highly networked set of information resources upon which to leverage international initiatives. Further, the senior leadership of UOGP and the academic colleges (including all campuses) should engage systematically and periodically to build truly collaborative international approaches.

Over the course of several decades, UOGP and various colleges and campuses of Penn State have acquired a large number of formal agreements with overseas institutions to further student and faculty exchanges and otherwise engage in collaborative programming. Unfortunately, many of these agreements represent little more than a piece of paper, an agreement struck in the excitement of a visit, and often negotiated and ratified by university administrators rather than based on concrete engagement by the faculties of those units who are expected to participate. Thus, the outcomes of many such engagements have been disappointing.

Penn State must make a fundamental change in the way it engages overseas partner institutions by focusing on fewer and more strategic universities in a true partnership manner. A recent task force studying UOGP has strongly recommended that Penn State adopt a policy of partnership with “Global Engagement Nodes,” which would be a selected and limited set of institutions in key global areas such as Asia, Africa, Europe, and Latin America. Our strategy is not to seek opportunities to build and/or operate Penn State campuses in other countries—as some of our peer institutions are doing—but rather to establish deep and broad partnerships with a set of universities that build on already established linkages or create new ones in key areas. An initial action item, then, will be the identification of complementary partners and the creation of new value-based relationships. Such linkage sets must contain, not entirely but to a significant extent, partner universities that are peers and that have faculty and students who can collaborate meaningfully with Penn State counterparts. This is the only true basis for partnership, as those arrangements that lack a strong rationale for faculty and students to be involved will not survive very long in any substantive way.

Partnerships with select universities should include collaborative degrees and requisite foreign language preparation so that Penn State students are fully capable of undertaking degree work in foreign universities in the local language. We need
to avoid an enclave mentality focusing only on those universities where English is used.

As the new School of International Affairs (SIA) reaches out to relevant colleges, campuses, and institutes, and identifies areas of mutual interest, it will also be an important vehicle through which Penn State’s global strategies can be effectuated. The SIA has strong academic and administrative ties to the Dickinson School of Law and a core group of faculty drawn from several academic colleges in the University. The SIA provides an outstanding opportunity through which Penn State can gain great visibility, attracting international students and scholars, and providing a wide range of legal, environmental, political, and economic development policy analysis on important issues affecting international relations, peace, and security. The SIA represents a particular source of strength that UOGP can leverage for even wider benefits to the University community.

As the University engages nations and institutions around the globe, conversations about engagement and collaboration must be tightly coupled with conversations about informational and transactional systems, architectures and infrastructure.
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3.3 Strategy: Expand Opportunities for Education Abroad and International Visiting Scholars

Actions: It is clear that a growing number of students would like to study abroad. The current stresses of global recession and the challenges of finding affordable and available student financial aid may temporarily reduce the number of Penn State students able to do so. Penn State is re-examining the budget model for Education Abroad to enhance student access to international experiences and improve collaboration among the academic colleges and campuses. Although Penn State ranks among the top universities nationally in the number of students experiencing education abroad, there is room for much improvement. Some years ago, it was stated that 20 percent of graduating seniors having studied abroad for a semester was a worthy goal, and there is still some way to go before that goal is achieved at Penn State. While semester-based education abroad remains the “gold standard” for international experiences, it is clear that an increasing number of undergraduate students are availing themselves of short-term international experiences led by Penn State faculty members. This is an alternative experience that Penn State must seek to encourage further, as these experiences are typically embedded into regular courses, and the time spent in another country connecting the coursework with on-
the-ground exposure can lead to a very rewarding outcome in terms of a better understanding of the international aspects of a particular program of study. As more faculty seek to incorporate international travel into their courses, the University must establish a more formal process for approving these trips, managing risk, and assessing the outcomes as true internationalizing experiences.

Penn State takes pride in providing all of our students with opportunities to develop abilities that can help them to live, work, and lead in a global environment where multicultural skills are at a premium. Special attention may be needed to assist students from underrepresented, underserved, and lower-income backgrounds to access these opportunities.

Our faculty and graduate students from different parts of the world also represent a tremendous resource for the University in our efforts to internationalize the curriculum and student/faculty experiences. Additionally, each year, Penn State welcomes over 700 visiting international scholars, most of them faculty of overseas universities, who come to study, lecture, and engage in joint research with our faculty. The interactions they have within their host academic units with faculty and students are tremendously enriching. The Fulbright Scholar Awards program creates opportunities for us to learn from visiting scholars as well as take advantage of the experiences of Penn State faculty and graduate students who, as Fulbright Scholars, return to the University with a experiences that enrich their scholarship. Academic units within the University should actively seek to host international scholars, and to utilize their talents and perspectives more fully while they are in residence at Penn State, as well as availing ourselves of their network of contacts as they return to their home nations and universities.
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3.4 Strategy: Infuse International Topics and Experiences into Instruction

Actions: Not every student will be able to travel to or study in another country, given financial constraints or semester course scheduling needs. However, much knowledge and understanding can be gleaned from both classroom and out-of-classroom experiences where faculty infuse greater international topics, assignments, and discussions into their interactions with students. Although baccalaureate degree requirements currently include an international cultures course, there is much more that faculty can do to increase international education across the breadth of courses in the University. To do so, training and development may be necessary if faculty are to embed international perspectives in their courses and participate as advocates in advancing globalization strategies.
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3.5 Strategy: Increase International Student Enrollments

Actions: In addition to a wealth of international and culturally diverse experiences provided at Penn State, an excellent way in which students can expand their global horizons is through contact with students from other countries. While Penn State has long attracted a substantial number of international graduate students, it is only in more recent years that the University has started to attract international undergraduate students in greater numbers. This success should be built upon further through the active recruitment of additional international undergraduate students.

This does not suggest that Penn State’s commitment to international graduate students should in any way diminish. We know that international graduate student applications have declined since early in this decade. Penn State still has a substantial pool of high quality international graduate students, but the University needs to continue to address this matter or the situation could change. International graduate students are important to the University and to the nation.
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Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education

Goal 4: Maintain Access/Affordability and Enhance Diversity

Penn State plays an important role in providing higher education access for Pennsylvania residents. Typically, eighty-five percent of all first year Pennsylvania applicants receive an offer to a baccalaureate degree program at one of Penn State’s twenty campuses.

Incoming students represent a wider range of high school preparation and socioeconomic backgrounds at the campuses than at University Park. Although the Commonwealth Campuses certainly attract excellent students, they also fulfill the University’s mission of providing access statewide for students who are somewhat less prepared for college level work, and whose family incomes are often much lower. The average family income for students at the Commonwealth Campuses in 2005-06 was $25,000 lower than for students at University Park. Through the 2+2 enrollment model, Commonwealth Campuses meet the needs of many of these students by offering a starting point, with access to a higher education with lower tuition costs, greater contact with faculty, and in many situations, the ability for commuter students to avoid room and board costs.

There is significant variability among Penn State’s Commonwealth Campuses in terms of admissions selectivity, curricular and co-curricular educational opportunities, student services and other amenities, and campus settings. In general, the larger and longer-established campuses—typically those with residence halls—tend to have a wider array of academic programs and student services. In short, we sometimes regard the Commonwealth Campuses as rather homogenous, but there are substantial and important differences among them.
Under its “one university, geographically dispersed” philosophy, Penn State must strive to continue to ensure that academic programs and support services for students are of high quality and appropriate to the individual campuses. Regardless of where they begin within the University, students should receive the quality of education that is expected as part of the Penn State experience.

Also regardless of campus location, student success must be envisioned, evaluated, and supported for all of our students—that is, not only for the traditional student base, but (and in some ways particularly) for segments that have been historically underrepresented and underserved in higher education, but which are now increasing. These populations include low-income, first-generation college students; students of color; women students, including those in the sciences, technology, engineering and math (STEM) fields; veterans; students with disabilities; adult learners; LGBT students; students from families having recently immigrated to the United States; and international students. These different groups have different needs. Some may require academic assistance or other support services; others may look to find a community of like-minded people. It is to the benefit of all that we assist students from such varied populations to gain access and develop the skills for success. They collectively bring different needs, perspectives, strengths, and benefits to the institution.

4.1 Strategy: Position the Commonwealth Campuses for Access and Affordability

Actions: Through its multiple campuses spanning the breadth of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Penn State provides unmatched access for students to complete associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degrees. Undergraduate students have a unique opportunity to enroll at a campus that meets their particular needs, whether those needs be primarily financial, academic, or based on a desire for a campus experience with many of the same characteristics of smaller private colleges and universities. The development of four-year campus programs over the past decade has given students additional flexibility. Whichever Penn State campus they choose to attend initially, the University allows students to change to another campus for completion of their programs of study, provided they meet entrance to major requirements, with a curriculum that is well-integrated across the spectrum of campuses.

The emphasis on the benefits of the 2+2 enrollment model has been embraced by a growing number of students as evidenced by the increased number of first choice campus applications and also alternate choice campus requests resulting in the growth in Commonwealth Campus baccalaureate enrollments. Record high levels of enrolled students at the Commonwealth Campuses in aggregate are attributable in significant part to the opportunities made available through 2+2 enrollment. Currently, about 3,600 students change campus to University Park annually after completing 60 credits of work at another campus, and other campuses also are recipients of student flows to complete their majors.
Following the Report of the Tuition Task Force in 2002, the University took steps
to expand what was then a small tuition differential between the Commonwealth
Campuses and University Park Campus, and between two different groups of
Commonwealth Campuses. This tuition gap has grown in recent years to $2,006
per academic year between University Park and the lowest priced Commonwealth
Campuses, and a corresponding gap of $7,459 for non-Pennsylvania students. We
believe this difference in tuition has made the Commonwealth Campuses more
attractive to prospective students and helps to account for both the increasing
enrollments of Pennsylvania students and very notable increase in out-of-state and
international student enrollments. Although the increases in tuition revenues at the
Commonwealth Campuses have not gone up as rapidly on a per student basis as
University Park Campus, the growth in enrollment has more than compensated for
the lower tuition for students at many of the individual campuses. Tuition to attend
University Park for four or more years of a degree program is becoming
prohibitive for many students from lower or lower middle income families.
Relatively lower tuition at the Commonwealth Campuses will protect access and
maintain a financially healthy University.

Leadership:  President and the Board of Trustees - Primary
Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses - Primary
Academic Leadership Council
University Faculty Senate
Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education
Vice President for Outreach

4.2 Strategy:  Invest Selectively in Capital Improvements and Student Services at the
Campuses

Actions:  In recent years, many of the public and private universities with which Penn State
competes for students have invested considerable sums in facilities and services to
make their campuses attractive to prospective students, most of whom have
considerable choice in their college selection decisions. The vitality of the
Commonwealth Campuses, in particular, depends upon both the academic and
physical attributes and attractiveness they display, as well as the quality of student
services. Considerable additional investment in new and newly remodeled
facilities has characterized Penn State's Commonwealth Campuses over the past
decade, and numerous capital projects are currently underway, but additional
selective investments will be necessary to maintain and enhance competitiveness.
Significant central funding for classroom improvements, including technology
enhancements, have greatly improved the physical environment for teaching and
learning. Nonetheless, there continues to be a need for selective investments to
improve the physical facilities and “curb appeal” of many of our campuses, as well
as support for facilities and services that improve student life at both residential
and commuter campuses. Selective investments in physical facilities should be
coupled with consideration of additional selective investment in the student
programs that give life to the physical facilities on our campuses. The aesthetics of the campuses should be matched by the experiences they offer, and both facilities and services must be selectively enhanced if we are to attract the students we seek.

