

The University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA

Self-Study Design

Provided to:
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
Final Draft
October 6, 2010



University of Pittsburgh

The University of Pittsburgh
Self-Study Design
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
October 2010

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction to the University of Pittsburgh.....	3
II.	Nature and Scope of the Self-Study.....	6
III.	Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study.....	8
IV.	Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups.....	10
V.	Charges to the Working Groups.....	16
VI.	Template for Working Group Reports.....	22
VII.	Inventory of Support Documents.....	23
VIII.	Organization of the Self-Study Report.....	27
IX.	Editorial Style and Format for All Reports.....	28
X.	Timeline.....	29
XI.	Profile of Visiting Evaluation Team.....	32

INTRODUCTION TO THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

The University of Pittsburgh, founded in 1787, is comprised of five campuses. The 132-acre Pittsburgh Campus is located in the City of Pittsburgh's educational and medical center. The University's four regional campuses are located in the following areas of western Pennsylvania: Johnstown, Greensburg, Titusville, and Bradford.

The Pittsburgh campus schools provide baccalaureate, master's, doctorate and professional practice degree programs as well as undergraduate and graduate certificate programs. The regional campuses offer undergraduate certificate programs and associate and baccalaureate degree programs. Overall the University provides 440 distinct degree programs, augmented by numerous dual, joint and cooperative degree program options.

The Pittsburgh Campus encompasses 16 undergraduate, graduate and professional schools including: the School of Arts and Sciences; the School of Dental Medicine; the School of Education; the College of General Studies; the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences; the University Honors College; the School of Information Sciences; the Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business and College of Business Administration; the School of Law; the School of Medicine; the School of Nursing; the School of Pharmacy; the Graduate School of Public Health; the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs; the School of Social Work; and the Swanson School of Engineering. The University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (UPMC), one of the largest health care systems in the nation, is affiliated with the University of Pittsburgh's schools of the health sciences.

Based on a total enrollment of approximately 35,000 students, about 25,000 are undergraduate students and approximately 10,000 are graduate and professional students. More than 4,000 full-time faculty members (and about 900 part-time), approximately 350 research associates and more than 7,000 staff members support the needs and interest of the University community. The University's alumni number more than 266,000 and reside in all states and 160 foreign countries.

The University of Pittsburgh is governed by its Board of Trustees which is responsible for advancing the purposes of the University; promoting and protecting its independence, academic freedom and integrity; and enhancing and preserving its assets for the benefit of future generations of students and society at large. The complete membership of the Board includes the Chancellor and four categories of trustees: Term (17); Special (15); Alumni (6); and Commonwealth (12), for a total of 51 members. The Board delegates general administrative, academic and managerial authority to the Chancellor of the University. The Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor is responsible for general academic policies and standards and for overall academic matters in all schools and colleges, regional campuses and centers.

The University of Pittsburgh's mission is to:

- Provide high-quality undergraduate programs in the arts and sciences and professional fields, with emphasis upon those of special benefit to the citizens of Pennsylvania.
- Offer superior graduate programs in the arts and sciences and the professions that respond to the needs of Pennsylvania, as well as to the broader needs of the nation and the world.
- Engage in research, artistic and scholarly activities that advance learning through the extension of the frontiers of knowledge and creative endeavor.
- Cooperate with industrial and governmental institutions to transfer knowledge in science, technology and health care.
- Offer continuing education programs adapted to the personal enrichment, professional upgrading and career advancement interests and needs of adult Pennsylvanians.
- Make available to local communities and public agencies the expertise of the University in ways that are consistent with the primary teaching and research functions and contribute to social, intellectual and economic development in the Commonwealth, the nation and the world.

The University of Pittsburgh became a state-related, public research university in 1966 and receives an appropriation from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania each year that in fiscal year 2010 accounted for 10.8% of total revenues.

