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Attachment A - Mission Statement
I. Nature and Scope of the Self-study

Bucknell University will conduct a comprehensive self-study with an emphasis on the close-knit relationship between the academic and residential facets of a Bucknell education. We have selected this emphasis because it is central to Bucknell’s identity as a residential liberal arts university and to its mission, which includes this statement:

*Bucknell fosters a residential, co-curricular environment in which students develop intellectual maturity, personal conviction and strength of character, informed by a deep understanding of different cultures and diverse perspectives.*

In light of technology’s changing role in society, increased competition from public and distance-learning institutions and the rising costs of private, residential universities, Bucknell will seek, through its self-study, to better understand how academics and residential life complement each other and how the university can better integrate these two facets of its purpose.

The self-study will emphasize (a) the specific goals associated with this part of Bucknell’s mission; (b) how well the university is fulfilling these goals; and (c) the processes currently being implemented to transform aspects of co-curricular life. It will be tied to current discussions of student engagement, campus climate, academic and residential space allocation and the integration of emerging technology with residential education.

II. Institutional Overview

Founded in 1846, Bucknell is a private, residential, primarily undergraduate liberal arts university located on a 400-acre campus in Lewisburg, Pa. Bucknell’s 3,500 undergraduates seek degrees in more than 50 majors and 65 minors in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Engineering. All academic programs, including engineering, are grounded in the liberal arts. A small graduate program offers master’s degrees in 11 departments and programs.

Bucknell is committed to the residential liberal arts model of higher education (see mission statement, Attachment A). The student-faculty ratio is 10:1, with 358 full-time, tenure-line faculty members employed by the university. Faculty members teach every class, and they mentor students outside of class by involving them in research, creative projects, panel discussions, conferences, field trips and more. About 85 percent of students live on campus,
including all first-year students. Students engage in a wide range of educational opportunities outside of their courses through student life programming, service projects, guest lectures, performances and study abroad experiences. Extra-curricular and social opportunities include Division I athletics along with intramural and club sports, campus activities programming, religious life offices, Greek organizations and almost 150 student-run clubs and organizations.

**Finances**

Bucknell’s operating budget in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012 is $186 million. As of June 30, 2011, its endowment was valued at $575.4 million. The 2012-13 comprehensive fee is $56,190 ($45,132 tuition, $10,812 room and board, $246 fees).

**Outcomes**

Bucknell’s retention, graduation and career placement rates are all high compared to national averages: The freshman-to-sophomore retention rate was 93.8 percent for the Class of 2014, the four-year graduation rate for students entering 2007 is 87 percent, and the six-year graduation rate for students entering 2004 is 91.3 percent. Within nine months of graduation, ninety-two percent of the Class of 2011 was employed, in graduate school, or both, and an additional five percent were engaged in volunteer activities (e.g., Vista, Peace Corps) or were traveling.

**Governance and Leadership**

Bucknell operates according to a model of shared governance. The president is a voting member of the Board. The faculty participates in monthly faculty meetings and 11 standing committees. As appropriate, policies related to specified aspects of the university’s educational program are implemented through the Colleges, the Deans of the Colleges, departments of instruction and interdepartmental programs, department chairpersons and the student government. The Bucknell Student Government serves as a forum for the expression of student opinion, concerns and ideas, and it represents the interests and promotes the welfare of all undergraduate students on the campus.

**Presidential Transition**

President John Bravman, Bucknell’s 17th president, joined the university in July 2010 following the departure of Brian C. Mitchell, who served as president from 2004-2010. Bravman came to Bucknell after a 35-year career at Stanford University, where he led the undergraduate program as the Freeman-Thornton Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and was the founding Dean of the Freshman-Sophomore Residential College. He also was the Bing Centennial Professor of Materials Science and Engineering and a Professor of Electrical Engineering, by courtesy. His numerous Stanford honors include the Walter J. Gores Award, the university’s highest teaching honor, and the Kenneth M. Cuthbertson Award, the university’s highest award.
for lifetime service. He is one of only two people in Stanford history to win both awards. Bravman has written and taught primarily in the fields of materials structure and analysis, thin-film mechanical phenomena, microelectronic reliability and high-temperature superconductivity. He earned his B.S. in Materials Science and Engineering from Stanford in 1979 and completed his master’s and doctoral degrees there. He holds a tenured position in the College of Engineering’s Department of Electrical Engineering.

Nine members of the Operations and Management Group report to President Bravman as senior leaders: the Provost, the Vice President for Communications and Community Relations, the Vice President for Library and Information Technology, the Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, the Vice President for Enrollment Management, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the General Counsel, the Director of Athletics and Recreation, and the Director of the Office of the President.

### III. Important Recent Developments

**Strategic Plan**

The university's strategic plan, *The Plan for Bucknell*, has since 2006 provided five overarching goals that serve as a guide for decision makers at all levels. The goals are: strengthen the academic core, deepen the residential experience, enhance diversity, build bridges and secure the financial future of the university. These goals were designed to work in tandem to strengthen Bucknell as a residential liberal arts university.

