SHIPPENSBURG UNIVERSITY

SELF-STUDY DESIGN

PREPARED FOR
MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION
ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FEBRUARY 2025

SHIPPENSBURG UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

I. INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania is a regional masters-comprehensive university, which enrolls approximately 5,000 undergraduates, graduate, and doctoral students, and is a member of Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education. Founded in 1871, Shippensburg University serves the educational, social, and cultural needs of students primarily from southcentral Pennsylvania. The university also serves students from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Mid-Atlantic region, the United States, and internationally. Of our ~4,400 undergraduate students, 45% are male, 55% are female, 23% are underrepresented minorities, and 25% are first generation. Our second-year retention rate for Fall 2023 first-time-in-college students was 77%, which is our second highest retention rate since Fall 2004. Our six-year graduation rate has consistently fluctuated around 55%; however, our underrepresented minority six-year graduation rate has fluctuated around 35% for the past five years, demonstrating a significant achievement gap. Our graduate student population has ranged between 720 and 810 since our last Self-Study in 2019. Sixteen percent of these students are underrepresented minority students.

Established as the Cumberland Valley State Normal School, the school received official approval by the state on February 21, 1873, and admitted its first class of 217 students on April 15, 1873. In 1917, the school was purchased by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. On June 4, 1926, the school was authorized to grant the Bachelor of Science in Education degree in elementary and junior high education. The school received a charter on October 12, 1926, making it the first normal school in Pennsylvania to become a state teachers' college. On June 3, 1927, the State Council of Education authorized the school to change its name to the State Teachers College at Shippensburg.

The business education curriculum was approved on December 3, 1937. On December 8, 1939, Shippensburg State Teachers College became the first teacher's college in Pennsylvania and the fourth in the United States to be accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and (Secondary) Schools. The State Council of Education approved graduate work leading to the Master of Education degree on January 7, 1959. On January 8, 1960, the name change to Shippensburg State College was authorized.

The arts and sciences curriculum was authorized by the State Council of Education on April 18, 1962, and the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration degree program was initiated on September 1, 1967. On November 12, 1982, the governor of the Commonwealth signed Senate Bill 506 establishing the State System of Higher Education. Shippensburg State College was designated Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania effective July 1, 1983.

Comprised of three academic colleges—Arts and Sciences, Business, Education and Human Services, plus the Wood Honors College—and two schools—the School of Engineering and the School of Academic Programs and Services that houses Exploratory Studies—Shippensburg confers baccalaureate degrees (BA, BS, BBA, BSW), master's degrees (MA, MS, MSW, MEd), and professional doctoral degrees (EdD). Two new doctoral degrees are the most recent addition to the university's advanced degree programs and have been launched to meet the needs of working professionals in the region. In fall 2015, the EdD in degree Educational Leadership began, and in fall 2017, the EdD degree in Counselor Education and Leadership commenced its first cohort. Both EdD programs are characterized by meaningful cohort sizes that offer both face-to-face and online components. The curricula for all degrees are designed to guide students in developing their intellectual abilities while they simultaneously obtain professional training in their respective fields.

The foundation of the undergraduate curriculum requires a first-year seminar course and a core of four additional courses in the arts and sciences designed to develop students' competencies in oral and written communication, quantitative reasoning, and historical knowledge. The first-year seminar course focuses on cultivating academic success, fostering personal wellness, practicing civility in a diverse society, building connections to the campus and the community, and promoting civic responsibility. The rest of the General Education Program offers courses designed to: help students explore interconnections between diverse US populations and global cultures and by learning a foreign language; consider the importance of citizenship and responsibility; understand the natural world as well as technology; and appreciate creativity and expression through the arts and literature.

Shippensburg is a residential university, with the majority of undergraduate students living either in campus housing or in private off-campus housing located in the immediate vicinity of the university. Low-cost graduate housing and graduate housing waivers are also available on campus, contributing to a vibrant graduate student community shepherded by an active Graduate Student Association. The campus provides a wide array of student services and programing, and the Luhrs Performing Arts Center serves as a cultural hub of the region.

The university's primary commitment is to support student learning and personal development by offering effective, innovative classroom and laboratory teaching and a wide variety of experiential learning opportunities. A primary goal is to inspire students to fully develop their intellectual, personal, and social capabilities, equipping them to become competent citizens ready to enter the workforce immediately after graduation or to pursue advanced studies. By achieving this goal, the university simultaneously fulfills its important mission of addressing regional, national, and global workforce needs. Its dedication to personal attention exemplifies the strong sense of community that permeates the campus, highlighting the central role students play within this environment.

The university encourages and supports activities which give students many opportunities to apply the theories and methods learned in the classroom to real or practical situations, such as faculty-student research and student internships. Student life programs and activities complement the academic mission and further assist students in their personal, social, and ethical development.

Shippensburg University (SU) offers unique learning opportunities to prepare students for their future careers. The Center for Land Use and Sustainability offers hands-on learning experiences for students to engage with the community through research and projects focused on sustainability initiatives. Students also engage in active learning experiences in the Brad E. Hollinger Stock Trading Room, the Fashion Archives and Museum, Shippensburg Community Resource Coalition, Growing Edges Community Clinic, and the Grace B. Luhrs University Elementary School, the only public elementary lab school in the state that provides teacher candidates with an on-campus practicum in early childhood education. Finally, in Fall 2016, the university launched the ShipStart dual enrollment program in collaboration with regional school districts. This initiative aims to attract high school students to SU, allowing them to experience the university's high-quality education while earning college credits in advance of their high school graduation. This program has grown substantially from the initial 27 students in 2016 to 307 in Spring 2025. Thirty-eight percent of ShipStart students matriculate as first-year students at Ship. The national average for dual-enrollment program matriculation is 20 percent.

Dedicated to public service and fostering community-centered relationships, the university collaborates closely with various organizations—at institutional, programmatic, and individual levels—to establish shared goals, optimize resource sharing, and jointly invest in the region's future.

II. INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE SELF-STUDY

To gain broad input regarding the institutional priorities to be addressed in Shippensburg's Self-Study, a survey was sent to all faculty (including adjuncts who were active in the spring 2025 semester) and to all staff (Shippensburg employees). Individuals who work in Shippensburg's auxiliary areas, such as dining services, student union staff, and the foundation, were not surveyed. To ensure a clear focus on the goals of the Self-Study (SS), these institutional priorities will be designated as Self-Study Institutional Priorities (SSIPs). The administrative co-chair of the SS, Associate Provost Schoolcraft, compiled goals from several recent sources to create the survey: the recent Comprehensive Planning Process (CPP) document (an annual document submitted to and voted on by the nine other chief academic officers and the nine other chief financial officers across the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE), the 2024–2026 Academic Master Plan, and the goals reported on at the annual State of the University address by the president each fall semester. The compiled list of goals was then reviewed by the president and his Executive Management Team. They determined

that one of the top priorities from the list would be to Achieve Financial Sustainability, and that the survey would ask participants to select three from the remaining seven priorities. The primary reason financial sustainability is designated as the top institutional priority for this SS is that our university must enhance its performance on financial metrics outlined in the CPP. The survey was sent to 355 faculty and 386 staff and was answered by 98 (27.6%) and 89 (23.1%) respectively. Participation by the number of individuals per area/unit are shown in the following tables.

