

**UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

**And**

**DEAN SCOTT EVENBECK**

**ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW**

## **UNIVERSITY COLLEGE/DEAN SCOTT EVENBECK ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW**

### **Introduction and Overview**

The Committee to review the performance of University College and University College Dean Scott Evenbeck was appointed by Chancellor Gerald Bepko during the spring semester, 2001. A roster of Committee members is included in Appendix A to this report.

An excerpt from Chancellor Bepko's memorandum giving the Committee its charge documents how this review has a slightly different orientation than is usual for administrative reviews (see Appendix B for the full memorandum):

Although we ordinarily conduct reviews during or after the incumbent's fifth year in office, we are conducting a review of Scott after only three years in accord with agreements reached when University College was established. Because University College is a new entity, we wish to have the benefit of advice about its establishment early in the process.

While we are interested in your assessment of Scott Evenbeck's effectiveness as Dean, we also ask that the Committee provide advice to us on how the mission and work of University College might be better realized. Implicitly, this review must encompass the leadership team Scott heads. University College is undoubtedly the single most important academic or administrative unit we have created at IUPUI in the last decade or two. Our success in achieving our vision for University College may well determine the future and fate of IUPUI. Even our graduate and graduate professional programs will be affected, since we can expect less public and state support for these areas of work until we can convincingly prove that IUPUI is fully meeting the region's needs with respect to undergraduates. Because it is new, University College has the flexibility to make adjustments that will enhance the ability to meet the hopes we have for it . . . .

The memorandum then outlined several specific areas that the Committee was asked to review, along with the generic areas that are part of the regular review of all campus administrators. Each of these specific and generic questions will be covered in this report. Additional details will be available in the appendices to this document and in files for the record. This report will address first the review issues pertaining to University College as a whole. The second

part of the report will summarize the Committee's assessment of Scott Evenbeck as Dean of University College.

During the past year, members of the Review Committee met several times as a group and as sub-groups to discuss procedures and findings among themselves, to review documents, and to interview a wide range of faculty, staff, and peer administrators regarding the performance of both Dean Evenbeck and University College. A list of individuals interviewed is included in Appendix C to this report and a list of principal documents that were reviewed is included in Appendix D. An online survey of faculty was also conducted and analyzed. The survey form is included in Appendix E to this report and a summary of the results is available in the files of the Committee. This report has also been submitted to Dean Evenbeck for review, and his comments are attached in Appendix F.

University College has the mission to assist entering students academically achieve and to facilitate their transition to degree granting units. A campus priority is to increase student retention and graduation rates. University College has established many programs to help IUPUI toward these goals and UC collaborates on many additional programs that are designed to improve retention and graduation rates significantly over time. University College is to be commended for its strong performance in such a short time; however, the committee also identified some areas that need strengthening.

The leadership performance of Dean Evenbeck was widely praised and the Committee endorses his position as Dean of UC. He has demonstrated high commitment to student success and great enthusiasm for developing support programs for students. He has been successful in managing UC resources and he has played major roles in acquiring many grants to fund UC programs. IUPUI is well known throughout higher education because of its efforts to promote student success and because of Dean Evenbeck and his staff's willingness to share UC's progress with other institutions. To build upon Dean Evenbeck's strong performance as UC Dean, a set of actions are recommended that will serve to strengthen UC.

## **UNIVERSITY COLLEGE REVIEW**

### **Background (from UC 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Report)**

IUPUI formed University College, appointed the founding faculty in 1997, and admitted the first students in summer 1998. The newly renovated UC Building was dedicated on October 2, 1998, in a ceremony that included Richard Riley, U. S. Secretary of Education. As UC's only Dean, Scott Evenbeck has

worked diligently both within and outside UC to increase academic achievement for beginning students.

University College is the academic unit at IUPUI that provides a common gateway to IUPUI's academic programs. Faculty, staff, and students of UC share in the responsibility for making IUPUI a supportive and challenging environment for learning and for creating opportunities for students to feel welcome. University College coordinates existing university resources and develops new initiatives to promote academic excellence and enhance student persistence.

The major programs and activities located in the UC building that are funded through University appropriations and private funding entities (e.g., Lilly Endowment) include orientation, Honors, academic advising, classes and adjunct academic services (e.g., Learning Communities, First-Year Success Seminar, Critical Inquiry and Structured Learning Assistance), K-12 initiatives, technology rooms to support learning, and a Learning Center that offers supplemental instruction. The newest initiatives include the development of Critical Inquiry and Structured Learning Assistance courses linked to content courses, the implementation of a Math Assistance Center to provide intensive academic support in mathematics, and a summer bridge program for newly admitted students. In addition, UC and the Center for Teaching and Learning collaborate to support student success in IUPUI's top-enrolling, introductory ("gateway") courses and to strengthen student learning through pedagogical innovation.

The primary objective for all UC programs is to increase undergraduate student academic achievement; this in turn leads to enhanced persistence and graduation. The primary target population of UC's programs is IUPUI's entering students. Retention figures, survey information, DFW rates, and other data were collected and analyzed as indicators of program success.

## **ISSUES FOR REVIEW**

This report is organized around the issues for review that were presented to the Committee by Chancellor Bepko and includes a summary of the Committee's findings, conclusions, and recommendations concerning each issue.

**1. Retention and student learning are the highest priority for University College in terms of developing programs and providing a focus for campus attention, in collaboration with the schools and the Office of Professional Development. Is University College leadership effective in providing innovation in developing programs for entering students?**

## *Findings and Conclusions*

University College provides a wide array of programs for first-year students that promote their academic development and address their needs for transition to degree granting units. Programs for entering students include New Student Orientation, First-Year Success Seminar, Learning Communities, Critical Inquiry, and Structured Learning Assistance. Other services in UC, such as academic advising, supplemental instruction, an Honors program, and the Math Assistance Center, although open to any student, are targeted for first-year students.

As stated by one of the persons interviewed, UC is a “cauldron of experimentation” for what might be possible on our campus. The UC staff has worked hard to identify the best practices from around the nation and bring them to IUPUI to be adapted to our circumstances. The leadership has regularly introduced ideas to UC and the campus, brought persons together to discuss projects, and coordinated program development, implementation, and evaluation. Leadership for these activities comes primarily from UC Deans in consultation with UC faculty and staff. UC staff and faculty members have also done a good job presenting their work at conferences and workshops so that others can learn from IUPUI.

The First-Year Success Seminar and Learning Communities represent significant examples of the capacity of the UC staff to develop and institutionalize programs. The staff, in collaboration with UC faculty, studied existing models of first-year courses; developed a template for the IUPUI course that allowed creative approaches to instructional strategies; developed the innovative approach of using instructional teams composed of a faculty member, a librarian, an advisor, and a student to teach sections through UC; stimulated the development of school specific seminars; investigated alternative structural arrangements of the seminar and other classes; and conducted extensive evaluation of the effectiveness of the seminars. Assessment has been undertaken to improve and enhance programs designed to improve retention. Concerning this particular initiative, the committee found somewhat mixed evidence on outcomes associated with the First-Year Success Seminar and UC will need to carefully monitor this and other programs to determine when modifications are warranted.

The Committee feels that UC’s success cannot be measured by the dimension of retention rates alone. Although this rate is important and reflects the ability of UC and IUPUI to motivate students for success, other parameters are of comparable importance to the assessment of UC’s future performance, including academic performance of entering students whether or not they remain at IUPUI, numbers of matriculated students who enter school majors, length of time required to select major, quality of advising and counseling students as they

determine major options, and the quality of the student educational experience on our campus. For example, the recent Hesburg Award that IUPUI received for work on Gateway courses reflects the collaborative leadership of Dean Evenbeck and UC.

Many (but not all) persons who were contacted felt that UC should continue to provide strong campus leadership for effective programs for entering students. However, concern was expressed that this leadership needs to engage more faculty members from across campus to develop programs to support entering students. More diverse participation from the campus community will enhance the university goal of institutionalizing activities and programs directed at entering students.

Furthermore, although many persons on campus appreciated program planning and coordination activities by UC, there was concern that many initiatives are developed in isolation and without the benefit of the insight of the broader campus community. Some of these concerns have arisen from lack of awareness of the programs offered by UC or lack of awareness of the efficacy of these programs. University College has posted documentation on its web site (e.g., RUSS Self-Study, Annual Reports, program descriptions) and disseminated print information, but additional communication activities will be needed to develop a better understanding of how UC is contributing to the success of entering students. Concerns were also raised about timing of initiatives and policy changes and communication with schools. School representatives sometimes felt that UC administrators did not provide sufficient notification and explanation for changes in programs and policies or fully consider the impact on those who must implement them in schools. Examples mentioned were a new policy to require an instructor's signature for withdrawal early in the semester and administrative withdrawal.