Given that non-traditional and returning adult students (aged 24 and older) will make up an increasingly larger segment of future college-going population, the provision of appropriate student services is also vitally important. Penn State’s Commonwealth Campuses, in particular, must expand their programming and efforts to reach the non-traditional student population at the same time as efforts continue to be directed toward capturing a larger segment of the traditional-aged college students.

Curricular and co-curricular programming and accommodations for non-traditional students tend to be different from those designed for the typical 18-22 year old college student. Returning adult and non-traditional students typically are highly career-focused, are more settled in their choice of major, and some bring prior coursework and past professional experiences. Most work either full- or part-time, and many have family responsibilities. They are often not able to attend classes at the conventional daytime hours and need access to educational services on evenings and weekends. Many also have unique needs in terms of student financial assistance or veteran’s benefits. These special circumstances must be factored into the programming and operations of our Commonwealth Campuses if Penn State is to serve a larger number of returning adult and non-traditional students, and not withdraw from this potential market, leaving it to other colleges and universities to serve their needs.

The majority of students on most of Penn State’s Commonwealth Campuses, however, will continue to be traditional-aged students, many of whom are seeking a residential college experience. Half of Penn State’s campuses with undergraduate degree programs have student residence halls on campus. Over the years, the practice has been to invest in student housing where additional residence hall investments would help to achieve greater efficiencies and where student demand was sufficiently high to fill residence halls on a permanent basis. Thus, much of the additional student housing over the past quarter century was constructed at campuses such as University Park, Erie, Harrisburg, Altoona, and Berks. Such construction has undoubtedly aided those campuses in attracting additional students from outside the campus service areas who are interested in a residential student life experience. The building of limited additional housing where housing already existed, coupled with scarce capital resources competing with academic needs, resulted in virtually no change in the relative distribution of University-operated student residences. Furthermore, there was little interest on the part of Penn State either in permitting non-University business interests from building student housing on campus lands or partnering with outside developers who wished to construct housing on the perimeter of campus land.

A task force has recently been appointed to (re)examine the issue of student
housing options on campuses that currently lack such facilities or have a small number of beds. This task force will explore alternative models of partnerships to lay the groundwork for what would be necessary for the University to engage in such potential ventures. Obviously, there are many issues, including whether or not the housing would be built on University land (and, if so, what sort of building standards would have to be followed), how the University could ensure that adequate oversight of students and their activities could be provided, whether campuses have the staff and programmatic capacity and resources to accommodate the shift from a non-residential to residential learning environment, and the nature of any partnership arrangements that might be appropriate with private developers. Not all campuses would be considered given the different land and community constraints, demographic futures, critical mass of students, and existence of prospective developers. Nonetheless, the consideration of additional student housing should be undertaken.

Leadership:  
Senior Vice President for Finance and Business - Primary  
Vice President for Student Affairs - Primary  
President and the Board of Trustees  
Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses and Campus Chancellors  
Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education

4.3 Strategy: Allocate Additional Funds from Tuition for Need-Based Student Aid

Actions:  
Especially in an era of economic downturn, college costs are obviously a major barrier for low-income and nontraditional students. Costs are becoming a more significant problem for families of moderate income levels but insufficient net worth to support comfortably their or their children’s education. This is a situation often encountered by first-generation college students and others who have recently entered the middle class. As tuition has increased in recent years, Penn State has allocated additional funding for need-based student financial aid each year, including funds to match Trustee Scholarships that are awarded to high-achieving students with high need. This funding has allowed for more students from lower and lower-middle income families and first generation college students to attend the University than would otherwise have been possible. Yet, the gap between available aid and need is growing each year. This pattern of setting aside some of the additional revenue from tuition increases for more need-based student aid must be continued and expanded when the financial condition of the University’s budget permits. This is a substantial benefit for all campuses, perhaps especially the Commonwealth Campuses where the family income of students is notably lower than at University Park.

Leadership:  
President and the Board of Trustees - Primary  
Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education - Secondary
4.4 Strategy: Sustain Investment in *For the Future: The Campaign for Penn State Students*

**Actions:** The *For the Future* campaign, currently in its quiet phase, could not possibly be more important to the future of the University and our students. In the face of the growing gap between available student aid and student need, private philanthropy will be essential for ensuring that highly qualified students can attend Penn State in the future. Penn State enjoys one of the most successful University Development units in higher education today, with one of the most efficient operations in terms of the ratio of dollars raised to fundraising expenses. Substantial new resources have been provided to University Development to launch the new campaign, all of which will be necessary to accomplish our goals, especially in a fundraising environment that has become more challenging amidst a global financial crisis. This commitment must be sustained even in a period of very scarce University financial resources. This is an investment that can leverage a high return for Penn State and our students.

**Leadership:** Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations - Primary
President and the Board of Trustees - Secondary
Academic Leadership Council

4.5 Strategy: Build on the *Framework to Foster Diversity*

**Actions:** Penn State has made considerable progress over the past decade in enhancing the climate for diversity, enrolling a significantly higher proportion of under-represented students, recruiting and retaining more women and faculty of color, incorporating multi-cultural and international content in its courses, improving the educational and physical environment for persons with disabilities, and enhancing institutional leadership of diversity endeavors. Much of that progress can be attributed to what is still regarded by many other universities as a bold strategy encompassed in *A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State*, a major five-year planning process that holds academic and administrative units accountable for making progress in achieving greater diversity. Unit plans are submitted at the start of a five-year planning timeline, progress reports are reviewed at the mid-point of the period and at the end, and institutional data are used to provide benchmarks for progress. Best practices in pursuit of major challenges are shared widely, and unit reports are publicly available on the Web. The second five-year plan under this approach will conclude in 2009.

The diversity planning process focuses on seven major challenges in creating a more diverse University, and fostering diversity must continue to be recognized as a core value of the institution. The University should continue to pursue progress for the seven challenges that have been identified through the *Framework* process: developing a shared and inclusive understanding of diversity, creating a welcoming campus climate, recruiting and retaining a diverse student body,
recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce, developing a curriculum that fosters United States and intercultural competencies, diversifying university leadership and management, and pursuing organizational change to support our diversity goals.

A new planning framework for diversity is being launched for the time period from 2010 through 2015, which will roughly parallel the University strategic plan. A separate diversity planning process remains necessary to continue to highlight our responsibilities as a University to lead in efforts to create a more multi-cultural environment for the future. Although it is beneficial to include these elements in the University’s strategic plan, experience indicates that it is too easy for diversity to get lost or become an afterthought or an appendix to the very challenging aspects of other University strategies. The forthcoming 2010-2015 planning process will target those areas in which further progress is necessary, while recognizing the considerable progress that academic and administrative support units have made in fostering greater diversity.

Leadership: Vice Provost for Educational Equity - Primary
Academic Leadership Council
Executive Vice President and Provost
President’s Council

Goal 5: Serve the People of the Commonwealth and Beyond

As part of its land-grant mission, Penn State serves the people of the Commonwealth in a role that is far larger than simply educating its citizens in the University’s classrooms. That role has historically had a strong focus—through Cooperative Extension—on research, education, and service to support the food and fiber sectors and the communities of which they are part, a commitment that Penn State will continue to honor. Over the past century, what we now generally refer to as “outreach” has expanded to many other forms of academic programming, research, and service, including continuing education, the online World Campus, conferences and institutes, public broadcasting, economic and workforce development, and in many respects, the Commonwealth Campuses. These activities, among others, serve to link communities to the rich intellectual and research resources of the university. This mission is crucial to Penn State, but in tough economic times, the nature of the mission will need to be adapted because of the changing nature of financial support, new technologies for delivery, and the desire to include more areas of the University to address the Commonwealth’s increasingly complex social, economic, and environmental challenges.

The use of advanced delivery technologies and strategic alliances among Cooperative Extension, the World Campus, the Commonwealth Campuses, and academic programs at University Park could position the University to serve its citizenry in ways that are surely consistent with the traditional intentions of the land-grant university, but in an even more effective manner. These could also be used to provide access to specialized knowledge and research, from agriculture to engineering, but also to the community, whether it’s healthcare management, community arts and
performance, or legal issues of gas drilling for landowners. Penn State has—and should have—a
stake in ensuring that communities are well served by their resources and the talents of their
people.

5.1 Strategy: Deliver More PSU Programming Using Technology and Media

Actions: The costs of program service delivery from multiple geographic locations are
becoming increasingly prohibitive in the face-to-face model. High speed Internet
access now exists across much of the Commonwealth. This is true even in many,
but certainly not all, rural areas. Service users are becoming more and more
familiar and comfortable with searching for information sources and availing
themselves of that information when and where they need it. Penn State should
shift even more of its information service delivery to an Internet-based format to
the extent possible. In addition, Public Broadcasting represents a tremendous
media resource for information delivery that should be utilized to the maximum
extent possible.

If online education, Cooperative Extension, and blended learning are to be
important avenues for reaching non-traditional, non-resident students, and the
general public, issues of Web accessibility for disabled individuals must also be
resolved. The University does have guidelines in place (e.g., Administrative Policy
AD-54) as well as coding tools and training and help for developers, but more
progress is needed to make relevant Web materials accessible for instructional and
outreach uses.

Leadership: Vice President for Outreach - Primary
Vice Provost for Information Technology - Secondary
Academic Leadership Council
Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences

5.2 Strategy: Consolidate Specialized Services at Regional and Campus Sites

Actions: In recent years, Penn State has begun to consolidate some service operations at
fewer, regional sites. Cooperative Extension, for example, has consolidated
operations significantly in response to reduced state and federal appropriations and
increased operating costs. Extension educators with a particular type of expertise
increasingly serve multiple counties. It may be necessary to serve the
Commonwealth from a single site in the case of highly specialized and
infrequently used expertise. It will surely be necessary to continue such forms of
consolidation, working closely with county governments and other constituencies
that rely upon and provide an increasing share of financial support to these key
educational activities, primarily in the food and fiber sectors of the state’s
economy.
Penn State currently operates at about 100 different geographic locations across the Commonwealth and at 24 campuses. This myriad of facilities and offices, most of which provide various educational services and community-based learning opportunities to the citizens of Pennsylvania, are often co-located with governmental and other non-profit organizations, while others are free-standing operations, frequently in rental space. To the extent feasible, these service operations should be co-located at Penn State’s Commonwealth Campuses, where they would bring people to campus and help to familiarize them with the educational programs and facilities of our campuses. Survey data indicate that many prospective students and their families are not familiar with Penn State’s campuses in their regional service areas, and co-locating facilities and aligning continuing education and admission service areas would help to disseminate that information. Experience tells us that once a prospective student visits a campus, the probability of attending that campus increases significantly.

