

Final Design Plan for 2013-2016 Self Study
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Submitted to

Dr. Debra Klinman

Middle States Commission on Higher Education

April 30, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NARRATIVE OF OUR PROGRESS ON THE SELF STUDY TO DATE.....	4
THE INSTITUTION, ITS MISSION, AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS.....	4
STRATEGIC PLANNING AND THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS	5
INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE 2013-2016 SELF STUDY.....	5
NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE SELF-STUDY	6
First steps for the 2013-2016 self-study: Forming the steering committee	6
Choosing the comprehensive model and forming the subcommittees.....	7
Plan for communications.....	8
Creating the research questions	8
Report from the MSCHE Self-Study Institute	9
CHARGES TO THE SUBCOMMITTEES	10
GUIDELINES AND TEMPLATE FOR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS.....	10
INVENTORY OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.....	11
ORGANIZATION OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT.....	11
EDITORIAL STYLE AND FORMAT.....	13
TIMETABLE FOR THE SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION.....	14
SUGGESTED PROFILE OF THE VISITING EVALUATION TEAM	16
APPENDIX A Strategic vision for IUP.....	17
APPENDIX B Steering committee roster.....	18
APPENDIX C Subcommittee rosters.....	19
APPENDIX D Communications plan for the IUP Middle States self-study.....	26
APPENDIX E Big picture themes for research questions.....	28
APPENDIX F Charges to the subcommittees.....	32
APPENDIX G Research questions.....	34
APPENDIX H Subcommittee report template	41
APPENDIX I Data organization and access	42

APPENDIX J Style sheet43

NARRATIVE OF OUR PROGRESS ON THE SELF STUDY TO DATE

Indiana University of Pennsylvania has received consecutive Middle States accreditation since its first review in 1941; our last comprehensive self-study was in 2005. Since that review, changes in university leadership have included five presidents and six provosts, as well as a number of financial challenges. Despite this, IUP has maintained a sound foundation and continued to offer students an excellent education. We approach the 2013-2016 self-study with renewed optimism for the future, and, consequently, a deep commitment to the rigor and success of the overall endeavor. We have put into place many of the building blocks on which the process will unfold, and we look forward to the opportunities this self-study will provide for us to grow and improve in the coming years. To put it succinctly, we are eager to embark on the next stage of our journey.

THE INSTITUTION, ITS MISSION, AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

IUP is one of the largest universities in the 14-member Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE) and the only doctoral/research university in the PASSHE. With relatively stable enrollments over the years, the university currently has approximately 12,600 undergraduate and 2,300 graduate students in 136 undergraduate, 57 master's, and 11 doctoral programs. In addition to the Indiana campus, educational offerings occur at three off-campus locations. There are 770 faculty members and about the same number of administration and staff members. Founded in 1875 as Indiana Normal School, the school achieved university status in 1965. It is among Pennsylvania's most affordable comprehensive universities.

Mission: Indiana University of Pennsylvania is a leading public, doctoral/research university, strongly committed to undergraduate and graduate instruction, scholarship, and public service. Indiana University of Pennsylvania engages students as learners and leaders in an intellectually challenging, culturally enriched, and contemporarily diverse environment. Inspired by a dedicated faculty and staff, students become productive national and world citizens who exceed expectations personally and professionally.

Recent major developments at IUP include changes in senior leadership and the creation of a strategic vision. Following a successful national search, our 26th and current president, Dr. Michael Driscoll, began his tenure in July 2012. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Dr. Timothy Moerland took office in January 2013, following a national search and the retirement of Provost Intemann, who had served from 2008 through 2012. Since the new provost began his position, two permanent deans have been hired, ending a long period at IUP during which many academic leaders were interim appointments. In addition, the Assistant to the President for Social Equity was hired to direct the Office of Social Equity in June 2013, filling the last high-level administrative vacancy on campus. By all accounts, the university's new leaders have made significant progress in placing IUP on a sound footing and in a good position to undertake this Middle States review. The renewed spirit of collaboration is especially evident in the productive and professional relationships between leaders of the university administration and the presidents of the three largest unions on campus, APSCUF, AFSCME, and SCUPA.

In addition to hiring new leaders, the university also finalized a strategic vision resulting from a wide-ranging process begun by President Driscoll soon after his arrival. During the spring and summer of 2013, faculty member Dr. Michele Papakie and 30 of her journalism students met with hundreds of members of the IUP and other stakeholder communities and asked two questions deemed critical for IUP's identity and future: *What makes IUP distinctive? What would you like to see IUP celebrate at its sesquicentennial celebration in 2025?* They also examined the vision, mission, core values, and strategic plan of each university in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education and the PASSHE's overall plan for the system. On October 28, 2013,

President Driscoll hosted a campus-wide meeting, the Strategic Visioning Summit. This was an unprecedented event for IUP in which over 400 faculty, staff, and students discussed a draft of the statement prior to its endorsement by the University Senate and Council of Trustees.

See Appendix A for the statement of IUP's strategic vision.

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS

With the university's vision statement in place, attention is now focused on creating a new strategic plan and the processes needed to sustain it. The long-standing and broadly representative University Planning Council was refocused in Fall 2013 and will continue to work with the president and provost to lead strategic planning. The UPC was identified many times in previous accreditation reviews as being a cornerstone of IUP's tradition of participatory decision-making – and one with an effective track record. Continuing the tradition and recognizing the effectiveness of this mechanism, the president, provost, and UPC will share information, including enrollment and budget data, and create plans that adhere to the university's vision, fulfill its mission, and above all expand opportunities for the students we serve.

The vision process, strategic plan, and MSCHE self-study have enlisted representatives from key stakeholder groups. It is our good fortune that timelines for the self-study and strategic plan are concurrent, with the self-study wrapping up in academic year 2015-2016 and the strategic plan due to be completed by May 2015. We have capitalized on this timing in two ways. The first grows out of the overlapping membership of the self-study and strategic planning groups and facilitates the sharing of data, analyses, reports, and recommendations as they evolve. The second is based upon the steering committee's goal for the outcomes of the self-study. Our final report will be a candid assessment whose recommendations will require follow up in the university's strategic plan. Accordingly, the steering committee believes that the key recommendations appearing in the final report must be taken up by the UPC and university leadership, and that they will be integrated with IUP's strategic plan. In other words, the UPC is the bridge between self-study and action plans.

We expect the positive synergy between strategic planning and the self-study will greatly accelerate IUP's progress toward its goals. Thus it is significant that the steering committee spent considerable time developing the specific outcomes intended for this self-study (see list of outcomes, below). They are focused and strategic, and they are meant to guide the subcommittees as they work toward the self-study's ultimate goal of advancing the institution.

INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE 2013-2016 SELF STUDY

1. Affirm that IUP is well-positioned to continue to fulfill its mission with respect to the 14 Middle States Standards of Excellence.
2. Capitalize on the overlapping efforts of university visioning, strategic planning, and Middle States self-study to inform IUP's decision-making processes and to identify IUP-specific opportunities and challenges, including budget and enrollment.
3. Discover and document our current assessment practices to identify shortcomings and opportunities and to make recommendations for continuous improvement of IUP's assessment practices.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE SELF-STUDY

First steps for the 2013-2016 self-study: Forming the steering committee

In March, 2013, Dr. Laura Delbrugge, Professor of Spanish and former department chair, was appointed as the faculty co-chair of the IUP 2015 Middle States accreditation steering committee. Soon after, Dr. Hilliary Creely, Assistant Dean for Research in the School of Graduate Studies and Research, was appointed as the administration co-chair of the steering committee. Dr. Ben Rafoth, Distinguished University Professor and Director of the IUP Writing Center, was appointed as faculty writer for the self-study. Drs. Creely and Delbrugge worked with IUP administration to appoint a representative steering committee to guide and lead the reaffirmation of accreditation process.

See Appendix B for a complete roster of the steering committee membership.

The 34-member steering committee met for the first time on May 7, 2013. At this meeting, co-chairs Creely and Delbrugge described the nature and purpose of the Middle States process for reaffirmation of accreditation, the history of IUP's last two self-studies, the role of the steering committee, and the timeline for the current review. The co-chairs described the responsibilities of the steering committee and responded to questions and concerns. The committee agreed to abide by the responsibilities and to assume additional roles and responsibilities as needed. The responsibilities of the committee are understood to be as follows:

1. Provide guidance for the entire self-study
2. Help to create self-study research questions for subcommittees
3. Coordinate documents and reports with Ms. Barbe Moore, the IUP Director of Planning and Assessment, and data point person for the 2013-2016 self-study.
4. Serve as co-chairs and/or members of subcommittees
5. Communicate with members of the IUP community
6. Guide the creation of surveys and other sources of data and evidence
7. Review, give feedback, and approve all subcommittee reports and the final report
8. Make key recommendations, based on evidence and analysis, for the university's identity and future.

Also attending this first meeting were President Driscoll and Provost Moerland, who charged the steering committee to use the review process to confront hard questions in order to help move the institution forward. The president, provost, and co-chairs urged the steering committee to remain future-oriented, ensure broad participation, and 'own' the endeavor. Members of the steering committee, several of whom were on the committee for the university's 2005 comprehensive self-study, agreed to lead the process, to gather and analyze evidence for each standard, and to produce a final report that is both comprehensive and well-focused. Members of the committee noted, for example, that communication with the IUP community will be key and technology will be critical to the effectiveness of this communication. They also pointed out that enrollment and state funding will continue to present challenges for the university that the self-study process can help us to meet, and they agreed that IUP will face decisions about which courses and programs to maintain, change, and eliminate; these decisions will require solid evidence that the self-study can provide.