University College has contributed in significant ways to providing a positive, receptive, and helpful climate during the first year. In addition to orientation, the First-year Success Seminar, Learning Communities, Gateway courses, and advising constitute a set of experiences that are common to most entering students. UC staff members have played critical roles in institutionalizing First-Year Success Seminars and Learning Communities in UC and in academic units. Dean Evenbeck has played an important leadership role facilitating the improvement of Gateway courses. Improvements in UC Advising, which provides information about academic schools, supplemental instruction, mentoring programs, and co-curricular activities, all of which are housed in the University College Building, are important elements for helping students make a successful transition to college and their respective academic units. In sum, there is evidence that programs that existed prior to the formation of UC have been improved,

expanded dramatically, and modified during the start of UC. As a result, there is currently more coherence to the college experience for entering IUPUI students than prior to the existence of UC.

### ***Recommendations***

The UC staff has created a very positive culture for developing innovative programs focused on the academic achievement of entering college students. Although UC has many active and productive internal programs and collaborations across campus focused on student success, UC should continue to engage more faculty members (both UC faculty and others) in the development, implementation, and evaluation of existing and new policies and programs. University College staff should not hesitate to modify or discard less successful initiatives as they identify stronger and potentially more successful activities.

Dean Evenbeck and his staff have established a history of innovations in the development of learning initiatives and of being advocates and leaders for undergraduate education on campus and nationally. The dean and his executive staff have been active participants in national forums, projects, and conferences and they should continue their participation.

The UC staff should continue to ensure that there is adequate coordination and communication with academic schools on programs that facilitate the transitions of students to these schools.

**2. The University College Building should be a place for involving students in the campus. How well does the leadership use the building as an asset for the campus in terms of space and in terms of programming?**

*Findings and Conclusions*

To involve students successfully in campus activities, the leadership within UC needed to develop programs and assign space appropriately to those programs. The University College Building, originally a library, has undergone one major and one interim renovation since 1996. The major renovation provided UC its own building for its programs. The interim renovation established the Math Assistance Center, more classrooms and meeting space, and social seating areas, aimed primarily for undergraduate students and activities.

The University College Building currently houses a wide array of programs and services devoted to both pre-college and undergraduate students, especially for first and second year students. These programs include, but are not limited to, Learning Center, Upward Bound, 21st Century Scholars, College Preparatory Initiatives, Math Assistance Center, and student advising. In addition, the University College Building houses the Honors Program, the Center for Service and Learning, Student Life and Diversity, areas for student mentoring and study, offices for student organizations and an active food court.

Though its building is considered very small by some of those interviewed, considering the growth of IUPUI and changes in demographics of entering students, UC consolidates student services that are seen as contributing positively to student involvement and retention. The University College Building is seen as an accessible and inviting place for undergraduate students to receive needed academic services and to meet with friends for study or meals.

What is not clear is how the future construction of the Campus Center Building will affect use of the University College Building. Respondents, including Dean Evenbeck himself, acknowledged that not all issues were resolved about programs that would remain in the University College Building after the Campus Center building is completed. His suggestion to physically connect the current University College Building with Cavanaugh Hall and the new Campus Center is good but may be unrealistic considering the current fiscal climate.

There was strong consensus that the presence of the University College Building has increased undergraduate student curricular and co-curricular involvement on campus. Under Dean Evenbeck, management of the building's resources has been successful in housing a wide array of programs and services. He has also done an effective job of coordinating use of space with units not

directly under his administration (e.g., Student Life and Diversity, Center for Service and Learning). Outcomes of decisions regarding the Campus Center building will generate new challenges for UC leadership and Dean Evenbeck.

### *Recommendations*

The University College Building should remain, first and foremost, an academic asset for students. This role should persist when the new Campus Center Building is constructed. Given the success of locating the Math Assistance Center in the University College Building, the relocation or development of additional academic services (e.g., Writing Center) should be considered to improve the visibility and utilization of the University College Building as a learning resource by students. If more classrooms are to be configured within the University College Building after the completion of the Campus Center Building, faculty and students need to be consulted regarding classroom design.

**3. University College has been charged with developing new undergraduate student orientation in concert with all the schools along with a first-year experience for students that provides a common transition to university study while providing the degree-specific introduction appropriate for IUPUI. How well is the initiative succeeding?**

### *Findings and Conclusions*

The New Student Orientation program at IUPUI has undergone significant change in the past few years. The program now serves a large number of students and parents, has implemented a fee to support its operations, has regularly revised the nature of the program, and has developed a positive approach for providing information. The orientation staff has worked very hard to increase the visibility and involvement of the academic schools in the orientation program.

Exit surveys of students participating in Orientation offer evidence that Orientation is positively received by students and that the majority of students reported that Orientation helps them feel prepared to start school. The percentage of students giving Orientation positive ratings increased slightly from 2000 to 2001. In 2001, almost half of the students (49%) strongly agreed that “My day at the Orientation Program was beneficial,” with most of the remaining students (41%) agreeing, and only 2% of student disagreeing. In 2000, 86% of students strongly agreed or agreed that orientation was beneficial. In 2001, the vast majority of students agreed that their advisors clearly explained options and expressed interest in them as individuals (84% and 85% respectively). In 2000, these percentages were 81% and 79%. Similarly high evaluations were given for

satisfaction with schedule of classes, confidence in using e-mail, and feeling orientation staff was welcoming. Institutionalizing an Orientation program is a challenge on a commuter campus and UC is to be commended for the growth and improvement of this program.

There is still some concern expressed by academic schools that Orientation does not provide enough focus on and information about the schools. However, the majority of students responding to exit surveys at Orientation in Fall 2000 (84%) and Fall 2001 (83%) agreed that “My school’s presentation helped me understand what I will need to do to achieve my academic goals.” Some school representatives mentioned that schools do not have enough opportunity to contact students who are not dually admitted to UC and a degree-granting unit. This concern must be considered, however, in the context of the limited availability of faculty at the time during which most orientation programs are held (i.e., summer) and the need to offer first-year students general information as well as focused academic information. A UC staff member commented that the focus of New Student Orientation is already too academic; on a commuter campus more time should be spent developing survival skills and a sense of connectedness to college and the campus community. The IUPUI student body is comprised of a significant number of transfer students; the current orientation program may not adequately address the needs of transfer students as well as it does first-time freshmen.

### ***Recommendations***

University College staff should continue to build upon their successes of developing and improving programs that provide effective transitions for entering students, including transfer students. Developing widespread campus support for and understanding of the orientation program should continue to include discussions with representatives from UC, the student body, Student Life and Diversity, and degree-granting schools. UC staff members should continue to evaluate and monitor other components of the first-year experience to make programmatic adjustments that improve outcomes. University College should consider how orientation is structured (e.g., length, goals, activities) and how it relates to and is coordinated with First Year Success Seminars and other programs and experiences for entering students. University College will also need to ensure that academic programs outside their direct purview, such as Gateway courses, continue to receive attention and development. University College has recently begun a campus-wide assessment of orientation, directed by a committee of UC faculty and staff. Results from this assessment can be used in future planning of the program.

#### **4. University College seeks to establish a unique model in having the leadership of full-time tenured faculty in the context of collaborative governance. How well is this concept succeeding?**

##### *Findings and Conclusions*

The concept of collaborative governance in UC has several distinct layers. Responses collected from interviews and information gleaned from surveys indicated that campus constituents had varied views on what collaborative governance means in the context of UC and its operation. At one level, the activities of the UC faculty represent an element of the collaborative governance structure of UC. The collaborative governance of all operational levels within UC, including its faculty, represents yet another level. Consideration of this aspect is partially overlapping with staff issues in item 11 of this report. Finally, the centrality of UC at IUPUI and the services it provides students on behalf of the other IUPUI academic units represents a third collaborative layer for UC. In some respects this level of collaboration is tightly related to the issues in item 9 of this report.

Concerning the role of UC faculty members in collaborative governance, UC has established a faculty that is interested and actively involved in facilitating the academic success of undergraduate students. There is high attendance at monthly Faculty Assembly meetings and at the twice-yearly retreats. Structures exist through which UC faculty members can play an effective role in teaching, research, and service activities within UC. An extensive Committee structure involves all full and adjunct UC faculty members (as well as faculty without UC appointments) and ensures in-depth and frank discussion of issues. Satisfaction is high among active UC faculty members at this time. From the perspective of faculty involvement, there is substantial and regular engagement with the UC administration. Faculty feel that their involvement in UC's work is noticed and highly appreciated by UC administrators. This is important since UC work is "new" work, and is not always taken into account by faculty's home units when raises are considered. Information gathered from interviews with individuals familiar with the operation of UC and its faculty found a positive view of the work of the faculty. At the outset, former UEC staff members were apprehensive about faculty oversight of operations. These concerns have largely disappeared.

However, survey responses, comments from interviewees, and remarks to UC faculty from campus constituents indicated that there is some confusion or even suspicion about the role or loyalty of UC faculty to their home unit versus to UC. Opinions varied on whether or not UC should even have its own faculty. Some persons outside UC have very simplistic perceptions about the roles of UC faculty. For example, UC faculty members are chastised for not fixing "problems"

with advising. Thus, persons who often did not have good knowledge about UC and faculty roles had less positive views than those who were more familiar.