It is worth noting that the past 15 years, in particular, have been a time of distinction and impact at the University of Pittsburgh as we developed academic programs of acknowledged strength and became more recognized as an international center of pioneering research. The University is currently one of the top 10 American higher education institutions in terms of total federal obligations for science and engineering research and development (as reported by the National Science Foundation) and in the top 5 universities in research and development support from the National Institutes of Health. During the aforementioned period, the University also became increasingly successful in attracting and retaining the best students. Since 1995, for example, Pitt students have been awarded three Rhodes scholarships, six Marshall scholarships, five Truman scholarships, five Udall scholarships and thirty-four Goldwater scholarships. In addition, two of our alumni were awarded a Nobel Prize. Our accomplishments across a spectrum of categories are represented in the annual evaluation of the Center for Measuring University Performance (<http://mup.asu.edu>), which for the past four years has placed us in the uppermost tier of the nation's top public research universities—a group that in this past year included Michigan, Illinois, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Berkeley and UCLA.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE SELF-STUDY

For the Self-Study, which will be part of our decennial reaccreditation in 2012, the University of Pittsburgh will use the Selected Topics model on the topic of “Using a University-wide Culture of Assessment for Continuous Improvement.” By primarily addressing the standards of institutional assessment and assessment of the student experience, this Self-Study will provide us with the opportunity to look in depth at a strategy to which we have been deeply committed for some time. These standards include Standard 7, Institutional Assessment and Standard 14, Assessment of Student Learning, and portions of Standard 2, Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal; Standard 8, Student Admissions and Retention; Standard 9, Student Support Services; Standard 11, Educational Offerings; and Standard 12, General Education.

We believe the progress of the University of Pittsburgh over the past 15 years has been driven significantly by the effective use of assessment as a guide to planning and budgeting and as a tool for guiding change. We have worked to incorporate assessment into our way of thinking as we plan for the future and as a means of helping us to determine whether we are truly achieving our institutional goals and fulfilling our mission. This includes a formal process for assessing student learning outcomes that was introduced in 2006.

In line with the requirements of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education review process, the fundamental elements of the assessment-driven activity described in our Self-Study will include: a documented, organized and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve programs, services and student learning outcomes; a foundation in institutional, unit-level and program-level goals; clearly articulated statements of expected outcomes; systematic use of qualitative and quantitative measures that can be used to inform decisions; demonstrated support and ownership by faculty and administration; and evidence of information sharing with appropriate constituents.

The Selected Topics model provides an excellent opportunity for us to reflect upon a culture of assessment at the University of Pittsburgh; to evaluate its contributions to the institution’s emergence in recent years as a leading public research university; to identify its strengths,

challenges and effectiveness in identifying opportunities for improvement or change; and to consider how it might best be used to further our ambitions.

The election of a new provost, who supported the development of assessment at the University, also makes this an opportune time for us to consider the impact of an assessment culture built over years and how it is ingrained in the institutional culture, serving as a foundation as we move forward under new leadership.

INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE SELF-STUDY

At the University of Pittsburgh, assessment is valued throughout the institution and is integrated at both the programmatic and operational levels. Rather than through a separate Office of Assessment, each unit is responsible for assessing outcomes and progress toward the goals for which the unit has responsibility. Accountability is ensured through documented reporting processes and the linking of planning, assessment and budgeting. In some cases, activities are further coordinated through campus- or school-wide committees. Faculty at the program level, for example, report annually on their assessment of student learning following guidelines established by the Council of Deans. Similarly, each school and campus reports annually on its assessment of progress toward goals as part of the annual planning and budgeting cycle.

Oversight responsibility at the institutional level depends upon the category of assessment. For example, the faculty of each program is responsible for the assessment of student learning, with oversight by the appropriate dean and ultimately the vice provost for undergraduate studies or the vice provost for graduate studies. For other types of assessment, the work of units or individuals responsible for integrating assessment into ongoing activities is subject to oversight by a dean, president, or director. Ultimate oversight for the assessment of student experiences is provided by the Enrollment Management Committee and oversight for institutional effectiveness is provided by the vice provost for resources management and planning or the vice chancellor of the budget and controller, as appropriate.

Because assessment is an on-going process and should lead to continuous improvement, we expect this Self-Study will help us to develop a deeper understanding of our current methods of assessment and the degree to which those methods are supporting improvements in institutional effectiveness and the student experience. We expect this understanding to identify where we are having success, and where we are not, and to lead to new insights, enabling us to improve certain approaches to assessment and, therefore, to achieve further progress.

We expect to further our understanding through the study of the ways in which various campuses, schools and units have integrated assessment into their planning and how the assessment of student learning is driving curricular change. This would provide an opportunity for us to identify best practices worthy of emulation by other schools and units.

