PENNSTATE

Rodney A. Erickson
Executive Vice President and Provost of the University

The Pennsylvania State University
201 Old Main
University Park, PA 16802-1589

(814) 865-2505
FAX: (814) 863-8583
rae@psu.edu

DATE: October 25, 2011

FROM: Rodney A. Erickson

TO: Mary-Beth Krogh-Jespersen

RE: Core Council Recommendations Regarding Penn State Worthington Scranton

The Academic Program and Administrative Services Core Council ("the Core Council") has discussed the recommendations received by Madlyn Hanes, Chair, on behalf of the Campus Academic Review Coordinating Committee (CARCC) regarding the Penn State Worthington Scranton organization and operations, and the background information you have provided about the campus, its successes, and its challenges. The University Park Academic Review Coordinating Committee (UPARCC) also reviewed curricular and operational matters that might affect the University Park (UP) colleges and these comments were taken into consideration in the formulation of the CARCC recommendations to the Core Council.

The purpose of this memo is to share with you the response of the Core Council to various Penn State Worthington Scranton organizational, operational, and curricular issues and initiatives, and to make recommendations for such further changes based in the analysis and deliberations of CARCC and the Core Council.

Context

The service area of Penn State Worthington Scranton (Worthington Scranton) includes the eastern portion of Wyoming County, along with nearly all of Susquehanna, Wayne, Pike, and Lackawanna counties. According to the 2010 census, the total population of the service area was 448,630, with a school-age population of 79,244 (17% of the population). Competition for the college-age population in the region is intense, with 13 colleges and universities vying for students. According to Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) projections, school districts in the service area are expected to experience a three percent increase in total enrollments over the next decade. **(Exhibit 1: Census Data)**

Worthington Scranton, a non-residential campus, is the third largest campus of the University College (UC). It is an attractive commuter campus, enjoying new facilities and upgraded classrooms. The campus had a headcount enrollment of 1,386 in Fall 2010, which represents a five-year growth rate in headcount of ten percent or 124 students (and 135.1 FTEs). The majority of students who attend Worthington Scranton are Pennsylvania residents (98%), baccalaureate-seeking (71%), and attend full-time (79%). More than 25% of students at Worthington Scranton are adult, non-traditional. Many of these students attend part-time,

challenged by outside demands of work and family. The minority population of the campus is ten percent, equal to that of its service area. **(Exhibit 2: Historical Fall Enrollments; Exhibit 3: Fall 2010 Enrollment Profile)**

Worthington Scranton's 2010-11 annual operating budget was $11.9 million. This consisted of a permanent base budget of $8.7 million with an additional $2 million in fringe benefits, to be budgeted at the campus beginning in FY 2011-12. In 2009-10, salaries accounted for 69% of the total General Funds expenditures. Temporary funds of $1.2 million were also budgeted as a result of cumulative enrollment growth since 2005-06. **(Exhibit 4: Five-year Cumulative Tuition Revenue Growth at 100%)**

In 2009-10, the campus employed 114 full-time people, including 58 faculty positions. The current faculty profile includes 41 faculty on standing appointments, five Multi-Year Fixed Term (MYFT), and 12 Fixed Term I (FT1) positions. Since 2005, the number of faculty positions has decreased by five, while shifting toward more FT1 positions. The majority of staff positions (61%) are in the functional areas of student services and academic support. **(Exhibit 5: Official Employee Annual Reporting Counts for Campuses with Student Population >1000; Exhibit 6: Staff Counts by Function)**

Instructional costs accounted for 49% of the campus's 2009-10 expenditures, above the median for peer campuses (45%). Worthington Scranton generated 64% of student credit hours (SCH) by full-time faculty, slightly above the median (63%) among peer campuses. **(Exhibit 7: 2009-10 Instructional Costs by Campus; Exhibit 8: Percent of Total Student Credit Hours Produced by Appointment Status)**

Worthington Scranton's 2009-10 direct cost per SCH at the 000-299 levels was $251, the lowest of peer campuses (median $287) and $388 for upper-division level courses, the second lowest of peer campuses (median of $432). **(Exhibit 9: Direct Cost Per Student Credit Hour)**

Recommendations

1. Enrollment Strategies

Students are admitted to Worthington Scranton primarily through one of three "access" or entry points: first-year baccalaureate, advanced standing, and new associate degree students. Since 2005, Worthington Scranton has realized a 48% growth (104 students) in first-year baccalaureate students. In Fall 2010, first-year baccalaureate students (321) accounted for 81% of new students. Among this cohort, direct first-choice applications totaled 263 students (82%), while 58 students were referred, choosing Worthington Scranton as their second choice. The campus admitted 41 new first-year associate degree students, a slight increase (21% or 7 students) since 2005. **(Exhibit 10: New Degree-Seeking Student Composition; Exhibit 11: Demographic Enrollment Indicators)**

The Core Council recommends that the college leadership proceed immediately to study and consider the impact of raising the minimum evaluation index (EI) to 2.20. The campus's minimum evaluation index (EI) in 2010 was 2.0 with an actual average of 2.6, on par with the similarly-sized campuses of the University College.