In accordance with this strategic plan, Bucknell has implemented a number of major developments related to the close-knit relationship between the academic and residential facets of its education. For example, in the last five years the university reduced the teaching load from six to five courses per year and added 37 tenure-line faculty to a) allow more time for faculty to focus on scholarship and pedagogy, b) increase the breadth of faculty expertise on campus and c) reduce the student-faculty ratio to 10:1. Since our last self-study, we merged Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to bring the many learning opportunities on campus under one umbrella and provide centralized leadership by the Provost, who ensures that Academic and Student Affairs align with and complement each other. In 2008, the Board of Trustees approved a Campus Master Plan that provides the blueprint for the future of our campus buildings, infrastructure and green space as we adapt our residential liberal arts environment to fulfill our mission in the 21st century.
In addition to these developments, Bucknell has recently spent significant time focusing on issues of campus climate. In 2010, President Bravman convened an ad hoc Campus Climate Task Force to examine the social climate for students. The task force’s report, issued in August 2011, identified several challenges related to alcohol consumption, student norms, intellectual engagement and diversity. Under the leadership of the Provost and the Dean of Students, Bucknell is holding a broad campus dialogue about how to strengthen the campus community and has reorganized academic and student life staff to address diversity issues. In addition to the open dialogue, six different committees comprising faculty, staff, students, and alumni were asked to take a detailed look at certain report topics. The three existing committees working on the report issues are the Coalition for Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response, the President’s Council on Diversity, and the Committee on Instruction’s Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Student Engagement. Three new committees were created as well: the Committee on a Better Fraternity/Sorority Community, the Committee on Student Leadership Development, and the Committee on Strengthening Bucknell’s Residential Community.

Curricular Developments

College of Arts & Sciences: From 2006 to 2008, the university reviewed the Common Learning Agenda (CLA), a set of general education requirements for the College of Arts and Sciences. About 80 percent of Bucknell students are enrolled in the College. Through an extensive series of surveys, forums and small-group meetings, the Curriculum Committee of the College gathered a wide range of views from the faculty, students and administration and studied general education practices at other universities and colleges.

The review reaffirmed the college’s commitment to several aspects of the CLA, including first-year foundation seminars and distribution requirements in the different academic disciplines and in a couple of topics of current interest. However, there was less enthusiasm for the CLA’s capstone (senior-level) requirement, along with a desire to alter the balance of the distribution requirements. In response to the ever-increasing importance of interdisciplinary interactions in contemporary life, a need was noted for more interdisciplinary courses, a common sophomore-level experience, a stronger environmental requirement and a language requirement. These changes were incorporated into a new Common Core Curriculum (CCC) approved by the faculty in Spring 2009. The CCC is consistent with a set of nine university-wide learning goals that were approved by the faculty in the 2007-2008 academic year. Each CCC element will be subject to ongoing assessment with a full review being conducted during the 2015-16 academic year.

The new CCC is being implemented in stages. The Class of 2011 was the last class bound by the original CLA requirements. The Classes of 2012 and 2013 are bound by the CLA but with CCC
The Class of 2014 is the first group bound by the new CCC, although some of the CCC requirements remain as electives until the new curriculum is fully implemented. The CCC will be completely implemented in the 2014-15 academic year with the implementation of a new interdisciplinary Integrated Perspectives course.

**College of Engineering:** The College of Engineering accounts for 20 percent of Bucknell students and faculty. The most significant change over the last several years was the full ABET accreditation of all College of Engineering degree programs in 2009. The Department of Biomedical Engineering underwent its very first accreditation review (this degree program was created in 2003) and received full accreditation.

Other significant curricular developments include the development of a new degree program in Computer Engineering, which will graduate its first class in 2013, the development of a new degree program in Environmental Engineering, which we expected to offer students entering Fall 2013, and a new enrollment management structure to better control the distribution of majors across the College. The new enrollment plan recently established caps for all engineering majors, whereas previously only biomedical engineering was capped. Students will still be allowed to enter the College as undecided engineering majors, and entry into a major will now be based on GPA and space available. We do not expect the distribution of students to change significantly. Caps on the civil and environmental engineering and mechanical engineering will be 48 each per graduating class, while caps on the other departments (chemical and electrical engineering) will be 35, and the cap on biomedical engineering will be 18.

Other significant curricular developments include: the Engineering Success Alliance, which supports students coming from under-resourced backgrounds in terms of both academic and college acclimation; the College’s membership in the Kern Entrepreneurship Education Network, an initiative that instills an entrepreneurial mindset among all of our engineering students; faculty-led, short-term study abroad opportunities in various parts of the world; and a new interdisciplinary design program offered between semesters.

**School of Management:** In 2008, in response to a motion by the Board of Trustees, the School of Management within the College of Arts and Sciences was established to provide a more formal and visible administrative structure for management education at Bucknell. The 550 students enrolled in the School’s degree programs comprise approximately one seventh of the university’s undergraduate student body. In academic year 2010-11, the School embarked on an effort to achieve accreditation by the Association for Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business. It has made rapid progress toward this goal.
Concurrent with the structural change, the School undertook a four-year process to revise significantly the curriculum leading to the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration degree. Consistent with the School’s commitment to a liberal arts education, students in the BSBA program continue to fulfill the general education requirements specified in the College of Arts and Science’s curriculum, the CCC (described above). In addition, they take nine and a half courses in a BSBA core curriculum composed of those fundamental courses required by all management students. Major changes to the BSBA core include an introductory management history course as the point of entry into the program, a business ethics requirement for all BSBAs, and a first-year quantitative reasoning course that lays an early foundation for analytics courses later in the program.

In addition, students now choose from four specialized major programs that replace the two previous available majors, Accounting and Management. The four new majors are Accounting and Financial Management; Global Management; Managing for Sustainability; and Markets, Innovation and Design. These programs reflect the School’s interdisciplinary approach to management education and offer opportunities for students to connect their study of management subjects to courses taken in other disciplines across the university.

The new curriculum was proposed by the School faculty in academic year 2009-10, approved by the relevant curriculum committees (School of Management, College of Arts and Sciences, and College of Engineering) and implemented in academic year 2011-12 for the graduating class of 2015.

