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# Executive Summary

The 2020-21 assessment cycle was marked by several challenges. After a “pandemic pause” in 2019-20, programs returned to annual assessment reporting –even as uncertainties due to the ongoing pandemic persisted. Further, 2020-21 marked the first cycle reported, University-wide, in the online Assessment Management System (AMS).

Despite these challenges, 73% of University degree and certificate programs required to submit an annual report did so–just 3 percentage points below 2018-19 rates. Undergraduate submissions held at 82%, graduate submissions fell from 71% to 64%, and certificate submissions dropped from 71% to 67%. Overall, rates across the campuses and colleges, as well as between undergraduate and graduate levels varied from 11% to 100%. In summary, participation was stronger than expected.

The implementation of the AMS enhanced submission tracking and communication with programs about various aspects of their assessment practice. For example, OPAIR could determine that while 73% of degree and certificate programs submitted an annual report, fewer (61%) included assessment results from last year, and 64% included a plan for the upcoming year. This new ability to separately monitor components of an annual report support more targeted intervention for maximum impact. This includes targeting programs to support assessment planning to generate forward momentum.

The AMS further eases tracking of core practices and metrics useful for characterizing the health and maturity of assessment at Penn State. Taken together, such measures suggest that assessment practice at Penn State is moving in a positive direction. Specifically, the vast majority (91%) of required degree and certificate programs have at least one active Program Learning Objective (PLO) entered in the AMS. This first step is a prerequisite to any additional assessment activity. Among assessment methods described in this year’s submissions, 73% utilized direct measures of student performance, and 91% exhibited strong alignment between PLOs and methods. Likewise, 94% of results submitted this year utilized a pre-set performance target, and in 69% of those studies faculty reported students meeting their expectations. Overall, 65% of submitted results also included an action plan describing how the faculty plan to use the assessment results. Most importantly, perhaps, among cases in which students fell short of faculty expectations, 86% of those included an action plan.

Still, some areas deserve additional attention. While relatively few studies overall (12%), relied on grades/GPA as evidence, 89% that did so were graduate degree or certificate programs. The Assessment Team will continue to discourage this practice by engaging directly with those programs. Another area for intervention concerns degree and certificate programs with both residential and World Campus delivery. Just 36% of such programs addressed both modalities in their results as is required.

# Program Learning Outcomes Assessment at Penn State: 2020-21 Process Updates

Entering 2019-20, a primary focus for the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research (OPAIR) was the University-wide implementation of its new online Assessment Management System (AMS). In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, however, the University temporarily suspended required annual assessment reporting to provide faculty more flexibility as they quickly pivoted to online instruction during a time of unprecedented upheaval. Reporting requirements were reinstituted in 2020-21 and –for the first time—all reporting was completed using the AMS.

In 2020-21 we returned to the standard assessment reporting process and schedule (Figure 1), which culminates with a June 30th deadline for report submissions. OPAIR assessment liaisons read each submitted report and wrote formative feedback to help strengthen programs’ assessment approaches. They also consulted with the assessment leaders of various academic programs throughout the submission process to provide guidance and support, and, during the fall, met with assessment leaders wishing to discuss their feedback and plans for 2021-22.

As in previous years, OPAIR shared submission rates with academic leaders in September, to provide them with an opportunity to encourage participation among degree and certificate programs that were behind in reporting.

Figure . Assessment Reporting Timeline

# Submission Rates

OPAIR requested AY 2020-21 program assessment reports from all active, non-accredited, undergraduate and graduate degree, and for-credit certificate programs across the University. New programs in their first year and programs that were in the process of being phased out were not required to submit. In this first year of University-wide use of the AMS, a submission was counted if the degree or certificate assessment leader indicated within the AMS that their materials were ready for review. In a small number of cases, submissions failed to include the required information. Moving forward, a more rigorous definition of a submission will be employed so that assessment reports will not be counted as submitted without results or a future assessment plan. These data represent the submission rates as of January 7, 2022. The degree and certificate list against which we compare submissions originates with the registrar and is updated by OPAIR as programs are closed or new ones are opened.