Members of the committee also noted two factors related to leadership and planning at IUP. First, the university's new president, provost, and leadership teams have begun their tenure with a fresh outlook on the university's strengths and challenges. Second, the initiatives for IUP's strategic vision (December 2013), self-study (2013-2016), and strategic plan (2015) come together to offer an unparalleled opportunity for institutional renewal.

Choosing the comprehensive model and forming the subcommittees

The summer of 2013 was an important planning stage in IUP's self-study process. At the recommendation of the co-chairs, steering committee members unanimously approved the comprehensive model for the self-study and these groupings of the 14 MSCHE Standards of Excellence into 7 subcommittees.

IUP SUBCOMMITTEE	MSCHE STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE
Subcommittee 1: Mission, Goals and Integrity	Standards 1 & 6
Subcommittee 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, Institutional Renewal and Institutional Resources	Standards 2 & 3
Subcommittee 3: Leadership, Governance, and Administration	Standards 4 & 5
Subcommittee 4: Student Admissions, Retention and Support Services	Standards 8 & 9
Subcommittee 5: Faculty and Educational Offerings	Standards 10 & 11
Subcommittee 6: General Education and Related Educational Activities	Standards 12 & 13
Subcommittee 7: Institutional Assessment and Student Learning Assessment	Standards 7 & 14

Subsequently, co-chairs Delbrugge and Creely worked through the summer to appoint subcommittee chairs. It was decided that each subcommittee would have co-chairs in order to provide representation of faculty, staff, and administrators in these important and visible leadership roles, as well as to ease the burden of work on the subcommittee co-chairs themselves. These appointments were made by the steering committee co-chairs. At least one of the two co-chairs on each subcommittee is a member of the steering committee. This appointment structure is designed to facilitate communication between the groups. Any subcommittee co-chair who is not an appointed member of the steering committee has been encouraged to attend steering committee meetings when appropriate. These subcommittee co-chair appointments have been instrumental in generating the high level of participation seen thus far in the reaccreditation process. All subcommittee co-chair appointments were completed by August, 2013. In addition, some early key appointments by virtue of expertise were made to a few subcommittees at the request of the subcommittee co-chairs.

As fall semester 2013 got underway, the steering committee co-chairs disseminated an email invitation to everyone in the IUP community to submit their names for consideration for membership on one of the seven subcommittees. These invitations were broadcast via a Qualtrics online survey and resulted in over 300 responses from staff, faculty, students, and administrators. This is the largest number of volunteer responses for any project in recent history.

- Faculty: 120 volunteers
- Staff: 41 volunteers
- Students: 67 volunteers (undergraduate and graduate)
- Administration: 42 volunteers

The appointments of 160 individuals (approximately), representing a cross-section of the IUP community, were then made by the steering committee co-chairs to the seven subcommittees. In doing so, the co-chairs tried to balance a number of factors, including volunteer preference, status as faculty, student, staff, or

administrator, areas of expertise and experience, gender, and ethnicity as well as appropriately balanced representation of colleges, departments, and university operating divisions. The steering committee co-chairs have been in frequent communication with university leadership throughout the self-study process in order to provide updates and appropriate opportunities for input and guidance. This feedback is communicated back to the steering committee but does not restrict the work done by this group. University leadership is firmly committed to the participatory and democratic nature of the self-study process.

See Appendix C for the roster of subcommittee members.

Plan for communications

In September of 2013, the co-chairs proposed, and the steering committee adopted, a communications plan for the self-study. In addition, a website (<http://www.iup.edu/middlestates/default.aspx>) was created within the webpage of the Division of Academic Affairs and news items were published in the *IUP Daily* campus bulletin. A promotional video by President Driscoll was placed on the website, and the commencement of the 2015 self-study process was announced by the president and deans during opening day ceremonies August 23, 2013. During the fall semester, the steering committee co-chairs also made 19 small-group presentations for the Council of Deans, the Division of Student Affairs, Facilities and Maintenance, Athletics, Division of Administration and Finance, Council of Trustees, and various student groups, among others. With the assistance of Informational Technology Services, the co-chairs implemented Confluence, a secure web-based software platform designed for team collaboration. Confluence has made it possible for the steering committee and subcommittees to store, organize, and share documents, control access to specific areas within the site, and collaborate on surveys, reports, and other documents. In addition, Ms. Barbe Moore, the Director of Planning and Assessment for IUP, was designated as the data point person for this Middle States 2015 self-study; she has been organizing data to be used by the subcommittees since June 2013.

See Appendix D for the complete communications plan.

Creating the research questions

The steering committee spent considerable time creating the necessary structure and guiding documents that will be needed for the self-study process. The steering committee has created a template to be used for the reports generated by each subcommittee, individual subcommittee charge documents, and a referral form for issues beyond the purview of each subcommittee. It has also created a template to be used for the format of the final report. Also, the steering committee and subcommittees have worked tirelessly to draft meaningful research questions that form the heart of the self-study process. These are described in separate sections in the pages that follow.

For a period of eight weeks in Fall 2013, the steering committee met four times to review, select, and draft research questions for each subcommittee. There were two phases of this review and selection.

For the first phase, the steering committee co-chairs assembled a list of hundreds of questions used in other self studies at IUP and other institutions; the steering committee examined each question on the list to ensure that every aspect of each standard was being considered. This was essential for ensuring that the self-study be comprehensive. At the same time, members of the committee combined, prioritized, and drafted new questions to reduce overlap and shape the questions to the university's needs. The steering committee also sought to compose the questions in language understandable to the university's various constituencies. Before taking up the questions, however, the co-chairs led the committee in creating a set of criteria for choosing the questions. These criteria grew out of the president's charge to the steering committee and the

committee members' familiarity with, and discussions of, conducting research and examining many facets of the university. The steering committee therefore decided that questions to be chosen for the self-study must meet the following criteria:

1. Be deemed important for the institution,
2. Not significantly overlap with the research questions of other subcommittees,
3. Be feasible for collecting and analyzing data, and
4. Contextualize IUP's past and be important for our future direction.

While affirming these criteria, the steering committee also made clear to subcommittee chairs that research questions may change as the various subcommittees collaborate to share evidence and prioritize their work as new evidence emerges. The steering committee also noted that while subcommittees may change their research questions as evidence is gathered, all changes from those listed in this design plan must first be approved by the steering committee. All draft research questions were completed by the steering committee on October 30, 2013, and the subcommittee charge documents were distributed to subcommittee co-chairs by November 1. Subcommittees then worked to revise and refine the questions by a December 1 deadline.

A subsequent, second phase in the creation of the research questions occurred at the November 12, 2013 meeting of the steering committee, a meeting devoted to reflection and oversight. As the subcommittees were in possession of the draft research questions, the steering committee was able to step back from its earlier work and consider the questions from a new perspective. At the November 12 meeting, the co-chairs asked the committee to reflect once again on the Standards of Excellence and the potential of the self-study to move IUP forward, as President Driscoll had charged at the steering committee's initial meeting. In other words, the co-chairs asked: What critical questions about the university have we not yet considered? The discussion was frank and ranged across the 14 standards. Some points overlapped with research questions already selected and some raised new issues, but the steering committee decided to refer all points from this discussion to each subcommittee for further consideration, with the understanding that the subcommittees were, at this point, in the best position to decide how best to prioritize them.

See Appendix E for the questions and discussion points from this November 12, 2013 meeting.

Report from the MSCHE Self-Study Institute

Shortly after returning from the MSCHE Self-Study Institute in Philadelphia, held November 12-14, 2013, the steering committee co-chairs and the executive staff assistant to the provost reported to the steering committee, the president, and provost the details of what they had learned over the course of five plenary meetings, discussions, and conversations. Their report may be summarized as follows. First, they reported on feedback they received indicating that IUP had made good progress to date in planning for the self-study. Second, they reported on Middle States' expectations for assessment, including the importance of ample documentation for the final report, clear and focused research questions, a strong sense of what the university hopes to achieve from the self-study, and a plan for sustaining the momentum for 2016 and beyond. Third, they noted that the institution will need to show evidence that it is making data-based decisions with respect to planning and resources. Fourth, they described the need to take into account new federal regulations that apply to compliance and self-study reviews. And fifth, they previewed the key steps to be taken by MSCHE before accreditation is awarded to the institution.

Dr. Debra Klinman, MSCHE vice president and IUP's liaison for the self-study, visited the IUP campus on February 26, 2014. This self-study design document has been revised according to the feedback received during this visit.

CHARGES TO THE SUBCOMMITTEES

See Appendix F for charges to the subcommittees.

The steering committee has now formally charged each subcommittee to investigate the Middle States Standards of Excellence it has been assigned, with the understanding that each subcommittee will follow the document entitled *Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report*, 2nd ed., and in particular Chapter Four: “Linking the Design and Self-Study to Commission Standards and Expectations” as a guide for each subcommittee’s research design.

See Appendix G for the list of research questions.

In addition, the steering committee expects that each subcommittee will be guided by their respective research questions, which were developed by the steering committee and chosen because (1) they are deemed important for IUP, (2) they do not significantly overlap with the questions of other committees, (3) the collection and analysis of data for them seems feasible, and (4) they are future-oriented. The steering committee welcomes proposals to revise these questions or pose alternate ones up to and continuing through data collection, and it will carefully consider each proposal. Any proposed changes to the research questions, however, must first be approved by the steering committee.

Once the research questions are finalized, the subcommittee is to gather and analyze evidence that addresses the questions and provide regular updates regarding the subcommittee’s progress to the steering committee. They are then to produce preliminary and final drafts of the subcommittee report, using the steering committee’s guidelines (see below).

The steering committee recommends that subcommittees use the guidelines to help them think about how best to address their research questions. The guidelines are not a required part of the process and may be modified, but they may help to organize subcommittee work.