We anticipate determining the degree to which an assessment mindset and assessment practices have taken hold at our institution, reflecting a cultural shift over time toward stronger accountability. As we better understand how the assessment process is driving change and advancing the institution, we can use that information as a platform to communicate and to raise awareness of our accomplishments to the University community.

While an expected outcome of the Self-Study is not the redesign of any assessment activities or processes, we do expect our analyses, deliberations and final recommendations will provide a foundation for subsequent groups to address existing challenges and to implement any changes that will foster continuous improvement.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUPS

The Steering Committee will have general oversight of the preparation of the Self-Study, oversee the process and progress of the Working Groups, facilitate the sharing of the document in the University community and beyond, moderate the University-wide discussion of the draft report and be responsible for the final text and production of the Self-Study report. Three Working Groups will be charged to address the standards and the Chairs of those Working Groups will be members of the Steering Committee. The Working Groups are expected to identify the critical issues for the University and to propose possible courses of action that will lead to improvement. Further details regarding expectations of the Working Groups are included in the following sections: Template for Working Group Report, Editorial Style and Format, and the Timetable.

Steering Committee

Co-Chairs

Patricia Beeson	Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor and Professor of Economics and Public Policy, School of Arts & Sciences
Samuel Conte	University Registrar

Members

David Bartholomae	Professor of English and Charles Crow Chair, School of Arts & Sciences
Andrew Blair	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Professor of Business Administration and of Economics, Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business and College of Business Administration
Jeffrey Brodsky	Professor of Biology and Avinoff Chair of Biological Sciences, School of Arts & Sciences

John Camillus	Donald R. Beall Professor of Strategic Management, Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business and College of Business Administration
Valire Copeland	Associate Professor, School of Social Work and Graduate School of Public Health, PhD program Director
Mary Crossley	Dean and Professor of Law, School of Law
David Gau	Undergraduate student and member of the Student Government Board
Steven Kanter	Vice Dean, School of Medicine
M. Kathleen Kelly	Assistant Professor and Vice Chair of Physical Therapy, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences and Co-chair of the Senate Education Policies Committee
Byron Kohut	Graduate student of Administrative and Policy Studies, School of Education
Alan Lesgold	Dean and Professor of Education, School of Education
Juan Manfredi	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and Professor of Mathematics, School of Arts & Sciences
Arthur Ramicone	Vice Chancellor, Budget and Controller
Sheila Rathke	Assistant Provost for Strategic and Program Development
Mark Redfern	Associate Dean for Research and Professor of Bioengineering, Swanson School of Engineering
Richard Schulz	Director, University Center for Social and Urban Research and Professor of Psychiatry
William Shields	President, University of Pittsburgh at Titusville
Jane Thompson	Associate Vice Chancellor, Management Information and Analysis

Working Group: Using Assessment to Improve the Student Experience:

Co-Chairs

- M. Kathleen Kelly Assistant Professor and Vice Chair of Physical Therapy, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences and Co-chair of the Senate Education Policies Committee
- Juan Manfredi Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and Professor of Mathematics, School of Arts & Sciences

Members

- James Baldwin Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs and Registrar, University of Pittsburgh at Bradford
- Frank Beatrous, Jr. Professor of Mathematics, School of Arts & Sciences
- Shawn Brooks Associate Dean of Students and Director of Residence Life
- Helen Burns Associate Dean for Clinical Education and Professor of Health and Community Systems, School of Nursing
- Sharon Corey Assistant Dean of Students and Assistant Professor of Pharmaceutical Sciences, School of Pharmacy
- Michael Goodhart Associate Professor of Political Science, School of Arts & Sciences
- Janet Grady Vice President for Academic Affairs (Interim) and Associate Professor of Nursing, University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown
- W. Richard Howe Associate Dean for Administration and Planning, School of Arts & Sciences
- Kathy Humphrey Vice Provost and Dean of Students
- Steven Husted Interim Dean of the University Honors College and Professor of Economics, School of Arts & Sciences
- J. Wesley Jamison Vice President for Academic Affairs and Associate Professor of Information Science, University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg
- Kelly Otter Associate Dean, College of General Studies