Leadership:  
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**5.3 Strategy: Share Programs, Faculty, Staff, and Facilities within Regions**

**Actions:** Many of Penn State’s Commonwealth Campuses are relatively small in numbers of students and, consequently, are not able to offer as wide a range of undergraduate degrees, courses, and student services as one of the University’s larger campuses. Thus, it makes good economic and educational sense to foster greater sharing of Penn State programs, faculty, staff, and facilities within regions across the Commonwealth. Although many of the campuses have begun to take such steps recently, this approach must be enhanced in order to reduce operating costs and improve the attractiveness of the academic programs and services at individual campuses. This approach may be even more important in coming years if the current weak economic climate persists and more students are unable to afford living away from home and instead commute to one of Penn State’s campuses.

Sharing faculty can be facilitated by collaborative scheduling that allows teaching at more than one campus, by the use of technology through which students at multiple campuses can participate in the same class, and by the use of online courses to supplement program offerings at any given campus. Similarly, shared degree programs can be offered among multiple campuses across a region to derive maximum value from limited resources. Some campuses have more access to specialized facilities than other campuses (e.g., science laboratories, computing technology, engineering facilities and equipment, etc.) and creative scheduling can make such facilities available to more students from multiple campuses than would otherwise be available.
A specific example where such sharing arrangements should be initiated is in the Philadelphia region where Penn State has two undergraduate campuses and one graduate campus. There is excess facilities capacity at the Abington and Brandywine Campuses during typical evening hours, while the Great Valley Campus is largely unused by students during the daytime hours because the campus serves almost exclusively professionals who work full-time during the day. The opportunity to open up new markets with faculty from other campuses filling in those open hours could attract new students to all of the region’s Penn State campuses.

Leadership: Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses and Campus Chancellors - Primary
Senior Vice President for Finance and Business
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Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education
Vice President for Student Affairs

5.4 Strategy: Re-Mission Some Campuses, if Necessary

Actions: A high priority for Penn State must be to provide Commonwealth Campuses with the best feasible prospects to succeed and thrive in the coming years. A vibrant set of campuses will help to ensure that the University as a whole continues to progress, and ensure that Penn State serves its land-grant mission by providing a high level of access and quality educational programs to the citizens of Pennsylvania. We recognize that the individual campuses may differ fundamentally and substantially in what they are and what they do best. This might mean more markedly building on the demonstrated research potential at a few of the stand alone campus colleges, strategic investment in those campuses which provide flourishing small-educational environments, moving other campuses more toward technical education, or the like. In short, the University will build upon the salient strengths and differences among the campuses.

The Commonwealth Campuses have, in general, achieved considerable success in growing their enrollments over the past three years, and these enrollment gains have helped to solidify their base of financial resources. Healthy finances provide the basis for increased programming, additional full-time faculty, and improvements to the academic vitality and enhanced student life experiences that are central to an excellent college education. As noted previously, however, not all campuses have enjoyed the historic enrollment growth, academic program evolution, and stability of some of the larger Commonwealth Campuses. In some situations, perhaps regional approaches are called for. The task before us is to improve the functioning of some of the campuses that are not flourishing to help them meet the needs of today and tomorrow.

This will mean that we must be sensitive to the realities that the future may bring. Deep and prolonged recession, changing demographics, and the competition from
lower-priced higher educational alternatives could all conspire to reduce enrollments significantly at one or more of our campuses. A substantial enrollment decline would not only damage the financial viability of a campus; it would likely also negatively affect the quality of the educational programming that could be offered as critical mass and fiscal resources were diminished.

While every effort must be made to maintain the viability of our campuses, some response would have to be forthcoming in the face of prolonged campus decline. Some form of “re-missioning” would have to occur. Analysis suggests that simply shifting away from resident instruction to continuing education would not support a campus financially. Other, more significant forms of re-missioning—developed in consultation with campus leadership and the faculty—would be necessary.

One possible type of re-missioning would be to shift away from traditional Penn State baccalaureate degrees toward more technical education. The Pennsylvania College of Technology in Williamsport has demonstrated the viability of high-quality technical education with robust enrollments and high job placement among graduates (many of whom join the Pennsylvania work force). The role of such associate and baccalaureate technical education could help to fill current labor force gaps in many occupations that are in high demand. Although the physical infrastructure available at most campuses is not completely amenable to technical education, the industry partnerships that Penn State has established over many years may help to provide the infrastructure and other support to make such a transition for one or more campuses—should it become imperative to undertake re-missioning.

Leadership: President and the Board of Trustees - Primary
Senior Vice President for Finance and Business
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Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses
Vice President for Outreach

5.5 Strategy: Create a More Entrepreneurial Approach to Service Delivery

Actions: Penn State, in its role as the Commonwealth’s land-grant university, has long felt obligated to provide many services free of charge to the public. However, as state and federal appropriations for public service activities have declined relative to the overall costs of University operations, such public service provision has become increasingly constrained by available resources. Furthermore, the absence of a “market” for much of this sort of public service provides rather limited information as to its value to consumers of those services. The risk with such programs can be a sense of limitless frontiers and resultant overreaching in extending offerings to a point beyond clearly demonstrable value.
Exploring the market for some of these public services, including the introduction of fees for additional types of services, would create both a more entrepreneurial delivery system and provide for a better assessment of how the public values these services. There may also be markets for these services outside of the Commonwealth, with users who are willing to provide financial support and spread the costs of providing and delivering those services.

There has long been an orientation to the food and fiber sectors in many of Penn State’s scholarship-based educational programs and service activities, including Cooperative Extension. This primary commitment must continue given the historic roots of the University and the continuing importance of food and fiber to the economy and quality of life within the Commonwealth. There is also the opportunity to continue to expand the role of Extension education and public services beyond its traditional realm into other academic fields of the University. There are wide ranging challenges in the Commonwealth, from environmental problems to economic development, that require the wide range of disciplinary expertise that Penn State is uniquely qualified to provide. A more entrepreneurial approach to public service delivery could help to provide additional resources to expand the scope of public services beyond the traditional core.

Leadership: Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences - Primary
Vice President for Outreach - Primary
Academic Leadership Council
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**Goal 6: Use Technology to Expand Access and Opportunities**

Vast amounts of information are essential to function in the contemporary world, and the University’s Libraries and information technology (IT) infrastructure are now the foundation for every aspect of the University’s mission, whether it is teaching, research, service, or outreach. Digital libraries and e-repositories are emerging as key components of teaching and learning and of research, and the reach of the University Libraries has extended as access is provided to Pennsylvania residents, the nation, and the world. The critical nature of IT and our University Libraries to fulfilling our mission is already evident today; but its importance will actually continue to increase and at an ever accelerating rate over the next decade. As the University sets priorities for excellence, smart and effective decisions about (and investments in) information technology will continue to be crucial, as will commitments to existing information formats.

To be a thriving university in the 21st century, we will have to be at the leading edge of academic transformation, and to be at the frontier, we will require the best IT that we can afford. IT is no longer a cost; it is a capital investment. IT is as necessary today as is our physical infrastructure; as the century unfolds, it will become even more important. While investments in IT will, of necessity, continue to rise, the benefits and especially the rate of return on that investment will also accrue. However these investments are to be made, we simply have no choice if we are to remain competitive among the best institutions of higher learning and research in the U.S. and
around the globe. In addition, it will be important to remember that while activities such as the online educational delivery systems and digital repositories are powerful and promising technologies in their own right, their success for Penn State will depend in large part on how successfully they can be embedded into the academic enterprise.

6.1 Strategy: Expand the World Campus and Other Online Educational Offerings

Actions: Over the past decade, Penn State’s World Campus established itself as one of the world’s first and most highly rated online distance education learning organizations. Currently expanding at more than 40 percent per annum, the goal for the World Campus is to have 50,000 course enrollments within the next decade. There are more than 60 certificate and degree programs, with a healthy mix of associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree offerings. Concomitant with the growth of the World Campus has been the increase in the number of online courses offered by Penn State’s academic colleges and campuses, courses that are delivered to resident education students both at the originating campus and at other locations through the mechanism of the eLearning Cooperative. Course data and student surveys indicate a notable trend of more resident instruction students taking one course online during a semester. The prevailing economic climate will likely influence individuals to seek higher education while staying in their jobs, leading to growing demands for online education and/or a mix of online courses and resident instruction. Demand for executive education delivered by high-quality providers is likely to continue to expand. The market for professional master’s degrees is particularly strong and likely will remain so. In short, there are many reasons to expect that much continuing professional education will be offered increasingly in the future online.

The World Campus provides an outstanding mechanism with which to reach literally across the globe to serve students. It must be a central element in the University’s approach to globalization and bringing students from a wide variety of nations into the Penn State community. The World Campus also is a means to reach many non-traditional student audiences who may not have the ability to physically attend courses on a campus. For example, it can reach students living in remote areas, individuals with disabilities, and those in active military service who enroll through the ConAP (concurrent admissions program) agreement with the U.S. Army.

The World Campus represents a tremendous actual and potential source of new revenues for academic units across the University. Many programs are benefitting greatly from the revenue sharing that is now accruing from their efforts to participate in the development and marketing of World Campus programs. This represents a critical area of future investment for the University where the return on investment is substantial.
Courses created for online delivery, whether delivered through the World Campus or by individual academic units, have important “dual use” capabilities. Online course materials can be used for “blended” courses in resident instruction that incorporate both face-to-face instruction and online components. In many instances, the online capabilities permit students to work repeatedly at problems and more readily lead them to solutions. An increasing body of research indicates that blended learning courses can improve student learning and also reduce the costs of instruction for certain types of courses.

Growth of the World Campus and other forms of online education should include a continued leading role for the faculty, academic units, and the University Faculty Senate. The long-term success of online programs, including the World Campus at Penn State, is linked to how well these programs can draw upon the unique strengths and academic capacities of the enterprise. Development of online programs provides academic units with the opportunity to craft blended learning courses, which are a mixture of online and traditional face-to-face instruction. Penn State has been funding the development of more such courses in recent years, and must continue this focus on key courses that are in especially high demand among resident education students. Data derived from the analysis of blended courses indicate that improvements in learning can be achieved simultaneously with a reduction in the costs of course delivery.

The budget models supporting the World Campus have evolved considerably over the past decade of operation. For example, considerable simplification of budget and revenue sharing models has occurred, and some Penn State colleges are now hiring faculty members based in part upon their expected contribution to creating, teaching in, and/or managing World Campus programs. We need to ensure that the budget models provide adequate incentives for units to bring forth programs with the greatest market potential, and that faculty with the requisite skill sets can be engaged to support those programs at a high level of quality.

Leadership: Vice President for Outreach - Primary
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6.2 Strategy: Invest in Robust/Flexible IT Infrastructure for Teaching, Research and Administration

Actions: No university can hope to remain competitive with its peers and on the cutting edge of knowledge creation and discovery without having world-class information technology infrastructure and services. Most faculty members now use the ANGEL course management system and incorporate technology to bring real-time events and other unique materials in their classrooms. For example, both new
Dickinson School of Law buildings enjoy advanced audiovisual telecommunications capabilities that enable the law school to operate a sophisticated world-wide program of distance learning that has resulted in the school’s designation by the American Bar Association as the pilot project for assessing the role of distance education in legal education. Information technology has also become a fundamental component of research and creative activities from the tracking and display of nanoscale changes in biological systems to the design of theatre sets. Appropriate information infrastructure is now essential for the management of complex University administrative systems. In short, robust IT clearly is crucial to teaching, research and administration.