Survey Participation by Division (Staff)

Division	Number of Individuals
Academic Affairs	38
Administration and Finance	17
Admission / Financial Aid / Marketing	15
Student Affairs	11
Athletics	6
President's Offices	1
Alumni Relations	1

Survey Participation by Unit (Faculty)

Unit	Number of Individuals
College of Arts and Sciences	54
College of Education and Human Services	19
College of Business	15
Library	4
Exploratory Studies	3
Counseling Center	1
Other	2

The ranked priorities are presented in order of response rates, from highest to lowest.

1. Increase student engagement, well-being, and success with student-centered approaches, high-impact learning opportunities, student development strategies, and student support programming. (118)

2. Expand flexible instruction to provide greater access to higher education. (97)

3. Attract and recruit a greater diversity of students—dual enrolled high school, transfer, military, international, and adult students— at both UG and G levels. (95)

4. Align program growth with workforce needs and increase partnerships with regional employers. (93)

5. Increase retention of subpopulations of students whose retention is lower than the average student (such as males, underrepresented minorities, first-generation, Pell eligible). (86)

6. Increase student credential achievement at all levels (including sub baccalaureate certificate). (47)

7. Other (with ability to provide text) (24)

Given the natural breaking points and the interrelatedness of the choices, these responses were combined into three SSIPs and added to the top priority of achieving financial sustainability.

Shippensburg University's Top Four Priorities for Self-Study

1. Achieve financial sustainability.

2. Increase student engagement, well-being, and success with a focus on closing achievement gaps and increasing retention for subpopulations of students (1 and 5).

3. Strategically use flexible instruction as a strategy to recruit new students and retain continuing students (2 and 3).

4. Align program growth with workforce needs, strategically increasing partnerships with regional employers.

The next table shows our four SSIPs and how they align with the seven MSCHE Standards. Working Groups whose Standard aligns strongly with a top priority are labeled Primary and those that align less strongly are labeled Additional.

Standard and ROA	Achieve financial sustainability	Increase student engagement, wellness and success (retention)	Strategically use flexible instruction (increase admissions, increase retention)	Align program growth with workforce needs (increase admissions)
I: Mission and Goals	Additional	Additional	Additional	Additional
II: Ethics and Integrity		Additional		
III. Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience		Additional	Primary	
IV. Support of the Student Experience		Primary		
V. Educational Effectiveness Assessment		Additional	Additional	Additional
VI: Planning, Resources and Institutional Improvement	Primary			
VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration	Additional			

The information that survey participants provided in the free form text of "Other" gives specific information, context, or emphasis on the choices for priorities. Those who provided comments were predominately faculty (18/24). While the number of staff who responded with text is small, each spoke about a different aspect of the university and their answers are grouped together with the faculty's responses. The largest number of faculty comments indicated how overwhelmed they are with increased teaching responsibilities (overloads, summer and winter sessions, individualized instructions, and advising) and service because the University has been managing its multi-year budget deficit through attrition (8/24). The strain due to staff turnover was mentioned as well, noting its impact on productivity and morale (2/24). Since spring 2024, the university has implemented a six-month freeze on replacing all staff vacancies. Recently, the three largest academic department chairs (Psychology, Teacher Education, and Management / Marketing / Entrepreneurship) report additional stress because their department secretary positions are held vacant. While the dean's offices are finding ways to provide additional support, the faculty chairs report that they are not able to keep up with the increased number of students who come to the department offices. The remaining "Other" comments provided specific recommendations regarding admissions (5 responses), retention (2), flexible instruction (1), engagement (1), and increasing university reserve funds (1).

An additional priority that the university is aligning with the SS process is revising the 2021–2024 University Strategic Plan (USP). Our mission as stated in this USP is "*Driven by purpose and truly collaborative engagement, our inclusive educational institution fosters belonging, honors proven practices, and celebrates achievements for the betterment of our communities.*" This statement will be revised at the suggestion of the 2019 MSCHE Team Report: "review the mission statement in order to more completely define the scope of the institution's purpose. … It is not clear from the mission statement which students the institution serves or what particular Shippensburg distinctions might draw students to choose the University." The Team was able to determine who the university serves from the context of the USP and referred SU to previous versions of the mission statement. The USP revision process was launched on Monday, February 3, with the meeting of the five-member USP Steering Committee, whose membership is comprised of SU's ALO and the MSCHE SS Steering Committee administrative co-chair who serves as an ex-officio member. Additionally, the SS Working Group for Standard I Mission and Goals is co-chaired by the co-chairs of the larger USP Committee, which allows for an overlap of some members for these two groups.

III. INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE SELF-STUDY

The co-chairs of the SS proposed the following intended outcomes by examining outcomes from sample SS designs and reflecting on the university's top priorities for the SS. These intended outcomes were reviewed by the President and his Executive Management Team for their approval.

- Demonstrate how Shippensburg University currently meets the Commission's Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation.

- Engage the institutional community in an inclusive and transparent self-appraisal process that actively and deliberately seeks to involve members from all areas of the institutional community, focusing on financial sustainability.

- Focus on continuous improvement in the attainment of the institution's mission and its institutional priorities.

- Leverage the SS process to create and implement the 2025–2030 University Strategic Plan which will prioritize how the university will attract and retain new student audiences by providing valued educational experiences in the desired modality of those audiences.

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUPS

STEERING COMMITTEE

The SS Steering Committee and Working Groups were appointed by President Charles Patterson based on nominations submitted by Vice Presidents, Deans, Associate Vice Presidents and Directors across the university. The Steering Committee is led by the SS co-chairs (one administrative and one faculty) and is comprised of the co-chairs (one administrative and one faculty) of each of the seven Working Groups, each focused on one of the Commission's seven standards (see table on the next page). The Steering Committee administrative members were chosen based on their expertise and positional authority. Faculty co-chairs were chosen

based on their current or past leadership positions at the university and expertise. The co-chairs and members of each Working Group are listed below with their standard and Lines of Inquiry.