**The University Writing Program:** The writing requirement (one first-year “W1” and two upper-level “W2” courses) is the only university-wide educational requirement. The entire Writing Program at Bucknell was reviewed during the 2005-06 academic year, and the faculty re-approved the program and its requirements in Fall 2006, along with a plan to assess student writing at Bucknell. A four-year assessment program was conducted between Fall 2007 and Spring 2011. The Composition Council of the Committee on Instruction reported the results of this assessment in Spring 2012 and will make recommendations based on the results in Fall 2012.

**Service-learning and Civic Engagement:** Bucknell is among a select group of higher education institutions that received selective classification from the Carnegie Foundation for its commitment to civic engagement. The academic service-learning program established in 2002 and the co-curricular volunteer community service operation in student life were combined in 2010 to form the Office of Civic Engagement in a common location at the front of the library. A
critical resource for faculty, students and community partners, the office supports the goals of Building Bridges and Strengthening the Academic Core in The Plan for Bucknell. This office coordinates volunteering by Greek organizations, residence hall groups, athletes and student organizations as well as academic service placements for students involved in disciplinary service-learning across the university. More than 70 courses that have a service-learning component are offered each year and more than 60 faculty have taken part in a three-day faculty development workshop on integrating service-learning and community-based research into their courses. To encourage students to act as educated citizens at the local and global levels, the Office of Civic Engagement coordinates service opportunities including local flood relief, a tutoring program at area elementary schools, support for English-language learners, a weekly hot-meal program, youth mentoring at affordable housing complexes and a new community garden.

**Effects of new technologies on fulfilling the university’s mission**

Integrating digital and residential learning is a major challenge for selective, residential liberal arts colleges and universities including Bucknell. In the last decade, the percentage of college students who have taken at least one online course has tripled (from 9.6 percent in Fall 2002 to 29.3 percent in Fall 2009). Currently, 61 percent of liberal arts colleges offer online courses, but Bucknell does not. We have, however, imported digital data in a variety of ways to complement and enhance classroom pedagogy, and we accept online coursework for transfer credit. Over the next decade, we must continue to strategically integrate digital and residential learning and adapt to a rapidly changing external context (e.g., Harvard and MIT’s edX partnership).

At Bucknell, Library and Information Technology (L&IT) operates Bertrand Library as the intellectual center of Bucknell University, maintains the electronic infrastructure on campus and ensures the security of data. L&IT is a merged organization with a staff of about 85 that reports to the Vice President for L&IT. The Division works with faculty and students to understand and meet their teaching and learning needs and to align L&IT initiatives with university and departmental goals. It also provides integrated online services to enhance access to data, information and collaborative tools. L&IT provides the administrative units of the university with resources to increase efficiency and productivity and increases ease of access to information.

L&IT has taken the lead on significant issues at the state and international level, including representing Bucknell as a founding member of the Keystone Initiative for Network Based Education and Research (KINBER). In 2010, the federal government awarded KINBER $128 million to create an educational and research network in the commonwealth. PennREN, the Pennsylvania Research and Education Network, is KINBER’s first project. It will deliver a
statewide platform for connecting its members through facilities-based fiber-optic networking. Members can use PennREN’s services and KINBER provider partners can offer open access for expanding broadband access across the commonwealth. PennREN will initially construct over 1,600 miles of fiber on a middle-mile network that will connect over 70 locations.

In collaboration with the Committee on Instruction, L&IT has taken a leadership role in bringing an Open Access policy to the faculty for its consideration. On October 4, 2011, Bucknell faculty adopted this policy for disseminating their scholarly articles. This vote was significant not only for faculty making their scholarship available to the world, but it also signified how our faculty view what happens at Bucknell in a global context. Open Access is an important element of scholarly communications, and Bucknell is taking the lead on this worldwide initiative.

IV. Expectations for the future

In order to build on the recent developments described above and further strengthen our educational offerings, Bucknell has established priority initiatives for the future. These initiatives will further strengthen our academic and residential offerings and the connection between them. Thus, the self-study and especially the findings related to emphasis questions will inform future developments, which include: providing scholarships to recruit diverse classes of highly qualified students from all socioeconomic backgrounds; increasing the university endowment -- and consequently the ratio of endowment per student -- to reduce dependence on tuition; establishing endowed professorships to recruit and retain the best senior teacher-scholars; implementing the Campus Master Plan by constructing new buildings and residence halls; expanding and enhancing existing academic centers and creating new ones based on emerging campus initiatives; and supporting faculty development, innovation, undergraduate research and student leadership.

To achieve these objectives, Bucknell launched the private phase of a $400 million comprehensive campaign in 2007. The public phase will be launched in Fall 2012, and the target for the campaign was increased to $500 million in Spring 2012. President Bravman has announced six key initiatives for this campaign: Creativity and the Arts, The International Initiative, Management in a Liberal Arts College, The Residential Initiative, Sustainability and the Environment, and the Bucknell-Geisinger Collaboration.
V. Intended Outcomes

The goals of our self-study process are as follows:

1. Through an open and transparent process, to compose a concise and constructive document that not only meets the needs of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, but also serves as a valuable tool to inform ongoing institutional planning, change and growth.

2. To promote and advance the institutional strategic priorities that enhance the close-knit relationship between academics and residential life at Bucknell.

3. To assist in clarifying both Bucknell’s long-term vision for its growth, sustainability and development within the changing field of higher education and specific action steps to achieve that vision.

4. To assess the extent to which Bucknell meets the characteristics of excellence described in the 14 Middle States Commission on Higher Education accreditation standards.