We request that degree and certificate programs submit a report even if they are not documenting assessment results, which can occur if a program is relatively newly established or there are very few graduates. These reports are included in the accounting. In the case of degrees and certificates offered at multiple locations, we count each location’s offering. For doctoral programs in which students obtain a master’s degree as part of the program, but a separate master’s is not typically offered, we count only the doctorate.

Overall, 73% of degrees and certificates submitted reports. The three percent decline from 2018-19 (Figure 2) was not unexpected given the reporting hiatus in 2019-20 and the transition to reporting in the AMS. By campus group[[1]](#footnote-2) and credential type, submission rates ranged widely, including as low as 47% for University College certificates to 85% among undergraduate degrees at the Campus Colleges. Graduate and certificate (graduate and undergraduate) programs saw the lowest submission rates overall (64% and 67%; Table 1).

Compared to submission rates seen in the last reporting year (2018-19), results were mixed. Certificate programs saw a slight decrease in submissions, with 73% in 2018-19 and 67% in 2020-21. Undergraduate degree submissions decreased slightly, from 84% in 2018-19 to 82% in 2020-21. Graduate degree submissions dropped from 71% in 2018-19 to 64% in 2020-21.

There are numerous factors that can affect submission rates, including program size, with small programs struggling to find enough students to assess or the faculty to do so; a program’s control of key courses (i.e., programs where key courses are taught by faculty that are not on the same campus or in the same program); unexpected changes in assessment personnel (e.g., sabbaticals, retirements), and the degree to which academic leadership within a unit emphasizes assessment. While these factors are consistently present, sustained attention and engagement by academic administrators can have a mitigating effect and lead to improved participation. Submission rates by unit can be found in the Appendix.

Figure . 2015 - 2021 Overall Submission Rates.

Table . Submission Rates by Level and Campus Group with Number of Degree or Certificate Programs Required to Submit Assessment Reports in Parentheses.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Certificate | Graduate | Undergraduate | All Levels |
| Campus Colleges | 73% (37) | 76% (17) | 85% (97) | 81% (151) |
| Special Mission Units | 71% (14) | 93% (14) | NA (0) | 82% (28) |
| University College | 47% (15) | NA (0) | 80% (147) | 77% (162) |
| University Park | 68% (103) | 60% (189) | 84% (95) | 68% (387) |
| All Locations | 67% (169) | 64% (220) | 82% (339) | 73% (728) |

Even as degree and certificate programs must submit an annual report, there are legitimate reasons why that report may not include assessment results from the prior year (e.g., small programs engaged in multi-year data collection). Still, most submissions should include results, and overall, 61% did (Table 2). Certificate programs, which often have low enrollments that make assessment a particular challenge, reported results at the lowest rate (48%). In contrast, 71% of undergraduate degree programs included results from the prior year. Among graduate degree programs, just over half (54%) of programs submitted results.

While there are reasons programs may not have results to report, all active degree and certificate programs *should* be able to enter an assessment plan for the future. Overall, however, only 64% articulated such a future plan with their submission. Across levels, certificate and graduate degree programs most often lacked a plan (58% and 57%, respectively; Table 3). Of particular concern in terms future planning were certificate programs in the University College (33%). On the other hand, 73% of the undergraduate degree programs in the University College submitted a plan–the highest rate across campus group or level (also matched by University Park). Result and plan submission rates broken out by college and campus can be found in the Appendix.