Edward Palascak	Associate Dean, College of Business Administration
Betsy Porter	Director, Admissions and Financial Aid
Cynthia Roberts	Director of Institutional Research, Office of Institutional Research
Robert Rodgers	Senior Information Analyst, Office of Institutional Research
Larry Shuman	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor of Industrial Engineering, Swanson School of Engineering
Molly Stieber	Undergraduate student and member of the Student Government Board
John Twyning	Associate Professor of English and Department Chair, School of Arts & Sciences
Hidenori Yamatani	Associate Dean for Research and Professor, School of Social Work
Madalina Valeria Veres	Graduate Student of Eastern European Studies, School of Arts & Sciences

Working Group: Using Assessment to Improve Institutional Effectiveness:

Co-Chairs

Richard Schulz	Director, University Center for Social and Urban Research and Professor of Psychiatry
Jane Thompson	Associate Vice Chancellor, Management Information and Analysis

Members

Susan Albrecht	Associate Dean for External Relations and Associate Professor, School of Nursing
Steven Belle	Professor of Epidemiology, Graduate School of Public Health
Mary Besterfield-Sacre	Associate Professor of Industrial Engineering, Swanson School of Engineering
Stephen Carr	Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies and Research and Associate Professor of English, School of Arts & Sciences

Samuel Conte	University Registrar
David Givens	Graduate Student of Religious Studies, School of Arts & Sciences
Amanda Godley	Associate Professor of English Education, School of Education
Elizabeth Greville	Assistant to the President and Director of Sponsored Programs, University of Pittsburgh at Bradford
James Gyure	Vice President for Enrollment Services and Planning, University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown
Laurie Kirsch	Senior Associate Dean and Professor of Business Administration, Katz Graduate School of Business and College of Business Administration
Sam Rezaeian	Undergraduate student and member of the Student Government Board
Linda Rinaman	Associate Professor of Neuroscience, School of Arts & Sciences
Cynthia Roberts	Director of Institutional Research, Office of Institutional Research
Eli Shorak	Associate Vice Chancellor, Business

Working Group: Demonstrating Compliance through Document Review:

Chair

Andrew Blair Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Members

Malcolm McNeil Distinguished Service Professor and Chair of Communication
Science Disorders, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences

Susan Meyer Associate Dean for Education and Professor of Pharmacy and
Therapeutics, School of Pharmacy

Thurman Wingrove Associate Vice Chancellor, Financial Information

CHARGES TO THE WORKING GROUPS

As noted in the organizational structure, three Working Groups will be formed. The first group will address using assessment to improve the student experience and the second group will address using assessment to improve institutional effectiveness. Together they will cover most of the fundamental elements of Standard 7, Institutional Assessment, and Standard 14, Assessment of Student Learning. In addition, we anticipate that these two groups will partially address the following standards: Standard 2, Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal; Standard 8, Student Admissions and Retention; Standard 9, Student Support Services; Standard 11, Educational Offerings; Standard 12, General Education. The third group will be responsible for compliance and will address, through document review, the standards not addressed in the Self-Study.

Working Group I: Using Assessment to Improve the Student Experience

This Working Group is charged with examining the extent to which assessment of programs, activities, and plans has assisted the institution in improving the student experience, both within and outside of the classroom, on all five campuses. The Working Group will cover two areas: (1) the review of processes used to assess student learning in undergraduate, graduate and professional programs and for undergraduate general education; (2) the assessment of other aspects (extracurricular) of the undergraduate student experience, which will include the effectiveness of assessment in the recruitment, retention and graduation of undergraduate students, as well as student satisfaction with the undergraduate experience. These two areas will address Standard 14, Assessment of Student Learning and portions of Standard 8, Student Admissions and Retention; Standard 9, Student Support Services; Standard 11, Educational Offerings; and Standard 12, General Education.

As a guide to its research, Working Group I is directed to consider the following questions:

- In November 2006, the Council of Deans approved guidelines for assessing student learning in all academic programs offered by the University. How has this process