Penn State must invest in a robust IT infrastructure to maintain its competitive edge. IT is very costly, and careful analysis is necessary to keep the University on the cutting edge without making expensive mistakes. Our IT infrastructure must be flexible enough to accommodate many different types of users in academic and administrative settings. Faculty represent a range of sophistication in terms of their uses and needs for IT in both teaching and research, and flexibility to serve those needs is critically important. There should be as much sharing as possible of the housing of large pieces of IT equipment for research applications. Penn State administrative IT systems, while some of the best in higher education, are old and in serious need of replacement or upgrades. These IT needs must be properly staged to address the highest priority systems upgrades before crises emerge in the years ahead.

Retaining electronic information and data will also become increasingly important in the future as most communications and information transfer will be accomplished using IT networks. Highly decentralized systems with distributed responsibility and varying structures will not be conducive or efficient to store, catalog, and provide access to information from a wide variety of sources and types of information. Thus, Penn State must develop more centralized shared digital repositories and/or participate with other universities and organizations in the support of digital records. Penn State will need to support the efforts of University Libraries and Information Technology Service to create such digital repositories at Penn State for our unique purposes. In addition, Penn State must work with our peer institutions through such organizations as the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (the Big Ten universities plus the University of Chicago) and the Association of Research Libraries to support collaborative efforts to expand the scope and content of digital repositories and to share in the costs of development and maintenance of such systems.

Finally, the use of open educational resources initiatives will greatly expand the capabilities of Penn State faculty and students to avail themselves of the teaching, research, and service information technology capabilities of a much wider community of scholars, professionals, and users. It is simply too expensive to “re-invent the wheel” each time a new need or application arises, and higher education must increasingly shun the “not invented here” syndrome that discourages the
adoption of new developments elsewhere. Faculty and students must be encouraged to contribute to such endeavors. Likewise, open source software is becoming more widespread for an expanding range of academic and administrative uses in higher education and, where possible, should be incorporated into the IT infrastructure of Penn State.

Leadership: Vice Provost for Information Technology - Primary
Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communications - Primary
Executive Vice President and Provost

6.3 Strategy: Re-Balance Centralized/Dispersed Facilities/Services for Greater Efficiency and Effectiveness

Actions: The balance between centralized and dispersed information technology infrastructure and services tends to swing like a pendulum in most organizations, and universities are no exception, except perhaps that they at times allow a level of dispersion that would be unacceptable in most business organizations. New technologies (for instance, for mass storage) will require a more centralized approach to be cost effective for the University. And it has become increasingly clear that, at Penn State, as the pendulum has swung to a dispersed system, there is considerable redundancy and inefficiency in the overall IT system. This has resulted in a plethora of IT equipment spread across colleges, campuses, departments, and administrative units that is not appropriately staffed, maintained, or utilized.

Re-balancing is not about creating a highly centralized and bureaucratic IT infrastructure and administration at Penn State; rather, it is fundamentally about creating partnerships with college, campus, and administrative units to provide infrastructure and services at the level that best addresses the teaching, research, outreach, and administrative functions of those constituencies—and the overall University—in ways that are both responsive to local needs, are cost effective, and avoid redundancies. These partnerships will require some units to relinquish local control over some systems and applications and some to take on additional IT responsibilities, and it must reward those that do with better service and lower costs, particularly for “commodity” services. The Vice Provost for Information Technology must take the leadership for convening a major task force to work collaboratively to find the best balance points between centralized and dispersed IT infrastructure in order to derive the best possible mix of service for the lowest possible costs.

Leadership: Vice Provost for Information Technology - Primary
Dean of University Libraries and Scholarly Communications
Executive Vice President and Provost
6.4 Strategy: Protect the Security and Integrity of the IT Infrastructure

Actions: Universities have become increasingly opportunistic targets for criminal elements and mischief-makers who seek to disrupt information technology services and, increasingly, to steal valuable information or otherwise use our network capabilities for illegitimate ends. Penn State’s network is probed tens of millions of times in a typical week for security weaknesses, and the distributed responsibility for our IT infrastructure and network administration provides ample opportunities for invasion. The openness of university networks, coupled with the high bandwidth of Internet 2 data manipulation and transmission capabilities, create a unique set of circumstances for IT management.

The Vice Provost for Information Technology must continue to develop both the technical infrastructure and educational programming to impress upon faculty, staff, and students the importance of everyone doing his or her part to maintain the security of Penn State’s information technology networks and infrastructure. Planning for the possibility of natural or other disasters must also be incorporated into future IT development, given that the University cannot operate long without core information technology support.

Leadership: Vice Provost for Information Technology - Primary
Executive Vice President and Provost

Goal 7: Control Costs and Generate Additional Efficiencies

Penn State is a large, complex organization that is truly unique in higher education. As “one university, geographically dispersed,” it operates as a coherent whole with 24 individual locations and a multitude of programs. By almost any measure, Penn State is one of the most efficient enterprises in higher education. The University continues to operate with fewer dollars per student than its peers in the Big Ten (within which Penn State’s appropriation per student consistently ranks last) and in Pennsylvania. Penn State’s 2007-08 income base per student of $18,010 compares to $19,620 for Temple and $20,370 for Pittsburgh, and our facilities and administrative cost rates (commonly referred to as the research overhead rate) of 47.5 percent compares to 51.5 percent for the University of Pittsburgh and 50.0 percent for Temple University. Penn State has achieved such efficiency by managing its resources carefully through reallocation of budgets and cost containment measures. From 1992-93 through 2008-09, Penn State recycled $173 million through internal budget reductions, reallocations, and cost savings initiatives. Even through years of budget recycling, Penn State has been able to build academic excellence, but resources that have been limited in the past may become even scarcer, and recycling decisions may now be impacting basic service levels and necessary capabilities.

The University remains strongly committed to ongoing cost containment efforts and one of the most effective continuous quality improvement programs of any university in the country. To maintain excellence in a time of decreasing resources, Penn State will require innovative and
flexible programs and policies, careful review of resources and processes, and investment in our workforce.

7.1 Strategy: Improve Instructional Productivity

Action:  Penn State’s faculty and support staff members are its core asset, representing the very heart of the University. Higher education is obviously a very “people-intensive” activity and, therefore, it should not be surprising that faculty and staff salaries and benefits currently account for 70 percent of Penn State’s general funds expenditures. The effective utilization of this array of resources is perhaps the greatest operating challenge that the University faces in a highly decentralized system of educational services delivery and a framework of dispersed decision-making. Each day, a myriad of decisions about courses and other educational offerings are made by department and division heads, program leaders, and directors of academic affairs that match student demands, program curricular requirements, and faculty and staff resources, delivering quality Penn State education to more than 92,000 students.

In order to make the best possible use of faculty resources, academic colleges and campuses must develop transparent workload policies by the end of the 2009-10 academic year. Some units have already developed such policies in recent years. These policies are best articulated at the college and campus level where appropriate flexibility and attention to the full range of context and consideration can be incorporated, and where legitimate differences among disciplines can be taken into account. There is a clear expectation that all faculty who are supported on General Funds will participate fully in the instructional programs of their respective units, and that those not engaged in highly productive programs of research will have higher instructional workloads than those who are publishing at a high rate, securing extramural funding as appropriate to the field, and supervising graduate students. All faculty, including tenure line and senior faculty are expected to participate in the education of undergraduate students.

This requirement for formal workload policies and related performance tracking is not only a matter of improving the productivity of the University’s faculty assets; it is also a matter of equity. Transparency of both the unit workload policies and expectations about individual faculty performance will help to ensure greater quality, efficiency, and equity.

In addition, recent data indicate that 11 percent of all course sections at University Park are under-enrolled by conventional definitions of under-enrollment at Penn State. Similarly, 32 percent of sections at the Commonwealth Campuses are under-enrolled. Under-enrollment is defined by policy as a lower division undergraduate course with less than 15 students, an upper division course with less than 8 students, and a graduate course or seminar with less than 5 students. We recognize that there are legitimate reasons why not every section should satisfy these criteria,
and that this is especially relevant at smaller campuses. Nonetheless, these under-enrolled sections represent a significant under-utilization of faculty resources, particularly when such sections are offered on a regular basis of near-continuous under-enrollment. Similarly, highly specialized topical courses offered regularly and repeatedly under SUBJ 297, SUBJ 497, or SUBJ 597 are not an appropriate use of experimental courses, the intent of which is to test a new content area and the prospective student interest. Such courses, if they are not “graduated” to regular course offerings, should cease to be offered or offered only very infrequently. Similarly, small numbers of students should be accommodated in independent study opportunities for students rather than as regularly scheduled courses. When sufficient enrollments for courses do not materialize, appropriate reassignments should occur in a current or subsequent semester. A monitoring system should be developed to allow transparency in the process of instructional performance if improved productivity of faculty resources is to follow.

Leadership:  
Academic Leadership Council - Primary  
Executive Vice President and Provost - Primary  
University Faculty Senate  
Vice Provost for Information Technology

**7.2 Strategy: Better Utilize Instructional and Research Facilities**

**Action:** The University has invested heavily in both the construction of new classroom and laboratory facilities and the renovation of existing facilities to accommodate new modes of teaching and learning and the greater use of technology. Too often, these facilities are not fully utilized—and the University constructs additional facilities—because of lack of use outside of certain “prime time” class periods or times of the day. Classroom space at University Park, for example, is near fully utilized between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. on a typical day, but much capacity is under-utilized at other times of the day. While a notable reduction in classroom utilization has occurred at 8:00 a.m., in response to student (and some faculty) preferences, mid- and late-afternoon scheduling remains significantly lower.

Penn State must invest in a state-of-the-art master scheduling system, particularly for use at University Park, in which classes can be better spread across the day between 9:00 a.m. and, at the least, 6:00 p.m. The offering of additional evening classes should also be explored and offered, if sufficient demand exists, as they regularly are at the Commonwealth Campuses.

Similarly, specialized research facilities should be better inventoried than they are at present, so that additional core facilities used by multiple investigators can be established. The increased cost of highly specialized equipment is straining University financial resources, and maximum utilization of such facilities is imperative. Many core facilities have already been established in research centers
and institutes such as the Huck Institutes for the Life Sciences, the Materials Research Institute, and the Penn State Institutes for Energy and the Environment, and this model is one that should be spread throughout the entire University. Again, scheduling of access is critically important to research investigators. Both central and college/campus allocations for equipment must be tied to collaborative use and access to increasingly costly facilities and equipment.

Penn State clearly has a huge investment in physical plant and equipment that is fully performing only when it is heavily used. The two semesters of the academic year leave basically the period from mid-May to mid-August with considerable excess capacity all across the University, well beyond that which is taken down for maintenance or renovation during the summer months. This situation represents an opportunity to capture additional revenues for the University and its academic and other units.

The approach to Summer Sessions is fairly unsystematic. Offerings are too often dependent on individual faculty members’ interest in teaching (and in teaching particular courses) and their schedules rather than student course needs and time preferences. A well-planned program would be more responsive to student needs and market demands, make greater and better use of blended programs merging online and face-to-face instruction, and reflect better coordination between continuing education and resident instruction. Programs in the Summer Sessions should be more deliberately built around a few key priority foci such as (perhaps) General Education, LEAP, intensive languages, and a few other special fields (e.g., certification of teachers and principals).