Table . Percentage of Degree and Certificate Programs
with Assessment Results for 2020 - 2021.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Certificate | Graduate | Undergraduate | All Levels |
| Campus Colleges | 57% | 41% | 76% | 68% |
| Special Mission Units | 57% | 43% | NA | 50% |
| University College | 27% | NA | 69% | 65% |
| University Park | 47% | 56% | 71% | 57% |
| All Locations | 48% | 54% | 71% | 61% |

Table . Percentage of Degree and Certificate Programs with Assessment Plans for 2020 - 2021.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Certificate | Graduate | Undergraduate | All Levels |
| Campus Colleges | 65% | 41% | 66% | 63% |
| Special Mission Units | 64% | 57% | NA | 61% |
| University College | 33% | NA | 73% | 70% |
| University Park | 58% | 59% | 73% | 62% |
| All Locations | 58% | 57% | 71% | 64% |

# Key Components of Assessment

A degree or certificate program’s annual report includes information describing the prior year’s assessment activities, as well as plans for activities in the coming year. Embedded within are several key components that can help to capture or describe the relative health of assessment practice at Penn State. These components include identification of a program learning objective (PLO) under examination, at least one method for evaluating whether students are achieving that objective, a performance target against which student performance is measured, collected results/evidence, an interpretation of results, and an action plan describing a program’s intended use of those results.

## Program Learning Objectives

Learning assessment at Penn State centers around the identification of program learning objectives (PLOs). In its inaugural year, 91% of active degree and certificate programs in the AMS had at least one active PLO in the system (Figure 5). Of the programs lacking PLOs, roughly half are graduate degree programs. Knowledge-focused PLOs were the most commonly identified PLOs for assessment (Figure 6), suggesting that additional resources may be needed to support assessment of PLOs that reflect high-order thinking. The large proportion (51%) of unclassified PLOs is being addressed by making this a required field in the AMS.

Figure . Degree and Certificate Programs with Active PLOs.



Figure . Program Learning Objectives by Category

While assessment leaders are not required to plan assessment out beyond one year into the future, a key advantage of the AMS is the ease with which long-term, comprehensive assessment plans can be mapped out. Despite this new planning feature, Table 4 demonstrates that programs are not yet taking advantage of this functionality–unsurprising, perhaps, given the recent transition to the AMS. If Penn State wishes to encourage this assessment best practice, additional emphasis will be needed to encourage planning further into the future.

Table . Number of PLOs Slated for Assessment by Year.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Year | Number of PLOs |
| 2020 - 2021 | 685 |
| 2021 - 2022 | 664 |
| 2022 - 2023 | 68 |
| 2023 - 2024 | 15 |
| 2024 - 2025 | 14 |
| 2025 - 2026 | 11 |
| No year designated | 2211 |

## Types of Measures Employed

Once degree and certificate programs have identified PLOs to study, the next step is to select appropriate methods or measures of student performance. High quality methods are closely aligned with the PLOs they seek to measure. For example, a well-alignment might approach would to be to assess an oral communication PLO student using student performance on an oral presentation. Poor alignment would be using term papers to measure that same PLO. Where submissions included enough information for the assessment team to make a qualitative statement about alignment between PLOs and methods, 91% of methods were well-aligned.

The best evidence of student learning is produced by a combination of direct and indirect measures of student learning. Direct evidence of student learning (student performance) is stronger than indirect evidence. Of the methods used by degree and certificate programs in 2020-21 that could be easily classified as direct or indirect, 73% were direct and 27% were indirect.

Twelve percent of the measures reported for 2020-21 relied on course grades or GPA. Although grades/GPA can provide some information and are appropriate in some circumstances, OPAIR recommends direct assessment utilizing specific assignments aligned with the learning objective. This is because course grades can reflect multiple learning objectives, some of which may not align with degree or certificate program-level objectives, and because faculty teach courses differently making grades difficult to compare. While the vast majority of measures (88%) avoided the use of grades/GPA the use of grades and GPA was particularly problematic in graduate degree programs at all levels (certificate, masters, doctoral). Of the 122 methods making up the 12% using grades, 108 were in graduate degree programs. In response to this finding, OPAIR released additional resources around the limitations of and alternatives to using grades in this way (see [Assessment Resources](https://opair.psu.edu/assessment/resources/)) to support its assessment consultation work.