Concerning collaborative governance across UC, in Spring 1999, Marion Terenzio was brought to IUPUI as an external consultant to analyze UC and recommend an organizational structure. In her report, Dr. Terenzio recommended a consensus/collaborative structure for the unit. In response to her recommendations, a UC Steering Committee on Collaborative Governance was formed to establish this new structure. The Committee generated a set of tenets to guide its work. The most compelling of these tenets was that decision-making in UC should be horizontal, not vertical. At the Fall 1999 UC Faculty Retreat, and subsequent meetings of other UC groups (e.g., administrators, mentors, advisors, committees), the Steering Committee administered a survey to identify the major UC stakeholders for each of the primary responsibility areas within UC. The results of this survey and the steering committee's recommendations were sent to UC in December 1999. The recommendations included suggestions about changes in the composition of standing committees of UC that reflected knowledge, expertise, and interests of the various UC groups.

While enfranchising all elements of UC in the decision making process in a more inclusive and representative manner is an appropriate objective for a collaborative governance structure, much work remains to be done to institutionalize the objectives of collaborative governance. External interviewees offered few comments about collaborative governance within UC because they were unaware of the operating structure for the unit. On the other hand, there were many comments from within UC that indicated that collaborative governance has yet to take hold. There were comments about insufficient information having been distributed, which has led to a lack of clarity about goals and priorities for UC. In spite of the intention to establish collaborative governance, current practices were seen as continuing to be hierarchical. This is understandable given that the governance structure is new and still evolving. Some commented that new initiatives were sometimes viewed as lacking in sufficient direction, discussion, and leadership. Part of this might be attributed to the criticism from outside UC that it tries to do too much and lacks focus for its primary work.

Concerning campus collaboration of UC with the rest of the campus, UC has worked hard to align itself with the expectation of being "community property" to the IUPUI campus. UC has been very active in working with departments and the Office of Professional Development on the Gateway initiative, which is designed to increase levels of student success in introductory courses. Some of those interviewed still feel that UC's collaboration with other units is not yet fully operational. Some issues associated with communication of policy and communication of student information to academic units were raised. Others went

so far as to say their schools did not feel a part of UC or that UC operates as an isolated unit. Some of these comments resulted from policies emanating from UC that affected students in other schools.

University College, as an academic unit, needs to assume an active role in campus governance. Currently, UC has a representative on Faculty Council who does not vote.

### ***Recommendations***

UC has taken important steps to establish collaborative governance at several levels and it should continue to develop this strategy as a part of its work. UC needs to inform the IUPUI community about how and why it has structured itself using the principles of collaborative governance. This might come in two parts. The first would list the overall operational structure of the full-time members of UC. The second would define the roles and activities of UC faculty. Better informing the IUPUI community about its structure of collaborative governance could also provide a model for the rest of the campus.

University College should continue to review and revise the implementation of its internal collaborative governance structure. This could include workshops or consultations to facilitate staff, faculty, and administration participation in the development of an improved version of collaborative governance.

As part of its approach to participation in campus governance, UC should continue to improve its performance in implementing new policies with the prior endorsement or at least knowledge of the academic units. The Academic Policies and Procedures Committee (APPC) may be a structure for this type of information exchange, although additional activities are probably justified.

As a general recommendation, but one that is applicable here, UC should be cautious about embarking on too many large initiatives. Having too many things happening simultaneously is sometimes confusing to internal and outside constituents, stretches resources thinly, and overburdens the staff members who are responsible for implementation.

**5. University College has been asked to provide leadership in academic advising in concert with the schools. Has it done so?**

### *Findings and Conclusions*

Addressing the counseling and advising needs of several thousand students is a formidable task for University College. Significant new activities have radically improved the delivery of these services to students. A highly skilled and experienced director of advising was hired and there is convincing evidence that she has contributed positively to the morale and performance of advisors. The current advising staff is achieving a more professional demeanor and has acquired many new and relevant skills through professional development activities. Successful changes that have been instituted in the Advising Center include adjusting advisor schedules to ensure maximum availability at peak times when students drop by the unit for advising; developing student profiles that include admissions data, high school transcript, and results from the Entering Student Survey to use when advising; using weekly advisor meetings to discuss advising processes and improvements in First-Year Success Seminars, Learning Communities, and orientation; and having advisors complete a professional portfolio each year that includes evidence of accomplishments and reflections on job challenges and plans for improvement as a basis for raising recommendations and professional development activities. Improvements have been noted in delivering advising through the participation of advisors on instructional teams of First-Year Success Seminars and Learning Communities. Their participation is an important form of professional development, enriches their work experiences, and increases the opportunities that advisors have for interacting with entering students.

University College has sought cooperation with other academic units in the area of advising. Although there have been mixed results in cooperation, UC has taken a leadership role in academic advising in order to improve its effectiveness across campus. However, much work still remains to be done. University College advising staff sometimes has not been well received by advisors in the other schools, who often feel shut out from decision making about advising by higher level administrators within UC. But communication and information exchange about policies and requirements have improved. Some schools are cooperating with UC by jointly funding and hiring advisors.

### ***Recommendations***

University College should continue its good work to improve the advising and counseling that students receive in UC. This should include professional development of advisors and developing stronger connections between UC advisors and academic units. University College needs to continue to strengthen the advising process by working to ensure staff morale and staff retention. University College must also seek to share more widely throughout the campus state-of-the-art advising practices and techniques. A range of assessment procedures to determine the efficacy of UC advising practice should continue to be developed and used. Having more concrete, quantitative data on effectiveness would help increase advisor's confidence about their work, reduce the widespread anecdotal evaluations of advising quality, and increase the respect that others have for UC advising.

University College should continue to target advisors in academic units to ensure an exchange of information on requirements and standards. University College advisors should continue to develop expertise in specialized academic areas and improve their understanding of the school and major requirements. In addition, UC should continue or expand activities that invite departmental representatives regularly to meetings with UC advisors to ensure the most up-to-date information is available. Dean Evenbeck should help to ensure that these initiatives are successful. Appointment of joint advisors in those areas with large numbers of undergraduate students is particularly promising and should be continued.

**6. University College by default is now coordinating many K-12 programs to increase access and preparation for college study. Is this a good plan? Should it be made formal?**

### ***Findings and Conclusions***

University College has developed several initiatives that serve K-12 students and families, including the College Preparatory Initiatives, Upward Bound, Future Problem Solvers, as well as serving as a support site for 21st Century Scholars Program. University College has been very successful obtaining external funding to support these programs. The mission of all of these programs is to help students and their families prepare for entry to college. Coordination of these efforts appears to be consistent with the mission of UC.

Successful preparation for college cannot be separated from success once enrolled in an institution of higher education. The expertise about college entry

and success housed in UC makes it appropriate that leadership of the K-12 programs continues to be associated with UC. The involvement of UC with Project SEAM is a major statement of the importance of transition from high school to higher education and is a significant example for the capacity of IUPUI to form internal and external collaborative partnerships to support K-12 education. Moreover, the involvement of academic schools, their faculties, and related support services is key to the success of pre-college programs and efforts. Some of those interviewed from outside UC were not persuaded that IUPUI should be concerned with K-12 issues. The faculty survey indicated that, of all functions in UC, faculty respondents know least about pre-college initiatives.

### ***Recommendations***

University College should continue to provide leadership both on campus and in the community for K-12 programs. Implied in this leadership responsibility is the necessity to build collaborative relationships with academic schools and faculty that are needed to institutionalize efforts to broaden student success initiatives to the pre-collegiate stage in students' lives. Dean Evenbeck should continue to play a leadership role supporting IUPUI's involvement in K-12 education. University College should continue to support these programs with external dollars.

**7. University College, as a “common property” of all the schools, has been charged with developing IUPUI as an effective model of urban higher education through assessing student achievement and program results. Is it using assessment and continuous improvement well?**

### ***Findings and Conclusions***

Ever mindful of its status as a unit created as the “common property” of all the schools at IUPUI and of its mission to serve as a gateway for entering students into the academic programs in which they are seeking majors on this campus, UC through its leadership and staff has demonstrated a commitment to continuous reflection on and assessment of its programs and initiatives. A wide range of evaluative tools and procedures has been developed and used since the beginning to obtain objective data, qualitative data, and subjective information about programs, initiatives, and student achievement. University College is to be commended for the use of quantitative and qualitative research methods and for developing cooperative projects with Information Management and Institutional Research (IMIR), the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Office of Professional Development, and outside evaluators and consultants. The solicitation of feedback from students, staff, and faculty members through self-

report instruments such as satisfaction surveys, exit surveys, and evaluations is an important component of this work.