The budget model for the Summer Sessions has been in place for many years, and is under-performing both in terms of the revenue generated and the range of programs that could potentially be offered. The incentives for academic programs to participate broadly are clearly not sufficient, and it appears to be increasingly difficult to field more than a limited set of General Education and a few graduate independent study courses aside from some professional programs such as teacher education. In addition, other important activities such as the World Campus and extramurally funded research increasingly compete for faculty resources. On the demand side, students find it increasingly necessary to work during the summer to help pay for their education, and other lower-cost alternatives for summer courses often abound in the vicinity of students’ permanent residences.

The Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education has recently charged a task force to examine broadly the many issues concerning the Summer Sessions, including the budget model and the pricing that supports it. The outcomes of this task force must produce change that will revitalize and rationalize the Summer Sessions so that the facilities and staff resources are better utilized and more closely match student needs across all Penn State campuses, or other appropriate rationalization, will be needed.
7.3 Strategy: **Reduce the Rate of Increase of Health Care Costs**

**Action:** The rapidly rising cost of health care for Penn State employees is an area of great concern, lest these costs crowd out the available resources for competitive faculty and staff salaries and funds to pursue the University strategic academic pursuits. Numerous program improvements have been made over time, both in terms of the quality of health care available to employees as well as efforts to control better the cost of providing those services. The University’s recent long-term relationship with Highmark to cover all Penn State employees across the Commonwealth under one plan has been a substantial improvement.

The University must be creative in the design of its health care programs of the future. Integrating additional wellness education and incentives must be a strategic initiative in the University’s planning. Other options such as health reimbursement accounts (HRA) and changes to deductibles and co-pays should be considered, along with differential rates for employees who continue to engage in higher health risk behaviors, and for those who utilize “in system” providers as opposed to other health care professionals. The University should also continue to support and promote faculty and staff wellness and health-related opportunities through efforts such as the Know Your Numbers program, Healthwise online, preventive screenings, flu shots, and related initiatives.

The University now provides health coverage for over 45,000 employees, retirees, and their dependents. Given that Penn State has about 26,000 covered lives in the State College region, it will be particularly important that the University devise ways to reduce the rate of increase in health care costs in this area of the Commonwealth. We believe that the creation of a regional medical campus of Penn State’s College of Medicine in State College/University Park can contribute significantly to reducing the rate of increase in medical costs for the University, increasing access to an even higher level of quality care in partnership with the Mt. Nittany Medical Center, while better utilizing the University’s own resources for improving wellness and treating medical conditions of our Penn State community.

Penn State provides a generous retiree health benefit to its faculty and staff. It is a defined benefit plan for which the estimate of future expense has been growing rapidly in light of general health care costs trends. Actuarial estimates of this liability calculate its growth to over $3 billion in future years consuming a larger
and larger percentage of the University annual health insurance expense budget. The University must move to implement a defined contribution retiree health insurance plan for new employees within the next year, incorporating some form of health savings account. Current faculty and staff would be grandfathered under the existing plan or given the opportunity to switch to the new plan.

**Leadership:**
- Senior Vice President for Finance and Business - Primary
- Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of the College of Medicine - Primary
- Executive Vice President and Provost
- President
- University Faculty Senate

### 7.4 Strategy: Develop Frameworks for Greater Budgeting and Staffing Flexibility

**Action:** Currently, the costs for faculty and staff benefits including health care and retirement are budgeted centrally by the University. Thus, the costs to the institution of additional faculty and staff hiring do not enter directly into the expenditure decisions of unit leaders. There are clearly advantages to the current model of centrally pooled benefits budgeting, but the disadvantage is also apparent in that benefits essentially become a “free good” at the unit operating level.

The University should explore various possibilities of change to the current model. Change could include, at the least, the sharing of information with unit executives concerning the costs of existing employees and the additional costs of future faculty and staff. Alternatively, while keeping benefits costs budgeted centrally, units could be provided with an allocation of benefits for current employees and required to transfer permanent funds to central administration to cover benefits for additional new employees.

The University has created many programs in recent years to support staff development and leadership, which have been, by all indications, very successful in improving the quality and performance of staff. These programs should be continued and shifted to an even greater focus on flexibility and cross-training for a wider range of responsibilities. Such development provides greater opportunities for staff personal and professional growth, as well as opportunities for the University to adjust to changing workforce requirements. Similarly, the use of less-than-full-time and less-than-full-year staff appointments should be expanded both to accommodate growing staff interest in such appointments and to improve the efficiency of academic and administrative operations that may not require traditional full time appointments.

**Leadership:**
- Senior Vice President for Finance and Business - Primary
- President and Budget Task Force
7.5 Strategy: Modify Central Recycling and Introduce Investment Models for New Initiatives

Action: The University has followed a strategy of unit budget recycling since 1992-93, recycling $173 million in recurring funds from operating budgets, and shifting considerable resources from administrative to academic units. These recycled funds have provided the means to keep faculty and staff salaries and benefits at competitive levels with Penn State’s peers, to provide some limited funding for new strategic initiatives, and to keep tuition lower than it would otherwise have been for our students. This recycling has averaged about 1.0 percent per year, and while academic units have collectively received more funding in other forms than they have recycled, all budgetary units have lost flexibility and much of their already meager department allotments that support their operations. While not devastating in any single year, the cumulative effect of annual recycling has created great “fatigue” among both academic and support units across the University, and is now impacting basic service levels and necessary capabilities.

The University must re-evaluate its approach to recycling and consider moving away from across-the-board, horizontal recycling to a model of differential recycling based upon the comprehensive approach to program review resulting in consolidation, alignment, and/or elimination of programs or functions that are not absolutely necessary or may not be performing at the highest levels.

In addition, the University should consider expanding the base of any future recycling to the possible inclusion of other units beyond those funded in Educational and General (E&G) budget lines. Although some of these non-E&G functions cannot be subject to recycling (e.g., restricted research funds), others such as some auxiliary enterprises could be expected to contribute toward recycling targets.

Penn State has a relatively centralized model of resource allocation for new initiatives, particularly in the allocation of recurring (so-called “permanent”) funds, which has served the University well for many years. However, a modified approach that could be used in many, but not all cases, would be similar to an “angel investor.” Funding for new initiatives would be provided in the form of temporary funds, which would be designed to enable the new idea to be developed and implemented. Incremental revenues from successful initiatives would be shared between central administration and the operating unit. In the event an initiative did not achieve targeted performance, central administration would be entitled to initial monies generated up to some guaranteed share. If the program cannot sustain itself, it would be subject to a sunset provision and discontinued. A similar modification could be implemented for units that do not directly generate revenue, with temporary funding provided for re-engineering processes to make longer term improvements in efficiency and service delivery.
Leadership: President and Budget Task Force - Primary  
Executive Vice President and Provost  
Senior Vice President for Finance and Business

7.6 Strategy: Cap University Allocations to Outreach Beginning 2010-11

Action: Penn State, as the Commonwealth’s land-grant university, has long fulfilled a role as the major provider of outreach services to the people of Pennsylvania. This long-standing commitment has continued despite decades of falling state support as a share of the University’s General Funds budget. As state and federal funding for Cooperative Extension has largely stagnated over the past decade and more, reductions in programming have had to occur in order to cover the increased costs of faculty and staff compensation including fringe benefits. Increasing contributions from county governments have not been able to offset these declines. University funds have also had to cover more of the increasing overhead costs.

Similarly, the wide range of other University-sponsored outreach programs have grown over the past decades to the point at which, overall, Penn State operates the largest unified outreach program in the nation, reaching one out of every two households in the Commonwealth. This has meant growing costs for faculty and staff salaries and benefits of those employed in Outreach, and for growing costs of University overhead on operations, despite the considerable successes that Outreach has had in securing extramural funding for many of its programs.

Given the increasing costs of tuition and living expenses for Penn State students and the associated difficulties of funding their education, along with the declining share of state funding for outreach programming, the University can no longer rely on student tuition to support the internally funded Outreach programs to the extent it has previously. Accordingly, all other Outreach programs centrally supported by E&G funds will be placed on the same financial model as Cooperative Extension, with the University’s contribution to programming capped at the 2009-10 level going forward from that date. That is, increased Outreach salaries and fringe benefits must come from extramural sources, or be taken from the base funding the University will continue to provide, until such time as public funding for the University increases beyond inflationary levels in higher education.

Leadership: President and Budget Task Force - Primary  
Vice President for Outreach - Primary

7.7 Strategy: Promote Continuous Quality Improvement and Reward Innovation

Action: Over the past 18 years, over 850 Continuous Quality Improvement teams have worked to improve University processes across a wide range of academic and administrative units. These teams have brought together individuals from affected
units, made a comprehensive analysis of existing processes, and recommended significant changes that have saved the University millions of dollars while improving overall service provision to students, faculty, staff, alumni, and other members of the Penn State community. The University must re-dedicate itself to a new focus on CQI and making process improvements wherever it can to achieve even greater efficiencies and effectiveness.

We believe that Penn State faculty and staff represent a wealth of creativity and innovation, and these capabilities should be harnessed for even greater efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery. The University should consider developing an incentive program in which faculty and staff who bring forward workable ideas should be rewarded by sharing in the benefits of such changes.

Leadership: Executive Vice President and Provost - Primary
Senior Vice President for Finance and Business - Primary

7.8 Strategy: Establish and Foster Sustainable Environments

Action: The increasing pressures on global resources and environmental conditions make it imperative that Penn State embrace sustainability in its many dimensions in ways that would position the University as a leader nationally and internationally. The University can demonstrate its leadership in terms of the incorporation of sustainability in its educational programs, in its research and knowledge creation about global issues surrounding sustainability, and in operating its multitude of facilities across the Commonwealth. In keeping with the theme of prioritization and excellence, strategies to embrace sustainability efforts are offered with the expectation that short-term investments will be necessary but that they can lead to long-term savings.

The current economic and environmental crises affecting a wide range of everyday existence for most of the Penn State community and its constituencies provide a platform from which responses can consider the impacts on sustainability. Energy and the environment are two critically important dimensions of sustainability, but there are far more dimensions that can be considered.

Penn State has been a leader in many aspects of sustainability education and operations from its support for the Center for Sustainability to its purchases of green power. The University benefits greatly from cooperation among many academic and administrative units in making these advances possible. There are numerous academic-administrative partnerships with students and researchers in areas such as emission reduction and the efficient use and conservation of resources. Also, Finance & Business has earned multiple awards in the area of environmental stewardship, with programs such as the use of biofuels in its service fleet, adoption of a new LEED policy for all new buildings, reductions in the
University’s greenhouse gas emissions, encouraging bicycle use, an increased recycling effort that already has resulted in 50 percent recycling of all Penn State waste, and much more. Yet, more can be done to position Penn State for a greater leadership role. This will require a higher level of coordination and collaboration than has characterized the many creative, but as yet relatively small, initiatives that have been launched.