GUIDELINES AND TEMPLATE FOR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

See Appendix H for the template for subcommittee reports.

Subcommittees are asked to keep the following guidelines in mind with regard to gathering evidence, conducting analyses, drawing conclusions, and making recommendations:

Research

- Research questions are meant to organize and focus the work of the subcommittees as they connect the standards to different dimensions of the institution. While the questions provide important scaffolding for planning, data collection, and analysis, Dr. Debra Klinman (our liason) noted, in her remarks to the steering committee during the campus visit, that we should expect the research questions to “fall away” as we move toward writing the subcommittee and final reports.
- It is helpful to consider what kinds of research is called for in any given research question. For example, some types of questions call for assessment (*How effective are the support services we provide to students?*); some call for describing the status of something or a process (*What is the current state of assessment of student learning at IUP?*); some call for analyzing a cause or impact (*How do PASSHE policies impact the university’s ability to manage its resources?*); some call for interpretation (*Are the university’s core values represented in its programs and activities?*); and some

call for other things like lists or identification (*Which university policies address the integrity standard?*)

Evidence

- Evidence may be found in existing documents such as the Middle States library we have established on the Confluence website or the various departmental five-year reports, or it may need to be gathered specifically for the self-study (such as part of the planned master IUP Middle States survey, to be conducted in fall 2014).
- For each research question, the committee must decide on the best methods for collecting and analyzing evidence. Subcommittee reports will need to summarize the methods used to collect and analyze evidence.
- Subcommittees need to weigh the extent to which evidence is sound, and the subcommittee report will address the quality of available evidence.

Analysis

- Analysis is needed to bridge the gap between a research question and the judgments and evaluations needed to answer it. Evidence cannot be assumed to speak for itself in answering the question.

The subcommittee co-chairs are advised to read Chapter 4 of *Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report* (2nd edition) for suggestions on creating research questions and gathering data.

INVENTORY OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

All supporting documents for this self study will be stored digitally on a secure server for convenient access and viewing by the visiting team and members of the IUP community until the final report is accepted. At the present time, relevant documents and data necessary for the completion of subcommittee reports are being maintained in a password-protected area of the Confluence site ('Middle States Library'). Prior to the dissemination of the final self-study in fall 2015, all supporting documents for this self-study will be stored digitally on a secure server for convenient access and viewing by the visiting team and members of the IUP community.

See Appendix I for information about data access and organization.

ORGANIZATION OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

From the outset, our goal in this self-study has been to ask hard questions, analyze evidence carefully, maintain a 'big picture' view of the university, and seek community input. We expect to discover new information and ideas, and we will need to organize the final report in ways that highlight what we have learned about the institution at the end of the process. Based on the subcommittee reports, the final report will be drafted by the faculty writer in collaboration with the co-chairs and with input, feedback, and final approval by the steering committee.

The table of contents for the final report may be organized as follows. Annotations appear in italics.

Executive summary of the self-study

A 3-5 page executive summary will summarize and highlight the process, conclusions, and recommendations of the full report.

Eligibility certificate statement

The certificate will be signed by the university president and chair of the Council of Trustees.

List of steering committee and subcommittee members

The list will contain names, titles, and affiliations for each individual.

PART I

Introduction

The introduction will contain the goal, purpose, and rationale for the self-study as well as an overview of the organization of the final report and the location of supporting documents.

Chapter One: Processes

Chapter One will describe various processes related to the project, including the organization and procedures of committees, gathering and analysis of data, and formation of conclusions and recommendations. The goal of this chapter is not only to provide accurate descriptions of what we did but also to build confidence in the openness and transparency of our conduct and values.

Chapter Two: Synthesis

This chapter will attempt to synthesize the seven subcommittee reports, including their conclusions and recommendations, in order to create a narrative of our institutional identity and future direction. This chapter will constitute the bulk of Part I and will link subcommittee findings and conclusions back to the overarching goal of the self-study, which is to provide evidence-based recommendations that help to move IUP forward. The synthesis provided in this chapter will lay the ground work for the recommendations in Chapter Three. Creating this synthesis will require the steering committee to be selective and to assign priorities, but doing so is seen as necessary to address the president's charge and ensure the success of the self-study.

Chapter Three: Key Recommendations

This chapter will contain the steering committee's list of recommendations for IUP, based on the reports of the seven subcommittees. These recommendations will be clear and specific, and they will include the steering committee's recommendations for those units the committee believes are primarily responsible for addressing them.

PART II

Executive Summaries of the Seven Subcommittee Reports

Each of the executive summaries from the subcommittees will appear here, as written by the subcommittee and based on its full report. Full reports will be published under separate cover. The executive summaries will be edited for clarity, format, and stylistic consistency. Prior to inclusion in the final report, each subcommittee's summary and full report will be reviewed and given feedback by the steering committee so that reports can be taken back to subcommittee and revised. Once the requested revisions have been made and are deemed acceptable by the steering committee, the committee will vote to accept the reports.

Production of the final self-study report, including layout, images, typesetting, binding, and other formatting features will be done by the IUP Communications Office and overseen by the faculty writer and steering committee co-chairs.

EDITORIAL STYLE AND FORMAT

See Appendix J for the style sheet for all reports.

TIMETABLE FOR THE SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION

TERM	ACCOMPLISHMENTS
April-May 2013	Steering committee formed First meeting of steering committee May 7, 2013
May 2013	Self-study organizational model chosen
June 2013	Subcommittee chairs selected; appointments to subcommittees begin
July 2013	Early draft research questions created by co-chairs; data gathering begins, organized according to MSCHE Accreditation Readiness Report Guidelines (“Document Roadmap”)
August 2013	IUP Middle States website created Data sharing wiki chosen (Confluence)
YEAR 1	SUBCOMMITTEES FORM AND WORK BEGINS
September 2013	MSCHE 2015 Review Process communicated to IUP community Subcommittee appointments finalized; Communication plan finalized
October 2013	Steering committee and subcommittees finalize research questions; Initial meetings of subcommittees/subcommittee review of research questions/ return revised research questions to steering committee for final approval
November 2013	Self-Study Institute
December 2013	Research questions finalized by steering committee; searchable data library created in Confluence
February 2014	Self-study design finalized by steering committee Site visit by MSCHE staff liaison to review self-study design on February 26, 2014; revisions to self-study design requested. Data point person meets with subcommittees about data in Confluence Subcommittees request data and begin analysis
March 2014	Steering committee revises self-study design
April 2014- May 2014	Revised self-study design sent to MSCHE liaison April 30, 2014; subcommittees continue to meet, gather data, and report back to the steering committee
YEAR 2	DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS BY SUBCOMMITTEES/ CREATION OF DRAFT SELF-STUDY REPORT
September- December, 2014	Subcommittees continue to collect and analyze data

TERM	ACCOMPLISHMENTS
October 2014	MSCHE Master Survey conducted via Qualtrics to IUP community
November 2014	Survey results received and tallied by steering committee
December 10, 2014	Subcommittees submit drafts of Chapter Outlines to steering committee
February 2015	First drafts of chapters from subcommittees submitted to steering committee co-chairs; reviewed by steering committee and feedback given to subcommittees
April 2015	Second drafts from subcommittees submitted to steering committee co-chairs; reviewed by steering committee
May 2015	Steering committee makes recommendations to Faculty writer by May 15
Summer 2015	Faculty writer synthesizes report and drafts self-study report
YEAR 3	CREATION OF THE FINAL REPORT AND ON-CAMPUS MSCHE TEAM VISIT
September 2015	Self-study report (revised draft version) shared with steering committee ; review and community-wide discussion of self-study; revisions made as necessary
October 2015	Second draft of self-study generated and distributed
November 2015	Self-study draft sent to Team Chair in advance of Preliminary Visit MSCHE Evaluation Team Chair visits IUP campus
December 2015- January 2016	Edits and revision of self-study based on feedback from Team Chair
February 2016	Final version of self-study produced and sent to Visiting Team
March-April, 2016	Visiting Team visits campus (no later than April 15, 2016)
June 2016	Commission meets to determine Accreditation Action

SUGGESTED PROFILE OF THE VISITING EVALUATION TEAM

While there are many facets to an institution of IUP's size, several are particularly relevant for the visiting evaluation team: a multi-institutional state-level governance structure headed by a board of governors, who in turn appoint the Chancellor and university presidents, a collective bargaining environment that covers IUP faculty and staff (but not manager administrators), a graduate mission, and an undergraduate liberal studies program. We would like the composition of our visiting evaluation team to include individuals who have experience at institutions of higher education that have some or all of these features:

1. Experience with a doctoral research/ graduate mission
2. Experience in a shared governance (union) environment
3. Experience with state-supported institutions, specifically with a multi-institutional state system
4. Experience linking strategic planning and institutional assessment
5. Experience with multiple location campuses

Suggested Peer Institutions (MSCHE Institutions appear in **bold** lettering)

Peers

Buffalo State SUNY

Indiana State University

Kean University

Rowan University

Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi

Towson

University of Arkansas at Little Rock

The University of West Florida

University of Northern Colorado

Montclair St University (NJ)

SUNY New Paltz

Morgan State University (MD)

Aspirational Peers

Central Michigan University

Oakland University

SUNY Binghamton

SUNY Albany

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

The Vision for IUP's Future

December 2013

Indiana University of Pennsylvania is a community where teaching, research, and service empower students to become innovative leaders while enhancing communities throughout the world. Remaining true to its traditions, IUP assesses society's needs and opportunities and meets them.

Students are hardworking, ready to learn, and come from diverse cultures, places, and backgrounds. Energetic, dedicated, and diverse staff and faculty members welcome them to a personal, vibrant college home. Students participate in many intentional and interconnected learning experiences in their studies, in their lives, and in the world.