University College has followed a 3-phase assessment framework that involves campus-wide surveys and internal program assessments. The three phases of this assessment program involve continuous *needs assessment* through program evaluation and institutional studies; *process assessment* through an on-going review of UC processes and the first year experience such as instructional teams, learning community networks, and academic policies and procedures; and student learning *outcomes assessment* through student portfolios, classroom assessment, and academic achievement and persistence of entering students. A review of the comprehensive assessment initiatives undertaken by UC since 1998 indicate that there have been assessments of the template for First-Year Success seminars, a review of best practices for instructional teams, studies on enhancing academic and faculty connections in UC advising and on peer mentoring in the First-Year Success seminar, the RUSS (Restructuring for Urban Student Success) external review of Learning Communities, a Learning Center task force, a gateway retention program, and a transitional education task force.

In response to data produced by these numerous assessment activities, UC is continually reflecting on ways to improve programs within its unit and contributing to a culture of assessment on campus. Assessment activities have contributed in significant ways to monitoring the improvements in UC advising. Changes have been made in the Learning Center that include the introduction of the Structured Learning Assistance and the Supplemental Instruction programs, a Tutor Program, and mentoring. The Office of Development and Operations, Student Support Services, Technology Services, Twenty-First Century Scholars, and Upward Bound are consistently reviewed and upgraded. In collaboration with the Department of Mathematical Sciences and the School of Science, UC instituted the Math Assistance Center on the first floor of the UC building to respond to a demonstrated student need. Current evaluative information on the Center is being collected and seems to support the critical importance of this unit and its potential to contribute to student achievement. Pilot programs such as the Summer Bridge Program, the Critical Inquiry course, and the administrative withdrawal policy that addresses student attendance practices, are monitored closely to see how to they have been received and what their impact is on student performance and retention.

IMIR has provided on-going reports of research on and evaluation of the impact of UC programs on student retention and academic performance, areas of particular interest to all faculty and administrators at IUPUI. Studies on the impact of First-Year Success Seminars and Learning Communities on student success and retention have been conducted regularly and a context for assessing

levels of success is provided. A program of Faculty Fellowships has been established whereby UC faculty members or other specialized faculty members from IUPUI have investigated such areas as advising, the mentoring program, the UC U110 template, instructional teams, and Learning Communities. The Qualitative Research Coordinator for UC recently concluded the “Learning Community Template Implementation Study” for Fall, 2001, another instrument to gauge the effectiveness of First-Year Success Seminars. All of these assessment activities provide useful information for the evolution of UC.

UC receives high praise for innovation on campus, yet it is viewed by some as an isolated unit with a top-heavy hierarchical structure that makes it difficult for people inside as well as outside to express concerns about new policies or program initiatives for first year students, such as the administrative withdrawal policy and the template for First-Year Success Seminars, that have broad implications across campus. Although UC reports results, especially to administrative committees and groups (e.g., Enrollment Management Group, the Program Review and Assessment Committee, the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee), some administrators in schools engaged heavily in undergraduate education feel that information does not reach them about new policies that are being piloted or that have been put into effect until after the fact. This contributes to an on-going tension between UC and some schools such as Science, Engineering and Technology, and Liberal Arts that are engaged in parallel programs with respect to entering students.

### ***Recommendations***

University College should continue to assess its multiple programs and internal units as it strives to create and define itself as an academic and service unit on campus. Obtaining convincing evidence about the effectiveness of these programs and UC’s capacity to make changes in response to systematic information collection will enhance the understanding, appreciation, and respect that other units have for UC’s work. University College needs to keep stakeholders across campus informed about assessment results through effective communication with administrators, faculty members, and staff in degree-granting schools, and with appropriate IUPUI Faculty Council committees, such as the Academic Affairs Committee, before new policies are established for entering students across campus.

Some people interviewed said that UC takes on too many disparate initiatives such as the Critical Inquiry course, Upward Bound, Twenty-First Century Scholars, and the K-12 initiatives. The emphasis that UC has placed on implementing effective assessment strategies needs to be more effectively used to help others understand how these programs are valuable campus assets. UC needs

to demonstrate to major stakeholders how it is applying information that is found in assessment reports dealing with the primary function of UC as a gateway into schools and majors for entering students including the costs and benefits of the First-Year Success Seminar and the investment of personnel in instructional teams. University College needs to be vigilant when something is not working well, or has had little or no impact, and modify programs or move on to new programs.

The concept of having a UC faculty made up of faculty members from all of the academic units on campus is viewed as good and a positive indicator that the unit is the “common property” of all schools. UC’s non-alignment with or total independence from schools on campus, however, is seen as an issue that needs to be rectified if all faculties, staff, and individual school administrators are to feel that they are stakeholders in this non-degree granting unit. One way to enhance crucial communication between UC and the schools might be to establish an “Undergraduate Council of Deans,” involving school-level deans from the Schools of Science, Liberal Arts, Engineering and Technology, Nursing, and other units that also deal with large numbers of entering students. University College would then be able to present new initiatives and provide reports about projects, assessment results, and new initiatives to this body and involve schools closely in monitoring existing programs and the development of new initiatives from the earliest stages. Enhanced collaboration and cooperation with schools on campus would dispel the notion that UC is a stand-alone unit. Campus administration could provide leadership for developing such a collaborative structure to aid UC in fulfilling its role as “common property.”

**8. University College is the home for Undergraduate Honors and is charged with providing support in developing an honors program suited to our campus. Will the current vision achieve this goal? What needs to be done to advance even more rapidly?**

### *Findings and Conclusions*

The Honors Program received a large budget increase, hired a director, received scholarship funds, and moved to UC as UC began operations. The Honors Program has been very successful in recruiting honors students in the three years it has been a part of UC and has been quite successful in retaining them. Eighteen students accepted scholarships in fall, 1998, and sixteen remain enrolled (88%). Forty-six students accepted scholarships in 1999 and thirty-two remain enrolled (70%). Fifty-two students accepted scholarships in 2000 and 79% remained in the program at the end of the year. Ninety-six students accepted scholarships in 2001 and 93% remain in the program.

The Program has been successful in expanding honors course opportunities, especially at the freshmen and sophomore levels. In fall, 2001, fourteen sections of 100- and 200-level courses and six 300/400 level courses were offered for honors credit (in addition to the offering of courses involving H-options, independent studies, and undergraduate theses). This is an increase from the offerings that existed five years ago, and a dramatic shift towards 100 and 200 level courses.

The Program has been successful in expanding enrollment of qualified high school students at IUPUI. In the fall of 1997, the SPAN program had a total enrollment of 37 students with an average registration of 24 and an average GPA of 2.3. SPAN enrollment is 172 for spring, 2002, with 80 students registered for some 400 credits; the average GPA is 3.5.

The location of the Honors Program in UC and the large increases in program funds have contributed to these successes. The location in UC gives an all-university base to a program that spans the university. The location also gives a strong institutional voice to the program, which is useful when negotiating with schools and departments. But the location of the Honors Program in UC also raises issues that will have to be addressed. For example, the Honors experience extends over the full tenure of the student, while UC focuses on entry-level students. In addition, funding faculty to offer honors courses located in departments will need attention.

### ***Recommendations***

Given the successes of the Honors Program, UC should continue to support the Honors Program and provide an administrative home for it. The relationships between the Honors Program and schools and departments must be further developed so that honors experiences over the full undergraduate tenure can be continuous, rich, and integrated. These relationships need to involve coordination of curriculum, funding, programming and administration, concerning both freshman-entry and transfer students.

Tension exists between two objectives: establishing a focused, coherent, and integrated honors experience on the one hand, and using the presence of honors students on campus to benefit all students on the other. The campus currently gains from the improved quality of students because of the Honors Program, but the benefit is not fully realized if high quality students are segregated from other students and from campus activities. The tension between these two objectives can and should be used to generate creative program initiatives for honors students. For example, the Honors Program should explore how honors students

can be better connected to other UC programs (e.g., supplemental instruction, K-12 initiatives, Math Assistance Center), to SLD, and to other campus activities.

Programmatic development of the Honors Program will need to continue in order to craft course experiences that work well at IUPUI, including effective use of the urban context. The Honors Program will need to focus on the difficulty in establishing critical masses for honors courses and the need to serve transfer students as well as entry-level students.

**9. University College is charged with cooperating with Student Life and Diversity, the University Library, student service offices, and the schools in identifying, implementing and assessing effective collaborative programs to foster student learning. How well does the University College leadership exercise its responsibilities for collaboration?**

### *Findings and Conclusions*

University College must develop cooperative connections with all other units on campus in order to ensure preparation of students for entry into IUPUI, educational achievement of those students during their critical early experiences at IUPUI, and their transition to degree programs.

Key campus leaders in schools and administrative units were asked to address the following questions: How do schools (e.g., Deans, Chairs, faculty, staff) view UC? How do UC programs with schools (e.g., Learning Communities, advising, joint positions, faculty involvement in UC) establish and enhance collaborative arrangements and contribute to student learning? How has UC provided important leadership and collaboration on some campus-wide issues (e.g., advising, retention, gateway courses, and orientation)? How successfully has UC collaborated with your unit and other units on campus?