VI. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee is chaired by two faculty members, Katherine Faull, professor of German and humanities, and Tom Solomon, professor of physics and astronomy, both of whom have accumulated extensive service time on the faculty at Bucknell University (25 and 18 years, respectively) and have a wealth of knowledge of the institution and the Middle States accreditation process. Also on the Steering Committee are Mick Smyer, provost; Ed Loftus, director of strategy implementation; Param Bedi, vice president for library and information technology; Susan Lantz, dean of students; George Shields, dean of arts and sciences; Keith Buffinton, dean of engineering; and Molly O’Brien-Foelsch, associate director of news and recruitment communications. A new director of institutional research, Kevork Horissian, has been appointed and will join the steering committee starting July 1, 2012.
Trustee and Student Government involvement
To facilitate university-wide engagement in the self-study, the Steering Committee will consult regularly with two liaison groups -- one composed of Trustees and one representing the Bucknell Student Government. The Chairman of the Board of Trustees has appointed a Middle States trustee liaison group composed of seven members, including the Chairman. Provost Smyer will serve as the main point of contact with the Trustee liaison group. He meets regularly with the trustee liaison group and also provides an update report to the Academic Affairs Committee at each of its meetings. In addition, the liaison group has full access to the electronic materials used for the self-study process.

University policy dictates that committees including student representatives cannot meet when classes are not in session. Therefore, since the Steering Committee will meet regularly throughout the year, including when classes are not in session, Steering Committee members (especially the co-chairs and the Dean of Students) will communicate with representatives of the Bucknell Student Government.

Working Groups
To address the accreditation standards both comprehensively and in a way that reflects the self-study emphasis, the Steering Committee has formed six working groups. Each will have two co-chairs, one of whom is a member of the Steering Committee. This structure was designed to facilitate clear communication between the Steering Committee and the Working Groups.
In selecting working groups, the Steering Committee included a cross-section of campus constituents who will best be able to address the specific focus of each working group. Given the need to ensure members can serve on the working groups for the entirety of the time it takes to complete a Middle States re-accreditation self-study, we appointed students who are presently in their sophomore year and faculty members whose leave schedules fall outside the next three years. The six working groups are:

Group 1: Institutional Planning and Resources, which will address standards 1 (Mission/Goals), 2 (Planning/Resource Allocation), 3 (Institutional Resources) and 7 (Institutional Assessment)

Members
Co-chair from Steering Committee: Ed Loftus, Director of Strategy Implementation
Param Bedi, Vice President for Library and Information Technology
Nancy White, Professor of Economics
Mike Toole, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Associate Dean of Engineering
Dennis Hawley, Associate Vice President for Facilities
Pam Benfer, Director of Business Operations, Office of the Provost
Dan Remley, Associate Dean of Students, Office of Housing Services
Dennis Swank, Associate Vice President for Finance
Kevork Horissian, Director of Institutional Research, starting July 2012
Kathy Graham, Associate Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations
Carol Burdsal, Assistant Provost for Research
Ben Marsh, Professor of Geography

**Group 2: Governance and Administration**, which will address standards 4 (Leadership and Governance) and 5 (Administration)

**Members**
*Co-chair from Steering Committee: Mick Smyer, Provost*
Craig Mills, Trustee
Kim Daubman, Chair of Faculty, Associate Professor of Psychology
Marty Ligare, Associate Professor of Physics
Dave Surgala, Vice President for Finance and Administration
Carol Kennedy, Director, Office of the President
Kari Conrad, Associate Dean of Students

Wayne Bromfield, General Counsel
Jeff Finegan ’14, Bucknell Student Government representative

**Group 3: Engagement, Integrity and Values**, which will address standards 6 (Integrity) and 10 (Faculty)

**Members**
*Co-chair from Steering Committee: Katherine Faull, Professor of German and Humanities*
Carol White, Professor of Religion
Greg Adams, Associate Professor of Mathematics
James Baish, Professor of Biomedical and Mechanical Engineering
Chip Marrara, Assistant Dean of Students
Mark Yerger, Director of Enterprise Systems, Library and Information Technology
Serena Fujita, Jewish Chaplain
Taylor Loughery ’14, Activities and Campus Events
Tim Pavlechko, Deputy Director of Athletics
Josh Grill, Executive Director of Alumni Relations
Lea Wittie, Associate Professor of Computer Science

**Group 4: Enrollment and Campus Life**, which will address standards 8 (Student Admissions and Retention) and 9 (Student Support Services)

**Members**
- Co-chair from Steering Committee: Susan Lantz, Dean of Students
- Coralynn Davis, Associate Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies and Anthropology
- Deirdre O’Connor, Director of the Writing Center
- Stephen Apanel, Associate Director of Housing Services
- Rob Springall, Dean of Admissions
- Associate Provost for Diversity, when hired
- Lisa Veloz, Assistant Director of Enterprise System Services, Library and Information Technology
- Maisha Kelly, Senior Associate Athletics Director
- Melissa Weber, Associate Registrar
- Lynn Hoffman, Associate Professor of Education, Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
- Adam Piggott, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Committee on Campus and Student Life
- Utsav Agarwal ’14, Student representative from Committee on Campus and Student Life
- William T. Conley, Vice President for Enrollment Management

**Group 5: Educational Offerings**, which will address standards 11 (Educational Offerings), 12 (General Education) and 13 (Related Educational Activities)

**Members**
- Co-chair from Steering Committee: Tom Solomon, Professor of Physics
- John Hunter, Associate Professor of Comparative Humanities
- Tammy Hiller, Associate Professor of Management
- Robert Midkiff, Registrar, Associate Provost and Dean of Summer School Programs
- Amy Badal, Associate Dean of Students
- Rich Robbins, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences
- Margot Vigeant, Associate Professor of Chemical Engineering and Associate Dean of Engineering
- Andrew Asher, Scholarly Communications Fellow, Library and Information Technology
- Maja Ostojic ’14, Student Representative
- Marguerite Castelnau-Santorine, Bucknell en France Program Coordinator
- and Study Abroad Adviser
**Group 6: Student Assessment**, which will address standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning)