Professors are active scholars and teachers in their disciplines who work together to expand their impact. They engage students in carefully designed open-ended, hands-on experiences to reinforce and enrich what students learn in the classroom. Professors use technology to enhance student learning and augment the face-to-face and peer-learning experiences that are the foundation of excellent education.

Alumni say their student experience was the best preparation for work and life. They continue to find joy in the bonds they built as students and the new connections they make with faculty and staff members, students, and other alumni. They are proud and they choose to invest in IUP's future.

IUP and the communities it serves work together to build a strong society and robust economy. IUP uses partnerships and activities to connect community members, students, faculty and staff members, and alumni, building a commitment to their shared future.

IUP values

- Demonstrating an excellent return on educational investment.
- Knowing students as individuals who work closely with faculty and staff members.
- Responding to the needs of students and society with a range of innovative programs and scholarship.
- Employing evidence in decision making and in demonstrating results.
- Drawing on IUP's tradition in Indiana and western Pennsylvania to serve students worldwide.
- Enjoying historic, inspirational, and functional campuses and facilities.
- Using technology to reach place-committed students and enhance learning for all.
- Celebrating engaged, successful alumni.

APPENDIX B Steering committee roster

1	Dr.	Laura	Delbrugge	Faculty SC co-chair
2	Dr.	Hilliary	Creely	Administration, SC co-chair/ Assistant Dean for Research, School of Graduate Studies and Research
3	Dr.	Ben	Rafoth	Faculty Writer
4	Ms.	Lynnan	Mocek	Executive Staff Assistant, Provost Office
5	Mr.	Terry	Appolonia	Dean, Punxsutawney Campus
6	Dr.	Yaw	Asamoah	Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences
7	Mr.	William	Balint	Chief Information Officer
8	Dr.	Parimal	Bhagat	Faculty
9	Mr. Ms.	Taylor Marissa	Billman/(2013) Olean (2014- 2015)	Undergraduate Student, President of Student Government
10	Dr.	Fredalene	Bowers	Faculty (Council of Chairs representative)
11	Dr.	David	Ferguson	Assistant Dean, Fine Arts
12	Mr.	Terrance	Hudson	Graduate Student/ President, Graduate Student Association
13	Mr.	Mike	Husenits	Director of Undergraduate Admissions
14	Dr.	Melvin	Jenkins	Faculty
15	Dr.	John	Kilmarx	Associate Vice President for Academic Administration
16	Ms.	Kate	Linder	Associate Dean of Students for Student Life and Community Engagement
17	Mr.	Jonathan	Mack	Trustee
18	Dr.	Theresa	McDevitt	Faculty
19	Ms.	Barbe	Moore	Director of Planning and Assessment
20	Dr.	Michele	Papakie	Faculty
21	Dr.	Kelli	Paquette	Faculty
22	Dr.	David	Piper	Faculty
23	Dr.	David	Pistole	Faculty/Director of Liberal Studies
24	Dr.	Edel	Reilly	Faculty
25	Dr.	Eric	Rubenstein	Faculty/Senate representative
26	Dr.	Tim	Runge	Faculty
27	Dr.	Ramesh	Soni	Faculty / APSCUF representative
28	Mrs.	Cynthia	Spielman	AFSCME
31	Ms	Joan	Van Dyke	Faculty
32	Dr.	Cornelius	Wooten	Vice President for Administration and Finance
33	Mr.	Bill	Zimmerman	SCUPA
34	Dr.	Pablo	Mendoza	Assistant to President for Social Equity

Subcommittee 1: Mission, Goals, and Integrity**Co-chairs: Bill Balint and Fredalene Bowers**

	Name	Role	Dept if applicable	College/ Division/Area
1	Holley Belch	Faculty	SAHE	Education and Educ. Tech.
2	Elaine Blair	Faculty	HPED	Health and Human Services
3	Robert Bowser	Admin		Administration and Finance Humanities and Social Sciences
4	Sharon Deckert	Faculty	ENGL	Housing and Residence Life
5	Sondra Dennison	Admin		Education and Educ. Tech.
6	Beatrice Fennimore	Faculty	PSE	Office of the President
7	Robin Gorman	Admin		Univ. Advancement
8	Regan Houser	Staff		Education and Educ. Tech.
9	James Kinneer	Student/GR/Alumni	COMM	Web team
10	Deb Klenotic	Staff		Health and Human Services
11	John Lewis	Faculty	CRIM	Research Institute
12	Ute Lowery	Staff		Information Technology Humanities and Social Sciences
13	Amanda Marshall	Staff		Humanities and Social Sciences
14	Michele Papakie	Faculty	JRNL	International Education
15	Hans Pedersen	Faculty	PHIL	Health and Human Services Natural Sciences and Math/Dean
16	Michele Petrucci	Admin		Health and Human Services
17	Joyce Shanty	Faculty	NURS	Administration and Finance
18	Deanne Snavely	Admin		Eberly College of Business
19	Kadeem Washington	Student/UG	HOSP	
20	Rick White	Staff		
21	Joette Wisnieski	Faculty	MGMT	

Subcommittee 2: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Renewal**Co-chairs: Shari Robertson and John Kilmarx**

	Name	Role	Dept if applicable	College/Division/Area
1	Jessica Baum	Faculty	ATHL	Health and Human Services
2	John Benhart	Faculty	GEOS	Humanities and Social Sciences
3	Thomas Borellis	Admin		Administration and Finance
4	Dolores Brzycki	Admin		Health and Human Services
5	Stephanie Caulder	Faculty	MUSC	Fine Arts
6	Mark Correia	Admin		Health and Human Services
7	Adam Jones	Staff		Housing and Res. Life
8	Ola Kaniasty	Admin		Natural Sciences and Math
9	Valerie Mercado	Admin		Human Resources
10	Doug Miller	Admin		Facilities
11	Terrance Mitchell	Student/GR	SOC/ALS	Humanities and Social Sciences
12	Sarah Neusius	Faculty	ANTH	Humanities and Social Sciences
13	Josh Noble	Student/UG	MKTG	Eberly College of Business
14	Muhammad Numan	Faculty	PHYS	Natural Sciences and Math
15	Autumn Shannon	Staff		Graduate School
16	Susie Sink	Admin		Administration and Finance
17	Gealy Wallwork	Trustee		IUP
18	R. Tyler Wilkinson	Faculty	COUN	Education and Educ. Tech.
19	Ray Wygonik	Staff		Facilities
20	David Yerger	Faculty	ECON	Humanities and Social Sciences
21	Ed Zimmerman	Admin		Libraries

Subcommittee 3: Leadership, Governance, and Administration

Co-chairs: Edel Reilly and Yaw Asamoah

	Name	Role	Dept. if applicable	College/ Area/ Group
1	Taylor Billman (fall 2013)	Student/UG	MGMT	Eberly College of Business
	Marissa Olean (spring 2014)	Student/UG	CRIM/prelaw	Health and Human Services
2	Lynanne Black	Faculty	EDSP	Education and Educ. Tech.
3	Paul Bliss	Student/GR	SAHE	Education and Educ. Tech.
4	Susan Boser	Faculty	SOC	Humanities and Social Sciences
5	Portia Diaz	Faculty	LIBR	Libraries/Punxsutawney
6	Michelle Fryling	Admin		Communications
7	Gretchen Heine	Student/UG	SPAN/HIST	Humanities and Social Sciences
8	Chris Jeffords	Faculty	ECON	Humanities and Social Sciences
9	David LaPorte	Faculty	PSYC	Senate
10	Mike Lemasters	Admin		Student Affairs
11	Malinda Levis	Admin		Center for Health/Well Being
12	John Lowery	Faculty	SAHE	Education and Educ. Tech.
13	Jonathan Mack	Trustee		IUP
14	Lindsey McNickle	Admin		Human Resources
15	Scott Moore	Faculty	HIST	Council of Chairs
16	Meg Reardon	Faculty	PSYC	Natural Sciences and Math
17	Dee Baker Simon	Staff		Procurement
18	Bob Simon	Admin		Registrar
19	Cynthia Spielman	Staff		AFSCME
20	Mark Staszkiwicz	Faculty	EDSP	APSCUF
21	Ruffina Winters	Staff		Office of the President
22	Bill Zimmerman	Staff		SCUPA

Subcommittee 4: Student Admissions, Retention, and Support Services

Co-chairs: Kate Linder and Jack Makara

	Name	Role	Dept. if applicable	College/ Division/Area
1	Shavonne Arthurs	Student/GR	CRIM	Health and Human Services
2	Matt Baumer	Faculty	MUSC	Fine Arts
3	Kevin Berezansky	Staff		Honors college
4	Jeannie Broskey	Staff		Registrar's
5	Dan Burkett	Faculty	MATH	Natural Sciences and Math
6	Zach Clark	Staff	Co-op	Co-op Association
7	Tory Dellafiore	Student/UG	MUSC	Fine Arts
8	Cathy Dugan	Faculty		Advising and Testing
8	Jessica Halchak	Staff		International Education
9	Derek Hanely	Student/UG	MATH	Natural Sciences and Math
10	Mike Husenits	Admin		Admissions
11	Melvin Jenkins	Faculty	DVST	Education and Educ. Tech.
12	Shirley Johnson	Faculty	PSED	Education and Educ. Tech.
13	Nick Karatjas	Faculty	ECON	Humanities and Social Sciences
14	Robert Kostelnik	Faculty	HPE	Health and Human Services
15	Patti McCarthy	Admin		Enrollment Management
16	Theresa McDevitt	Faculty		Library
17	Steve Roach	Faculty		Athletics
18	Mitchell Steffie	Student/GR	SAHE	Education and Educ. Tech.
19	Paula Stossel	Admin		Graduate School Center for Student Life-
20	Theo Turner	Staff		Punxsutawney