Based on the evidence from answers to these questions, there is general consensus that UC under Dean Evenbeck's leadership has established a climate that reflects a highly cooperative attitude and manner. Dean Evenbeck is respected as an administrator, viewed as someone who can be trusted, and valued for his creative ideas about establishing cooperative arrangements.

One of the factors that interferes with relations with schools is the lack of the ability of UC to generate money through tuition. University College's reliance on non-tuition revenues strongly and negatively affects how some schools view UC. As a new unit that is establishing its role at IUPUI, UC and Dean Evenbeck are

continually acquiring new responsibilities through decisions made at the campus level. New responsibilities raise concerns about UC's mission, changes in its mission through these additions, appropriateness of some of the new responsibilities, budget implications, rate and scope of change, manageability, and accountability.

Some rough edges were noted in starting all of UC's initiatives and success has not been uniform. However, all respondents noted progress and good prospects for UC's future role on campus, although some noted that UC would change over time. On occasion, it was noted that progress lagged not because of UC or Dean Evenbeck's work, but because changes and unpreparedness existed in the collaborative unit. Individuals cited specific examples of collaborative arrangements that added to campus life, such as joint positions, collaborative funding arrangements, coordination of programs, and new or revised programs.

Dean Evenbeck's leadership was cited as important to many noteworthy collaborative activities and accomplishments, including retention initiatives, gateway courses, campus-wide development of the First-Year Success Seminar and Learning Communities, student recruitment programs (including minorities), coordination of UC advising with schools, and K-12 initiatives. In its own way, each of these collaborative programs has contributed positively to the learning environment on campus.

Thus, there is widespread and pervasive evidence that Dean Evenbeck is someone with whom others can and will collaborate, that these collaborative programs have contributed to the success of entering students, and that the prospects for further collaboration are favorable.

### ***Recommendations***

Although there are many positive examples of collaborative arrangements under Dean Evenbeck's leadership, UC must continue to increase the knowledge and understanding among schools of the role that UC plays in the work and mission of IUPUI. Dean Evenbeck and UC have been very successful in generating external support to supplement university resources in support of its programs, but seeking and managing these grants has costs and external funding is not always predictable. The University may need to strengthen base funding for UC. Relations with other schools will remain strained as long as they feel internal funds are diverted to support UC programs without fully understanding their benefits from those investments.

**10. University College has been charged with seeking external support for programs to supplement scarce university resources. How effective has the leadership been in seeking external funds?**

*Findings and Conclusions*

Writing and securing external grants to support programs within UC and for programs related to its mission is one of Dean Evenbeck's strongest qualities. University College currently is the beneficiary of 21 grants totaling 13 million dollars. The programs that these grants support fit well with the overall mission of UC and IUPUI at large. A majority of the proposals focus on retention and K-12 initiatives. However, there is serious concern expressed by UC and other schools regarding UC's over-reliance on soft money to operate the programs in UC (also see #9).

Dean Evenbeck has done an excellent job establishing goals for grant-funded programs and making them clear to both internal and external groups, especially in the area of student retention. The ability to clearly articulate goals, identify hurdles that must be overcome, and develop plans to reach goals are reasons why Dean Evenbeck is so successful at getting grants funded. He takes a leadership role in pre-proposal consultations (bringing the right people to the table for preliminary discussions) and in writing grants. However, as mentioned previously, the rapid pace of implementing some of these programs causes some confusion among those who are not close to them or who are peripherally connected to them.

*Recommendations*

University College cannot perform its mission without external funding, especially in outreach programs for K-12 that are considered essential for closing the gap between secondary and post-secondary education. Although UC has been highly successful in securing external grant dollars, UC must continue to seek external funding in order to perform its mission. The types of grants UC has obtained carry little overhead that can be used by the unit to offset indirect costs of preparation and management of the grants; thus, UC should carefully assess the allocation of staff time and resources to projects to ensure that they are appropriately invested. University College also needs to more fully develop fund raising through gifts and endowments.

**11. What is the role of the staff in the accomplishment of the University College mission? What is the satisfaction level of staff members? Has University College staff been used effectively?**

### *Findings and Conclusions*

Generally speaking, UC staff members are very positive about their work and being part of the unit. Staff spoke about the energy and excitement that accompanies their jobs and the positive climate within UC. There is a strong sense of collegiality and team spirit among staff, with new staff members speaking positively about the strong training programs and personal attention in the orientation to their jobs. Staff members are very satisfied with the central location of the unit on campus; those who had worked in the Union Building find the current location promotes far more formal and informal interaction with students. They feel that strong efforts have been made to connect UC with other units on campus. Access to resources to support their work, including technology, was considered to be outstanding.

Staff members did express similar concerns to those constituents outside of the unit that there are some unclear channels of communication, particularly about new initiatives. At times, some staff members felt overwhelmed by the number of programs occurring at once, and there was concern that not enough time was spent allowing one program to become fine-tuned and settled before another was introduced. There was the suggestion that more connections need to be made between programs so students have a seamless experience (e.g., from orientation to learning communities to critical inquiry and supplemental instruction). Staff members were sometimes confused about where information is supposed to come from and through what channels their feedback should be sent.

When asked about their role in collaborative governance, most staff members commented that they could not respond because they did not know enough about how collaborative governance was supposed to work or is working. This indicates that staff members were not yet sufficiently involved in collaborative governance (see #4). There was consensus that there are decisions made in UC that should go through the collaborative governance process, but all do not do so. Instead, UC seems to be operating through the use of committees, which sometimes do not include appropriate staff members. When staff members were present, they sometimes perceived that their input was not always welcome. It was acknowledged that there were times when the input of staff was both solicited and appreciated.

Overall, the staff role in UC has improved dramatically. Staff members are engaged in a wide diversity of activities, well beyond the historical scope of their mission. Student interaction and availability is achieved by a much-improved reception for students through orientation, mentoring activities, student assistance, and structured learning. The presence of students in the University College

Building is concrete evidence of how UC staff members have created an inviting climate for students.

### ***Recommendations***

University College should continue to nurture the positive spirit that has been established among staff members. University College needs to continue the collaborative governance structure with specific attention to defining what types of issues should go through this process and those that should be handled by committees made up only of faculty or staff. When collaborative committees are formed, appropriate staff should be invited to participate as full members. More communication between the Deans and the sub-units of UC about initiatives and programs needs to occur so that staff members develop a good understanding of the work of UC, including communication at all stages of program development, from idea generation to implementation. Appropriate staff members should be involved throughout the process.

## **REVIEW OF DEAN SCOTT EVENBECK AS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR**

### **Introduction and Overview**

University College was established on July 1, 1997, and Scott Evenbeck is in his fourth year as Dean. As stated earlier, while administrative reviews normally take place after the fifth year of service, Dean Evenbeck asked to be reviewed after his third year in the position. This review would coincide with a review of the performance of UC itself.

In announcing the formation of the new academic unit, Dean of Faculties William Plater wrote:

The Dean of University College will be the chief academic and executive officer of the unit and will serve as a member of the Council of Deans, will represent UC in all matters requiring senior leadership, will ensure the effective administration of the unit, will coordinate UC with schools and with administrative units, and will work with the faculty of UC to achieve its mission. The Dean must have an outstanding record of leadership in undergraduate learning, effective administrative experience, and intimate knowledge of IUPUI, Indiana University, and central Indiana.

The announcement in the Chronicle of Higher Education, soliciting candidates for the position, added these dimensions to the job:

University College will help achieve IUPUI's mission as a student-centered urban University by providing an entry point for all undergraduate students. It will coordinate curricular, advising, and co-curricular activities in such a way as to provide students with the skills and insights necessary for them to demonstrate academic achievement. University College will also provide faculty in IUPUI's schools with a shared home for general education and a mechanism by which students and faculty can come together across disciplinary lines for the purpose of enhancing student learning.

Some would argue that the challenges in the statements above would be impossible to meet by the most competent person in the country, even with the broadest delegation of authority and the widest support for the mission of UC. Scott Evenbeck was an excellent choice because of his background and experience at IUPUI and his dedication to undergraduate students. In retrospect, even his critics agree that he has done an outstanding job establishing UC's role on the IUPUI campus, especially given limitations on resources. The new Dean

has had to struggle with a very low level of campus acceptance and understanding of UC and the Dean's role, but he has faced this challenge with a positive attitude.

After interviewing many persons on campus, conducting a survey, and consulting many documents, the Review Committee concludes that Dean Evenbeck deserves high praise for his performance as the chief administrative officer of UC. Starting UC presented many unique challenges that are not typically faced by a Dean, including selecting a faculty, making decisions about a facility, selecting a staff, designing and expanding programs, defining a new and distinctive academic unit, establishing policies and procedures, and being an advocate for UC. Through his achievements, he has demonstrated exceptionally hard work, a capacity to attract external funding, dedication to students and IUPUI, a willingness to collaborate, and a positive management style.