The Core Council recommends the development of strategies to improve year-to-year student retention rates to 80% in the next three years, a goal for all Commonwealth Campuses. Worthington Scranton's one-year retention rate for the Fall 2010 first-time, full-time baccalaureate cohort was 69%, below the median for comparably-sized campuses (76%).

The Core Council recommends that the campus study its graduation rates to determine the reasons for the relatively lower graduation rates and higher than average time-to-degree, and to develop strategies to improve six-year graduation rates for students who remain at Worthington Scranton. The campus has demonstrated a lower six-year graduation rate as compared to its peer campuses. In a study of the Fall 2003 cohort of first-time, full-time baccalaureate degree seeking students, 40% (80/206 students) of this cohort graduated from Penn State within six years. Of the non-graduating students, 56% (70/126) transferred to another institution, and 44% (56/126) are still enrolled at Penn State or not enrolled elsewhere. Worthington Scranton students who changed assignment to University Park graduated at a lower rate than those who started at UP (86% versus 91.0%); with time-to-degree of 4.75 years vs. 4.41 years for students who started and completed at UP. However, students who started and remained at Worthington Scranton were less likely to graduate in six years (average of 23%) with average time-to-degree of 5.14 years. The Core Council endorses the goal of increasing graduation rates for students who remain at Worthington Scranton to 55%, a minimum expectation for all University College campuses. (Dooris and Yin, 2010: http://www.psu.edu/president/pia/eis/Students/ChangeOfAssignment/)

Like many Commonwealth Campuses, Worthington Scranton has been challenged to build upper-division enrollment through growth at the junior access point. Advanced standing admission, change of assignment (CHOA), and retention of students who begin at the campus and remain to complete their baccalaureate study present opportunities to increase upper-division enrollment. Worthington Scranton admitted 34 advanced standing students in Fall 2010. CHOA students to Worthington Scranton totaled nine in 2010, the lowest number in over a decade. Of students admitted to the campus in Fall 2008, 49 remained to complete baccalaureate study and 131 transitioned to UP, well below the campus target (189).

The Core Council recommends in its review of the campuses as a whole that each campus, in consultation with the vice president for Commonwealth Campuses (VPCC), drive appropriate strategic initiatives to maximize the use of each student access point, control CHOA movement to UP, while fostering more campus-to-campus CHOA among

Commonwealth Campuses, and increase the number of advanced standing transfer students through articulation agreements and active communications with prospective students.

In addition to increasing the number of students retained at the originating campus to complete their baccalaureate studies, the Core Council endorses the concept of fostering an increase in the number of campus-to-campus CHOAs to campuses other than University Park; this approach should focus on increasing CHOA to campuses with strengths in particular majors and/or those campuses with a wider variety of majors from which to choose. This is especially important for otherwise qualified students who may encounter difficulty entering UP majors in controlled environments or whose majors are unavailable at the originating campuses. The number of campus-to-campus student transitions has incrementally increased in recent years. In 2009-2010 over 900 students changed assignment from one Commonwealth Campus to another. Although numbers vary across campuses, each campus, including Worthington Scranton, received some CHOA students.

The Core Council recommends the development of strategies to increase the retention of students at Worthington Scranton and to support the transition of students to other Commonwealth Campuses to complete majors not otherwise available at the campus. The offices of the VPCC and vice president and dean for Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) will be identifying new central mechanisms in the near future for communicating more systematically to students in the sophomore year prior to their entrance-to-major, informing them of options available University-wide and redirecting them to campus choices for the majors they are seeking. **The Core Council recognizes that seamless transitions will also require concerted local efforts in academic advising and recommends that the campus leadership assure that the necessary academic services are in place to facilitate student transitions.**

The Core Council recommends the development of program articulation agreements with community colleges, in consultation with the offices of the VPCC and VPDUE, and the implementation of dual advising practices (e.g., a "best practice" of Penn State Harrisburg and Harrisburg Area Community College) to facilitate a seamless transfer process. Strengthened relations with community colleges through articulation agreements, strategic deployment of degree-completion programs for adult students (see Continuing Education) and improved retention strategies will also be necessary to continue this positive trend and to position the campus for long-term growth. Worthington Scranton is not a partner in any articulation agreements with community colleges, but in 2010, received a small number of community college students (21) from Northampton County Community College and Luzerne County Community College. The campus leadership should develop program-specific articulation agreements with these colleges in collaboration with Lehigh Valley and Wilkes-Barre.