A key part of establishing a measure is the establishment of a performance target. A performance target provides a level of performance at, or above which faculty consider students to have met the learning objective. Without a clearly articulated performance target, it is difficult to determine whether students have met this threshold. Ninety-four percent of all measures reported with results in 2020-21 had a performance target. Of those 69% of degree and certificate programs met their performance target (Figure 8).

Figure . Conclusions Based on Performance Target.

## World Campus Programs

Among those degree and certificate programs that are offered via the World Campus either exclusively or in addition to traditional offerings, only 36% addressed World Campus students explicitly in their assessment findings. Feedback to these programs emphasized the importance of including these students in their assessments and encouraged programs to monitor the outcomes of residential and World Campus students to ensure that disparities related to the mode of instruction delivery can be addressed.

## Action Plans

The goal of learning outcomes assessment is to use evidence to either maintain or strengthen learning and the educational experiences provided to students. As a result, a particular focus of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education-Penn State’s accrediting body-is the ways in which programs use the information they gather. OPAIR staff use a degree or certificate program’s articulated action plan to gauge intentions to use assessment data. It is important to keep in mind that in the right circumstances (e.g., when students meet or exceed performance targets, or when no areas of concern are identified), that making no changes is a valid action plan. Among all findings submitted, 94% had an action plan and 86% of those that did not meet the established performance target had an action plan (Figure 9).

Figure . Results with Action Plans

# Assessment Management System Implementation

In 2019, OPAIR staff led the customization of the Nuventive online platform to support degree and certificate program assessment, unit-level strategic planning, and accreditation processes across the University. The LOA team has worked closely with Nuventive staff to develop an efficient and user-friendly interface so assessment leaders can track and report on their degree and certificate program assessment efforts and academic administrators can monitor the assessment efforts of their programs. After the initial design phase was completed, six groups were identified to pilot the new Assessment Management System (AMS): Penn State Altoona, Penn State DuBois, the College of Agricultural Sciences, all Biology baccalaureate programs, and all Health Policy and Administration baccalaureate programs. These groups were selected for the pilot because they represent different models of AMS usage – campus, college, and degree programs offered at multiple locations. Pilot programs submitted their 2018/19 assessment reports in the AMS, pilot feedback was overwhelmingly positive, and plans were in place to fully implement to system for 2019/20 reporting.

**AMS Advantages**

* Standardizes assessment process
* Minimizes repetitive data entry
* Creates an archive of all assessment efforts
* Streamlines information availability across programs
* Simplifies custom report creation
* Provides a historical archive
* Eases transitions to new assessment leaders

Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted many plans and Penn State instituted a “pandemic pause” from assessment reporting to devote time and resources to addressing the unexpected contingencies of 2020. Despite this exemption from reporting, 36 degree programs still submitted reports in the AMS, providing a beneficial, though unintended, second pilot test of the system. Although the pandemic continued to strain University resources and personnel in 2020/21, the University reconfirmed its commitment to learning outcomes assessment in 2021/22 and degree and certificate programs were once again required to submit annual assessment reports.

OPAIR staff developed extensive AMS end-user training to support the implementation. Beginning in January 2021, OPAIR conducted 14 live training sessions, engaging 216 participants, and numerous one-on-one training sessions with assessment leaders. [Detailed instruction guides and recorded trainings](https://opair.psu.edu/assessment/ams/training/) were also made available to assessment leaders and academic administrators.

Assessment leaders were asked for feedback as part of the report submission process. Positive comments related to the AMS and the assessment support provided by OPAIR were the most common theme, making up 46% of all feedback. Ten percent of comments related to improving the system for shared degree programs or other issues related to collaboration across shared programs, 8% related to real or perceived system weaknesses, and 7% related to training availability and resources. User feedback provided OPAIR with valuable insights into ways in which the interface could be further improved. Among the anticipated improvements for 2022 are a simplified submission process, improved reporting capabilities, a more efficient approach for shared programs, and updated training materials.