Members of the Self-Study Steering Committee

	Administrative Co-chair	**Faculty Co-chair**
Self-Study	Dr. Tracy Schoolcraft, Associate Provost and Interim Dean of Exploratory Studies	Dr. Karen Johnson Associate Professor of Academic Engagement and Exploratory Studies, Co-Chair of the General Education Council
Standard I	Dr. Darrell Newton, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs	TBD (faculty co-chair of the Strategic Planning Committee)
Standard II	Dr. Megan Luft, Vice President for Enrollment Management and Marketing	Dr. Carrie Sipes, Associate Professor of Communication, Journalism and Media (Pending)
Standard III	Dr. Nicole Hill, Vice Provost and Dean of the College of Education and Human Services	Dr. Grant Innerst, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Chair of University Curriculum Committee
Standard IV	Ms. Lorie Sheetz, Vice President of Student Affairs and Dean of Students Dr. Jennifer Haughie, Associate Vice President of Retention and Student Success	Dr. Michael Levinstein, Associate Professor of Academic Engagement and Exploratory Studies, Director of Advisor Development
Standard V	Dr. Terry Dean, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences	Dr. Jose Ricardo, Associate Professor of Global Languages and Culture
Standard VI	Dr. Jolinda Wilson, Vice President of Administration and Finance	Dr. Travis Waters, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Special Education
Standard VII	Mr. Drew Alosi, Chief of Staff Dr. Sabita Manian, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences	Mr. Aaron Dobbs, Professor and Chair of the Library, Chair of University Forum

WORKING GROUPS

Working Groups' Charge

The Working Groups will contribute to the SS Report and Evidence Inventory to prepare for MSCHE accreditation. Working Groups will conduct a thorough review and evaluation of SU's programs, processes, and policies for their MSCHE Standard. Each Working Group will review evidence to determine the extent to which SU meets the standard. Each Working Group will be led by co-chairs who are responsible for coordinating the committee's work and meeting with the Steering Committee Co-chairs. Working Group Co-chairs will also represent their group to the campus community as needed. Specifically, Working Group members will:

a. Meet monthly to focus on strategies for collecting evidence and drafting the SS. The chairs will schedule the meetings, and a designated member will record meeting minutes and store the minutes in the corresponding Standards folder on Teams.

b. Review and analyze MSCHE's Standards for Accreditation, Requirements for Affiliation, Evidence Inventory, and SU's SSIPs.

c. Distribute responsibilities within the groups that may include: a) an archivist who identifies gaps in the Evidence Inventory, saves evidence to the inventory, and works to collect missing evidence; b) a writer who collects the contributions and composes the analytical narrative for the Standard; c) contributors who collect evidence and analyze information in the Alignment Overview and SS documents to ensure the narrative meets the guidelines in the Standard. Chairs will need to ensure that all criteria are covered. Members assigned to a particular criterion should analyze and write the sections for those criteria and/or Requirements of Affiliation.

d. Clearly define key terms within the Standard and designate those terms for the glossary.

e. Complete the Alignment Overview, a first draft of the chapter for the Standard, and final draft of the chapter. All these documents will assess institutional strengths and weaknesses in relation to the Standard and suggest opportunities for improvement and innovation that are connected to SU's SSIPs, recognizing that submitted reports serve as source information and all information may or may not appear in the final document.

f. Present findings to the SU community as needed.

g. Participate in MSCHE Review Team's site visit in spring 2027.

Standard I: Mission and Goals

The institution's mission defines its purpose within the context of higher education, the students it serves, and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals are clearly linked to its mission and specify how the institution fulfills its mission.

This Working Group is designed to have its membership overlap with the University Strategic Planning Committee, indicated by an asterisk.

Name	Title
Dr. Darrell Newton* (co-chair)	Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs
Faculty* (co-chair) TBD	
Ms. Brigette Allen	Director of Fraternity / Sorority Life and Commuter / Non-Traditional Students
Dr. Jayleen Galarza	Associate Professor, Social Work and Gerontology
Mr. Bruce Herring	Assistant Director of Planning and Engineering
Dr. John Kooti	Dean, John L. Grove College of Business
Dr. Alison Mellot	Associate Professor, Teacher Education
Dr. Manuel Ruiz*	Assistant Vice President of Inclusion / Belonging and Director of Social Equity
Ms. Cathy Sprenger	Registrar
Dr. Allan Tulchin	Associate Professor, History
Undergraduate student	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027
Graduate student	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027

Related Self-Study Institutional Priorities

All four of SU's SSIPs need to be addressed in this standard. The Working Group should review the mission and goals in the previous USP as well as the revised USP to analyze the extent that the SSIP's are reflected and achieved.

- Achieve financial sustainability.

- Increase student engagement, well-being and success with a focus on closing achievement gaps and increasing retention for subpopulations of students.

- Strategically use flexible instruction as a strategy to recruit new students and retain existing student audiences.

- Align program growth with workforce needs, strategically increasing partnerships with regional employers.

Specific Lines of Inquiry

1. With the revision of the USP, explain how the revision process was appropriately collaborative and inclusive of those who are responsible for institutional development and improvement and how the USP addressed internal and external contexts as well as internal and external constituents.

2. Describe the approval process for the USP.

3. How well do the revised mission and goals guide decision-making by faculty, administration, staff and governing structures? Provide information on decision-making related to planning, resource allocation, and program and curricular development. Explain how the mission and goals guide SU's stated institutional and educational outcomes.

4. How well do the revised mission and goals align with the level of scholarly inquiry and creative activity at SU?

5. Explain how the revised mission and goals will be publicized to internal stakeholders so that they are widely known. To what extent are they mentioned by internal stakeholders in meetings and communications?

6. To what extent are SU's goals, as stated in the revised USP, realistic for its role in higher education as a member of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education and in its mission as a regional comprehensive university?

7. To what extent do SU's goals regarding student learning outcomes and student achievement reflect its commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion? How has SU prioritized institutional improvement of its retention, graduation, transfer, and placement rates and focused on decreasing achievement gaps among subpopulations such as underrepresented minority students, low-income students, first-generation students, and military students? How well do administrative, educational, and student support programs and services contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes and student achievement?

8. How well did the mission and goals in the previous USP reflect and achieve the four SSIP? How well does the revised USP reflect the four SSIPs?

9. Explain how SU periodically assesses its mission and goals to ensure they are relevant and achievable.

Standard II: Ethics and Integrity

Ethics and integrity are central, indispensable, and defining hallmarks of effective higher education institutions. In all activities, whether internal or external, an institution must be faithful to its mission, honor its contracts and commitments, adhere to its policies, and represent itself truthfully.

Working Group Members

Name	Title
Dr. Megan Luft (co-chair)	Vice President of Enrollment Management and Marketing
Dr. Carrie Sipes (co-chair, pending)	Chair and Associate Professor of Communication, Journalism, and Media
Dr. Laura Beckman	Associate Professor, Criminal Justice
Dr. Dhiman Chattopadhyay	Associate Professor Communications, Journalism, and Media and Director of Ethnic Studies
Ms. Emma Durnin	Editorial Content Writer, Communications and Marketing
Mr. Jaime Juarez	Learning Specialist and Academic Coach
Mr. Chad Kegerreis	IT Security Coordinator and Microsoft System Administrator
Dr. Chandrika Paul	Professor of History
Karl Schucholz	Deputy Chief of Police
Undergraduate student	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027
Graduate student	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027

Related Self-Study Institutional Priorities

The second criterion of this Standard is related to SU's SSIP of increasing student engagement. That criterion is "to possess and demonstrate a climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration from a range of diverse backgrounds, ideas and perspectives."

- Increase student engagement, well-being and success with a focus on closing achievement gaps and increasing retention for subpopulations of students.