## **REVIEW ISSUES FOR DEAN EVENBECK**

### **1. Has the administrator exercised appropriate leadership of the unit in establishing, maintaining, and facilitating clear goals and objectives?**

#### *Findings and Conclusions*

Dean Evenbeck has done a meritorious job exercising appropriate leadership as UC has defined its mission, goals, and objectives. He has championed a collegial and collaborative process for defining mission and goals, he is a role model in attracting external support for the programs and activities that are consistent with the mission and goals of UC, and he has enthusiastically moved UC initiatives from planning stages to implementation. His executive staff members are comfortable with his style and they feel that he is good at setting goals and objectives, managing operations during their implementation, and establishing a culture of assessment that provides meaningful opportunities to evaluate programs and make adjustments. He is widely respected throughout the campus for creative and energetic collaborative work toward improving new student success and retention, which is among the highest priorities at IUPUI.

He appears to take more upon himself than may be desirable, but this may have been the result of UC being a new initiative and not having all procedures and roles clearly defined or understood. Dean Evenbeck is to be applauded for taking the initiative on so many tasks that "just had to be done" during the early stages of the development of UC, but he is encouraged to identify more opportunities when he can delegate to others.

The success of UC in generating external resources is one of his paramount achievements. These grants have created many new initiatives that have clarified and expanded the goals and objectives of UC. Many of these programs were begun in a relative brief period of time, which placed demands on staff members in new roles. However, through staff meetings, collaborative governance, and American Association of Higher Education summer institutes, Dean Evenbeck has involved UC staff and faculty members and others in working through these challenges. Dean Evenbeck has been willing to assume responsibility for new and existing campus programs (e.g., Gateway courses, Honors scholarships, Career Center). Although some of these have complicated establishing and clarifying the goals of UC, Dean Evenbeck has demonstrated the administrative capacity to incorporate these additions into the mission and operations of UC. During all of the changes and transitions of UC, though, Dean Evenbeck has been able to maintain a strong focus on a collaborative approach to academic success and undergraduate education on a campus dominated by professional schools and strong traditions of unit autonomy.

### ***Recommendations***

Dean Evenbeck must continue to develop programs that are consistent with the central academic mission of UC. As UC evolves during its emergence as a campus unit, the leadership must be prepared to adjust goals, programs, strategies, and staff assignments. Dean Evenbeck should continue to create regular opportunities for wide participation in developing strategic planning processes at multiple levels of UC. He needs to consider when it is appropriate to delegate more to others. More time and attention needs to be paid to the implementation of new policies and programs within UC and new policies and procedures must be adequately communicated through the staff structure.

## **2. How effectively does the administrator represent the unit to persons outside the unit, including peers nationally?**

### ***Findings and Conclusions***

Dean Evenbeck has done an excellent job representing UC to persons outside the unit and to peers nationally. This conclusion is supported uniformly by the information that was collected by the Committee and campus interviews that were conducted. In addition, the faculty survey found universally positive responses on this area.

Dean Evenbeck is willing to participate in both formal and informal dialogues and discussions about the work and role of UC on the IUPUI campus.

He is accessible and eager to collaborate with others and the early work of UC demonstrates that he is forging an increasingly visible role for UC on the campus. He has been able to adeptly use his institutional knowledge of IUPUI in this regard. In addition, during the challenging time of establishing UC, he has shown enthusiasm and resiliency in the face of critical inquiry and misunderstanding, and he has demonstrated commitment to the importance of the mission of UC to the IUPUI campus and its future.

University College must communicate with diverse constituencies, including prospective students, entering students and their families, transfer students, high schools, potential funders, academic and nonacademic units on campus, and the general public. Publications that have been developed to meet specific and general needs are striking in appearance and quality.

Dean Evenbeck has also made IUPUI known nationally and internationally by his participation in numerous national, state, and local conferences. In addition, he and his staff have participated in projects and activities that have benefited the development of UC (e.g., RUSS Self-Study, AAHE summer institutes, Greater Expectations). From interviews and Committee members' interactions with persons in higher education nationally, it is clear that Dean Evenbeck is respected nationally for this work and the work of UC. He has been active in participating in forums and projects that have brought attention and respect to UC and IUPUI because of their good works. He is also well respected by individuals in public and private funding agencies, which has led to strong external support for programs. Dean Evenbeck has both internal and off-campus roles to play, and these roles are sometimes in conflict.

### ***Recommendations***

Dean Evenbeck should continue with a vigorous campaign to enhance the perception and understanding of UC on the IUPUI campus. This is a difficult challenge that will require relentless work. He and his administrative staff need to ensure that the operations and successes of UC are known to other units on campus, that they are connecting UC's initiatives to the work of other units, and that they are using multiple means of communicating with the campus community. His demeanor is acknowledged to be a strength of how he relates to others on campus and he is encouraged to maintain that positive, collaborative attitude.

Dean Evenbeck should continue to have himself and his staff build upon their successes as participants in national forums and initiatives to the extent that these activities clearly benefit local operations. They should continue to relate the work

and future of UC to the national agenda of higher education and share their good work so that others may learn.

**3. How successful has the administrator been in managing the human and financial resources of the unit in the face of competing pressures or uncertainty?**

*Findings and Conclusions*

As UC took shape, Dean Evenbeck faced the challenge of assembling a staff to ensure the early success of UC. All evidence supports the conclusion that he made good personnel decisions for critical positions within UC and he is given high marks for his ability to train, develop, motivate, and organize staff. This is especially evident in UC advising where many changes have occurred and the net result has been very positive. The faculty of UC represents another new entity for the IUPUI campus and he has been very successful at nurturing the support and organizing the work of a committed faculty. Determining how the role of the UC faculty and its members changes over time will remain a challenge for Dean Evenbeck.

The Dean manages a budget effectively and encourages innovation to improve student success. He has acquired campus resources to support UC's work and he has been very successful in gaining external support. The scope and use of UC's budget is difficult to compare with other units because of the differences in revenue from tuition and the nature of the services that need to be offered to entering students. However, his use of funds seems to be very cost effective for the large number of students who receive services. Giving Dean Evenbeck control of monies for retention seems appropriate, as does the use of those funds. Some schools were critical of the numerous brochures and public relations materials produced by UC, which are seen as a waste of resources when schools are confronting budget shortages. These expenditures need to be carefully weighed against evidence that the monies are being effectively used.

There is concern that the strong external funding base for some programs masks some underlying programmatic needs that deserve internal funding. Even though UC's budget does not come from taxes on academic units but from campus appropriations, there is still concern that others on campus view UC's budget as representing monies that could be used by academic units for related or other uses. The survey indicates that some faculty members believed that the monies were not always being used effectively and that the academic units would use the monies more effectively. These perceptions by others are important and

Dean Evenbeck must continue to demonstrate how these monies are being used effectively.

The combination of starting many new programs and developing the skills and roles of persons in new positions has created inevitable strains. Dean Evenbeck has successfully encouraged his staff to continue in the face of these difficulties. The pace seen in the emergence of UC may be lessened in the coming years, although Dean Evenbeck's interest in new programming may continue to generate strains on human and financial resources.

### ***Recommendations***

Dean Evenbeck should continue to direct attention toward human resource issues (e.g., new hires, qualifications of positions) and staff development. The roles, rewards, and assignments of UC faculty must be critically examined so that it is clear to faculty members and their corresponding academic unit how their involvement in UC is worthwhile and meaningful. More work needs to be done to help Dean Evenbeck promote collaborative governance, continue innovation, seek external funding, and continue to aggressively assess program efficacy. He needs to address modifying or terminating less successful programs in favor of successful ones. Across all of the fiscal and human resource decisions that are made, he must continue to maintain the paramount goal of providing a coherent and meaningful educational experience for entering students.

### **4. How is the unit perceived by its faculty and staff? How is the unit perceived on campus, system, state, and national level?**

#### ***Findings and Conclusions***

University College is perceived by its faculty and staff as generally successful in its activities to contribute to student success. They are proud to be a part of the formation and development of UC and would like the unit to be a model of collaborative governance for others. The opportunity for advisors to participate on instructional teams for First-Year Success Seminars enriches their work and provides a connection to the academic work of UC.

As documented elsewhere, for a variety of reasons, the perceptions of UC on the IUPUI campus were more mixed. Many still did not know what UC is or does, and some persons understand the mission of UC but felt they could do a better job in their academic units of meeting the needs of new students if only they had UC's resources. Others support and appreciate the unique role that UC is fulfilling in a coherent and coordinated way on a diverse and large campus. There

was a perception that there is insufficient assessment of UC initiatives and that both Dean Evenbeck and his staff travel to conferences far too often. Although these perceptions may be ill informed, they need to be acknowledged, understood, and responded to.

As documented earlier, the reputation of UC on the state and national levels is very positive as a result of Dean Evenbeck's leadership. Much of this success is due to the personal efforts of Dean Evenbeck and his staff, the design of good programs, and objective assessments of UC's successes. University College continues to win recognition for its programs not only through grants but also through receipt of national awards.