Subcommittee 5: Faculty and Educational Offerings**Co-chairs: Ramesh Soni and Steve Hovan**

	Name	Role	Dept. if applicable	College/ Area/Division
1	Mohammed Alarjani	Student/UG	MGMT	Eberly College of Business
2	Luis Almeida	Faculty	COMM	Education and Educ. Tech.
3	Heather Andring	Staff		Admissions
4	Hanna Beightley	Student/UG	NSM	Natural Sciences and Math
5	Parimal Bhagat	Faculty	MKTG	Eberly College of Business
6	Lynn Botelho	Faculty	HIST	Humanities and Social Sciences
7	Ben Ford	Faculty	ANTH	Humanities and Social Sciences
8	Andrew Gillham	Faculty	ART	Fine Arts
9	Tammy Hamilton	Admin		Grants Accounting
10	Terrance Hudson	Student/GR	PSE	Education and Educ. Tech.
11	Chris Janicak	Faculty	SAFE	Health and Human Services
12	Joann Janosko	Faculty	LIBR	Libraries
13	Tim Mack	Admin		Dean/ Graduate School
14	Janelle Newman	Student/GR	ENGL	Humanities and Social Sciences
15	Lloyd Onyett	Admin		Education and Educ. Tech. (IT)
16	Gian Pagnucci	Faculty	ENGL	Humanities and Social Sciences
17	Lisa Price	Faculty	EDEX	Education and Educ. Tech.
18	Stephan Schaffrath	Faculty (temp)	DVST	Developmental Studies
19	Brian Sharp	Faculty	MATH	Natural Sciences and Math
20	Tracy VanHorn-Juart	Staff		Registrar's Office
21	Kimberly Wick	Staff		Center for Student Life
22	Robert Wilson	Admin/C&I		IMAPS

Subcommittee 6: General Education and Related Educational Activities**Co-chairs: Terry Appolonia and Gail Wilson**

	Name	Role	Dept. (if applicable)	
1	Jan Baker	Faculty	EDEX	Education and Educ. Tech.
2	Lisa Marie Baker	Staff		Admissions
3	Tedd Cogar	Staff		Center for Student Life
4	Chauna Craig	Faculty	ENGL	Humanities and Social Sciences
5	Lisa Dupnock	Faculty	LABR	Health and Human Services
6	Nancy Evans	Staff		Informational Technology
7	Luke Faust	Staff	DVST	Education and Educ. Tech.
8	Luis Gonzalez	Admin/Dean	LIBR	Library
9	Dot Gracey	Admin/Dean		Eberly College of Business
10	Dakota London	Student/ UG	COMM	Education and Educ. Tech.
11	David Martynuik	Faculty	MUSC	Fine Arts
12	Melanie Muscatello	Staff		Financial Aid
13	David Pistole	Faculty	BIOL	Natural Sciences and Math
14	Shawn Rooney	Student/UG	RGPL	Humanities and Social Sciences
15	Theresa Rufrano-Ruffner	Faculty	PSYC	Natural Sciences and Math
16	Gail Sechrist	Faculty	GEOG	Humanities and Social Sciences
17	Ramy Shaaban	Student/GR	ACE	Education and Educ. Tech.
18	Yaya Sissoko	Faculty	ECON	Humanities and Social Sciences
19	Dawn Smith Sherwood	Faculty	FNLG	Humanities and Social Sciences
20	Mary Williams	Faculty	NURS	Health and Human Services

Subcommittee 7: Institutional Assessment and Student Learning Assessment**Co-chairs: Barbe Moore and Tim Runge**

	Name	Role	Dept if applicable	College/ Area/Division
1	Mimi Benjamin	Faculty	SAHE	Education and Educ. Tech.
2	Karen Rose Cercone	Faculty	GEOS	Natural Sciences and Math
3	Melissa Daisley	Staff		Registrar's Office
4	Jeff Fratangeli	Admin	EDUC	Dean's office
5	Elizabeth Poje Hawk	Admin		Academic Affairs
6	Christina Huhn	Faculty	FNLG	Humanities and Social Sciences
7	Katherine Jenkins	Admin		Libraries
8	Chris Kitas	Staff		Administration and Finance
9	Becky Knickelbein	Faculty	EDEX	Education and Educ. Tech.
10	John Levey	Faculty	MUSC	Fine Arts
11	Scott Mensch	Faculty	BTST	Eberly College of Business
12	William Oblitey	Faculty	COSC	Natural Sciences and Math
13	Lisa Palmer	Faculty	NURS	Health and Human Services
14	David Porter	Staff		Informational Technology
15	Todd Potts	Faculty	ECON	Humanities and Social Sciences
16	Joseph Rosenberg	Student/GR	ALS	Humanities and Social Sciences
17	Eric Rubenstein	Faculty	PHIL	Humanities and Social Sciences
18	Bradley Simko	Student/UG	SOC	Humanities and Social Sciences
19	Mark Sloniger	Faculty	HPE	Health and Human Services
20	Kim Weiner	Faculty	COUN	Counseling Center

August 2013-May 2016

August 2013

- August 19 IUP Middle States Accreditation Website goes live: iup.edu/middlestates
- Housed in Academic Affairs
 - Link on Academic Affairs home page
1. News item published as highlight in IUP main news web page and in IUP Daily announcing launch of Middle States 2015 Accreditation Review
 2. Promotional videos of president and provost available on website
 3. Confluence wiki available
- August 23 Campus-wide opening day/ speeches by campus leadership
- August 29 Co-chairs presentation to Council of Deans; co-chairs offer to speak to individual departments or colleges as requested

September 2013

- September 4: Steering committee meeting
1. Communications Plan reviewed and finalized by steering committee
 2. Website reviewed by steering committee
 3. Confluence site introduced/ tutorial at meeting
 4. Steering committee members asked to share recruitment message with their constituents
- September 9: Initial campus-wide subcommittee volunteer request goes out via Qualtrics email survey. Deadline for response was September 30.
- September: Meeting with steering committee co-Chairs and all subcommittee chairs (14)

Throughout Summer and Fall 2013

1. Steering committee co-chairs made informational presentations to the following groups:
 1. Student Affairs (June 26, 2013)
 2. Council of Deans (Aug 29, 2013)
 3. Council of Chairs (Sept. 4, 2013)
 4. Associate and Assistant Deans Council (ADEans) (Sept. 10, 2013)
 5. Academic Affairs Council (Sept. 5, 2013)
 6. Facilities/ Maintenance (various meetings)
 7. Athletics (August 27, 2013)

8. UPC (Sept. 3, 2013)
9. Housing and Residence Life (Sept. 16, 2013)
10. Administration and Finance (Aug. 26, 2013)
11. Enrolment Management and Communications (Aug. 20, 2013)
12. Trustees (Sept. 12, 2013)
13. Administration and Finance (various meeting)
14. University Planning Council (September 3, 2013)
15. Council of Chairs (September 4, 2013)
16. Departments and colleges as requested (as scheduled)

2. Co-Chairs made follow-up participation inquiries to any groups who may not have had access to IUP website announcements. In some cases, newsletter articles were written to facilitate communication.

Throughout the 2013-2014 Academic Year

1. IUP Daily news box established; regular posts throughout September and October (done through Provost's office)

Spring semester 2014

1. Draft self-study proposal shared with campus community (February)
2. Information regarding Dr. Debra Klinman's visit (February 26, 2014) shared as news posts with campus community

2014-2015

Fall and spring semesters, 2014-2015

1. Provide progress updates to IUP community via Accreditation webpage and news posts on website
2. Solicit input and feedback to various issues raised in self-study via a general Middle States Qualtrics Survey distributed to all members of IUP community
3. Solicit feedback from smaller groups via targeted Qualtrics surveys

Fall 2015

1. Disseminate draft self-study to IUP community via news posts, email, and Qualtrics invitation to open forums
2. Specifically target dissemination of draft self-study to IUP student body via news postings in *The Beak* and emails
3. Share the results of the feedback with IUP community, along with any resulting revisions to the self-study

Spring 2016

1. Media blitz announcing Middle States Site Visit to IUP Community

The following are based on the steering committee meeting held on Tuesday, November 12, 2013.

Subcommittee 1: Mission, Goals, and Integrity (Standards 1 and 6)

- Standard 6 Integrity
 - How does the university consistently uphold and practice high ethical standards? For academic integrity, how are expectations communicated; how are educational, training, and best-practice resources available; and how are problems fairly adjudicated across the university?
 - For responsible conduct of research?
 - All members of the university community behaving legally and ethically in both on- and off-campus
 - How are principles of academic freedom -- inquiry, exploration, innovation, experimentation, and learning -- understood and incorporated in instructional and non-instructional environments?
 - Are employees free to do their jobs and contribute to the university's progress with enlightened and empowering supervision?

Subcommittee 2: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Renewal (Standards 2 and 3)

- Standard 2
 - To what extent does IUP use its resources to accomplish its mission and goals?
 - How does IUP measure the implementation of goals and objectives?
 - To what extent does IUP use assessment to maintain and improve institutional quality?
- Standard 3
 - To what extent does IUP use its human capital effectively and efficiently?
 - To what extent does IUP use its financial, technical, facilities and non-human resources effectively and efficiently?
 - To what extent are resources available and accessible to faculty and staff in achieving IUP's mission and goals?

Subcommittee 3: Leadership, Governance, and Administration (Standards 4 and 5)

- Standard 4
 - How does IUP fit within the governing structure of PASSHE?
 - Is there an assessment of the current governing structure and how does that change?