Specific Lines of Inquiry

1. What policies and processes exist to support SU's commitment to academic freedom, intellectual freedom, freedom of expression, and respect for intellectual property rights? Are these policies and processes adequate?

2. What practices are in place that foster a climate of respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration from a range of diverse backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives? Is this culture of respect pervasive?

3. Describe the policies, procedures, and practices that exist to ensure fair and impartial treatment to all constituencies (students, faculty, and staff) in all aspects of operations to promptly and appropriately address complaints and grievances, to avoid conflicts of interest, and to communicate with honesty and integrity? How effectively are these policies, procedures, and practices disseminated among constituencies? Are these policies sufficient?

4. What processes and practices ensure fair and impartial practices for hiring, evaluation, promotion, discipline, and separation for employees? Is appropriate attention given to diversity in these practices and processes?

5. What mechanisms exist to ensure that there is honesty and truthfulness in all campus communications, including public announcements, advertisements, recruiting materials, and internal communications? Are these mechanisms effective?

6. As appropriate to our mission, services, programs, how effectively does SU promote diversity, equity, inclusion, affordability and accessibility, full disclosure of information on institutional assessment, and institutional compliance of all applicable mandated guidelines? To what degree do these facilitate student understanding of funding sources and options, value received for cost, and methods to make informed decisions about incurring debt?

7. Describe how SU complies with all federal, state, and Commission reporting policies, regulations and requirements. Are these efforts effective?

8. How does SU systematically and periodically assess its policies, processes, and mechanisms to ensure that it is achieving its mission with ethics and integrity. Are these methods effective?

Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

An institution provides students with learning experiences that are characterized by rigor and coherence at all program, certificate, and degree levels, regardless of instructional modality. All learning experiences, regardless of modality, program pace/schedule, level, and setting are consistent with higher education expectations.

Working Group Members

Name	Title
Dr. Nicole Hill (co-chair)	Vice Provost and Dean of the College of Education and Human Services
Dr. Grant Innerst (co-chair)	Associate Professor, Mathematics and Chair, University Curriculum Committee
Dr. Laurie Cella	Professor of English, Co-director of First-Year Experience, and Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning
Dr. Thomas Crochunis	Associate Professor of English and Director of the Interdisciplinary Arts Program
Dr. Allen Dietrich-Ward	Professor of History and Director of the Graduate School
Mr. Scott Gallagher	Instructional Technology Specialist
Ms. Corinne Goyt	Associate Registrar
Dr. Kim Klein	Professor of History and Director of the Woods Honor College
Dr. Wendy Kubasko	Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Special Education
Dr. Arelys Madero	Associate Professor of Criminal Justice
Dr. Melissa McNelis	Associate Professor of Communication Studies
Dr. Kirk Moll	Associate Professor of Library
Ms. Cindy Murray	Learning Specialist
Undergraduate student	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027
Graduate student	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027

Related Self-Study Institutional Priorities

The SSIP of matching the instructional modality of programs to attract new student audiences to SU strongly aligns with this Standard. Designing curriculum to meet the life needs of adult learners as well as the needs of dual enrolled high school students who cannot travel to campus is essential to growing these audiences. As Shippensburg attracts these new audiences, it needs to ensure that the "rigor and coherence" is appropriate for higher education and represents Ship's high-quality brand.

- Strategically use flexible instruction as a strategy to recruit new students and retain existing student audiences.

The SSIP of student engagement also aligns with this Standard. Courses and programs should examine how student achievement gaps among subpopulations of students can be eliminated through instructional design.

- Increase student engagement, well-being and success with a focus on closing achievement gaps and increasing retention for subpopulations of students. .

Specific Lines of Inquiry

1. How well do SU's academic programs foster a coherent student learning experience of the appropriate length and rigor while promoting synthesis of learning?

2. How well does SU ensure and support undergraduate and graduate student learning experiences that are designed, delivered, and assessed by qualified faculty or other appropriate professionals who demonstrate effectiveness of professional responsibilities, are sufficient in number, engage in professional growth, and are regularly evaluated?

3. To what degree do academic programs of study clearly and accurately communicate information about academic offerings, requirements, academic progress, and resources so that students can understand and follow program requirements to make informed decisions?

4. Which learning opportunities and resources at both the undergraduate and graduate levels are most appropriate and effective to support students' program of study and academic progress? How is SU responding to the needs of diverse populations to ensure inclusion and student success?

5. In what ways does the general education program foster students' essential skills, new areas of intellectual experiences, cultural and global awareness, cultural sensitivity, and the ability to make well-reasoned judgments?

6. To what extent are qualified faculty providing graduate students opportunities for the development of research, scholarship, and independent thinking?

7. If SU provides third-party providers, what does the review and approval process reveal about how well student learning opportunities are designed, delivered, and assessed by third party providers?

8. How effective is the periodic assessment of student learning experiences for all students?

Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience

Across all educational experiences, settings, levels, and instructional modalities, the institution recruits and admits students whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals are congruent with its mission and educational offerings. The institution commits to student retention, persistence, completion, and success through a coherent and effective support system sustained by qualified professionals, which enhances the quality of the learning environment, contributes to the educational experience, and fosters student success.

Working Group Members

Name	Title
Ms. Lorie Sheetz (co-chair)	Vice President of Student Affairs and Dean of Students
Dr. Jennifer Haughie (co-chair)	Associate Vice President of Retention and Student Success
Dr. Michael Levinstein (co-chair)	Associate Professor of Academic Engagement and Exploratory Studies
Ms. Brandy Brady	Director of Enrollment Events and Orientation
Ms. Mary Burnett	Director of Global Engagement and International Programs
Mr. Dylan Curtis,	Coordinator of Intramurals and Club Sports
Ms. Holly Garner	Director / Chairperson Luhrs Elementary School
Mr. Zack Grabosky	Director of Academic Support
Ms. Ashley Grimm	Associate Director of Athletics
Dr. Thomas Hatvany	Associate Professor of Psychology
Ms. Alex Karlheim	Director of Academic Entry and Veterans Benefits
Ms. Nicole Kunkle	Textbook Lending Library Technician
Dr. Allison Predecki	Associate Professor of Chemistry
Mr. Jamie Rhine	Director Technology Supplemental Services and Divisional Budgets
Dr. Jordan Windholz	Associate Professor of English
Undergraduate student	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027
Graduate student	Working group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027

Related Self-Study Institutional Priorities

The SSIP of student engagement, well-being and success aligns with this Standard of Support of the Student Experience.

- Increase student engagement, well-being and success with a focus on closing achievement gaps and increasing retention for subpopulations of students.

Specific Lines of Inquiry

1. Does SU clearly state ethical policies and processes for recruitment, admissions, financial aid, retention, supporting underprepared students, and facilitating student achievement? Are the processes used to disaggregate and analyze student achievement data effective in informing and implementing strategies to improve success for all student populations?

2. How fair and transparent are policies and procedures related to the evaluation of transfer credits, credit for prior learning, credit for experiential or non-academic learning, competency-based assessments, and other alternative learning approaches effectively implemented?