2. Consolidation of Administrative Infrastructure

The Core Council recommends greater shared administrative infrastructure among Commonwealth Campuses, as it does for University Park colleges, to capitalize on opportunities for increased efficiency and quality of services. The Core Council recognizes that some functions require considerable personal and face-to-face interactions and may not lend themselves to inter-campus sharing.

Every campus, regardless of enrollment size, does not necessarily need one of each type of staff support position (or a faculty member in each of a wide range of disciplines) when it is possible to share such personnel. Some of this collaboration can take place within various geographic regions of the Commonwealth that would make it possible for one staff (or faculty) member to serve more than one campus. Because of larger size and greater critical mass, the stand-alone campus colleges may be able to provide some sharing of functions. Similarly, two or more smaller campuses may work collaboratively on particular infrastructure sharing; various units at the University Park campus could be drawn into the mix as well. The idea is NOT to create any additional administrative levels, but rather to have greater flexibility for staffing across the Commonwealth Campuses. The recent arrangement whereby Brandywine provides business and human resources functions for Great Valley, and the Great Valley librarian provides leadership for both the Great Valley and Abington libraries, are examples of what the Core Council is proposing. The Core Council suggests that these potential collaborations should include a broad mix of campuses working programmatically across locations, academic colleges, and the World Campus.

The Core Council recommends that the Worthington Scranton Campus leadership, in collaboration with colleagues at other campuses, work expeditiously (by Spring 2012) to develop an analysis of the potential for shared infrastructure with expectations for increased use of technology, assessments of campus expertise and capacity, and opportunities to be realized through natural attrition of faculty and staff. The OVPCC will provide planning support and reporting parameters and review planning documents, in consultation with the executive vice president and provost, in advance of the implementation of any collaborative ventures.

3. Program Performance, Collaboration, and New Program Development

Worthington Scranton offers six associate degree programs and eight baccalaureate programs. The University College conferred 179 degrees at Worthington Scranton in 2010-11, 106 baccalaureate and 73 associate. The majority of the campus's baccalaureate programs have demonstrated stable enrollments since 2005. Low-enrolled programs include Organizational Leadership (OLEAD), with enrollments between two and six students annually since 2005, and English, with one to two students enrolled since being added to the campus portfolio in 2007. Three associate degree programs—Nursing, Letters, Arts and Sciences, and Business— enroll the majority of students, while others are low-enrolled. **(Exhibit 12: Program Enrollment Details)**

The Core Council identified the following low-enrolled majors and recommends phase out (closure) or initiatives to increase enrollment with the expectation that actions will be realized by Summer 2012. The Core Council notes that new majors need time to attract students and focuses its recommendations on existing majors that, after several years, have remained small and struggling or have declined from initially satisfactory enrollments. The campus leadership will need to appropriately consult faculty and file requisite paperwork with the OVPCC, the Faculty Senate and the OVPDUE. Of course, all currently enrolled students must have adequate opportunities to complete the major.

- Phase out the associate degree in Building Engineering Technology (2BLET); enrollments declined to eight in 2010 and conferred degrees ranged from four to six in the previous three years.

- Phase out the baccalaureate degree in American Studies; enrollments have ranged from two to 14 in recent years, with seven degrees conferred in 2010-11, and two to four in each of the three previous years.

- Phase out the baccalaureate degree in Organizational Leadership; enrollments declined to four students with zero to one degree conferred in the three previous years.

- Phase out the baccalaureate degree in English; since 2007 the program has enrolled two or fewer students and conferred one degree.

- Phase out the associate degree in Information Sciences and Technology (IST); enrollments totaled nine in 2010, with zero to three degrees conferred in the three previous years. Given the low enrollment, the program has minimal to no impact on recruitment to the four-year program.