- How does shared governance work within the larger picture of Board of Governors, Chancellor's Office, Trustees, etc.?
- Standard 5
 - Is there a formal link between administrative structure and the mission of IUP?
 - How will the budget future impact the overall administrative structure
 - These questions imply an assessment of how structure, mission, and budget facilitate learning, scholarship, quality improvement, and the resources to support them.

Subcommittee 4: Student Admissions, Retention, and Support Services (Standards 8 and 9)

- Standard 8
 - Based on economics and demographics, are the mission goals congruent with the current environment?
 - What services occur or need to be created based on changing demographics?
 - Quality versus Size – How large do we want to be in terms of numbers while focusing on quality?
 - ➔ Assessment: More assessment on front end of student goals; senior year in High School or after the first semester at IUP. Start gathering baseline evidence early on.
- Standard 9
 - What students support services does IUP have? Is there equal access at all sites to both academic and social support services?
 - ➔ Assessment: How are we assessing the quality of our student services?

Subcommittee 5: Faculty and Educational Offerings (Standards 10 and 11)

- Standard 10:
 - What is the institutional climate or culture that supports innovation and gives confidence to try new approaches, to propose new curricular endeavors, and to reward those who do?
 - What mechanisms exist that promote a creative marriage of research and service effort (like teacher-scholar model)?
 - How does the institution show/provide moral support/respect and reward those who demonstrate pedagogical creativity?
 - How satisfied are we (IUP) with the tenure and promotion process? In other words, how satisfied are we with the recruitment and retention of faculty?

- Standard 11:
 - How is IUP positioning itself in relationship to sister PASSHE institutions with regard to the Board's policy that enables other institution to offer professional degrees? Should IUP assume a bigger role in a PASSHE- wide review of new doctoral programs proposals?
 - How/what is the process by which faculty can shepherd cutting edge curricular proposals to fruition (approval and implementation)?
 - Are there mechanisms in place to guard against curricular drift? Or curricular stagnation? Can IUP break that cycle?
 - How can we get IUP to "exhale," that is, loosen up, with respect to peer review process for curricular approvals? In other words, can we get something approved without having to show what other institutions do or what other departments do if we are looking internally?

Subcommittee 6: General Education and Related Educational Activities (Standards 12 and 13)

- Standard 12
 - Is IUP collecting data from its alumni 5 – 10 – 20 years after graduation with respect to their perception of preparedness for career professional development? What evidence does IUP collect from alumni in terms of their perceptions, residential exams, promotions, opportunities, GRE scores, etc.?
 - How well are IUP's course offerings intentionally designed for students to acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills?
 - Where in the curriculum do students demonstrate proficiency in oral communication? In written communication? In scientific and grant reasoning? In technological competency?
 - Where and how well in the curriculum do students demonstrate proficiency in other skills, such as wellness, global and multicultural awareness, and other skills?

Subcommittee 7: Institutional Assessment and Student Learning Assessment (Standards 7 & 14)

- How accurate is the PASSHE performance funding model in reflecting the success or failure of IUP both annually and long term?
- How effective is IUP's individual program assessment structure (accreditation and/or five-year program reviews) in evaluating academic programs and leading to continuous improvement efforts?
- Are individual employee priorities and resources deployed in a manner consistent with the university's strategic plan and is there any formal review to ensure that the plan is being followed as designed?
- Do IUP students meet anticipated success levels when exposed to quantitative industry-standard measures such as Praxis and NCLECS?

- How accurately do IUP's academic programs adhere to and measure achievement and proficiency as per the official student learning outcomes of the program?
- How well does IUP integrate non-instructional student activities (student life, co-curricular, etc.) into student learning outcomes?
- Does IUP measure its success in appropriately exposing students to diversity in its many forms and globalization?

One of the responsibilities of the IUP Middle States steering committee is to formally charge each subcommittee with its tasks and responsibilities. Accordingly, the steering committee charges this subcommittee with the following:

1. Investigate the Middle States Standards of Excellence that you have been assigned
 - a. Examine the following research questions, which were developed by the steering committee. The steering committee chose these research questions because (1) they are deemed important for IUP, (2) they do not significantly overlap with the research questions of other committees, (3) the collection and analysis of data for them seems feasible, and (4) they are future-oriented. The steering committee welcomes proposals to revise these questions or pose alternate ones and will carefully consider each proposal.
 - i. *Insert first research question here.*
 - ii. *Insert second question here, etc. [See list of research questions.]*
2. Once the research questions are finalized, the subcommittee should gather and analyze evidence that addresses the questions. The subcommittee will provide regular updates to the steering committee regarding its progress.
3. Each subcommittee will compose preliminary and final drafts of the subcommittee report. Use the steering committee's template when drafting and submitting the final draft of the report.
4. Please read and follow *Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report*, 2nd ed., and in particular Chapter Four: "Linking the Design and Self-Study to Commission Standards and Expectations" as a guide for each subcommittee's research design.

Subcommittees are asked to keep the following guidelines in mind with regard to gathering evidence, conducting analyses, drawing conclusions, and making recommendations:

Research

- Research questions are meant to organize and focus the work of the subcommittees as they connect the standards to different dimensions of the institution. While the questions provide important scaffolding for planning, data collection, and analysis, Dr. Debra Klinman (liason) noted, in her remarks to the steering committee during the campus visit, that we should expect the research questions to "fall away" as we move toward writing the subcommittee and final reports.
- It is helpful to consider what kinds of research is called for in any given research question. For example, some types of questions call for assessment (*How effective are the support services we provide to students?*); some call for describing the status of something or a process (*What is the current state of assessment of student learning at IUP?*); some call for analyzing a cause or impact (*How do PASSHE policies impact the university's ability to manage its resources?*); some call for interpretation (*Are the university's core values represented in its programs and activities?*); and some call for other things like lists or identification (*Which university policies address the integrity standard?*)

Evidence

- Evidence may be found in existing documents such as the Middle States library we have established on the Confluence website or the various departmental five-year reports, or it may need to be gathered specifically for the self-study (such as part of the planned master IUP Middle States survey, to be conducted in fall 2014).
- For each research question, the committee must decide on the best methods for collecting and analyzing evidence. Subcommittee reports will need to summarize the methods used to collect and analyze evidence.
- Subcommittees need to weigh the extent to which evidence is sound, and the subcommittee report will address the quality of available evidence.

Analysis

- Analysis is needed to bridge the gap between a research question and the judgments and evaluations needed to answer it. Evidence cannot be assumed to speak for itself in answering the question.
5. The steering committee recommends that subcommittees use the worksheet below to help them think about their research questions. It is not a required part of the process, and may be modified, but it may help to organize subcommittee work.

Worksheet for Collection of Evidence

What is the research question?	Why is addressing this question important to IUP?	What kind of evidence is needed? <i>E.g., existing documents, new evidence, etc.</i>	Where or from whom can the data be obtained?	What is the deadline?
RQ #1				
RQ #2				
RQ #3 etc.				

The steering committee is ready and willing to assist subcommittees at every stage of the process. Please do not hesitate to contact the steering committee co-chairs if you have questions or concerns. Good luck!

Subcommittee 1: Mission, Goals, and Integrity (Standards 1 and 6)**STANDARD 1: MISSION AND GOALS**

1. How effectively do the University's mission, goals, and objectives support teaching, learning, service and scholarship?
 - a. How are these components assessed?
 - b. What is the process for revision and renewal?
2. How does the development of the strategic plan reflect:
 - a. collaboration
 - b. flexibility
 - c. utilization of institutional assessment
3. What degree of collaboration occurs among the five divisions to support the academic purpose of the institution?
4. How does the university communicate its missions and goals and progress toward the goals to internal and external constituencies?

STANDARD 6: INTEGRITY

1. How do university policies address Standard 6 (Integrity)?
 - a. Are they clearly stated and readily available?
 - b. Are they effectively developed with university community input before and after implementation?
 - c. Are they adequately supported by institutional resources?
 - d. Are they periodically reviewed, assessed, and revised as necessary?
 - e. Are they implemented to ensure consistency and fairness?
2. What measures are taken to determine whether policies are followed? What processes for investigating complaints and for appeal are in place? What measures are taken to ensure the best stewardship of all resources?
3. How does IUP communicate its policies, practices, and products?
4. How does the university promote a climate of civility, integrity, and appreciation for diversity?
5. How does the university support principles of academic freedom, academic integrity, and responsible conduct of research?
6. How does the institution ensure the integrity of performance and conduct of all employees?

Subcommittee 2: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Renewal (Standards 2 and 3)

STANDARD 2: PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL

1. During this period, how has the university set goals and conducted ongoing planning to carry out its mission? How well does the planning respond to changes in the environment?
2. How does the university allocate resources to carry out its mission and goals?
3. Are the divisional and unit goals clearly expressed, coordinated and aligned with university mission and goals?
4. What processes does the university use to assess the effectiveness of planning, resource allocation, and implementation of the plans?
5. How are the results of assessment used to anticipate needs, improve institutional quality, and promote institutional evolution?

STANDARD 3: INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

1. What are the resources (human, financial, facilities, technology, and other) available and how effectively and efficiently are they allocated to achieve the university's mission and goals?
2. How are the actions of the PASSHE and IUP's affiliate organizations (e.g., Foundation for IUP, Alumni Association, Student Cooperative Association, and the IUP Research Institute), state and federal bodies, and regulatory agencies impacting IUP's ability to provide and manage resources?
3. How does the university's response to actions by these forces have a positive impact on the institution?
4. What changes in resources and external forces can we anticipate? What processes are in place to respond to anticipated and unanticipated impacts on resource availability in a thoughtful and timely manner?