Leadership:  
President’s Council - Primary  
Senior Vice President for Finance and Business - Secondary  
Academic Leadership Council  
University Faculty Senate

Implementing the Plan and Measuring Progress

Often, when a plan is written, it becomes a shelf document and not an agenda for leadership or a guide for decision making. To ensure that the goals of this plan are realized and the strategies and actions are implemented, it is necessary to have both a plan for implementation and a means to measure progress toward meeting our goals. The Strategy Implementation Matrix in Appendix 5 identifies the prospective leadership responsible for the actions to implement each strategy, a projected start date for the strategy, the fiscal impact, and selected measures of performance. Progress will be monitored and reported periodically to the Board of Trustees, President’s Council, the Academic Leadership Council, the Faculty Senate, and other constituencies.

Measuring progress toward our goals is not new. Since 1998, Penn State has tracked and published a set of strategic performance indicators in a companion document to each of the University-level strategic plans.

In addition, planning units (such as colleges and campuses) also have established and annually tracked their own indicators. Many of these are similar, some are unique, but all are tied to Penn State and unit goals, to high quality, and to efficiency in the use of resources. Penn State’s strategic performance indicators are updated annually. The most recent report may be viewed at http://www.psu.edu/president/pia/indicators/.

At the University level, indicators have been chosen with the following explicit criteria in mind:

1. Does the measure reflect an important University-wide performance dimension?
2. Are data on this measure likely to lead to improvement?
3. Does the measure reflect Penn State’s stakeholder needs?
4. Do key stakeholders view the measure as credible?
5. Can the measure be communicated to and understood by a wide audience?
6. Is the direction clear—that is, would an increase be desirable or undesirable?
7. Is the cost/benefit relationship sensible in terms of data availability versus value?
8. Can we identify units accountable for providing the data?
9. Will the measure be sustainable over a period of years?
The Implementation Matrix including an expanded set of performance indicators to be developed will serve as a tool for organizational learning, communication, strategic change, and improvement, all in the context of existing management processes. Critical assessment of performance helps us to maximize the return to all who invest in Penn State, and to all whom Penn State serves.

When the goals of this plan have been achieved, Penn State will be closer to realizing the vision of being a global university, committed to excellence, with a passion for creating knowledge and educating leaders for a better tomorrow. We will have thought boldly and set priorities for excellence; we will have become a more student-centered University, we will have invested and built upon our areas of strength in fields of societal importance. We will have expanded access to knowledge and education to the citizens of Pennsylvania, the nation, and the world. We will have streamlined processes, increased productivity, and become even more efficient and better stewards of our fiscal and physical resources. We will have met the challenges and will have emerged a stronger university.
DATE: June 26, 2007

FROM: Rodney A. Erickson

TO: Budget Executives of Strategic Planning Units


The strategic planning process continues to evolve at Penn State as we strive to enhance excellence in a time of increased challenges and diminished resources. Changing demographics, rising costs, growing competition, declining state appropriations as a share of university budgets, and increasing national and state efforts to moderate tuition increases have come to characterize the environment in which we now operate. As we approach the end of the present three-year planning cycle, it is important to reaffirm our commitment both to strategic planning and assessment.

We also reaffirm our commitment to the six general goals outlined in the University’s current strategic plan, “Fulfilling the Promise: The Penn State Strategic Plan.” However, recent discussions concerning the University’s overall strategic plan call for some significant changes from the process that has occurred over the past ten years. First, the timeline for strategic planning needs to be lengthened again. The shorter time horizons of previous plans were meant to be more tactical in nature because of considerable uncertainties regarding Commonwealth and other funding sources; it is imperative that we now think more strategically about our University’s priorities farther into the future. Second, it will be necessary and appropriate to broaden the range of involvement in the overall University planning process given the longer-term issues and future priorities that must be confronted. Third, representation of individual constituencies must be put aside in favor of the “greater University good” as we search for ways to not only maintain, but to enhance, excellence at Penn State in a future of increasingly scarce public resources in higher education.

This fall, President Spanier will appoint a University Strategic Planning Council, a group of about a dozen members. The Council will be charged with developing the University’s overall strategic plan, drawing extensively on the various unit plans emerging from within the University, information about the external environments for Penn State and higher education, and a wealth of data and reports that are available from our own internal analyses and metrics.

President Spanier and I believe it will be a desirable part of the University-level strategic planning process to seek input from, and provide updates to, the Board of Trustees. It will be important to have the Board’s support for, and concurrence with, our ultimate plan. Therefore, representatives from among the Trustees will serve on the University Strategic Planning Council to help develop our plan for the next five years and beyond.
Penn State has traditionally utilized a top-down/bottom-up strategic planning approach, with each major planning unit defining its own planning approach, strategy for implementation of changes within the unit, and identification of measures of performance. This approach has served us well over the years in identifying strategies, innovations, best practices, and critical concerns from the major budgetary units. This unit-level planning process is valuable in its own right, and will continue to be a backbone of the next phase of University strategic planning, which will incorporate elements of the units plans into the overall plan for Penn State. The guidelines for the next cycle of unit plans should not be viewed as a rigid set of requirements. How the goals are addressed and their progress measured will continue to vary because of differences in mission, priorities, and organizational culture among budget units.

We are extending the planning cycle from three years to five years to encourage more strategic thinking. I am requesting that you develop a five-year strategic plan for your unit for the academic years 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 (the overall plan for Penn State, when completed, will begin with the 2009-10 academic year and continue through 2013-14). Please include the following elements in your unit’s strategic plan:

1. **An articulated vision of where you see your unit’s future in 5-10 years.** This vision should include an identification of those functional areas and types of programming that will be enhanced and those that will be less emphasized or eliminated in order to achieve the unit’s vision within a context of limited financial and other resources. This vision for the future should incorporate an analysis of the overarching trends and forces that are shaping the environment in which your unit operates, nationally and locally.

2. **A discussion of specific strategies for achieving the vision.** As you consider future directions, you should address the implications and impact on current capacity in areas such as enrollments, staffing requirements, budgetary resources/flexibility, and space/facilities, as appropriate to your academic or support unit. Discuss the unit’s current internal and external challenges that have been identified through benchmarking, constituent feedback, market analysis, and other assessment data, and how they will be addressed.

Be especially cognizant of major University initiatives and priorities that have implications for unit level planning. For example, units may wish to highlight interdisciplinary and cross-campus collaborations and efforts to reduce costs and improve efficiencies.

3. **(For Academic Units) A discussion of progress and initiatives in learning outcomes assessment.** Plans should include information regarding how academic assessment and efforts to review undergraduate and graduate degree programs will be accomplished, especially for those fields not subject to national accreditation reviews.

4. **Strategic performance indicators appropriate to unit level goals.** The University will continue to monitor strategic performance indicators at the university level. Units are encouraged to continue to collect data and utilize indicators appropriate to unit level goals and strategies.

5. **An indication of how elements of the Framework to Foster Diversity are incorporated into the unit’s strategic plan.** Although diversity planning will continue to occur in a parallel planning process, units should take advantage of the opportunity to incorporate related elements of their goals and commitments regarding diversity into the larger context of the unit’s future vision and strategies. Units should also incorporate other elements of climate that may be reflected in faculty and staff surveys as available.
6. A five-year recycling plan that describes those adjustments that would be necessary for the unit to recycle centrally up to 1.0% of its permanent operating budget each year. Some continued central recycling will almost assuredly be necessary to balance the University’s overall budget, providing for regular and competitive salary increases, improved facilities, and limited new strategic investments.

7. Units should identify those centrally funded, jointly funded, and/or enrollment-growth-funded (in the case of Commonwealth Campuses and Great Valley) strategic investments that would have the greatest impact in helping to achieve the unit’s articulated vision. Units should consider three possible scenarios when making their requests: (1) the unit would have at its disposal strategic investment funds (in addition to the regularly provided general salary increase funds) over the next five years equal to approximately half of those funds that would be centrally recycled, and (2) the unit would have strategic investment funds equal to the total of those funds centrally recycled by the unit, and (3) the unit would have the equivalent of its centrally recycled funds plus an increment of strategic investment funds equal to approximately 5.0 percent of its current base budget. The last of these scenarios should provide units with the opportunity to think more boldly and creatively about how they could best position themselves for future success in an environment of more plentiful resources, recognizing that only a few units may, in the end, experience such increases. It should also be noted that the University’s continuing goal is to shift relatively more of its resources to “core” instructional, research, and related support functions, and to operate administratively in the most efficient and streamlined manner possible while not adversely impacting mission critical support services.

Each unit is asked to submit to psapia@psu.edu electronically in PDF format, a five-year strategic plan to the Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment by July 1, 2008. Please refer questions to the Office at 863-8721 or email Louise Sandmeyer at lss1@psu.edu. The Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment is available to consult with units and facilitate this process.

cc: Graham Spanier
    Stephen Curley
    Louise Sandmeyer
    Rachel Smith
RE: University Strategic Planning Council

I am writing to ask you to serve on the newly created University Strategic Planning Council. I am appointing a group of individuals who can think strategically and be far reaching in their discussions about the many challenges and opportunities Penn State faces as an institution in the years ahead. It is my intent that during your deliberations you will seek input from faculty, staff, and students in addition to Trustees, alumni, and others who care about, and will contribute to, defining the vision of the future for Penn State.

The University Strategic Planning Council (USPC) will be asked to think specifically about what we hope to accomplish during the next five years and the accompanying strategies we need to embrace to achieve those goals. In addition, I would charge the Council to think beyond the next planning cycle to consider more broadly where we should be as a university in 10 to 20 years. With that vision for the future, the Council will develop the Penn State Strategic Plan for the years 2009/10 through 2013/14, seeking input from a broad group of stakeholders. Some of the issues I would like the USPC to address include the future of the Land Grant university in the 21st century; balancing student access and the associated financial aid with the increasing tuition and other resources necessary to continue Penn State’s momentum as a world-class university; strategies for building faculty strength and attracting students in a highly competitive environment; the priorities we should place on various ways to achieve greater student centeredness across the University; the relationship of the University’s strategic planning to our challenges for enhancing diversity; the Commonwealth Campuses and their respective missions; multi-campus, cross-college, and multi-disciplinary collaborations that can produce mutual gains; the implications of new information technologies for enhancing the activities of the University; and ways in which the University can operate more efficiently and effectively, including any major cost-cutting or organizational shifts that will help Penn State achieve its future vision.

This approach is a departure from the process we used in the development of the previous two University plans, which could perhaps be described as more tactical than strategic in nature. As you may recall, those plans were based an amalgamation of the strategies and initiatives identified in the three year plans submitted by the colleges and administrative units. Unit-level plans, currently in development by the various colleges, campuses, and academic and administrative support units, will again provide critically important input toward the development of the overall University plan. But I
am also asking the USPC to provide more than an amalgamation of these unit plans by considering the broader context and environment in which the University will operate in the future and to create a plan that is more strategic in nature and whose composite is greater than the simple sum of the parts. Because your task as a Council is broader than the previous two rounds of strategic planning, the Council may wish to appoint several subcommittees for selected topics that would enlist the help of individuals with specific knowledge and interests outside the membership of the USPC. The USPC will be assisted in staffing its efforts by the Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment, along with key individuals elsewhere in the institution who are most familiar with University financial resources, staffing, and other critical information.