- been effective in helping the University fulfill its mission to provide high-quality undergraduate, graduate, and professional student programs?
- For undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs:
 - Is the process employed by the academic programs to assess student learning outcomes consistent with the guidelines established by the Council of Deans?
 - Do the assessments generally yield clear and convincing (direct and indirect) evidence that can be used with confidence to improve programs?
 - How well is assessment information used to drive curricular change and enhance student learning?
 - For general education at the undergraduate level:
 - Is the process employed by schools or campuses for assessing student learning outcomes for the general education curriculum consistent with the guidelines established by the Council of Deans?
 - Do the assessments generally yield clear and convincing (direct and indirect) evidence that can be used with confidence to improve programs?
 - How well is assessment information used to drive curricular change and enhance student learning?
 - In what ways does the evidence suggest that the University should rethink or refine its process for assessing student learning outcomes?
 - How well is assessment used to improve the other aspects of the undergraduate student experience on each of the five campuses? On the Pittsburgh campus, this should include the activities of the Enrollment Management Committee, as well as the individual schools and administrative units (including the Offices of Admissions and Financial Aid, Registrar, Facilities, Student Financial Services, and Student Affairs). Similarly, this should include both centralized and unit-level activities on

each of the regional campuses. For each, the following questions should be addressed:

- What are the assessment activities?
- How are assessment activities organized at each campus, school, and unit?
- How well are ongoing assessments used to gauge progress in improving the undergraduate experience? Have *ad hoc* assessments been useful?
- Are the results of these assessments shared appropriately and used to guide strategies for improving the undergraduate experience?
- Is there evidence of a culture of assessment leading to continuous improvements in this campus, school, or unit?
- In what ways does the evidence suggest the University should rethink or refine its assessment activities to better guide programming to improve the student experience?

Working Group II: Using Assessment to Improve Institutional Effectiveness

This Working Group is charged with examining the extent to which assessment of programs, activities, plans, and processes has contributed to the advancement of the University's academic goals. This portion of the Self-Study will review the use of assessment in the University's decentralized planning and budgeting process; consider the effectiveness of institutional and unit level benchmarking; examine the role of assessment in driving institution-level planning for Information Technology and Facilities, and the International Plan for Academic Programs; and review assessment practices in the finance and budget area of the University that are designed to help protect, secure, and manage the institution's assets. These areas fall under Standard 7, Institutional Assessment and Standard 2, Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal.

As a guide to its research, Working Group II is directed to consider the following questions:

- The current planning and budgeting system was adopted in 1992 and during the intervening years that system has evolved to incorporate formal assessment components.
 - How well are assessment components used to guide planning in the individual schools and campuses?
 - How have assessment activities been improved and refined to better inform planning and resource allocation in the schools and campuses over the past decade?
 - What evidence suggests that the use of assessment in the planning process has contributed to a growing culture of assessment, leading to continuous improvement, in the individual schools and campuses?
- In 2003, the University adopted its current set of peer and aspiration peer institutions as well as metrics against which it would measure progress toward key goals.
 - How well has the institution-level benchmarking been used to guide the institution in the advancement of its academic goals?

- How has benchmarking been improved and refined to better inform planning and resource allocation over the past decade?
- What evidence is there these benchmarking activities have contributed to a growing culture of assessment at the University, leading to continuous improvement?

- How well are assessments used in key infrastructure areas that support the academic mission?
 - How well is assessment used to guide the development and implementation of the Information Technology plans, the Facilities plans, and the International plan? What evidence is there of a growing culture of assessment, leading to continuous improvement, in the areas covered by these plans?
 - How well is assessment used in the finance and budget area of the University to help achieve its goal of supporting the academic mission by protecting, securing, and managing the University's assets? Specifically, evaluate the use of assessment in the following areas:
 - Establishing a good system of financial controls
 - Procurement improvements
 - Implementing the asset allocation plan
 - Budget monitoring

- In what ways does the evidence suggest that the University should rethink or refine its assessment activities to better guide its progress in any of the above areas?

Working Group III: Demonstrating Compliance through Document Review

This Working Group is charged with ensuring that we have demonstrated compliance with the standards and fundamental elements not covered in the Self-Study by collecting relevant documents and developing an annotated roadmap for each of the standards.

TEMPLATE FOR WORKING GROUP REPORTS

Working Groups I and II will submit reports that conform to the following organization and format:

- Provide an overview of the Working Group topic and charge
- Identify the critical issues for the institution on the topic
- Address the key research questions (add others as they arise)
- Provide an analytical discussion of the inquiry undertaken and evaluate relevant assessment strategies and processes
- Summarize strengths of present systems that have led to a culture of assessment for continuous improvement
- Identify opportunities and make recommendations for improvement or change
- Explain how the group's findings and conclusions relate to MSCHE standards as articulated in Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education
- Discuss the connection of this group's topic with the other group, and of any collaboration between groups that took place.