The planned Canvas integration, a part of the initial Nuventive contract, has been in the setup and testing phase for the past two years. This integration has faced significant technological challenges and while efforts are ongoing, we currently do not have a timeline for rollout. Some improvements requested by users, such as the ability to use rich-text formatting to include charts and tables in their narrative, are available in Nuventive but would require Penn State to adopt a new version of the system. Considering the online system “change fatigue” among University employees, OPAIR is currently holding off on moving to the new version and will reconsider next year.

The AMS is not a “magic bullet” for assessment. It is a tool that is intended to make the recording, tracking, and reporting of assessment information easier for both faculty and administrators. By making the core components of good assessment part of the system structure and making assessment more efficient and intuitive, we hope that the AMS will positively impact Penn State’s assessment culture. It is too soon to make a summative statement about its impact, but experiences during this initial year have been positive. Moreover, this year marks a baseline data that can be used in the future to assess the work of the assessors.

# Next Steps for Program Assessment

As we look ahead to upcoming assessment cycles, we draw upon experiences from the last cycle to inform future approaches and to guide where and how we apply additional energy and focus in stewarding Penn State’s learning outcomes assessment process. The following are areas of focus and initiatives we intend to engage with in the coming cycles.

* **A greater focus and push for assessment plans** – the best indicator a degree or certificate program will conduct assessment in a given cycle is whether they have a plan to follow. The enhanced tracking capabilities of the AMS allow better targeting of programs that lack plans, so we will be marshalling our efforts and partners to push for more planning.
* **A greater focus and push for submissions, overall** – a significant focus over this last cycle was transitioning assessment leaders to the AMS. While AMS training will be ongoing, the major transitional hurdle has been surmounted. This will allow us to focus efforts toward targeting programs that have not engaged and to identify and address barriers to report submissions.
* **Further decreasing the use of grades or GPA as evidence** – this has been an ongoing focus, and we have had great success in discouraging the use of grades or GPA except where it is warranted. We have already provided feedback to programs about this issue (primarily graduate programs) and developed a new training resource that explains why grades are not typically the best assessment measure but will continue to monitor new plans to discourage this approach.
* **Ensure assessment of learning in World Campus programs** – degree and certificate programs that include a World Campus component must address those populations and programs in their assessment approaches. Some programs have neglected to collect evidence from World Campus students; others have collected such evidence but have not highlighted their efforts in reporting. We have already targeted those programs in our feedback and will continue to monitor the situation into the future.
* **Continue making tweaks to AMS** – with an entire University-wide cycle of AMS use completed, we have gathered a wealth of information about what has worked well, and what can be improved in the AMS interface and processes. Using feedback we have gathered, we will work with our vendor Nuventive to make adjustments in the AMS that will have the most positive impact on our assessment leaders’ user experiences.
* **Additional, enhanced engagement with unit leaders** – we will work in the upcoming cycles to further engage campus and college leadership around the assessment process. Our experiences suggest that when leaders are engaged, faculty tend to be more engaged. Previously our interactions with leadership have been primarily with assistant and associate deans and DAAs at the campuses. We intend to develop additional outreach to deans and chancellors to bring them closer to the process.
* **Cultivate assessment champions** – we will work to identify faculty and staff within the colleges and campuses who can help communicate the importance of assessment, as well demonstrate to faculty and administrators the links between assessment, educational improvement, and strategic planning. Early conversations around this initiative have drawn on similar models of applied expertise across Penn State such as the General Education Faculty Scholars. We intend to collaborate with the Office of General Education and the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence to further foster connections between teaching practice, curricula, and assessment in courses and degree programs and certificates.