Subcommittee 3: Leadership, Governance, and Administration (Standards 4 and 5)

STANDARD 4: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

1. To what degree and in what ways does the practice of leadership through shared governance reflect and respond to constituents' values and the public interest?
2. What mechanisms exist to enable the sharing of information and opportunities to provide feedback between and within the governing bodies and various constituency groups? How effective are the processes for communication between, within, and among the governing bodies?
3. What changes have taken place with respect to the relationship between PASSHE and IUP since the 2005 self-study?
4. How effective has university leadership been in cultivating resources to support its mission and goals?

5. What are the mechanisms to ensure that members of the University's Council of Trustees represent and are representative of constituencies? Are they consistent with the mission of the institution and do members embody the expertise appropriate to guide the institution? What periodic assessments are in place to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of the Council of Trustees?
6. To what extent is there an environment for employee leadership development? How do employees participate in succession planning and the mentoring of future organizational leaders? To what extent do we encourage leadership growth among minorities and other underrepresented groups?

STANDARD 5: ADMINISTRATION

1. What have been IUP's staffing patterns and employee-development practices since the last self-study, and have these practices enabled the institution to address the goals of each division and the institution as a whole, given its size and complexity?
2. How do IUP's administrative bodies coordinate their efforts to improve efficiency and quality in their procedures and decision-making? How well are these coordinated efforts working, and how are resultant changes in policies or procedures communicated to the University?
3. How are IUP's leaders selected, trained, supported, evaluated, and held accountable?
4. How have the administrative structure changes since the last self-study affected IUP? How do the current administrative structures ensure appropriate levels of institutional input and accountability?
5. Do IUP's organizational structure and decision-making processes have a balance of centralization and decentralization?
6. How do administrative structures and services facilitate student/faculty rapport?

SUBCOMMITTEE 4: Student Admissions, Retention, and Support Services (Standards 8 and 9)

STANDARD 8: STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND RETENTION

1. To what extent are IUP's admissions goals sufficiently clear, realistic, and consistent with the institution's mission? How does the institution analyze its recruiting materials, admissions policies, financial aid information, and processes so they are coordinated and geared towards its goals? How do admissions standards reflect the university's commitment to academic quality and access?
2. What do demographic and job market trends suggest will be the future of IUP's undergraduate and graduate student base? How is the institution positioning itself to handle any demographic changes?
3. Is information relating to financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, and refunds kept up to date, comprehensive, understandable, and accessible? How does IUP help students understand the financial liability of attendance? How does this impact student admission and retention? What impact do they have on the recruitment of transfer students?
4. What information and policies exist regarding credits earned, transfer credit, credit for extra-institutional college-level learning, articulation programs, financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, and refunds? Are these published and effective?

5. How do the institution's admission policies and procedures reflect a strong commitment to diversity and to what extent are these policies and procedures effective in attracting students across racial, ethnic, gender and economic backgrounds? How does the university succeed in its recruitment and enrollment of international, transfer, non-traditional, and veteran students?
6. What evidence is there that the institution regularly utilizes available enrollment, retention, and graduation data to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of policies, develop strategic goals, and identify programs and services that are well tailored to the characteristics and needs of our enrolled students?
7. How does IUP conduct regular reviews of its retention and graduation rates? Is IUP doing enough to retain and ultimately graduate students in a timely manner?

STANDARD 9: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

1. How does IUP define student support services and how are they offered? What evidence demonstrates how IUP students access support services?
2. How well does IUP inform students, faculty, and staff about student support services?
3. To what extent do support services and co-curricular activities reflect students, including but not limited to, international, transfer, non-traditional, under-represented, and military veteran students? How satisfied are students with these offerings? How does IUP evaluate these services and what improvements can be made?
4. Regarding student complaints and grievances, how does the institution develop, implement, and publicize reasonable policies, procedures, and record-keeping practices, and are these practices effective?
5. Regarding secure maintenance and release of student information, how effective are the institution's policies, procedures, and communication practices?
6. How is academic advising organized across the university? How well do current practices assist students in attaining their academic and career objectives?
7. How have the living/learning Residential Revival initiatives contributed to meeting university goals for undergraduate students? How is the impact of the Residential Revival being measured and assessed?

SUBCOMMITTEE 5: Faculty and Educational Offerings (Standards 10 and 11)

STANDARD 10: FACULTY

1. How does the institution define the teacher-scholar model? How are service and fulfillment of professional responsibilities represented in this model? Does the teacher-scholar model accurately describe faculty roles and contributions at IUP?
2. How do the evaluation, tenure, and promotion processes support the teacher-scholar model? How does IUP support and reward all faculty at all stages of their careers? How does the university ensure that faculty are prepared and supported in all teaching environments? What are the implications of the current methods?

3. How does IUP define successful academic advising and how are faculty rewarded for it?
4. How does the institution support innovation to try new curricular and scholarly endeavors and how does it reward those who do?
5. What are the policies and procedures related to recruitment, appointment, mentoring, and retention of qualified and diverse regular and temporary faculty?
6. What are the current trends across campus in the use of temporary faculty and teaching associates and what impact has this had on colleges and departments?

STANDARD 11: EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

1. How does IUP's peer review process for curriculum ensure appropriate standards of rigor, content, resource adequacy, and program priority to the evaluation of new, existing, and revised program and course proposals? How can IUP improve the curricular process? What procedures are used to guide curriculum and how are they tied to institutional priorities?
2. What processes are in place to ensure that academic programs remain current, challenging, and viable?
3. How does IUP address the curricular needs of diverse and under-prepared students?
4. How does IUP ensure that all modes of instruction are of similar quality?

Subcommittee 6: General Education and Related Educational Activities (Standards 12 and 13)

Standard 12: General Education

1. To what extent are the goals of the Liberal Studies program aligned with the university's mission statement? How does the Liberal Studies program contribute to the education of the whole student?
2. To what extent do faculty and students understand the intent of general education? What tools and methods (sources/resources) are available to promote this understanding?
3. How and by what rationale has the Liberal Studies program been modified since the last comprehensive self-study? What has been the institutional impact of these modifications? What is the process for quality improvement?
4. How and by what rationale have the Liberal Studies assessment processes been modified since the last comprehensive self-study? What has been the impact of these changes? What is the process for quality improvement?
5. To what degree are the institution's graduates demonstrating Expected Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (EUSLOs)? What processes are in place to assist students in their ability to demonstrate proficiency of university student learning outcomes?
6. To what extent are Liberal Studies student learning outcomes and academic program (i.e. majors) outcomes compatible?

7. To what extent and in what ways does the University's commitment to general education goals provide support to the academic units offering Liberal Studies courses?

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

1. Are existing off-site academic programs aligned with the mission of IUP? Is IUP oversight of these programs sufficiently thorough to ensure their quality and cost-effectiveness?
2. To what extent are regional campus goals, academic programs, operations and services, and student learning outcomes aligned with the institution's mission statement? Do regional campus operations and resource allocations, including instruction, reflect the quality and integrity of the Indiana campus?
3. What is the process for identifying pre-matriculation under-preparedness and post-matriculation under-achievement among students? Once identified, how effectively does the University meet these needs in order to positively impact student persistence, performance, and graduation?
4. Is the development of distance education programs and courses aligned with IUP's mission? To what extent does IUP effectively identify and respond to the need and opportunity for distance education? In what ways does the institution establish and oversee the quality of distance education courses and programs? What is the support for distance-education courses and programs—including course/program availability, support for faculty, adequate facilities, and technical assistance?
5. In what ways are the goals of University Libraries contributing to IUP's mission? In what ways does University Libraries impact student recruitment, retention, and graduation rates? In what ways does University Libraries contribute to the teaching, research and publication, and public service goals of IUP? What modifications have been made since the last comprehensive self-study to enable University Libraries to maintain its relevancy to the IUP and Indiana communities? In what way is the organizational model for University Libraries appropriate for dissemination of programs and services to all University learning sites and delivery models?
6. In what ways are IUP's programs for professional development serving emerging markets for students with distinct academic needs? Are such programs aligned with the university's mission? How is the institution assessing the need for and quality of these programs? How is the institution leveraging its resources in response to these needs?
7. Are the goals of the varsity and club sport athletic programs aligned with the mission of IUP? How effective are these programs in meeting their established goals and support student academic performance? What is the process of institutional oversight for these programs, in partnership with their governing agencies, to ensure quality and cost-effectiveness in terms of human, fiscal, and physical plant resources? Does this process include continuous quality improvement?
8. In what ways do credit-bearing experiential learning activities contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes?

Subcommittee 7: Institutional Assessment and Student Learning Assessment (Standards 7 and 14)

STANDARD 7: INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

1. What is the current state of institutional assessment at IUP? How are assessment results used to support planning and continuous improvement and to inform resource allocation?

2. How does the university's organization, procedures, and culture encourage, support, and value assessment? How effective are assessment processes in helping to fulfill the university's mission and goals?
3. How are PASSHE performance indicators incorporated in the institutional assessment process?
4. How are institutional assessment results communicated to stakeholders? What opportunities are there for dialogue throughout the process? What evidence is there that assessment results inform decision-making at the unit, college, department, and program levels?

STANDARD 14: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

1. What is the current state of assessment of student learning at IUP? How are assessment data utilized to inform the university's processes for continuous improvement at all levels?
2. Are IUP student learning outcome statements mission driven and of high quality relative to accepted standards within higher education? What evidence indicates that students achieve key learning outcomes?
3. To what extent is student learning assessment at IUP integrated into university culture? To what extent has assessment of student learning been a meaningful process? How are assessment results used to improve teaching and curricula?
4. What resources are available to support student learning assessment and are they adequate?
5. How does IUP know it has added value to student development?