Working Group III will compile relevant documents and develop a documentation roadmap for standards not addressed in the Self-Study. The roadmap will be contained in the appendix of the Self-Study.

NOTE: Use format guidelines on page 28 with one exception. For the initial drafts of the Working Group document, use 1.5 spacing for ease of editing. Provide final draft in 1.0 spacing.

INVENTORY OF SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

The Office of the Provost will work with the Chairs of each Working Group to ensure that Working Groups and subcommittees have all the data and documents they need to fulfill their charges. Requests for additional data and documents or for new research should be made by the Chairs to the Office of the Provost. Using the University portal, Working Groups will be able to access all data and documents that are available electronically as well as see an inventory of paper documents available in the “document room.” What follows is an abbreviated list of the electronic and paper data and documents that will be available.

Mission, Goals, and Planning

- Institutional Mission and Goals Statement
- Provost Area Goals
- Chancellor and Provost Reports and Speeches
- A Description of the Planning and Budgeting System
- Reviews of the Planning and Budgeting System
- Provost’s Instructions and Requests to Units for Annual Plans
- Schools’ and Units’ Annual Plans
- Provost’s Review of Schools’ and Units’ Annual Plans
- Provost Area Planning and Budgeting Committee Review of Schools’ and Units’ Annual Plans
- Facilities Plans
- Information Technology Plans
- International Plan
- Policies and Procedures for Adding or Closing Academic Programs

Benchmarking

- Annual Benchmark Reports on the University
- Benchmark Reports for Schools and Regional Campuses
- Presentations to:
 - The Board of Trustees
 - The University Senate
 - The Council of Deans

Assessment

- Surveys, including:
 - Student Satisfaction
 - National Survey of Student Engagement
 - Cooperative Institutional Research Program
 - Student Experience in the Research University
 - Graduation/Senior Surveys
 - Post-Graduation Surveys
 - Alumni Surveys
 - Leaver Surveys
- Accreditation Reports for Schools and Programs
- Assessments of Student Learning Outcomes, including:
 - Assessment plans for each degree and certificate program (including general education for undergraduate programs)
 - Annual reports on assessment activities for each degree and certificate program
 - Annual review of plans by the Provost's Office
 - Summary of programmatic changes as a result of assessments
 - Results of student performance on national assessment tests
 - Collegiate Learning Assessment

- Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency
 - Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills
- Presentations and workshops

Publications and Reports

- Charter and Bylaws
- Organizational Charts
- Catalogs and Bulletins
- Handbooks for Students, Faculty, and Staff
- Policy Manual
- Annual Budget Reports
- Audited Financial Statements
- Enrollment Management Studies and Reports on:
 - Diversity
 - Undergraduate Education
 - Retention and Graduation
 - Freshman Integration and First Year Experience
 - Early Intervention
 - Student Services
 - Student Affairs Programs
 - Student Life
 - Student Satisfaction
- Admissions Resources, including website, transfer information, and overview of programs
- Financial Aid Resources, including website and information on scholarships
- Annual Admissions Reports
- Student Affairs Resources, including website, policies, programs, and related services
- Annual Institutional Research reports including information on enrollment, retention and graduation

- University Fact Book

Middle States Documents

- Middle States Annual Institutional Profiles
- Middle States Statement of Accreditation
- 2001 Self-Study and response
- 2007 Periodic Review Report
- Middle States Association Publications, including:
 - *Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report (2007)*
 - *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Eligibility Requirements and Standards for Accreditation (2006)*
 - *Team Visits: Conducting and Hosting an Evaluation Visit (2007)*
 - *Assessing Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness: Understanding Middle States Expectations*
 - *Student Learning Assessment: Options and Resources (2007)*

ORGANIZATION OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

1. Executive Summary and Eligibility Certification Statement
2. Overview of Self-Study Process
3. Institutional Profile
4. Using Assessment to Improve the Student Experience
5. Using Assessment to Improve Institutional Effectiveness
6. Demonstrating Compliance through Document Review
7. Summary of Major Findings and Recommendations
8. Appendices
 - Documentation roadmap
 - Evidence or support documents
 - Any new reports that are generated