3. How are orientation, advising, and counseling programs designed to support student retention and to guide them through their educational experience?

4. Describe how SU supports students' educational goals, including degree completion, transfer to other institutions, and post-completion placement.

5. How is the privacy of student information securely maintained and appropriately released?

6. To what extent are athletics, student life, and other extracurricular activities regulated and assessed by equivalent academic, fiscal, and administrative processes and procedures that govern all other programs?

7. Explain how appropriate institutional review and approval is conducted for student support services that are designed, delivered, or assessed by third party providers.

8. How does SU periodically assess the effectiveness of student support services?

Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Assessment of student learning and achievement demonstrates that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their program of study, degree level, the institution's mission, and appropriate expectations for institutions of higher education.

Working Group Members

Name	Title
Dr. Terry Dean (co-chair)	Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Dr. Jose Ricardo (co-chair)	Associate Professor of Global Languages and Cultures
Faculty (TBD)	Faculty co-chair of University Assessment Committee
Dr. Joao Dias	Associate Professor of Civil and Mechanical Engineering
Ms. Stefanie Elbel	Assessment Coordinator and Labor Market Specialist
Dr. Amber Norwood	Associate Professor of Psychology
Dr. Anne Papalia	Associate Professor of Special Education and Chair of Educational Leadership and Special Education
Dr. Mohamed Rahman	Associate Professor of Marketing
Dr. Justin Sentz	Chief Information Technology Officer, Academic Technology, and User Services
Ms. Josefine Smith	Associate Professor, Lehman Library
Undergraduate student	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027
Graduate student	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027

Related Self-Study Institutional Priorities

The SSIP that addresses the alignment of program growth with workforce needs aligns with this Standard. When our programs demonstrate program-level learning outcomes that employers value, we are able to strengthen our partnerships with them. Their feedback on our outcomes allows our students to see how Shippensburg prepares them for careers.

• Align program growth with workforce needs, strategically increasing partnerships with regional employers.

Specific Lines of Inquiry

1. How well do the course, program, and institutional student learning outcomes and educational experiences align with the mission of the university?

2. To what extent are course-level student learning outcomes used to improve student learning across multiple sections or multiple delivery modalities?

3. To what extent does SU's systematic, comprehensive assessment plan of student learning outcomes and use of results improve educational effectiveness consistent with its mission? How are these assessments communicated to stakeholders?

4. How are disaggregated assessment results used to improve student learning, achievement, and program and institutional-level effectiveness?

5. Describe how assessment processes and policies are periodically assessed for the purpose of improving educational effectiveness.

6. How are programs responding to workforce needs and building partnerships with regional employers to enhance program growth and innovate curricular offerings?

Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

The institution's planning processes, resources, and structures are aligned with each other and are sufficient to fulfill its mission and goals, to continuously assess and improve its programs and services, and to respond effectively to opportunities and challenges.

Working Group Members

Name	Title
Dr. Jolinda Wilson (co-chair)	Vice President for Administration and Finance
Dr. Travis Waters (co-chair)	Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Special Education
Ms. Jen Milburn	Director of Housing and Residence Life
Ms. Misty Gruver	Technology Fee Manager
Dr. Eric Zeglen	Executive Director Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning
Dr. Michelle Foreman	Dean of the Libraries
Mr. Tim Paules	Report Developer / Technical Specialist
Mr. Matt Dominick	Director of Facilities Management and Planning
Dr. Adam Powell	Associate Professor of Management, Marketing, and Entrepreneurship
Dr. Sam Forlenza	Associate Professor of Exercise Science
Dr. Jackie Chovanes	Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Special Education
Dr. Chad Kimmel	Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology
Dr. Bahman Naser	Associate Professor of Civil and Mechanical Engineering
Undergraduate students	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027
Graduate student	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027

Related Self-Study Institutional Priorities

Shippensburg's top SSIP of achieving financial sustainability directly aligns with this Standard.

• Achieve financial sustainability.

The institution's additional SSIPs will also be examined in this Standard because resources are necessary to achieve the priorities which are aligned with our mission and goals.

• Increase student engagement, well-being and success with a focus on closing achievement gaps and increasing retention for subpopulations of students.

• Strategically use flexible instruction as a strategy to recruit new students and retain existing student audiences.

• Align program growth with workforce needs, strategically increasing partnerships with regional employers.

Specific Lines of Inquiry

1. How well do institutional and unit goals contribute to the achievement of the university's mission and goals? Are all goals clearly stated? To what extent are these goals assessed? How are the assessment results used for planning and resource allocation? How well do the financial and budgeting processes align with SU's mission and goals and with each unit's strategic plans or objectives? To what extent are these processes evidence-based?

2. How well are the planning and improvement processes communicated and documented? To what extent is the participation in these processes inclusive of the constituents?

3. To what extent does planning lead to overall institutional improvement and effectiveness? To what extent does planning focus on student achievement and educational outcomes that is appropriate for SU? How well does planning integrate the results of institutional assessments? To what extent does planning lead to institutional improvement for SU's diversity, equity and inclusion goals? How well does planning determine and maintain sufficient resources for these goals?

4. To what extent does SU have the fiscal and human resources as well as the physical and technical infrastructure to support the operation of programs? How well do financial plans document financial resources and a funding base to support the educational purposes, programs, and related entities, such as SU's auxiliaries, in a financially sustainable manner?

5. Explain how SU demonstrates a record of responsible fiscal management, including preparing a multi-year budget. How are the results of the independent audit used to change internal financial controls to address any material findings cited in the audit or accompanying management letter? Explain how SU responds to any concerns raised about financial sustainability.

6. To what extent are the decision-making processes well-defined and appropriately inclusive to reach institutional and unit effectiveness? Provide information on the clear assignment of responsibility and explain how accountability is achieved.

7. Explain how planning for facilities, infrastructure and technology occurs. How is deferred maintenance incorporated into this planning? What considerations are made regarding sustainability? How are these planning processes linked to SU's strategic and financial planning processes?

8. How does SU demonstrate our compliance with its responsibilities under existing federal Title IV and other state laws and regulations, including any audits of financial aid programs as required by federal and state regulations?

9. What strategies does SU use to measure and assess the adequacy and efficient utilization of instructional resources required to support the SU's mission and goals? How well do these work?

10. Explain how SU periodically assesses the effectiveness of its planning, resource allocation, institutional renewal processes, and availability of resources.

Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

The institution is governed and administered in a manner that allows it to realize its stated mission and goals in a way that effectively benefits the institution, its students, and the other constituencies it serves. Even when supported by or affiliated with a related entity, the institution has education as its primary purpose, and it operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.