**Members**

*Co-chair from Steering Committee*: George Shields, Dean of Arts and Sciences  
Karen Marosi, Associate Dean of Engineering  
Dee Casteel, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences  
Abe Feurstein, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences  
Ann Tlusty, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences  
Candice Stefanou, Associate Professor of Education, CCC Coordinator  
Carrie Rampp, Director of Library Services and Instructional Technology  
Thomas Alexander, Associate Dean of Students, Student Diversity  
Matt Bailey, Associate Professor of Management  
Kevork Horissian, Director of Institutional Research, starting July 2012  
Jim Orbison, Professor of Engineering

**VII. Charges to the Working Groups and Guidelines for Their Reports**

*Overall charge*

Each working group is charged with addressing a subset of the Middle States 14 standards of excellence. The groups should analyze and document whether and to what extent Bucknell is meeting each standard, and the conclusions of this analysis should be accompanied by supporting data. Special attention should be paid to how those standards contribute to the emphasis identified by the Steering Committee for the self-study.

Each working group will write a draft report of its findings, along with recommendations. The draft reports will follow this template, so that they may be easily edited into a seamless final self-study report.

- An overview of the group’s charge and the questions it addressed
- An analytical discussion of the inquiry undertaken and the outcomes of that inquiry -- with links to supporting evidence -- including strengths and challenges
- An explanation of how the group’s findings and conclusions relate to the standards of Middle States and to the chosen emphasis of the self-study
Discussion of the connection of the group’s topic with those other working groups, and of any collaboration between groups that took place

Recommendations for improvement

Working groups met for the first time in Spring 2012 and worked collaboratively with the Steering Committee to formulate a series of research questions to guide the working groups’ work. Draft research questions are outlined below. Also in Spring 2012, each working group planned a strategy for data aggregation and collection. During academic year 2012-13, working groups will review and collect data corresponding to its charged standards, in consultation with relevant campus and trustee governance bodies. The groups will analyze the data and will write draft reports of findings that address the standards and the emphasis questions. The draft reports, which will be completed by the end of April 2013 will also include a small number of recommendations for next steps. The Steering Committee will then create a comprehensive self-study document from these working group reports.

The following is a draft of the research questions to guide the discussions in each of the working groups. In order to aid the groups in focusing their discussions, certain questions have been marked as pertaining to the emphasis of our self-study.

**Working Group 1: Institutional Planning and Resources**

Standards

- Mission/Goals
- Planning/Resource Allocation
- Institutional Resources
- Institutional Assessment

1. **Emphasis question.** To what extent are the claims of Bucknell’s mission statement that “Bucknell fosters a residential, co-curricular environment in which students develop intellectual maturity, personal conviction and strength of character, informed by a deep understanding of different cultures and diverse perspectives” reflected in the institution’s goals and initiatives?

2. Explain how institutional goals are developed by the University in a manner consistent with its stated mission.

3. Describe the measures by which Bucknell assesses how it is achieving its goals.
4. Describe how resource allocation process is informed by the mission and goals of the University and the planning processes currently used to conduct an internal review of the effectiveness of the allocations.

5. Define the approach by which the University integrates its strategic planning with the budget development process and how institutional planning adjusts to the economic challenges presented during the planning cycle.

6. Describe how Bucknell plans for major challenges to assure that resources are available to continue to fulfill its mission.

7. How do Bucknell’s resources compare to those of its peers and how does the University allocate those resources according to its mission and goals?

8. Describe how Bucknell uses the results of institutional assessment to ensure that resources are allocated or reallocated in a manner that supports its goals and mission.

9. Describe the methods Bucknell uses to gather data, assess progress against stated goals, and share the results of assessment with various university constituencies so that they may be acted upon.

10. To what extent are the results from assessment processes incorporated into the institution’s focus on student engagement and fostering the “living-learning community” prominent in the university’s mission?

11. Describe how the institution will incorporate the suggestions for change anticipated from this study into the planning process.

**Working Group 2: Governance and Administration**

Standards

4 Leadership and Governance

5 Administration

1. What have been the governance changes -- both in shared governance and in trustee governance -- enacted during the past five years? What were the objectives and goals for those changes, and is there evidence that the changes were successful with regard to those goals? For changes that are recent or anticipated (but too early for any data to
assess effectiveness): What are the objectives for these changes and how will their effectiveness be assessed?

This question encompasses changes in procedures for trustee governance as well as shared on-campus governance.

2. What is the current working relationship among trustees, administration, faculty, students and staff? Is there evidence that the various constituencies work together in shared governance toward a common goal? Is the current system of shared governance best aligned to achieve the goals of our self-study and of the university?

3. **Emphasis question.** What have been the changes to the administrative structure in terms of the emphasis (e.g., merging of Academic and Student Affairs)? In what ways does this structural organization contribute to and enhance the integration of academic and residential life of the university?

4. **Emphasis question.** What are the university’s leadership development programs (e.g., Student Affairs, ROTC, Athletics and elsewhere)? How do we document their impact? In what ways are student leaders empowered to take an active role in the life of the university? Are there ways in which student governance can be modified to enhance student engagement? How effectively does the university integrate student turnover in leadership with organizational continuity?

5. **Emphasis question.** Are governance and administrative procedures effective for situations where quick action is needed, especially in emergency situations where people’s lives might be at risk? As a residential campus, we have responsibility for our students’ well-being 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Are our governance and administrative procedures effective in carrying out these responsibilities?

6. What are the university’s efforts to appoint and continue to develop strategic administrative leadership (e.g., President, Provost, Deans, etc.)? What has been their impact?

7. What are processes to review and improve administrative operations? What has been the impact of changes that have been made in the administrative organizational structure?
8. Are governance procedures and policies written and distributed in a manner that is both clear and accessible? What are the mechanisms in place to promote continual review of shared governance at Bucknell?