EDITORIAL STYLE AND FORMAT FOR ALL REPORTS

All documents presented for the Self-Study will be reviewed and edited by the Steering Committee for content as well as to ensure consistency in format, voice and style. Each Working Group is requested to follow the format guidelines listed below to facilitate the process of integrating the chapters into a final report:

Software:	Microsoft Word 2007 (get upgrade if necessary) for text Microsoft Excel for graphs, charts, tables
Spacing:	1.0 spacing, 1" margins
Font:	Cambria (12 pt)
Headings:	Main headings, large caps, bold; secondary headings, caps and lower case, bold
Bullets:	First-level bullets—solid circles; second-level bullets—unfilled circles; third-level bullets—filled-in squares; repeat
Text Boxes:	Add sidebars, as appropriate
Paragraphs	Block style, left justified
Length:	No more than 50 pages for each Working Group, single-spaced, plus appendices
Editorial Style:	First person plural, present tense, active voice, not text heavy but provide clear rationalizations and transitions, make prudent use of bullets. Use Pitt style guide at www.umc.pitt.edu/styleguide/
Pagination:	show x of y pages
Guiding Principle:	Limit opinion. Base assertions on fact and support with evidence
Footnotes:	APA Style

TIMELINE

March 2010

- March 11, 2010: Submitted preliminary Self-Study proposal to MSCHE including draft Document Roadmap
- March 18, 2010: Met with MSCHE liaison, Dr. Mary Ellen Petrisko

Summer 2010

- Steering Committee and Working Groups formed, Self-Study Design developed and reviewed

August - September 2010

- August 31: Steering Committee meets to discuss and approve Self-Study Design and research questions
- September 7: Self-Study Design and research questions submitted to Middle States
- September 22: MSCHE liaison conducts Self-Study preparation visit

September 2010 – May 2011

- Steering Committee oversees research and reporting by Working Groups
- Working Groups meet, establish calendar, gather data to answer research questions
- Working Group Chairs update Steering Committee Chair monthly, update full Steering Committee once per term

December 2010

- Working Groups submit interim reports to Steering Committee

January – February 2011

- MSCHE selects Evaluation Team Chair, and Pitt reviews and communicates any conflicts of interest regarding selection
- Team Chair and Pitt select dates for team visit and for Team Chair's preliminary visit
- Pitt sends Self-Study Design to the Team Chair

March – September 2011

- MSCHE selects Evaluation Team members, and Pitt reviews and communicates any conflicts of interest regarding selections
- Steering Committee receives draft text from Working Groups and develops draft Self-Study
 - April 30: Working Groups submit reports
 - May: Steering Committee meets to discuss Working Group reports
 - July 30: Draft Self-Study text submitted to Steering Committee for review
 - September: Steering Committee approves draft Self-Study

September – November 2011

- Pitt community reviews draft Self-Study
- Pitt's governing board reviews draft Self-Study
- Pitt submits draft Self-Study to MSCHE Evaluation Team Chair prior to Chair's visit

December 2011 – January 2012

- Team Chair makes preliminary visit to Pitt four months prior to Evaluation Team visit
- Document Review by MSCHE generalist reviewers on campus
- Pitt prepares final draft of Self-Study

February – May 2012

- Pitt sends final Self-Study to Evaluation Team and MSCHE liaison six weeks prior to visit
- Evaluation Team visit
- Evaluation Team report

- Pitt response

Summer 2012 or Fall 2012

- Committee on Evaluation Reports meets; Commission action

PROFILE OF THE VISITING TEAM

The University of Pittsburgh suggests a visiting Evaluation Team with 7-9 members. For the process to be useful, it would be best to have as team members individuals from research universities with profiles similar to the University of Pittsburgh and who are experienced in implementing assessment processes at a highly complex, decentralized institution. The team should include individuals with responsibility for implementing assessments at various levels within such institutions including: faculty members (possibly department chairs) from professional schools such as Law, Engineering, and Business, as well as the Arts and Sciences; Associate Deans from these same schools; and Vice Provost/Deans for Undergraduate Education. Since our Self-Study will also include a review of key assessment activities within the Business and Finance areas, it will be important to also include individuals from these areas with responsibilities related to financial controls, procurement, asset allocation planning, and budget monitoring.

The Chair of the Evaluation Team should be an experienced team chair who is provost, president or chancellor of a major research university.