Working Group Members

Name	Title
Mr. Drew Alosi (co-chair)	Chief of Staff
Mr. Aaron Dobbs (co-chair)	Professor of the Library
Dr. Sabita Manian	Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Mr. Kyle Miller	Director of Student Conduct and Community Standards
Dr. Cheryl Slattery	Professor of Teacher Education
Dr. Michael Lyman	Professor of Social Work and Gerontology
Dr. Emily Kramer	Associate Professor Biology
Ms. Kim Kolenc	Executive Assistant for the Vice President of Administration and Finance
Mr. Colin Arnold	Student Trustee, Council of Trustees
Graduate student	Working Group to identify; keep on as alumni if they graduate before spring 2027

Related Institutional Priorities

The university's administration, Council of Trustees and ultimately the Board of Governors of the State System of Higher Education have the responsibility to ensure that the university accomplishes its mission and goals. The top SSIP of achieving financial sustainability to deliver our mission and goals is aligned with this Standard.

• Achieve financial sustainability.

Specific Lines of Inquiry

1. How does the institution evaluate and provide evidence that its governance structure clearly displays roles, responsibilities, and accountability for decision-making by all constituencies, including SU's Board of Trustees, administration, faculty, staff, and students?

2. How does SU's governing body ensure that the institution fulfills its mission and goals and provides fiduciary responsibility along with accountability for academic quality, planning, and fiscal well-being?

3. Explain how the governing body maintains its integrity and institutional independence from undue influence by external forces.

4. What processes and policies are in place to ensure that the institution is empowered to conduct daily business without interference from the governing body and/or individual members of that governing body?

5. How does the governing body provide oversight for academic policies related to program quality, program/degree approval, awarding of degrees, personnel decisions, and strong fiscal management?

6. How does the governing body evaluate the performance of the president?

7. How is the board's effectiveness evaluated?

8. Explain the conflict-of-interest policies that are in place to ensure the governing body's integrity.

9. To what extent does the president have a sufficient administration with the appropriate experience and credentials, clearly defined roles and responsibilities, appropriate resources, and processes for assessing SU's efficiency and effectiveness?

10. Using the organizational chart, describe the reporting relationships and how the leadership team is an appropriate size, represents diversity, embodies appropriate credentials, and has relevant, professional experiences consistent with SU's mission and that equips them to assist the president.

11. Explain the processes that are in place to ensure that the administration and leadership teams regularly engage with faculty and students to promote SU's goals and objectives.

12. What process does SU use to periodically assess the effectiveness of governance, leadership, and administration?

V. GUIDELINES FOR REPORTING

Process for Writing the Interim Report

1. Using the **"MSCHE Evidence Inventory Templates"** and **"The Evidence Expectations by Standard Guidelines,"** Chairs, Administrators, and Working Group members will gather and upload evidence to the Evidence Inventory and the appropriate Working Group folder on Teams. Working Groups should also upload evidence that is not listed on the Inventory Template if it demonstrates how the Standard has been met. Unique types of evidence not listed on the Inventory Templates that provide clarity on how a particular criterion was met should be included in the Evidence Inventory.

2. Working Groups will review the Lines of Inquiry, the evidence in the Evidence Inventory, and the particular SSIPs connected to a criterion. Each group can determine if they would like to revise or edit the Lines of Inquiry as they see fit.

3. Each Working Group will utilize the appropriate "**Alignment Overview**[1]" document that corresponds with their standard and is located in the MSCHE Teams folder (A sample of this Alignment Overview can be found in Appendix A). This document will be used to examine how each criterion is met. In the Alignment Overview document, team members will write in the appropriate institutional priorities and evidence that demonstrates how the criterion was met. Using the information from the Evidence Inventory and the Institutional Priorities, Working Group members will answer an appropriate Line of Inquiry for that criterion. Careful attention should be made to analyze how criteria in the Standard and the Requirements of Affiliation, if applicable, have been met and to determine strengths, weaknesses, and any gaps in the evidence. Members in the Working Groups should select data that provides the best information to evaluate criterion achievement as well as identify additional evidence that must be gathered.

4. While analyzing the Standards, MSCHE recommends five guiding principles to help evaluate compliance: 1) Application of the Standards within the context of SU's Mission and Goals; 2) Centrality of the Student Experience; 3) Reflection on Diversity Equity, and Inclusion; 4) Emphasis on Data and Evidence-Based Decision-making; and 5) Innovation as an Essential Part of Continuous Improvement.

5. Working Groups gather any additional evidence needed to evaluate achievement of criteria.

6. After analyzing the evidence and reviewing responses from the Lines of Inquiry, Working Groups will complete the Summary section of the document to evaluate findings, highlight areas of strength, suggest opportunities for improvement and innovation, and propose institutional strategies for improvement.

---

[1] This document was adapted from the MSCHE's Self-Study Preparation: Resources and Tools from the Self-Study Institute Week 3.

Writing the Initial Self-Study Draft Report

Using the Style Guidelines and referring to the **Alignment Overview** document, members of Working Groups will contribute to the writing of the report by submitting drafts that balance the elements of descriptive narrative, analytical prose, and documentation of evidence. Reviewing completed self-studies from other universities in the Teams folder may be helpful when drafting this portion of the report. Draft reports should include the following areas:

1. **Introduction:** The introduction provides a brief overview of the processes, methods, and context for how the Working Group examined the achievement of this standard.

2. **Evidence and Analysis:** In this section, refer to each criterion to evaluate how the evidence demonstrates the achievement of SSIPs and the standard. This section may be organized by themes that naturally occur with groups of individual criterion. Describe the compiled data, which can include policies, processes, and assessments, that were analyzed and explain how results have been used to evaluate achievement of institutional, unit, and student learning goals. Sufficient examples of evidence and subsequent analyses are needed to illustrate how SU meets or exceeds SSIPss and criteria in the Standard.

3. **Conclusion:** In a paragraph or two, summarize the overall findings of the chapter and highlight new insights learned from the study. Provide a smooth transition to discuss the two subsections, Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

   - **Strengths:** In one to two paragraphs, concisely elaborate on SU's strengths that are explained in the analysis and how SU practices evidence-based decision-making. Use assessment results to support the discussion of strengths.

   - **Opportunities for Improvement:** In one to two paragraphs, explain the ways SU can employ university-wide efforts to better achieve the Standard and our SSIPs.

4. Each Working Group will contribute to the writing of the report, but the Working Group Chairs will write the report for each standard. The Initial Study Draft Report should be between 10-12 single-spaced pages.

5. The Steering Committee will provide feedback on the Initial SS Draft to help the Working Group make revisions for the Final SS Report. The first draft is due at the end of the 2025 fall semester.

Style Guidelines

- Reports should be written in Microsoft Word within the corresponding standard folder on Teams.

- Report length should range from 10-12 pages, be single-spaced, and use Times New Roman 12-point font with one-inch margins.

- Two levels of headings should be used:

  - Main headings should be bolded, in title case, with 14-point Times New Roman font, left justified.

  - Sub-headings should be in italics, in title case, with 12-point Times New Roman font, left justified.

- Page numbers to appear in bottom center; no other header or footer should be used.

- Reports should be succinct but include relevant details.

- Use bullets to highlight essential points, emphasize key details, summarize findings, and conclude findings related to programmatic strengths and opportunities for improvement.

- Use tables to condense quantitative or qualitative data, illustrate assessment results, or to emphasize comparisons.