# Appendix

Table A-. Submission Rates by Campus/College.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Campus/College | \*Degree/Cert. Programs (#) | Undergrad. | Graduate | All Levels |
| Abington | 19 | 89% | NA | 89% |
| Agricultural Sciences | 57 | 72% | 10% | 30% |
| Altoona | 24 | 58% | NA | 58% |
| Arts and Architecture | 10 | 67% | 71% | 70% |
| Beaver | 7 | 86% | NA | 86% |
| Berks | 22 | 76% | 0% | 73% |
| Brandywine | 13 | 92% | NA | 92% |
| Business | 15 | 25% | 45% | 40% |
| Communications | 4 | 100% | 33% | 50% |
| DuBois | 10 | 70% | NA | 70% |
| Earth and Mineral Sciences | 35 | 82% | 54% | 63% |
| Education | 37 | 50% | 100% | 92% |
| Engineering | 52 | 100% | 98% | 98% |
| Erie | 38 | 89% | 67% | 87% |
| Fayette | 9 | 11% | NA | 11% |
| Great Valley | 14 | NA | 100% | 100% |
| Greater Allegheny | 11 | 100% | NA | 100% |
| Harrisburg | 48 | 95% | 74% | 83% |
| Hazleton | 13 | 83% | 0% | 77% |
| Health and Human Development | 25 | 75% | 54% | 64% |
| Hershey | 14 | NA | 64% | 64% |
| Information Sciences and Technology | 17 | 90% | 100% | 94% |
| Intercollege | 10 | 100% | 63% | 70% |
| Lehigh Valley | 11 | 90% | 0% | 82% |
| Liberal Arts | 88 | 75% | 43% | 59% |
| Mont Alto | 11 | 91% | NA | 91% |
| New Kensington | 9 | 89% | NA | 89% |
| Nursing | 8 | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| School of International Affairs | 5 | NA | 100% | 100% |
| Schuylkill | 12 | 67% | NA | 67% |
| Science | 24 | 100% | 58% | 79% |
| Scranton | 15 | 93% | NA | 93% |
| Shenango | 11 | 73% | NA | 73% |
| Wilkes-Barre | 18 | 65% | 0% | 61% |
| York | 11 | 73% | NA | 73% |
| Total | **728** | **79%** | **64%** | **73%** |

\*The number of programs presented in the table is the number of active programs required to submit University assessment reports. New programs, programs that are phasing out, and programs that have disciplinary accreditation with its own assessment requirements are not included in this number.

Table A-. Percentage of Certificate and Degree Programs with Assessment Results
for 2020 – 2021 by Campus/College.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Campus/College | \*Degree/Cert. Programs (#) | Undergrad. | Graduate | All Levels |
| Abington | 19 | 84% | NA | 84% |
| Agricultural Sciences | 57 | 56% | 18% | 30% |
| Altoona | 24 | 54% | NA | 54% |
| Arts and Architecture | 10 | 67% | 71% | 70% |
| Beaver | 7 | 86% | NA | 86% |
| Berks | 22 | 76% | 0% | 73% |
| Brandywine | 13 | 77% | NA | 77% |
| Business | 15 | 25% | 18% | 20% |
| Communications | 4 | 100% | 33% | 50% |
| DuBois | 10 | 40% | NA | 40% |
| Earth and Mineral Sciences | 35 | 55% | 54% | 54% |
| Education | 37 | 50% | 87% | 81% |
| Engineering | 52 | 50% | 91% | 87% |
| Erie | 38 | 77% | 67% | 76% |
| Fayette | 9 | 11% | NA | 11% |
| Great Valley | 14 | NA | 79% | 79% |
| Greater Allegheny | 12 | 75% | NA | 75% |
| Harrisburg | 48 | 81% | 41% | 58% |
| Hazleton | 13 | 75% | 0% | 69% |
| Health and Human Development | 25 | 67% | 38% | 52% |
| Hershey | 14 | NA | 21% | 21% |
| Information Sciences and Technology | 17 | 80% | 100% | 88% |
| Intercollege | 10 | 100% | 63% | 70% |
| Lehigh Valley | 11 | 70% | 0% | 64% |
| Liberal Arts | 88 | 66% | 34% | 50% |
| Mont Alto | 11 | 82% | NA | 82% |
| New Kensington | 9 | 78% | NA | 78% |
| Nursing | 8 | 0% | 100% | 63% |
| School of International Affairs | 5 | NA | 0% | 0% |
| Schuylkill | 12 | 67% | NA | 67% |
| Science | 24 | 67% | 58% | 63% |
| Scranton | 15 | 87% | NA | 87% |
| Shenango | 11 | 55% | NA | 55% |
| Wilkes-Barre | 18 | 47% | 0% | 44% |
| York | 11 | 73% | NA | 73% |
| Total | **728** | **67%** | **53%** | **61%** |