Subcommittee Report Template for Executive Summary and Full Report

Please use 12-point Times New Roman font, double-spacing, and one-inch margins. Be sure to follow the style sheet (see Appendix J).

Each subcommittee will produce (1) a full report of 20 to 25 double-spaced pages in length, and (2) an executive summary of 5 pages in length. Both will be submitted to the steering committee for final approval. Executive summaries will be included in the bound volume of IUP's self-study report. More information on the executive summary appears below. Full subcommittee reports will be published separately. Both the full subcommittee reports and the executive summaries should be organized as indicated below, using the four key parts as main subheadings and the subordinate parts as sub-subheadings. You may also have a separate data report to be included in an appendix to the full report.

- I Reprint the two MSCHE standards, word for word.
- II Give a brief description of the area(s) under review:
 1. What is the **context** of the area under review? (e.g., narrative description, key statistics, accomplishments, trends, etc.)
 2. What is the focus of the subcommittee's investigation? While the research questions provided important scaffolding for planning, data collection, and analysis, Dr. Debra Klinman (liason) advised that research questions be allowed to "fall away" as we write the subcommittee and final reports; therefore, instead of listing each research question verbatim, you may choose to distil them into your focus or to summarize them. Be sure to explain their importance for the university (e.g., why was the focus/question chosen? What is at stake?)
 3. What **evidence** was gathered and by what means? Evidence must be stored and made available for the site visit, and so you must document the sources of evidence in your report (e.g., *Smith, 2002*; a detailed style sheet for documentation will be provided. You may also include a narrative describing how the subcommittee operated or conducted its business.
- III Provide an analysis of the evidence as it pertains to the focus of the research questions and draw conclusions that address the focus explicitly. Connect these conclusions back to the standard.
 - Well-reasoned **conclusions**, supported by evidence and analysis, should constitute the bulk of the report.
 - Explain the **significance** of these conclusions for the area(s) under review and the standard as it pertains to the university as a whole.
- IV Make recommendations. These may include calls for:
 - Specific changes
 - Continuation of current practices or policies
 - Further study
 - Other

The executive summary should also follow the four-part outline above. For purposes of the executive summary, however, subheadings may be collapsed to improve readability. The executive summary must be 5 pages in length and contain no appendices, attachments, or additional pages. Instead, the executive summary should refer to material contained in the full report.

IUP is organizing its self-study data according to the Middle States Commission of Higher Education Accreditation Readiness Report (that is, the “Document Roadmap.”) Data is being stored and made available to steering and subcommittee members in IUP’s secure Confluence wiki. Much work has been done to create a searchable data library within Confluence. Within this library, as per the Document Roadmap, data is organized by Standard of Excellence and then grouped into one of the seven subcommittee areas. All steering and subcommittee members have access to all data available in the Confluence library, not just for his or her particular subcommittee, and subcommittee co-chairs can also request that documents be added to the library via IUP’s self-study data point person, Ms. Barbe Moore, Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment.

The subcommittee and final reports will contain citations to documents stored in the library. All members of the Middle States Visiting Team will have digital, secure access to the Middle States Library in the IUP Confluence wiki prior to, during, and after the spring 2016 site visit. In addition, IUP will prepare a physical Evidence Room for the team visit, with hard copies or computer links to all data and evidence used during the self-study process, and cited in the Self-Study document.

Parts of this style sheet are adapted from the IUP Web Team Style Guidelines

Subcommittees should use the following style sheet when composing drafts of their full reports and executive summaries. Additional information about the organization of reports appears in the subcommittee Report Template (see Appendix H).

General Style Requirements

Use 12-point Times New Roman font, double-spacing, and one-inch margins. Create the reports in MS Word for Windows. Do not use Word 'Styles,' table-of-contents, or automatic formatting features because they will have to be removed. Use flush-left formatting for text. Bullet and numbered lists are acceptable.

The full report must be between 20 and 25 double-spaced pages in length.

The executive summary must be 5 double-spaced pages in length.

Citing Sources in Reports and Executive Summaries

The Middle States Library is the repository for all documents cited in the final report, subcommittee reports, and executive summaries. Reports and summaries must be supported by evidence, and documents are the main type of evidence you will draw upon. They must be cited in such a way that readers can readily locate the specific source material you are drawing from. All documents are organized in the library into eight areas:

Middle States Library (library's index is searchable for all titles entered into the library)

GI General Information	S4 Student Admissions, Retention, Student Support Services
S1 Mission, Goals, Integrity	S5 Faculty and Educational Offerings
S2 Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal	S6 General Education and Other Educational Offerings
S3 Leadership, Governance, Administration	S7 Institutional Assessment and Assessment of Student Learning

The documents listed in each subcommittee area will usually be titles that link to IUP web pages. When writing your report, you will use these titles to create the in-text citations. For example, the General Information area of the library currently contains items such as:

- Common Data Set
- Enrollment Bookmark
- Graduate Catalog
- Undergraduate Catalog

All cited sources must be included in the library. To add a source to the library, send it to Barbe Moore.

When you use one of these documents, you will create a citation in the text of your report and a reference at the end of the report. Let's say you are in the General Information area and viewing the Common Data Set. For your report, you decide to state IUP's enrollment for full-time undergraduates by gender. You would then state the information and follow it with a parenthetical citation:

Full-time undergraduate enrollment at IUP for 2012-2013 consisted of 5,458 men and 6,737 women (GI Common Data Set).

Then, at the end of your report in your list of references, you would write:

References

GI Common Data Set. <http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=21479> Common Data Set 2012-2013.
Accessed [insert the date you accessed it].

Note the three parts of this reference: (1) The first part (GI Common Data Set) matches the in-text citation and the URL matches the one listed in the library. 'GI' refers to the General Information area of the library; for a document from the Subcommittee One area, you would write 'S1,' and so on. (2) The next part, Common Data Set 2012-2013, is the title of the specific document that contains the enrollment data. Include here any section headings, page numbers, paragraph numbers, etc. to help readers navigate to the content you are referring to. (3) The last part is the date you accessed the information. Alphabetize the list of references.

Questions or concerns about citing sources? Please contact Ben Rafoth at brafoth@iup.edu

Acronyms and Initials

Use the full name of an organization, unit, program, etc. on first reference; thereafter, use the acronym or initials. Please follow this rule even for familiar acronyms. *Indiana University of Pennsylvania*, then *IUP*.

Alumni

Use the proper form for the individual or group in question:

Alumnus – one man; *Alumna* – one woman; *Alumnae* – more than one woman (a group constituting only women); *Alumni* – more than one man or mixed group

Capitalization of Proper vs. Common Nouns

Proper nouns are capitalized; common nouns are not: *Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra*; *the orchestra*; *Council of Trustees*; *the trustees*; *Stapleton Library*; *the library*; *the University Museum*; *the museum*; *Indiana University of Pennsylvania*; *the university*. Note: What often happens in such instances is that each time the word university is even mentioned, it is capitalized, which detracts from the focus of the piece. (For example, *IUP is the largest University in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education and Clarion is another state-owned University* are wrong, although the statements themselves are right.) In general, avoid capitalization except for proper nouns.

Chair, Chairperson, Chairman

Use *chair*, unless the convention of another organization dictates otherwise.

Comma in Series

Use a comma before the "and" in a series of more than two items. *He bought milk, eggs, and bread.*

Credits and Credit Hours

See *Numbers*

Dashes and Hyphens

The *hyphen* is the “short dash” character found on your keyboard. Use it for compound words (e.g. *read-only file*).

The *en dash* is longer than a hyphen but shorter than an em dash. If your version of MS Word does not automatically create a dash when you want it, then simply use two hyphens to indicate a dash; the proofreader will then convert double hyphens to dashes.

Dates

In general, use this format for dates: *January 21, 2014*. When the full date is given, commas are used before and after the year: *The trustees met September 23, 2002, to approve the resolution*.

Freshman, Freshmen

It is better to avoid these terms and use *first-year student(s)*.

Footnotes, endnotes

Do not use them in the executive summary; they will have to be removed. Try to avoid them in the full report.

Headings

Use no more than 3 levels of headings, not counting the title of the document. Type *Heading Level 1* (or 2 or 3), flush left and then type the heading immediately after it. Do not use Word’s automatic ‘Style’ or ‘Outline’ features - these will have to be removed.

Links

Link text should identify the item being linked to. Avoid using “*click here*.” Don’t make surrounding punctuation—such as periods, commas, or quotes—part of the link. Try to keep links short; where necessary, provide additional information to help the reader navigate to the source.

Names

Give first name, surname, and title on first use. Use just surname thereafter, without designations Mr., Mrs., Dr., etc.

Numbers

Spell out one through nine; use numerals for 10 and higher. Exceptions: Use numerals for percentages and in other mathematical or scientific contexts. Spell out numbers when they begin a sentence.

Examples:

- *The three new parking lots at IUP will provide space for 500 more cars.*
- *Thirty-two faculty members in 12 departments were promoted to the rank of professor.*
- *The property is held on a 99-year lease.*
- *About seven percent of the property is wooded.*
- *Indiana County is more than 200 years old.*

PASSHE

Follow the rule in **Capitalization of Proper vs. Common Nouns** above, using, on first reference, *Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education*. In subsequent references, use *the System*, *the State System*, or *PASSHE*.

Quotation Marks

Use quotation marks around the title of a published work. Avoid the use of scare quotes. If the meaning or use of a word requires clarification, it is better to provide the clarification than to use quotation marks.

Spacing

Use only one space after punctuation at the end of a sentence and after a colon. Do not add white space to separate sections. Double-space throughout.

Universitywide

When using words with *wide*, the suffix should be added with no hyphens, e.g., *campuswide*, *worldwide*, *etc.*