The Core Council further recommends the following in regard to new programming and program collaboration:

Explore a select few additional programs (high demand, high interest) in a consortia arrangement with other Penn State campuses. Collaboration to advance the campus's otherwise limited program portfolio is strongly encouraged. The Core Council's recommendations for the aggregate of the campuses support introducing new programs as other programs are being phased-out or consolidated as a result of targeted reviews. New programs should be strategically selected based on high prospective student demand and, to the extent possible, career-oriented. Programs delivered in a collaborative arrangement with other Penn State campuses in the region merit full consideration. New programs should also maximize faculty and related resources and give full consideration to the use of technology, video and online learning, and hybrid and blended delivery.

Academic programs must have a strong foundation of faculty on standing appointments. New programs especially need a standing faculty to guide development. The campus leadership is also advised to leverage natural attrition of retiring faculty by sharing faculty across

campuses. Tenure-line and MYFT faculty must continue to play a dominant role in undergraduate instruction. This is a university strategic Priority (Strategy 2.1 of *Priorities for Excellence*). **The Core Council recommends investment insofar as possible in tenure-line and multi-year faculty appointments to support new program development and realign its credit hour production more towards delivery by standing faculty.** The percentage of SCHs generated by part-time faculty in 2009-10 was 36%, exceeding the recommended limit (30%) for UC campuses. The campus has been fiscally conservative; clearly the use of part-time faculty has contributed to reduced instructional costs. Nevertheless over-reliance on part-time faculty raises quality concerns and, as a strategic priority, the campus is strongly encouraged to reduce the number of part-time faculty in favor of standing and MYFT faculty in the near future.

The Core Council recommends a thorough case review by the campus leadership, in consultation with the OVPCC, to reduce insofar as possible extreme or outlying practices regarding course release and supplemental II compensation. In 2010-11, Worthington Scranton paid over $150,000 in supplemental II compensation for instruction. The campus granted approximately 29 course releases (approximately 5 FTE faculty). Worthington Scranton should reduce supplemental II spending for instruction by considering alternative approaches, including increasing present section sizes, employing instructional technologies, and instituting long range planning of course schedules. Arrangements, especially those long standing ones that result in reduced individual teaching schedules, should be reexamined.

The Core Council recommends building increased faculty capability in online, hybrid or blended program delivery, providing greater opportunities for engagement in program ventures with the World Campus and other campuses and colleges. Worthington Scranton participates in a northeastern campus collaborative among five campuses exploring opportunities for sharing programs and courses. Currently, the five campuses partner in a successful weekend and evening delivery of the BSB program via Polycom for adult students. The campus collaborates via Polycom in the delivery of Chinese, German and IST lab courses with Hazleton; these approaches maximizes course enrollments and provide curricular depth. In Fall 2011, the campus is offering e-Learning Cooperative courses (eight sections; 40 seats) and one campus-based online course (history) for its resident students. Building increased academic programming capacity will assist the campus in attracting (and retaining) resident students who need greater flexibility in scheduling courses and additional course options. This capability will become increasingly important as the campus seeks to attract returning adult students and mitigate under-enrolled courses and course sections. An investment in technical and design assistance will likely be necessary; the cost of acquiring this expertise may also be shared among participating campuses.

4. Reduction of Under-enrolled Sections

The Core Council recommends the development of strategies to reduce the overall percentage of under-enrolled classes. In Fall 2009, Worthington Scranton's overall percentage of under-enrolled sections was 16%, below the mean for UC campuses (26%), and the lowest among the seven peer campuses. The campus is more efficient at the lower division level, (13% at 000-299 level) as compared to the upper division level (27% at 300-499 level), indicating excess capacity in upper-division courses. Low-enrolled majors contribute in large part to Worthington Scranton's under-enrolled course sections and create scheduling and staffing inefficiencies. The Core Council suggests that majors with small enrollments are at the heart of the under-enrollment issue and further submits that elimination of those majors (see Program Performance, Collaboration and New Program Development) will undoubtedly help to mitigate the extent of under-enrolled sections. Program collaboration across campuses, specifically for the delivery of upper-division courses, will also facilitate greater efficiencies. Enhanced schedule planning, through the development of a four-year schedule of courses for each major/program offered, accounting for prerequisites, and ensuring normal academic progress for undergraduate students, should potentially reduce the number of under-enrolled sections. Monitoring of under-enrolled courses during the registration process will facilitate mid-process adjustments to the overall schedule and space assignments. The campus leadership is asked to participate in the further development and implementation of these strategies.