### ***Recommendations***

Dean Evenbeck has created positive perceptions of UC among UC staff and faculty. He should continue to promote shared governance, better establish its role among UC's faculty and staff, and ensure that its contribution to operations is understood and appreciated.

Dean Evenbeck needs to continue to build a strong base of support on the IUPUI campus. Lack of information and misinformation about UC will continue to be challenges that warrant creative and varied approaches to correct. He will need to invest more time and energy building bridges across the IUPUI campus, inviting faculty and staff to observe and participate in UC's programs, and disseminating information that document successes and demonstrate how program adjustments have been made. The IUPUI administration also needs to develop mechanisms and opportunities for UC and its Dean to engage UC's peer groups on research and strategies on student retention and advising. Dean Evenbeck and his staff should continue to share their successes at higher education conferences and forums to maintain the positive image of University College and IUPUI.

**5. How effectively has the administrator led the unit in carrying out unit and campus policies, including affirmative action plans and the unit's five-year plan?**

*Findings and Conclusions*

Dean Evenbeck is a team player and is diligent in his efforts to carry out both unit and campus policies. Dean Evenbeck, his deans, UC faculty members, and staff members have begun to play increasingly salient roles in the administration and development of UC policy and campus policies (e.g., PRAC, Faculty Council). A significant manifestation of this is the new role that UC will now play with Enrollment Management Services concerning admissions policies.

Dean Evenbeck believes strongly that assessment of UC's programs is critical. The manner in which assessment can inform and shape policy for UC and the campus (especially for incoming and continuing high-risk students) is still emerging. The diversity of policy issues on which UC can contribute is daunting. To date, the performance of the Dean and his staff has been good.

IUPUI as a whole is challenged in the area of affirmative action, as are most institutions of higher education. Dean Evenbeck has done as well as, if not better than, most other units on campus in successfully implementing affirmative action policies.

*Recommendations*

University College has the opportunity to define its role on the IUPUI campus in many ways, including policy issues. Dean Evenbeck should continue to advocate for faculty involvement with campus policies affecting student admissions standards. We recommend that Dean Evenbeck receive strong support for playing a role in UC influencing the academic achievement of entering students through the critical examination, modification, and development of policies. The administration should encourage and nurture UC's role in these changes with firmness and sensitivity.

**6. What are the administrator's strengths and weaknesses and their impact upon effectiveness?**

*Findings and Conclusions*

Dean Evenbeck has many strengths that both critics and admirers expressed glowingly. He is viewed as being a person of great vision and creativity, coupled

with practicality. He has excellent leadership skills and sets an energetic pace for others. He has demonstrated a good understanding of local issues and a broad understanding of higher education, which he has effectively brought to bear in the emergence of UC on the IUPUI campus. He has earned the respect of superiors, peers, subordinates, and students. He celebrates achievements by those with whom he works and he has demonstrated concern for equity and fairness. He has a sincere interest - even love - for students and is a strong advocate for them and their interests. He works well with a wide range of constituencies and he is excellent at generating human and financial support for his ventures. He has powers of persuasion that makes him successful in areas where authority would normally be required. All of these traits have contributed to his effectiveness as Dean over the past four years.

Inevitably, Dean Evenbeck's performance also has some shortcomings that need attention. Although he is devoted in principle to collaborative governance, he has faced challenges in its implementation and institutionalization. He is also more inclined to do as many things as possible himself rather than delegate to others. He has faced challenges in communication with his staff and subordinates during times of change and transition. He has had to determine how best to balance his role as an internal administrator and an external representative, sometimes causing some consternation among UC staff and peers on the campus. Some have viewed him as a staff person for the Chancellor and Dean of Faculties rather than as the Dean of a compelling academic unit at IUPUI. He tends to let a proliferation of ideas exceed UC's resources for implementation and sometimes he does not seem to understand the impact of his ideas on internal staff and other schools.

### ***Recommendations***

There is widespread consensus that Dean Evenbeck was an excellent choice to head University College, possessing assets that ensured its emergence at IUPUI as an important unit. He has effectively dealt with the multitude of tasks and challenges that faced UC, while demonstrating persistence, patience, dedication, and skill. The Review Committee found widespread respect for Dean Evenbeck's work, especially from those who have a good understanding of what he has accomplished.

Most of these criticisms that have been identified are inherent in a difficult job of establishing and selling UC, especially given the political, cultural, and historical circumstances that surrounded its development and implementation. We believe that an opportunity to step back and reflect on the strengths and challenges of UC can be the basis for Dean Evenbeck's developing a clear plan of action for his continued professional growth and the growth and maturation of

UC. We recommend that the administration continue to support Scott Evenbeck as Dean of UC.

**Appendix A: List of Review Committee Members**

**List of Review Committee Members**

**Philip J. Rutledge, SPEA, Chair**  
**Robert G. Bringle, Director, Center for Service and Learning**  
**Cathy Buyarski, Director of Advising, University College**  
**Michael Gleeson, Associate Professor, SPEA**  
**Linda L. Haas, Professor of Sociology, School of Liberal Arts**  
**Norman D. Lees, Professor of Biology, School of Science**  
**David J. Malik, Professor of Chemistry, School of Science**  
**Alan E. Mikesky, Associate Professor, School of Physical Education**  
**William Orme, University Library**  
**Jennifer Pease, Associate Director, Admissions**  
**Katherine Tyler Scott, Community Leader**  
**Akhouri Sinha, Professor, Engineering and Technology**  
**Richard C. Turner, Professor of English, School of Liberal Arts**  
**Rosalie A. Vermette, Professor of French, School of Liberal Arts**  
**Jeffrey X. Watt, Associate Professor of Mathematics, School of Science**  
**Sherree A. Wilson, Associate Director, Career and Employment Services**  
**Enid Zwirn, Associate Professor of Nursing, School of Nursing**

## **Appendix B: Chancellor Bepko's Memorandum**

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Philip J. Rutledge, SPEA, Chair  
Robert G. Bringle, Director, Center for Public Service & Leadership  
Cathy Buyarski, Director of Advising, University College  
Michael Gleeson, Associate Professor, School of Public &  
Environmental Affairs  
Linda L. Haas, Professor of Sociology, School of Liberal Arts  
Norman D. Lees, Professor of Biology, School of Science  
David J. Malik, Professor of Chemistry, School of Science, Graduate  
School  
Alan E. Mikesky, Associate Professor, School of Physical Education  
William Orme, University Library  
Jennifer Pease, Associate Director, Admissions  
Yale Pratt, Student  
Kathy Tyler Scott, Community Leader  
Akhouri Sinha, Professor, Engineering and Technology  
Richard C. Turner, Professor of English, School of Liberal Arts  
Rosalie A. Vermette, Professor of French, School of Liberal Arts  
Jeffrey X. Watt, Associate Professor of Mathematics, School of Science  
Sherree A. Wilson, Associate Director, Career and Employment Services  
Enid Zwirn, Associate Professor of Nursing, School of Nursing

**FROM:** Gerald L. Bepko, Chancellor

**SUBJECT:** Administrative Review for Scott Evenbeck, Dean of University College

**DATE:** February 22, 2001

In accordance with our procedures for reviewing campus administrative officers, I write to ask that you serve as members of the committee to review the Office of Dean, University College, and its incumbent, Scott Evenbeck. Enclosed is a list of those being invited to serve on the committee, including addresses and phone numbers, and the campus policy on review procedures for administrative officers. We have asked Phil Rutledge to serve as chair of the committee

This review process is designed to promote healthy lines of communication at all levels and to help all of us in the university administration do our jobs better. In this sense, the review process should continue to have a major, positive impact on the quality of life and management of our university. The experience we have had with this procedure at Indianapolis suggests that we are accomplishing these objectives and that the policy has been a wise enhancement to the university's administration. Although we ordinarily conduct reviews during or after the incumbent's fifth year in office, we are conducting a review of Scott after only three years in accord with agreements reached when University College was established. Because University

College is a new entity, we wish to have the benefit of advice about its establishment early in the process.

While we are interested in your assessment of Scott Evenbeck's effectiveness as dean, we also ask that the committee provide advice to us on how the mission and work of University College might be better realized. Implicitly, this review must encompass the leadership team Scott heads. University College is undoubtedly the single most important academic or administrative unit we have created at IUPUI in the last decade or two. Our success in achieving our vision for University College may well determine the future and fate of IUPUI. Even our graduate and graduate professional programs will be affected since we can expect less public and state support for these areas of work until we can convincingly prove that IUPUI is

fully meeting the region's needs with respect to undergraduates. Because it is so new, University College has the flexibility to make adjustments which will enhance the ability to meet the hopes we have for it, and we ask that you consider the following points in particular:

1. Retention and student learning are the highest priority for University College--in terms of developing programs and providing a focus for campus attention, in collaboration with the schools and the Office of Professional Development. Is University College leadership effective in providing innovation in developing programs for entering students?
2. The University College Building should be a place for involving students in the campus. How well does the leadership use the building as an asset for the campus--in terms of space and in terms of programming?
3. University College has been charged with developing new undergraduate student orientation in concert with all the schools along with a first-year experience for students that provides a common transition to university study while providing the degree-specific introductions appropriate for IUPUI. How well is the initiative succeeding?
4. University College seeks to establish a unique model in having the leadership of full-time tenured faculty in the context of collaborative governance. How well is this concept succeeding?
5. University College has been asked to provide leadership in academic advising in concert with the schools. Has it done so?
6. University College by default is now coordinating many K-12 programs to increase access and preparation for college study. Is this a good plan? Should it be made formal?