Provost Rod Erickson has agreed to chair the University Strategic Planning Committee. I would like the USPC to develop a draft plan by the end of December 2008 so that we may have the Spring Semester of the 2008/09 academic year to receive feedback from members of our Board of Trustees, the Faculty Senate, student leaders, our Alumni Council, and other groups of key University stakeholders. This schedule will allow time to finalize the document and be prepared to launch the new plan and the associated strategies at the outset of the next planning cycle beginning with the 2009/10 academic year.

Please inform Louise Sandmeyer (lesl@psu.edu), executive director of the Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment, of your willingness to serve on the University Strategic Planning Council. An inaugural meeting of the USPC will be scheduled in the near future, and a schedule of meetings will be forthcoming following that meeting.

Thank you very much for your willingness to be involved in this important and challenging work on behalf of Penn State and its future.

Sincerely,

Graham B. Spanier

Cc:  S. Curley
     R. Erickson
     L. Sandmeyer
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University Strategic Planning Council
Membership

Rodney Erickson  Executive Vice President and Provost; Council Chair
Michael Adewumi  Vice Provost for Global Programs
                    Professor of Petroleum & Natural Gas Engineering
Daniel Alexander  Undergraduate Student, Architectural Engineering
Marianne Alexander  President Emerita of the Public Leadership Education Network;
                    Member, Board of Trustees
Ingrid Blood  Professor of Communication Sciences and Disorders,
              College of Health and Human Development;
              Chair, University Faculty Senate
Jim Broadhurst  Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Eat’n Park
                Hospitality Group, Inc.; Chairman, Board of Trustees
Melanie Doebler  Director, Public Engagement and Organizational
                Development, Penn State Public Broadcasting
Yvonne Gaudelius  Assistant Vice President and Associate Dean for
                Undergraduate Education
Lynda Goldstein  Associate Professor, English and Women’s Studies,
                Penn State Wilkes-Barre
Kevin Grigsby  Vice Dean for Faculty and Administrative Affairs, Penn
                State College of Medicine and Penn State Hershey
                Medical Center
Daniel Hagen  Professor of Animal Science, College of Agricultural
                Sciences
Samuel Hayes, Jr.  Former Majority Leader and Whip, Pennsylvania House of
                    Representatives; and former Secretary of Agriculture,
                    Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Member, Board of Trustees
Donald Heller  Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education
                Professor of Education and Senior Scientist, College of Education
Albert Horvath  Vice President for Finance and Business
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title, Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Larson</td>
<td>Dean, Eberly College of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita McDonald</td>
<td>Chancellor, Penn State DuBois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Pell</td>
<td>Sr. Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Peterson</td>
<td>Director, School of Public Affairs; Professor of Political and Public Affairs, Penn State Harrisburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Sanchez</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Provost for Educational Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Thole</td>
<td>Professor and Head, Department of Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering, College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Tyworth</td>
<td>Professor and Chair, Department of Supply Chain and Information Systems, Smeal College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Curley</td>
<td>University Budget Officer, University Budget Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dooris</td>
<td>Director of Planning Research and Assessment, Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Sandmeyer</td>
<td>Executive Director, Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Smith</td>
<td>Financial Officer and Special Assistant to the Executive Vice President and Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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University Strategic Planning Council
Task Force Membership

Achieving Academic Excellence

Daniel Larson, Chair
    Dean, Eberly College of Science
Ingrid Blood
    Professor of Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Health and Human
    Development; Chair, University Faculty Senate
Simon Bronner
    Professor of American Studies and Folklore, Penn State Harrisburg
Peter Hudson
    Director, Huck Institutes for the Life Sciences; Willaman Professor of Biology, Eberly
    College of Science
Mary Jane Irwin
    Noll Professor of Computer Science and Engineering, College of Engineering
Barbara Korner
    Dean, College of Arts and Architecture
Susan Mc Hale
    Professor, Human Development and Family Studies; Director, Social Sciences Research
    Institute and Children, Youth, and Families Consortium, College of Health and Human
    Development
Eva Pell
    Senior Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School
Anne Riley
    Member, Board of Trustees; Retired English Teacher
Carol Weisman
    Distinguished Professor of Public Health Sciences and Obstetrics and Gynecology,
    College of Medicine
Michael Dooris, Staff Support
    Director of Planning Research and Assessment, Office of Planning and Institutional
    Assessment

Campus Missions

John Romano, Chair
    Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses
Mark Burnett
    Undergraduate Student, College of the Liberal Arts
Ann Crouter
    Dean, College of Health and Human Development
Peter Johnstone
    Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Penn State Abington
Ted Junker  
Member, Board of Trustees; Retired Vice Chairman, PNC Bank Corporation

Anita McDonald  
Chancellor, Penn State DuBois

Steven Peterson  
Director, School of Public Affairs; Professor of Political and Public Affairs, Penn State Harrisburg

Anne Rohrbach  
Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Undergraduate Education

Dhushy Sathianathan  
Head of Design, Technology and Professional Programs, College of Engineering

Rachel Smith, Staff Support  
Financial Officer and Special Assistant to the Executive Vice President and Provost

Lisa Squire, Staff Support  
Senior Director, Administration, Planning and Information Technology, Office of the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses

Ensuring Student Success

Yvonne Gaudelius, Chair  
Assistant Vice President and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education

Andrea Dowhower  
Director, Student Affairs Research and Assessment, Division of Student Affairs

Hillary Gupta  
Undergraduate Student, Smeal College of Business

George Henning  
Member, Board of Trustees; Business Consultant and Retired CFO LTV Corporation

Suzanne Hickey  
Graduate Student and Assistant, Center for the Study of Higher Education

Victoria Sanchez  
Assistant Vice Provost for Educational Equity

Karen Thole  
Professor and Department Head, Department of Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering, College of Engineering

Mark Wardell  
Associate Dean, the Graduate School; Director, Office of Postdoctoral Affairs

Marianne Guidos, Staff Support  
Quality and Planning Research Associate, Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment

Information Resources, Technologies, and Services

Nancy Eaton, Chair  
Dean, University Libraries and Scholarly Communications

Daniel Alexander  
Undergraduate Student, Architectural Engineering, College of Engineering
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David DiBiase
Director, John A. Dutton e-Education Institute, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences

Henry Foley
Dean, College of Information Sciences and Technology

Kevin Morooney
Vice Provost for Information Technology

Joel Myers
Member, Board of Trustees; President, AccuWeather, Inc.

Wayne Smutz
Associate Vice President for Academic Outreach and Executive Director of Continuing and Distance Education

Eugene Tyworth
Department Chair and Professor of Supply Chain Management, Smeal College of Business

Daniel Nugent, Staff Support
Management Information Associate, Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment

Internationalizing Penn State

Robert Crane, Chair
Professor of Geography; Director, Alliance for Earth Science, Engineering and Development in Africa, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences

Michael Adewumi
Vice Provost for Global Programs

Cynthia Baldwin
Member, Board of Trustees; Partner, Duane Morris, LLP

Christian Brady
Dean, Schreyer Honors College

Pamela Hufnagel
Senior Instructor in Education, Penn State DuBois; University Faculty Senate

Peter Schiffer
Associate Vice President for Research

Barbara Sherlock, Staff Support
Planning and Improvement Associate, Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment

Land-Grant Mission

Donald Heller, Chair
Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education; Professor of Education and Senior Scientist, College of Education

Melanie Doebler
Director, Public Engagement and Organization Development, Penn State Public Broadcasting

Lynda Goldstein
Associate Professor, English and Women’s Studies, Penn State Wilkes-Barre
Anna Griswold
   Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education; Executive Director of Student
   Financial Aid
David Jones
   Member, Board of Trustees; Assistant Managing Editor (retired), New York Times
Bruce McPheron
   Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education, College of Agricultural Sciences;
   Director of the Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station
Susan Welch
   Dean, College of the Liberal Arts
Louise Sandmeyer, Staff Support
   Executive Director, Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment

**Resource Management and Revenue Enhancement**

Albert Horvath, Chair
   Vice President for Finance and Business
Deborah Blythe
   Director of Facilities Resources and Planning, Office of Physical Plant
Keith Crocker
   William Elliott Chaired Professor of Insurance and Risk Management, Smeal College of
   Business
Steve Garban
   Vice Chair, Board of Trustees; Senior Vice President for Finance and
   Operations/Treasurer Emeritus
Kevin Grigsby
   Vice Dean for Faculty and Administrative Affairs, Penn State College of Medicine and
   Penn State Hershey Medical Center
Daniel Hagen
   Professor of Animal Science, College of Agricultural Sciences
Madlyn Hanes
   Chancellor, Penn State Harrisburg
James Thomas
   Dean, Smeal College of Business
Billie Willits
   Associate Vice President for Human Resources, Finance and Business
Stephen Curley, Staff Support
   University Budget Officer, University Budget Office
# The Penn State Strategic Plan - Priorities for Excellence - 2009-2010 through 2013-2014

## Strategy Implementation Matrix

### Goal 1. Enhance Student Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Leadership (P - Primary</th>
<th>S - Secondary</th>
<th>O - Other)</th>
<th>Projected Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact of Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Expand Learning Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td>University Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Academic Leadership Council</td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
<td>VP and Dean for Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>Sr VP for Research and Dean of the Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Expand and Promote Opportunities for Students to Engage in Research and Active Learning</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Improve Key Student Transition Experiences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Encourage Better Advising and Student Ownership of Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Promote and Support High Quality Graduate Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Assist Students to Explore Ethical Issues in Their Professional and Personal Lives</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Selected Performance Measures

- **Percentage of academic programs with specified learning objectives**
- **Percentage of academic programs with a formal assessment plan**
- **Percentage of undergraduates who have participated in academic research with faculty outside of class, written a thesis, or completed a capstone project**
- **First-year and third-year undergraduate retention rates**
- **Four-year and six-year undergraduate graduation rates**
- **Graduate student completion rate**
- **Average graduate student time-to-degree**
- **Participation in LEAP, iLEAP, and STEP**
- **Selected measures from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) such as "Level of Academic Challenge", "Active and Collaborative Learning", "Student-Faculty Interaction", "Enriching Educational Experiences", "Supportive Campus Environment" and "Percent of students reporting having completed a practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment"**
- **Percentage of students reporting that Penn State contributed to their "developing a personal code of values and ethics"**

### Fiscal Impacts on Operating Budget

- **Cost Neutral** - no new expenditures required; no costs saved; existing resources redeployed
- **Minimal Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - mainly repogramming existing resources; less than $250,000 on a recurring basis
- **Moderate Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $250,000 to $1,000,000 on a recurring basis
- **Large Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $1,000,000 or more on a recurring basis
- **Efficiency Improvement** - creates greater efficiency and may avoid future costs