9. What are the current student governance structures? What is their impact?

Working Group 3: Engagement, Integrity and Values

Standards

6 Integrity
10 Faculty

1. **Emphasis question.** How effectively do Bucknell’s institutional policies and practices promote personal integrity, dialogue and debate, and an inclusive community?

2. **Emphasis question.** How consistent and clear is Bucknell in communicating its stated policies of professional and student behavior to the campus? How well does it follow through on implementing its policies?

3. **Emphasis question.** How well do students understand Bucknell’s expectations for their personal integrity, trust and respect among each other?

4. **Emphasis question.** To what extent are the goals of Bucknell’s mission to “foster a residential, co-curricular environment in which students develop intellectual maturity, personal conviction and strength of character, informed by a deep understanding of different cultures and diverse perspectives,” upheld by its curriculum?

   This question overlaps with those from Working Group 5.

5. How has Bucknell dealt with student, faculty or staff grievances over the last five years? Are there any patterns that can be identified?

6. How does Bucknell address the problem of plagiarism? Are there measures underway to improve on education, communication and adjudication of cases of plagiarism?

7. How has support for faculty development changed over the last five years? What has been the impact of the change? Is support equitably distributed? Is there institutional
planning for any increase in the coming years to assist in the recruitment of the best faculty for the institution?

8. **Emphasis question.** How is the quality of instruction in all areas (broadly defined) assessed? (Instructors include Athletics coaches, adjuncts, IT services staff, Writing Program staff.) In what ways does teaching evaluation affect student engagement and campus climate?

9. What developments have there been in the support of instruction? What impact have these developments had? (e.g. Teaching and Learning Center, Library and Information Technology, Civic Engagement and Service-learning, CCC grants, grants through Provost/Deans, Mellon and Luce grants)

10. **Emphasis question.** How have the university’s characteristics, recruitment policies and profile affected the development of a diverse and engaged body of teacher-scholars?

11. To what extent do departments have different or comparable criteria for retention and tenure and promotion?

**Working Group 4: Enrollment and Campus Life**

Standards

8 Student Admissions and Retention
9 Student Support Services

1. **Emphasis question:** To what extent do the university’s admissions profile, policies, procedures and admission’s resources reflect its mission and goals?

   This question overlaps with those from Working Group 1.

2. **Emphasis question:** To what extent is the university successful in providing financial assistance to students so that it can meet its stated goals? To what extent does the university have the resources to be able to meet its long-term financial aid goals?

   This question overlaps with those from Working Group 1.

3. **Emphasis question.** How effective is the university in admitting, retaining and serving students in ways that foster an inclusive campus community?
4. To what extent are policies and procedures that related to student privacy effective, understood and consistently implemented?

5. How well does the university support students’ well-being? Are there support services for students who are “at-risk”? How are these services used and are they effective?

6. How does the university foster students’ personal and social development? How effective are the programs that are in place in doing this?

7. What kind of review has been carried out in the last five years of student services? What were the results and what changes have been implemented?

8. **Emphasis question.** Is the university providing adequate comprehensive student support services to enable it to fulfill its educational mission?

9. **Emphasis question.** How well are the university’s educational experiences that occur outside the traditional classroom integrated into the university’s overall educational goals? Are these opportunities open to all enrolled students? Are they adequately funded? Assessed? Reviewed?

10. **Emphasis question.** How effective are co-curricular opportunities in enabling students to meet the liberal arts goals of the institution?

11. **Emphasis question.** How well do physical spaces and programming contribute to campus climate and student engagement? How are these issues linked back to the planning process?

**Working Group 5: Educational Offerings**

Standards

11 Educational Offerings
12 General Education
13 Related Educational Activities

1. **Emphasis question.** In what ways is the academic life of Bucknell students influenced by the residential nature of Bucknell? How can the integration between residential and academic life be improved in the future?
2. **Emphasis question.** How well do the academic programs promote student engagement? To what extent are students challenged at an appropriate college level? How do grading policies contribute to or discourage student engagement? To what extent do tenure and promotion activities encourage faculty to teach their courses at an appropriate level?

3. **Emphasis question.** How well does the university help students find an appropriate balance between academic and non-academic activities (athletics, student organizations, Greek activities)?

4. To what extent is the new CCC being implemented in a manner that is consistent with its stated goals and objectives? How is the effectiveness of the CCC being assessed?

   This question overlaps with those from both Working Groups 1 and 6.

5. **Emphasis question.** In what ways are students and faculty able to interact with each other in one-on-one or small group settings? In what manner do these interactions advance the mission of the University?

6. How do we balance serving the interests of major-related curricula with a holistic sense of obligation to the university as a whole? How do we balance departmental responsibility of teaching general education versus major-related curriculum?

   This question is particularly relevant in light of the recent transition to a five-course teaching load and implementation of new Common Core Curriculum.

7. **Emphasis question.** In what ways are the educational offerings changing in response to new instructional technologies and pedagogical methods? What is the impact of new instructional technology on the educational outcomes? How well do we integrate digital technology and the residential model?

8. What is the role of graduate education at Bucknell? In what way does graduate education enhance undergraduate education at Bucknell?

9. **Emphasis question.** How well does Bucknell support non-classroom, “experiential learning” opportunities? How well integrated are these opportunities into the
university’s overall mission? Under what circumstances are non-classroom activities granted course credit? What are the policies that are used to grant credit for non-classroom experiences? How can we assess how these experiences contribute to student engagement on campus?

10. **Emphasis question.** How well are Bucknell’s study abroad experiences integrated into the overall curriculum and campus experience? How effective is institutional oversight of study abroad (including “Bucknell in …”) programs? How can we assess and document the extent to which study abroad experiences affect student engagement and the campus climate at Bucknell?