Scott Evenbeck Review  
February 22, 2001  
Page 2

7. University College, as a “common property” of all the schools, has been charged with developing IUPUI as an effective model of urban higher education through assessing student achievement and program results. Is it using assessment and continuous improvement well?
8. University College is the home for Undergraduate Honors and is charged with providing support in developing an honors program suited to our campus. Will the current vision achieve this goal? What needs to be done to advance even more rapidly?
9. University College is charged with cooperating with Student Life and Diversity, the University Library, student service offices, and the schools in identifying, implementing, and assessing effective collaborative programs to foster student learning. How well does the University College leadership exercise its responsibilities for collaboration?
10. University College has been charged with seeking external support for programs to supplement scarce university resources. How effective has the leadership been in seeking external funds?

University College has attracted considerable national attention for its programs. These awards and citations are based on reports and documents which will be made available to the committee. Additionally, I am asking Victor Borden to provide any analysis or data which may help you in your work.

The first meeting of the committee will take place on Thursday, March 22, at 12 noon in the Purdue Room of the University Place Hotel. IUPUI Faculty Council President Paul Galanti and Vice Chancellor Bill Plater will be present with us to assist in providing a charge to the committee and to discuss the procedures the committee may wish to follow. The incumbent’s job description will be provided at that time.

Because of the importance these reviews hold for our campus, we hope you will be willing to serve on this review committee and look forward to seeing you at the first meeting.

GLB/ks

Enclosure

xc: Victor Borden, Associate Vice Chancellor, Information Management  
and Institutional Research

Scott Evenbeck, Dean, University College  
Mary Fisher, Vice President, Faculty Council Executive Committee  
Paul Galanti, Faculty President, IUPUI Faculty Council  
William M. Plater, Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties

**Appendix C: List of Individuals and Groups Interviewed by the Committee**

### **Persons and Groups Interviewed By Review Committee**

1. Victor Borden, Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Management and Institutional Research
2. Cathy Buyarski, University College Director of Advising
3. Nancy Chism, Office of Professional Development
4. Scott Evenbeck, University College Dean
5. Essie Fagan, Vice President, Mays Chemical Company; Chair, University College Campaign Cabinet
6. Paul Galanti, Co-Chair, IUPUI Faculty Council
7. Mark Grove, IUPUI Registrar
8. Barbara Jackson, University College Associate Dean
9. Joseph Kuczowski, Associate Dean, School of Science
10. Miriam Langsam, Associate Dean of Students, School of Liberal Arts
11. David Lewis, Dean IUPUI University Library
12. Mark Minglin, Director, Learning Center
13. Angela McBride, Dean, School of Nursing
14. Ted Mullen, Director, University College Honors Program
15. Herman Saatkamp, Dean, School of Liberal Arts
16. Philip Seabrook, Assistant Dean, University College
17. David Stocum, Dean, School of Science
18. Lisa Ruch, Assistant Director of Advising, University College
19. Karen Whitney, Vice Chancellor and Dean of Students, IUPUI
20. Gayle Williams, Assistant Dean, University College
21. University College Staff Council – Group Interview
22. Rebecca Porter, Enrollment Management Services
23. University College Advisors

## **Appendix D: Principal Documents Reviewed**

### **Selected Documents Reviewed**

1. University College Annual Reports 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001
2. Dean Evenbeck's Reports to IUPUI Dean's Council
3. IUPUI Self Study Report, 1999
4. University College Assessment Initiatives for PRAC
5. "Critical Trends", Report for IUPUI
6. "Defining The Responsibilities, Roles and Recognition of University College Faculty"
7. "Student Retention at IUPUI – Fall 2000", Enrollment Report and Analysis, IMIR
8. "Analysis of Student Transfers", IMIR
9. "Great Expectations", Proposal to Association of American Colleges and Universities
10. University College Student manual, 2001
11. *INSIGHT*, Spring 2001 – University College Magazine
12. Template for Student Advising, University College
13. Restructuring for Urban Student Success Self-Study
14. IUPUI Honors Program, Annual Report, 1999-2000 and 1998-1999

**Appendix E: List of Questions Administered via the Internet to Faculty**

## **Faculty Survey on University College and Dean Scott Evenbeck**

As part of the review process established at the formation of University College (UC), we are conducting a survey of faculty perceptions on the effectiveness of UC and its Dean, Scott Evenbeck. We hope that you will take a few minutes to complete this review. The responses you provide will be factors in deciding how UC will function in the future.

Background data  
Your Years at IUPUI

Your School

SA = strongly agree  
A = agree  
N = No opinion  
D = disagree  
SD = strongly disagree

### Questions

UC offers beginning students an effective summer orientation program, introducing them to IUPUI and college life.

UC effectively collaborates with schools in providing summer orientation programs to beginning students.

UC offers beginning students not admitted to schools an effective first-year seminar (UC 110).

UC collaborates well with schools in helping to establish school-based first-year seminars.

UC programs of supplemental instruction for first-year courses are effective in enhancing students' academic success.

UC collaborates well with schools in helping to establish school-based supplemental instruction programs.

UC has taken a leadership role in improving academic advising provided by UC.

UC has taken a leadership role in developing and coordinating K-12 programs designed to increase student access to and preparation for college.

I feel I have received adequate information about UC programs and activities and their impact on student retention and success.

UC has been effective in raising the retention rate of first-year students.

UC plays an important role at IUPUI.

Dean Evenbeck has provided effective leadership in articulating the mission of UC and its importance to the IUPUI campus.

Dean Evenbeck has been effective in working with IUPUI schools and other units to promote student success.

Dean Evenbeck has been effective in managing and investing the resources of UC.

Dean Evenbeck has been effective in obtaining external support for UC programs.

Please make any comments that would enhance your responses or would bring forth other issues that you wish to share about UC and its leadership.

This is a confidential survey. Click on submit below to complete your questionnaire. If desired, you can print this page in your browser

## **Appendix F: Dean Evenbeck's Comments**

## Memorandum

To: Gerald L. Bepko, Chancellor  
William M. Plater, Dean

From: Scott E. Evenbeck, Dean

Subject: Review

Date: May 1, 2002

I have had the opportunity to review the report of the Review Committee chaired by Dr. Rutledge. He invited me to make comments, and I shared some feedback on the report for the Committee's consideration.

My comments back to the Committee were very brief as I found the report very insightful and helpful both in terms of my review and in terms of a review of the work of University College.

My primary reaction to the report is to highlight the extent to which the work of University College represents collaboration—among faculty, staff, students, and others in administrative roles. Faculty governance in a new unit that was itself a new model for working with entering students was “invented” and is monitored by the faculty of University College. They have been fully supportive of collaborative governance, also involving the advisors, other staff, and students, in making decisions about and then implementing and assessing our work. The commitment of the faculty has been outstanding and absolutely essential to our progress.

The Review Committee's reflections on the importance of attending more to communication were very helpful. Though we communicate often with the other units and have established joint positions with many schools and units in part to foster communications, in such a large and complex organization as IUPUI, it is important that we redouble our efforts with communication.

I also note that I believe we have an exemplary program of assessment for entering student initiatives. Our commitment of resources is significant—we have provided the majority of funds for a program evaluation PhD in IMIR and we fund a qualitative research PhD located here. We need to do more to help the

Gerald L. Bepko, Chancellor  
William M. Plater, Dean  
Page 2  
May 1, 2002

campus celebrate this model program of assessment, which owes much to Trudy Banta and Vic Borden's leadership and collaboration.

Another ongoing issue has been what I characterize as a misperception among some on resources in University College. I believe that our model of RCM is different from the model on some other campuses. Fee income goes only to the unit offering the course, none to the unit otherwise serving the student. The University of Michigan assigns a portion of the fee income to the home unit. I think this very model at IUPUI has potential to distort perceptions—contributing to impressions that only the unit offering a course has impact on students, ignoring the enormous work the students' home units make in students' ultimate successes. The issue merits consideration.

Finally, thanks to the support of the Faculty Council and of you and others in campus leadership, University College has been able to become the “experimenting place” and “learning place” envisioned at our formation. The challenge is to continue to re-invent our programs and structures in ways consistent with changes in students, on campus, and in the society. We seek to continue to be a place where we will seek out, define, implement, and assess best practices for increasing student learning, resulting in increased academic achievement and persistence of our students, particularly students who reflect the diversity of our community.

cc: Phillip Rutledge, Chair