- Use the Oxford comma (comma before "and") in any series.

- Employ formal language by avoiding contractions, referring to positions and not individuals, and by writing in third person.

- Employ active voice as much as possible.

Final Self-Study Reports Guidelines

Final Reports are written in the corresponding Standards folder in Teams. Using feedback from the Steering Committee, Working Groups will write a Final SS Report, using the same structure as the Initial SS Report. Final Reports should follow the organizational pattern below:

1. **Introduction:** Provide a brief, general overview of how criteria were met and linked to our institutional priorities.

2. **Evidence and Analysis:** Provide an analysis using appropriate evidence gathered on the Alignment Overview document and the Initial SS Draft to explain how SU meets or exceeds SSIPs and criteria in the Standard.

3. **Conclusion:** Briefly summarize the chapter's main points and include subsections for Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

   - **Strengths:** Concisely highlight the strengths of SU as identified in the analysis.

   - **Opportunities for Improvement:** Identify major areas for improvement that resulted from the SS, keeping in mind that all recommendations may not be included in the final version of the SS. However, suggestions for institutional improvement will be sent to the appropriate responsible unit for further consideration and action.

4. Each Working Group will contribute to the writing of the report, but the Working Group Chairs will write the report for each standard. The Final Study Draft Report should be between 10-12 single-spaced pages. The final draft is due at the end of the 2026 spring semester.

After all final reports have been submitted via the Teams folder, the final SS Report will be written. The submitted documents may be edited, paraphrased, or revised to reflect a single voice written by one author.

Reporting Timelines

August 2025–December 2025: Working Groups should use the completed Alignment Overview Report for Standards that includes the preliminary summary of findings, a gap analysis, and emerging recommendations, to draft the Initial SS Draft Report. The Steering Committee will update the community and the trustees on the progress of their groups by October 31, 2025. Working Groups will write the Initial SS Draft Report in their respective Teams folder and finish the draft by the end of the fall semester. Feedback on the Initial SS Report will be given to the Working Groups between February 1- 27, 2026.

January 2026–December 2026: Working Groups will complete the Final Report with Gap Analysis and Emerging Recommendations by May 22, 2026. SS Report updates will be sent to the community and Board of Trustees. Workgroups will continue to refine reports as needed in response to feedback from stakeholders. Working Groups submit final reports following the organizational template by December 2026.

VI. ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL SELF-STUDY REPORT

The SS will be organized according to the Standards and will begin with an Executive Summary and end with a chapter that highlights Opportunities for Improvement. The following structure is anticipated for the SS:

1. Table of Contents

2. Glossary of Terms

3. Executive Summary

    • Summary of Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement by Standard

4. Introduction

    • Institutional Context and Overview of the Institution

    • Explanation of SSIPs and its Relationship to the Seven Standards

    • Description of SS Process

    • Brief Description of Remaining Chapters

5. Standard I: Mission and Goals

    • Introduction

    • Evidence and Analysis by Criterion

    • Conclusion

        • Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

6. Standard II: Ethics and Integrity

    • Introduction

    • Evidence and Analysis by Criterion

        • Requirements of Affiliation #1

    • Conclusion

        • Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

7. Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

    • Introduction

    • Evidence and Analysis by Criterion

    • Conclusion

        • Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

VII. SELF-STUDY TIMELINE

Date	Task
January 31, 2025	• 3 Institutional Priorities for framing of SS • Solidify outcomes of SS • Solidify Guiding Questions for each standard • Draft budget for MSCHE SS
January 31, due Feb 7, 2025	Review of SSD by EMT
February 7, 2025	Finalize SS design; send to Kim Hess
February 14, 2025	Upload SS design to MSCHE (Eric Zeglen)
February 15–28, 2025	Have Kickoff meeting; orientation
March–May 2025	• Monthly meetings of workgroup co-chairs with SS co-chairs • Ensure Evidence Inventory is complete • Assessment of each standard has begun • Improvements for each Standard are identified
March–May 2025	Campus visit by MSCHE Vice President Liaison
August–December 2025	• Monthly meetings of workgroup co-chairs with SS co-chairs • Co-chairs attend standing meetings across campus to provide information and get feedback about the MSCHE process • Host visit of Team chair • End of semester meeting of all workgroups with report out • Finalize first rough draft of SS and share with university stakeholders
January–December 2026	• Open Forums for feedback on first rough draft, and co-chairs attend meetings across campus to get feedback • Monthly meetings of workgroup co-chairs with SS co-chairs • Workgroups continue to refine Self-Study • Workgroup co-chairs meet in meaningful pairs (III and V, I and VI) • End of semester—meeting of all workgroups with report out
January–May 2027	• Submit final version of SS • Campus prepares for Team visit • Host Team visit
After Team visit	Draft and submit university response to Visiting Team's Report
Summer 2027	MSCHE Action

VIII. COMMUNICATION PLAN

To effectively achieve the participation required, these goals and objectives will guide the university in its efforts to educate the community on the value, purpose, and impact of accreditation, as well as share expectations and tasks.

Additional assets will be created in support of these objectives as the need arises.

Goal 1: Increase awareness of the Middle States affirmation process.

- Objective 1A: Create a look and voice that includes both the university brand and Middle States brand that will allow audiences to immediately recognize that a communication or promotional item is about the process.

- Objective 1B: Develop an e-mail communication strategy that will serve as a trusted source of information throughout the process. This strategy will include the creation of audience lists, who should send the e-mails, frequency, and boilerplates.

- Objective 1C: Create a communication timeline that aligns with the process to keep audiences informed.

- Objective 1D: Create fact sheets for leadership and supervisors to utilize in educating reports on the process.

- Objective 1E: Create supporting items that will allow leadership to consistently communicate throughout the process, including but not limited to, PPT templates, boilerplate messages, timelines, steps in the process, invitations to key events, and value of process.

- Objective 1F: Draft media release and internal announcement that can be utilized once the process is completed and affirmation is confirmed.

Goal 2: Create long term awareness of Middle States Accreditation and the value it brings to the institution.

- Objective 2A: Create and implement a presentation that educates new employees about Middle States and the value it brings to the institution and what it means to our students.

- Objective 2B: Update and enhance Middle States information on ship.edu, so that it is a recognized part of our brand.

- Objective 2C: Create messaging for leadership and supervisors that will keep accreditation at the forefront of what we do, not just during the affirmation process.

IX. EVALUATION TEAM PROFILE

Shippensburg is requesting representatives from the following public institutions in MSCHE. The reasoning for these universities is provided.

- Salisbury University: similar size and program mix

- Empire State University: flexible instruction with unionized faculty, programs that are designed to meet workforce needs

- Montclair University: regional public university that is growing

- SUNY Cortland: for student affairs personnel

- Delaware State University: for their ability to help students from a variety of backgrounds achieve a higher education degree

- A university that has closed the graduation rate gap between URN and non-URM student, such as Rutgers Newark, Towson, Ramapo College, CUNY Hunter and The College of New Jersey, in this order.