\*The number of programs presented in the table is the number of active programs required to submit University assessment reports. New programs, programs that are phasing out, and programs that have disciplinary accreditation with its own assessment requirements are not included in this number.

Table A-. Percentage of Certificate and Degree Programs
with Assessment Plans for 2020 – 2021 by Campus/College.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Campus/College | \*Degree/Cert. Programs (#) | Undergrad. | Graduate | All Levels |
| Abington | 19 | 47% | NA | 47% |
| Agricultural Sciences | 57 | 61% | 10% | 26% |
| Altoona | 24 | 54% | NA | 54% |
| Arts and Architecture | 10 | 67% | 71% | 70% |
| Beaver | 7 | 100% | NA | 100% |
| Berks | 22 | 71% | 0% | 68% |
| Brandywine | 13 | 85% | NA | 85% |
| Business | 15 | 0% | 27% | 20% |
| Communications | 4 | 100% | 33% | 50% |
| DuBois | 10 | 60% | NA | 60% |
| Earth and Mineral Sciences | 35 | 55% | 54% | 54% |
| Education | 37 | 50% | 97% | 89% |
| Engineering | 52 | 100% | 98% | 98% |
| Erie | 38 | 83% | 67% | 82% |
| Fayette | 9 | 11% | NA | 11% |
| Great Valley | 14 | NA | 93% | 93% |
| Greater Allegheny | 12 | 83% | NA | 83% |
| Harrisburg | 48 | 62% | 52% | 56% |
| Hazleton | 13 | 83% | 0% | 77% |
| Health and Human Development | 25 | 75% | 62% | 68% |
| Hershey | 14 | NA | 29% | 29% |
| Information Sciences and Technology | 17 | 70% | 100% | 82% |
| Intercollege | 10 | 100% | 63% | 70% |
| Lehigh Valley | 11 | 70% | 0% | 64% |
| Liberal Arts | 88 | 68% | 36% | 52% |
| Mont Alto | 11 | 91% | NA | 91% |
| New Kensington | 9 | 78% | NA | 78% |
| Nursing | 8 | 0% | 100% | 63% |
| School of International Affairs | 5 | NA | 100% | 100% |
| Schuylkill | 12 | 58% | NA | 58% |
| Science | 24 | 75% | 50% | 63% |
| Scranton | 15 | 93% | NA | 93% |
| Shenango | 11 | 55% | NA | 55% |
| Wilkes-Barre | 18 | 47% | 0% | 44% |
| York | 11 | 73% | NA | 73% |
| Total | **728** | **67%** | **59%** | **64%** |

\*The number of programs presented in the table is the number of active programs required to submit University assessment reports. New programs, programs that are phasing out, and programs that have disciplinary accreditation with its own assessment requirements are not included in this number.

1. The Campus Colleges are Penn State Abington, Altoona, Behrend, Berks and Harrisburg. Special Mission Units include the College of Medicine and Penn State Great Valley (All Penn State Carlisle/Dickenson Law programs are accredited, and this location has no programs that are required to participate in the University learning assessment process). The University College is Penn State Beaver, Brandywine, DuBois, Fayette, Greater Allegheny, Hazleton, Lehigh Valley, Mont Alto, New Kensington, Schuylkill, Scranton, Shenango, Wilkes-Barre, and York. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)