11. How does the university keep its academic offerings responsive to cultural changes and changes in academia while maintaining its liberal arts identity?

---

**Working Group 6: Student Assessment**

Standard 14 Assessment of Student Learning

1. Are there effective linkages between course-level and program/department-level educational goals and the overall mission of the university?

2. Are educational goals made clear to the students, along with information about how they are expected to satisfy these goals?

3. Are the results of assessment of sufficient quality so that results can be used to inform decisions?

4. Is there evidence that assessment results are being used to improve teaching at the department/program level?

5. **Emphasis question.** How is student learning assessed in out-of-classroom experiences? (This should include the residential environment.)

6. If some programs have not yet implemented sufficient assessment of their key student learning outcomes, how adequate are the plans in place to do so?
7. Is there adequate, periodic review of academic programs, and are the results of these reviews used to improve the programs?

8. How adequate is institutional support of student assessment? Is there sufficient administrative staffing to support assessment? Does the university place a sufficient value on assessment efforts?

9. Is there an institutional culture that values assessment of student learning? Is there sufficient faculty and administrative leadership? Do faculty members understand their roles in assessing student learning? Do tenure and promotion activities recognize and reward assessment of student learning?

VIII. Inventory of Support Documents

The following are among the types of documents that will be gathered over the summer to assist the working groups in their analysis.

Working Group 1: Institutional Planning and Resources

STANDARD 1: MISSION AND GOALS
Mission, values and goals
University catalog
The Plan for Bucknell

STANDARD 2: PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL
The Plan For Bucknell
Board approved goals
Comprehensive campaign presentation
Buildings and Grounds update April 2011
Student housing plan
Bucknell Cottage renovation
Academic West and South Campus plans
Examples of linkage between resource allocation and campus planning (e.g., Academic West Overview, Student Housing Overview, Project Financial Model)

STANDARD 3: INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES
Campus Master Plan
Audited financial statement
Annual endowment report
Audited financial statements of peer schools
Board of Trustees Peer Book
Committee on Planning and Budget reports
Financial and budget statements from recent fiscal years
Campus Master Plan timeline
Finance presentation 2011
Campaign progress report

**STANDARD 7: INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT**

University assessment plan
ABET accreditation
Middle States institutional profile
First-year and senior surveys
NSSE reports
Periodic departmental reviews
External reviews of programs (e.g., Residential Colleges, Weis Center for the Performing Arts, Graduate Program)
HERI faculty survey
Previous Middle States decennial report and team visit report
Previous Periodic Review Report and Middle States response

*Working Group 2: Governance and Administration*

**STANDARD 4: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE**

Charter and bylaws
Trustee handbook
Faculty and staff handbooks
Organizational chart
Trustee directory
Agendas and minutes of faculty meetings
Agendas and minutes of administrative/support staff forums

**STANDARD 5: ADMINISTRATION**

President Bravman CV
Staff handbook
Materials for trustee meetings
Administration organization chart
Working Group 3: Engagement, Integrity and Values

STANDARD 6: INTEGRITY
Report from Provost’s group on student engagement
Faculty and staff handbooks
Student handbook
NSSE reports
Wolaver Report on Student Engagement in Residential Colleges
Number of cases evaluated by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure and by the Faculty Hearing Committee (without any identifying information)
Community Conduct Board reports
University Review Committee guidelines
Departmental Review Committee guidelines
Conflict of interest document
Non-fraternization policy
Affirmative action policy and report
Sexual harassment policy

STANDARD 10: FACULTY
Faculty handbook
Faculty update 2011
Faculty publications report
Affirmative Action policy and report
Tenure and promotion guidelines
Departments’ hiring policies
HERI faculty survey
Periodic Performance (merit) review policy for faculty
Committee on Planning and Budget reports for faculty salary model
Dean’s travel funds policy
Policy on sabbatical and untenured leaves
Curricular and scholarly development grants
New program for support for grant development
International research fund
Charge/description of Teaching and Learning Center
Working Group 4: Enrollment and Campus Life

STANDARD 8: STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND RETENTION

Enrollment model
Admissions brochures
Non-enrollment student survey
Family Education Finance survey
Survey of high school seniors 2011
Visitor survey
Data from exit surveys
BSSE survey data
Financial aid and enrollment data
Classes of 2015 and 2016 admission profiles
Retention and graduation rates
NCAA report for admission and graduation rates of student athletes
Retention reports

STANDARD 9: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Campus Climate Task Force (CCTF) report
CCTF response committee reports
  ● Strengthening Our Residential Community
  ● A Better Fraternity and Sorority Community
  ● Coalition for Sexual Misconduct Response and Prevention
  ● Academic Student Engagement
  ● Student Leadership Development
  ● President’s Council on Diversity
Student handbook
Student affairs goals
Student affairs annual report
Housing task force report
Sexual misconduct task force report
Committee on Campus and Student Life (CCSL) minutes
Clery Report on campus crime statistics
Assessment surveys
  ● NSSE
  ● National Student Health Association
  ● AlcoholEdu
  ● First-year student satisfaction survey
  ● Senior satisfaction survey
Working Group 5: Educational Offerings

STANDARD 11: EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS
Course catalog
CCC
Writing program legislation and 2005 review
Academic calendar
Faculty meeting agenda and minutes
Links to course syllabi
External reviews of academic departments
Library fast facts
Instructional technology and library services opportunities for faculty
School of Management report 2009
Writing Program annual report

STANDARD 12: GENERAL EDUCATION
CCC legislation
Data on courses that satisfy CCC requirements
Data on courses that satisfy W-course (writing intensive) requirements
CLA (previous general education curriculum) documentation
Committee on Academic Advising charge and reports
External Review of Graduate Program
List of service-learning/community-based learning courses