### Performance Measures Key:

Normal text - existing indicator for which a data source is defined

_Italicized text_ - new indicator for this 5-year planning cycle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2. Advance Academic Excellence and Research Prominence</th>
<th>Leadership (P - Primary  S - Secondary  O - Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fiscal Impact of Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Projected Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Focus on Faculty Recruitment and Retention for Excellence</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Foster Research, Instruction, and Outreach in Emerging, Interdisciplinary Fields of Great Societal Importance</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Enhance the College of Medicine’s Research and Clinical Capabilities in Central Pennsylvania</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Consolidate Academic and Administrative Programs through Targeted Reviews</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Acquire Additional Endowments to Enhance Faculty and Student Quality</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected Performance Measures**
- Percentage of full-time faculty with tenure or on the tenure-track
- Percentage of full-time faculty on fixed-term, multi-year appointments
- Tenure success rate
- Total research expenditures
- Number of extramural research awards
- Average amount of research awards
- Number of budgeted joint appointments
- Number of targeted reviews of academic programs
- Number of administrative programs that have been eliminated or consolidated
- Number of baccalaureate degree programs that have been eliminated or consolidated
- Number of graduate degree programs that have been eliminated or consolidated
- Number of associate degree programs that have been eliminated or consolidated
- Number of graduate assistantships and fellowships
- Total funds available for graduate assistantships and fellowships
- Number of endowed chairs, professorships, and faculty fellowships
- Percentage of tenured faculty holding endowed chairs, professorships, and faculty fellowships
- Total funds available for endowed chairs, professorships, and faculty fellowships

**Fiscal Impacts on Operating Budget**
- **Cost Neutral** - no new expenditures required; no costs saved; existing resources redeployed
- **Minimal Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - mainly reprogramming existing resources; less than $250,000 on a recurring basis
- **Moderate Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $250,000 to $1,000,000 on a recurring basis
- **Large Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $1,000,000 or more on a recurring basis
- **Efficiency Improvement** - creates greater efficiency and may avoid future costs

**Performance Measures Key:**
- Normal text - existing indicator for which a data source is defined
- Italics - new indicator for this 5-year planning cycle
### Goal 3. Realize Penn State’s Potential as a Global University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership (P - Primary  S - Secondary  O - Other)</th>
<th>Projected Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact of Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP for Global Programs</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP for Information Technology</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Dickinson School of Law</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, School of International Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Global Engagement Node institutions with whom Penn State has a defined partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of students participating in Education Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of students participating in Education Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of international visiting faculty scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of undergraduate Education Abroad participants by region of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of graduate Education Abroad participants by region of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of undergraduate international students by region of home country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of graduate international students by region of home country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of courses identified with &quot;International Cultures&quot; designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of courses with embedded international experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of students who pursue advanced foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of Total Undergraduate Enrollment by International Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of Total Graduate Enrollment by International Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fiscal Impacts on Operating Budget

- **Cost Neutral** - no new expenditures required; no costs saved; existing resources redeployed
- **Minimal Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - mainly reprogramming existing resources; less than $250,000 on a recurring basis
- **Moderate Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $250,000 to $1,000,000 on a recurring basis
- **Large Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $1,000,000 or more on a recurring basis
- **Efficiency Improvement** - creates greater efficiency and may avoid future costs

### Performance Measures Key:

- **Normal text** - existing indicator for which a data source is defined
- **Italicized text** - new indicator for this 5-year planning cycle
### Goal 4. Maintain Access/Affordability and Enhance Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership (P - Primary</th>
<th>S - Secondary</th>
<th>O - Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President and Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Provost</td>
<td>University Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Selected Performance Measures
- Amount of the tuition differential between University Park and other Penn State undergraduate campuses
- Percentage of students receiving need-based institutional scholarships
- General Funds available for need-based aid
- Total funds available for need-based aid
- Total unmet need
- Progress in meeting the "Ensuring Student Opportunity" goal of the "For the Future" capital campaign
- Percentage of full-time faculty by demographic group
- Percentage of full-time staff by demographic group
- Percentage of undergraduate enrollment by demographic group
- Six-year baccalaureate degree graduation rates by demographic group
- First-year and third-year retention rates by demographic group
- Percentage of graduate enrollment by demographic group
- Completion rates for graduate students by demographic group
- Average time-to-degree for graduate students by demographic group
- Tenure success rate of faculty by demographic group

#### Fiscal Impacts on Operating Budget
- **Cost Neutral** - no new expenditures required; no costs saved; existing resources redeployed
- **Minimal Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - mainly reprogramming existing resources; less than $250,000 on a recurring basis
- **Moderate Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $250,000 to $1,000,000 on a recurring basis
- **Large Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $1,000,000 or more on a recurring basis
- **Efficiency Improvement** - creates greater efficiency and may avoid future costs

#### Performance Measures Key:
- Normal text - existing indicator for which a data source is defined
- Italicized text - new indicator for this 5-year planning cycle
## Goal 5. Serve the People of the Commonwealth and Beyond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership (P - Primary  S - Secondary  O - Other)</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact of Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President and Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Faculty Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr VP for Finance and Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP and Dean for Undergraduate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr VP for Research and Dean of the Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP for Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP for Commonwealth Campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP for Outreach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP for Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assistant to the President for Gov’t Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Year
1/2
2/3
1
- 2

### Fiscal Impact on Operating Budget
- **Cost Neutral** - no new expenditures required; no costs saved; existing resources redeployed
- **Minimal Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - mainly reprogramming existing resources; less than $250,000 on a recurring basis
- **Moderate Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $250,000 to $1,000,000 on a recurring basis
- **Large Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $1,000,000 or more on a recurring basis
- **Efficiency Improvement** - creates greater efficiency and may avoid future costs

### Performance Measures Key:
- *Normal text* - existing indicator for which a data source is defined
- *Italicized text* - new indicator for this 5-year planning cycle

### Selected Performance Measures
- **5.1 Deliver More PSU Programming Using Technology and Media**
  - Number of online/blended learning courses
  - Headcount enrollment in online/blended learning courses with breakout for resident instruction
- **5.2 Consolidate Specialized Services at Regional and Campus Sites**
  - Percentage of resident instruction students taking World Campus courses
- **5.3 Share Programs, Faculty, Staff, and Facilities within Regions**
  - Number of community outreach functions co-located at a Penn State campus
  - Enrollment in academic programs shared within regions
  - Number of faculty and staff shared across campuses
  - Non-traditional student enrollments
  - Pennsylvania citizens’ participation with Penn State
- **5.4 Re-Mission Some Campuses, if Necessary**
  - "Return on Investment" for Outreach programs
- **5.5 Create a More Entrepreneurial Approach to Service Delivery**
  - Enrollment in academic programs shared within regions
  - Number of faculty and staff shared across campuses
  - Non-traditional student enrollments
  - Pennsylvania citizens’ participation with Penn State
  - "Return on Investment" for Outreach programs
### The Penn State Strategic Plan - Priorities for Excellence - 2009-2010 through 2013-2014

**Strategy Implementation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 6. Use Technology to Expand Access and Opportunities</th>
<th>Leadership (P - Primary  S - Secondary  O - Other)</th>
<th>Projected Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact of Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Expand the World Campus and Other Online Educational Offerings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large Revenue Generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Invest in Robust/Flexible IT Infrastructure for Teaching, Research and Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large Investment/ Efficiency Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Re-Balance Centralized/Dispersed Facilities/Services for Greater Efficiency and Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large Investment/ Large Cost Savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Protect the Security and Integrity of the IT Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected Performance Measures**

- Enrollment in World Campus programs
- "Return on investment" for World Campus programs
- Usage and growth of digital repositories
- Percentage of faculty reporting use of Open Educational Resources (OER) materials
- Cost for "commodity" information technology services
- Percentage of faculty and staff computers with anti-virus software, spyware detection software, and adware detection software installed
- Percentage of faculty and staff laptops with full disk-drive encryption
- Percentage of Penn State’s merchants who are Payment Card Industry (PCI) compliant
- Percentage of University units meeting current security standards

**Fiscal Impacts on Operating Budget**

- **Cost Neutral** - no new expenditures required; no costs saved; existing resources redeployed
- **Minimal Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - mainly reprogramming existing resources; less than $250,000 on a recurring basis
- **Moderate Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $250,000 to $1,000,000 on a recurring basis
- **Large Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation** - $1,000,000 or more on a recurring basis
- **Efficiency Improvement** - creates greater efficiency and may avoid future costs

**Performance Measures Key:**

- Normal text - existing indicator for which a data source is defined
- *Italicized* text - new indicator for this 5-year planning cycle
### Appendix

#### Goal 7. Control Costs and Generate Additional Efficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>(P - Primary  S - Secondary  O - Other)</th>
<th>Fiscal Impacts on Operating Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Cost Neutral - no new expenditures required; no costs saved; existing resources redeployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Minimal Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation - mainly reprogramming existing resources; less than $250,000 on a recurring basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP for Finance and Business</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Moderate Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation - $250,000 to $1,000,000 on a recurring basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP for Outreach</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Large Cost Savings, Investments Required, or Net Revenue Generation - $1,000,000 or more on a recurring basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP for Information Technology</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Efficiency Improvement - creates greater efficiency and may avoid future costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected Performance Measures**
- Percentage of academic units with transparent workload policies
- Student credit hours per instructional faculty full-time equivalent
- Current credit hour
- Percentage of sections that are under-enrolled
- Percentage of sections taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty
- Utilization rate of classroom space
- Utilization rate of research space
- Enrollment in Summer Session
- Rate of increase of health care costs
- Percentage of staff on full-time, year-around appointments
- Revenue generated from "angel investor" initiatives
- Percentage of recycled funds from vertical cuts
- Number of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) teams
- Research focused on sustainability
  - Number of projects or grants
  - Dollar value of project or grants
  - Number of Academic Offerings focused on sustainability education
  - Number of Academic Offerings that incorporate sustainability into the curriculum
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Greenhouse gas reductions
- Quantity of environmentally-responsible purchases versus standard purchases

| 7.1 Improve Instructional Productivity | 45 | P O P | O 1 Large Cost Savings |
| 7.2 Better Utilize Instructional and Research Facilities | 46 | O O O O | P 1 Large Cost Savings |
| 7.3 Reduce the Rate of Increase of Health Care Costs | 48 | O O O | P 1 Large Cost Savings |
| 7.4 Develop Frameworks for Greater Budgeting and Staffing Flexibility | 49 | O | P 2 Large Cost Savings/Efficiency Improvement |
| 7.5 Modify Central Recycling and Introduce Investment Models for New Initiatives | 50 | P O | P 2 Large Cost Savings/Large Revenue Generation |
| 7.6 Cap University Allocations to Outreach (2010-11) | 51 | P | P 2 Large Cost Savings |
| 7.7 Promote Continuous Quality Improvement and Reward Innovation | 51 | P | P 1 Large Cost Savings/Efficiency Improvement |
| 7.8 Establish and Foster Sustainable Environments | 52 | O P O S | 1 Large Cost Savings/Efficiency Improvement |

**Selected Impact Measures**
- Percentage of academic units with transparent workload policies
- Student credit hours per instructional faculty full-time equivalent
- Current credit hour
- Percentage of sections that are under-enrolled
- Percentage of sections taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty
- Utilization rate of classroom space
- Utilization rate of research space
- Enrollment in Summer Session
- Rate of increase of health care costs
- Percentage of staff on full-time, year-around appointments
- Revenue generated from "angel investor" initiatives
- Percentage of recycled funds from vertical cuts
- Number of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) teams
- Research focused on sustainability
  - Number of projects or grants
  - Dollar value of project or grants
  - Number of Academic Offerings focused on sustainability education
  - Number of Academic Offerings that incorporate sustainability into the curriculum
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Greenhouse gas reductions
- Quantity of environmentally-responsible purchases versus standard purchases

**Performance Measures Key:**
- Normal text - existing indicator for which a data source is defined
- Italicized text - new indicator for this 5-year planning cycle