5. Reduction of Developmental Course Offerings

In 2010-11, Worthington Scranton offered nine sections of developmental math (MATH 003 and 004) to 186 students, and ten sections of ENGL 004 to 174 students. These courses do not apply to graduation or fulfill General Education requirements, adding to students' time to degree and cost. **The Core Council supports the reduction in resources devoted to developmental courses at the Commonwealth Campuses, provided replacement activities and approaches are developed that will help students succeed in their chosen programs.** Refinement of testing and assessment methods to pinpoint those aspects of Math and English that represent deficiencies may lead to less than a full course of remediation. Also, the development/delivery of online alternatives, perhaps as discrete modules, may effectively bring students up to satisfactory levels of achievement. In addition, these could provide advising alternatives for meeting the Quantification (GQ) requirements for majors that do not prescribe algebra, pre-calculus, or calculus. The campus leadership is asked to engage in exploring the feasibility and efficacy of these and other approaches.

6. Global Programs

Worthington Scranton holds the international campus designation. The campus enrolled two international students in Fall 2010 and four in Fall 2011 (the latter includes complete and incomplete registrants). **The Core Council suggests in its review of the aggregate of the campuses that the current designation criteria are not sufficiently stringent, and recommends that the OVPCC with the University Office of Global Programs (UOGP), in consultation with other relevant University offices, periodically assess the criteria for designating a campus to receive international students, and that such assessments be based on quality indicators, including maintenance of a critical mass of international students, student engagement, retention and graduation rates, and student satisfaction.** These assessments may identify new or revised criteria. Worthington Scranton does not as yet have a critical mass of students. **The Core Council recommends that the campus leadership participate in an initial assessment in 2011, in conjunction with the next admissions cycle, and in periodic maintenance reviews (five-year cycles) based on new or revised quality indicators.**

7. Outreach and Continuing Education

Continuing Education (CE) has traditionally been a mix of credit and non-credit activities. An income and expense analysis for Worthington Scranton CE in 2009-10 shows that contract and non-credit programs generated revenues of $471,208 and incurred expenses of $332,119, for a gain of $139,089. Credit programming generated revenues of $158,349 and expenses of $61,813 for a gain of $95,536. The combined gain was thus $235,625. However, after accounting for administrative expenses, including fringe benefits, the CE operation incurred a net overall gain of only $29,962 in 2009-10. **(Exhibit 13 CE Income and Expense)**

The Core Council recommends a full -scale evaluation of statewide CE, led by the VPCC and vice president for Outreach, leading ultimately to a reconfiguration of the current organizational structure and greater emphasis on relevant credit programming, inter-campus program planning and revenue sharing to better serve broader populations and generate net new revenue. Financial and employee workload audits of CE activity at each campus should be completed to determine administrative costs associated with credit and non-credit activity with anticipated adjustments (redirection) in program activity and levels of efforts toward credit programming. The campus leadership is asked to participate fully in these evaluations to benefit future planning and informed program development, and to provide strategic direction for Continuing Education.

The Core Council recommends the integration of CE's credit programming portfolio within Worthington Scranton's broader academic program planning and quality assurance processes. Credit programming should realize net new CE students to the campus and avoid capturing existing resident instruction students. **Also, non-credit CE activities should be aligned more closely with Penn State's core mission and priorities.** While non-credit programming is sometimes important for the advancement of the University's goals, it

is important that the campus look critically at its alignment with University priorities, the needs of its surrounding region, and the projected return on investment before initiating non-credit activities.

The Core Council also recommends that the campus leadership implement the programs and strategies identified by the Degree Completion Task Force to attract returning adult students to the campus. Approximately 26% (over 98,350) of the campus's local population (18 and over) have some college credits but no degree. This presents exceptional opportunities for attracting net new adult learners to the campus to complete degrees.

Please report back to the Core Council the actions that have been or will be taken in response to these recommendations by January 15, 2012.

cc: Core Council
      Madlyn Hanes

EXHIBITS
PENN STATE WORTHINGTON SCRANTON

- Exhibit 1: Census Data

- Exhibit 2: Historical Fall Official Enrollments

- Exhibit 3: Fall 2010 Enrollment Profile

- Exhibit 4: Five-year Cumulative Tuition Revenue Growth at 100%

- Exhibit 5: Official Employee Annual Reporting Counts

- Exhibit 6: Staff Counts by Function

- Exhibit 7: 2009-10 Instructional Costs by Campus

- Exhibit 8: Percent of Total Student Credit Hours Produced by Appointment Status

- Exhibit 9: Direct Cost Per Student Credit Hour

- Exhibit 10: New Degree-Seeking Student Composition

- Exhibit 11: Demographic Enrollment Indicators

- Exhibit 12: Program Enrollment Details

- Exhibit 13: CE Income and Expense