X. STRATEGY FOR ADDRESSING ANNUAL INSTITUTIONAL UPDATE INDICATORS AND METRICS

Data identified in the Annual Institutional Update is analyzed and used to make data-informed decisions on a regular basis throughout the university. Data is presented to the university community through a series of dashboards available to all employees on an intranet. At a strategic level, the indicators are used for the State System Comprehensive Planning Process (CPP) process which guides the university to set student achievement, enrollment, and financial goals to bring financial stability to the university.

The CPP process requires five years of data, the previous year's audited data, the current year data, the preliminary data for the upcoming year, and two future years. SU uses historical data along with enrollment management goals to provide realistic projections for each fiscal year that is inclusive of enrollment, student success metrics, and balanced budget projections. The data used for the CPP process to create enrollment and budget models include multi-year persistence rates (which is inclusive of graduation rates), total enrollment as well as enrollment for selected subpopulations, and a detailed balanced budget.

As part of the SS process, Working Groups Four and Six will work closely with Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) team to analyze student success, enrollment management, and financial data to ensure usage of data and assessment to further the mission and goals of the university.

XI. EVIDENCE INVENTORY STRATEGY

Each item in MSCHE's Evidence Expectations by Standard has been parsed into a SharePoint list/database along with other metadata to help organize and track the collection process. Where necessary, evidence has been indexed to ensure each item is unique within the list/database. Metadata helping to organize the evidence include: the division and department responsible for providing the evidence, associated standard and criteria, and the deliverable. PowerBI dashboards have been developed to visually communicate progress toward evidence collection to the university community. Each division will use the dashboard to assess their progress in collecting the necessary and relevant evidence. Working Groups tasked to write each section of the SS will use the list/database to help guide the writing of the narrative and ensure evidence to support the narrative is collected and ready to upload to the MSCHE evidence inventory.

Division leaders have met with IRPA team to identify and strategize for the collection of evidence. Evidence will be sent to members of the IRPA team to verify and upload to the evidence database. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee will monitor the progress via the PowerBI dashboards and assess if any action needs to be taken for the collection process.

As divisions identify additional evidence supporting the SS but not identified in the MSCHE list, those items will be added to the database and uploaded to the MSCHE portal.

XII. STRATEGY FOR IDENTIFYING SELF-STUDY SITE VISITS TO BE CONDUCTED

Shippensburg has two approved additional locations: Cumberland Valley School District and Central Penn College, both within an hour's drive.

SU's ALO and administrative co-chair of the SS will consult with the MSCHE Liaison regarding the programs offered at these two locations to determine possible changes through the substantive change process. For example, our Counselor Supervision, EdD program teaches 13 of 20 courses at Central Penn College. These courses are 100% face-to-face each Saturday from 8:30am to 3:30pm. Central Penn College, however, is under Non-compliance Warning from MSCHE and has been asked for teach-out plans, we are looking into alternative locations to offer this program. The Cumberland Valley location is also under review; the Educational Leadership program has been delivering a master's program at this location and we are seeking information on its status.

Appendix A

Alignment Overview—Standard I

Standards (and ROA)	Institutional Priorities	Evidence	Line(s) of Inquiry
Demonstrate how the institution currently meets the Commission's *Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation (Fourteenth Edition)*. *(Outcome 1)*	Focus on continuous improvement in the attainment of the institution's mission and its institutional priorities. How do these priorities align with the criteria? *(Outcome 2)*	Data sources (qualitative and quantitative) used to support / substantiate claims / findings in the Self-Study report *Evidence Expectations by Standard*	Critical questions that develop or investigate a particular analytical focus. These questions should determine to what extent criteria have been met based on the evidence and our institution's priorities. This column should attempt to answer these questions.

Standard I Mission and Goals

The institution's mission defines its purpose within the context of higher education, the students it serves, and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals are clearly linked to its mission and specify how the institution fulfills its mission.

Criteria: A candidate or accredited institution possesses and demonstrates the following attributes or activities:

1. clearly defined mission and goals that:
 	
  a. are developed through appropriate collaborative and inclusive participation by all who facilitate or are otherwise responsible for institutional development and improvement;
 	
  b. address external as well as internal contexts and constituencies;
 	
  c. are approved and supported by the governing body;
 	
  d. guide faculty, administration, staff, and governing structures in making decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curricular development, and the definition of institutional and educational outcomes;
 	
  e. include support of scholarly inquiry and creative activity, at levels and of the type appropriate to the institution;
 	
  f. are publicized and widely known by the institution's internal stakeholders;
 	
  g. are periodically evaluated;			

2. institutional goals that are realistic, appropriate to higher education, and consistent with mission;

3. goals that focus on student learning outcomes and student achievement that include retention, graduation, transfer, and placement rates; consider diversity, equity, and inclusion principles are supported by administrative, educational, and student support programs and services; prioritize institutional improvement; and

4. periodic assessment of mission and goals to ensure they are relevant and achievable.

Summary of Report

Identified Gaps: Identify gaps in evidence to support the attainment of goals and explain the type of evidence needed to evaluate goal achievement.

Analysis: Analyze the lines of inquiry and summarize findings.

Areas of Strength: Based on the findings, evidence, and analysis, explain SU's areas of strength that reflect SU's Institutional Priorities and meet MSCHE criteria and standards. Highlight programs, processes, and achievements.

Opportunities for Improvement and Innovation: Based on this analytical report, describe evidence-based opportunities for improvement and innovation consistent with these Standards and SU's Institutional Priorities.

Initial Strategies on Continuous Quality Improvement: Propose institutional strategies for improvement.

1871 Old Main Drive, Shippensburg, PA 17257-2299
(717) 477-7447 | sunews@ship.edu

ship.edu

President
Dr. Charles Patterson

Council of Trustees
Douglas Harbach '82, Chair
George McElwee '98, Vice Chair
Glen R. Grell, JD
Moriah Hathaway '19
Ashley Loper '14
Bryan Lowe '08-'17M
Matthew Steck '83
Colin D. Arnold

Executive Management Team
Dr. Darrell Newton, *Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs*
Dr. Jolinda Wilson, *Vice President for Administration and Finance*
Dr. Megan Luft, *Vice President for Enrollment Management and Marketing*
Lorie Sheetz, *Vice President of Student Affairs and Dean of Students*
Dr. Leslie Folmer Clinton, *President and CEO of the SU Foundation*
Drew Alosi, *Chief of Staff*
Dr. Manuel Ruiz, *Assistant Vice President for Inclusion and Belonging and Director of Social Equity*

Associate Vice Presidents and Deans
Dr. Sabita Manian, *Dean of College of Arts and Sciences*
Dr. John Kooti, *Dean of John L. Grove College of Business*
Dr. Nicole Hill, *Vice Provost and Dean of College of Education and Human Services*
Michelle Foreman, *Dean of Libraries*
Dr. Tracy Schoolcraft, *Associate Provost and Interim Dean of Exploratory Studies*
Dr. Jennifer Haughie, *Associate Vice President for Retention and Student Success*

Athletic Administration
Jeff Michaels, *Director of Athletics*