STANDARD 13: RELATED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES
External Review of Residential College Program
Descriptions of summer research programs on campus, including federally-funded research sites and Bucknell-sponsored opportunities
Lists of students doing research, students as co-authors on papers, students attending conferences
Study abroad guidelines
Study abroad options
“Bucknell in” study abroad programs documentation
Working Group 6: Student Assessment

STANDARD 14: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Committee on Assessment charge and reports
Faculty-approved assessment plan
Committee on Instruction/faculty-approved list of university-wide educational goals
Writing Program assessment Spring 2012
Individual department/program assessment plans and data from that assessment

IX. Organization of the Self Study

The final self-study will be organized around the reports from the six working groups.
- Chapter 1: Overview and introduction
- Chapters 2-7: Working Group responses to standards and research questions
- Chapter 8: Future actions based on findings and recommendations

Editorial Style and Format

Bucknell University is currently looking into purchasing a software package that will help with the organization and style of the final self-study. The self-study will follow Bucknell’s online editorial style guide. In addition, Molly O’Brien-Foelsch, associate director of news and recruitment communications in the division of communications, has been a member of the Steering Committee from the outset and is participating in the whole self-study writing process.

Timetable for Self-study and Evaluation

Fall 2011
- Steering Committee Chairs announced
- Self-study Institute held
- Steering Committee members chosen
- Self-study design chosen
- MSCHE staff liaison schedules self-study preparation to Bucknell University

Spring 2012
- Working Groups set up
- Draft self-study design document finalized, including draft questions to the Working Groups
● Self-study design document sent to MSCHE liaison by March 30, 2012
● MSCHE staff liaison conducts self-study preparation visit (April 26, 2012)
● Revised design document submitted to MSCHE staff liaison (June 2012)
● Staff liaison approves Bucknell’s self-study design

Fall 2012
● Steering committee oversees research and reporting by Working Groups
● Working Groups gather data, discuss and formulate answers to questions

Early Spring 2013
● Working Groups submit reports to Steering Committee co-chairs
● MSCHE selects the evaluation team Chair and Bucknell approves the selection
● Chair and Bucknell select dates for team visit and Chair’s preliminary visit
● Bucknell sends a copy of self-study design to the team Chair

Late Spring 2013
● MSCHE selects evaluation team members and Bucknell approves the selection
● Co-chairs send draft self-study to Steering Committee

Fall 2013
● Campus community reviews draft self-study report
● Bucknell’s Board of Trustees reviews draft self-study report
● Bucknell sends draft self-study report to evaluation team Chair, prior to latter’s preliminary visit
● Evaluation team Chair reviews draft self-study report
● Team Chair makes preliminary visit at least four months prior to team visit
● Bucknell prepares final version of the self-study report
● Bucknell sends final report to evaluation team and to MSCHE at least six weeks prior to the team visit

Spring 2014
● Team visit
● Team report
● Bucknell response
Summer/Fall 2014
- Committee on Evaluation report meets
- MSCHE action

X. Profile of Visiting Evaluation Team

We look forward to working with members of the visiting team whom we expect with help us complete the process of evaluation of our operations and identification of areas for improvement. Members of the visiting team should have experience with predominately undergraduate institutions with a focus on residential, liberal arts education. Considering the emphasis that we have chosen for this self-study, we are particularly interested in team members with experience and insight into issues related to campus climate, student academic engagement and diversity. We are particularly interested in team members with expertise and insight into student affairs issues, especially the integration of academic and student life. For example, possible leaders in national organizations such as NASPA (National Association of Student Personnel Administrations) and ACPA (American College Personnel Association) would be welcome. As an institution with a strong core commitment to the liberal arts in addition to a nationally recognized College of Engineering and School of Management, Bucknell would benefit most from a team whose members reflect the diversity of academic offerings at Bucknell (faculty from humanities, social sciences, natural sciences and mathematics, management and engineering). Also, it would be helpful to have someone with an appreciation for the role of Division I athletics at an undergraduate institution.

As for the Team Head, the president of a residential, liberal arts institution that has successfully merged academic and student affairs would be a good choice.

Bucknell’s Peer/Aspirant List from the MSCHE region includes the following colleges and universities:

- Colgate University
- Lafayette College
- Lehigh University
- Villanova University

Other schools that are considered competitors include: Penn State, Cornell University, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, and Tufts University.
Our top choice for institutions that could provide a team chair include the following four-year Baccalaureate Institutions within the MSCHE region: Swarthmore College, Skidmore College, Bryn Mawr College and Vassar College. Other possibilities include Gettysburg College, Moravian College, and Sarah Lawrence College.
Attachment A

Mission Statement

Bucknell is a unique national university where liberal arts and professional programs complement each other. Bucknell educates men and women for a lifetime of critical thinking and strong leadership characterized by continued intellectual exploration, creativity, and imagination. A Bucknell education enables students to interact daily with faculty who exemplify a passion for learning and a dedication to teaching and scholarship. Bucknell fosters a residential, co-curricular environment in which students develop intellectual maturity, personal conviction and strength of character, informed by a deep understanding of different cultures and diverse perspectives. Bucknell seeks to educate our students to serve the common good and to promote justice in ways sensitive to the moral and ethical dimensions of life.

Bucknell’s rich history and heritage will influence its planning for the future. Bucknell’s potential as an institution of higher learning extends beyond that of a traditional liberal arts college by virtue of its larger size and expansive programs. The university’s broader spectrum of disciplines and courses of study within a diverse and active residential campus community enhance the quality of all aspects of the undergraduate experience, both in and out of the classroom.