

2012



AMERICAN UNIVERSITY SELF-STUDY DESIGN PLAN

Presented to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education

For more information about this self-study design please contact:

Karen Froslid Jones

Director, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

American University

202-885-6155

kfroslid@american.edu

Table of Contents

American University: An Overview	1
History and Mission	1
Student Body and Educational Offerings.....	3
Administration, Faculty and Staff.....	4
Financial Strength.....	5
Nature and Scope of the Self-study	5
Intended Outcomes for the Self-study	6
Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Subcommittees	7
Self-study Steering Committee	7
Charge of the Steering Committee	9
Charge of the Subcommittees	9
Organization of the Subcommittees: Covering the Standards.....	10
Study Questions	13
Advancing and Supporting AU’s Mission Subcommittee	13
Leadership, Shared Governance and Administration Subcommittee.....	14
Faculty Subcommittee	15
Admitting, Supporting and Retaining Undergraduates Subcommittee	17
Undergraduate Subcommittee.....	18
Graduate Subcommittee.....	19
Educational Initiatives Subcommittee	21
Inventory of Support Documents	23
Editorial Style and Format	23
Self-Study Timeline	25
Profile of the Visiting Team	27
Appendices	29
Appendix A: Inventory of Select Support Documents	
Appendix B: Subcommittee Members	

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY: AN OVERVIEW

History and Mission

American University (AU) is a private doctoral research university located in Washington, DC. Chartered by an Act of Congress in 1893, the university was originally a graduate institution established to train and support public servants. The first graduate class graduated in 1916 and by 1925 the first undergraduate students were admitted. The university was founded under the auspices of the United Methodist Church. Today, the university's academic focus is defined by the programs and faculties of its major schools and colleges: the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Communication, School of Public Affairs, School of International Service, Kogod School of Business, and Washington College of Law.

Throughout its history, AU has stayed true to its roots. It is an institution dedicated to interdisciplinary inquiry, international understanding, interactive teaching, research and creative endeavors, and practical application of knowledge. It values public service and encourages the integration of academic programs and campus life with the larger local, national, and international communities. It strives to combine the finest qualities of a liberal arts college with the best qualities of a research university. AU's current mission, known as the "Statement of Common Purpose" states:

The place of American University among major universities with first-rate faculties and academic programs grounded in the arts and sciences is secured by its enduring commitment to uncompromising quality in the education of its students. But its distinctive feature, unique in higher education, is its capacity as a national and international university to turn ideas into action and action into service by emphasizing the arts and sciences, then connecting them to the issues of contemporary public affairs writ large, notably in the areas of government, communication, business, law, and international service (see http://www.american.edu/president/statements/common_purpose.html)

In 2008, under the leadership of President Neil Kerwin, university students, faculty, staff, alumni, and trustees worked collaboratively to develop a new strategic plan designed to advance the university's mission. The plan, "AU in the Next Decade: Leadership for a Changing World", was developed by a 20-member committee that included members from every division on campus. The group had access to data and assessment information. Through a series of town hall meetings, on-line chats, a blog, and a dedicated email address, the committee was able to gather feedback from the

university community. It issued a report that focused on four major areas, the university's strengths, limitations, opportunities, and challenges. This report formed the basis of other discussions across campus that culminated in the development of the final plan. The plan includes 10 transformational goals, including:

1. Epitomize the Scholar-Teacher Ideal;
2. Provide an Unsurpassed Undergraduate Experience;
3. Demonstrate Distinction in Graduate, Professional, and Legal Studies;
4. Engage in Great Ideas and Issues through Research, Centers, and Institutes;
5. Reflect and Value Diversity;
6. Bring the World to AU and AU to the World;
7. Act on our Values through Social Responsibility;
8. Engage Alumni in the Life of the University;
9. Encourage Innovation and High Performance; and
10. Win Recognition and Distinction.

In addition, the plan includes six enabling goals designed to assist in the fulfillment of the university's mission. These include: diversify revenue sources, employ technology to empower excellence, improve the university library and research infrastructure, forge partnerships by leveraging our Capital location, continue as a model for civil discourse, and align facilities planning with strategic goals.

Much progress has been made in the past four years, and many of the targets set already have been realized. The university had a Strategic Plan Measurements Project Team that helped develop metrics to track the plan's progress. (These metrics were updated in 2010.) By tracking progress the university has been able to identify strengths and areas of concern. The results of strategic plan assessments have been used to set budget priorities. In the three and a half years since the plan was formally approved, the institution has provided regular updates to the university community on the plan's progress. (For a more complete view of goals, objectives, and progress please see: <http://www.american.edu/strategicplan>.) On March 8, 2012, AU's Campus Plan was approved by the District of Columbia's zoning commission, paving the way for significant improvements and additions to facilities.

While AU is a strong institution, the university recognizes the changing nature of higher education and the challenges that it faces. As President Kerwin stated at a recent event:

Never has the fundamental model of American higher education been challenged by so many strong forces. Some may pass, others will prove difficult to resist. Cost, the diversity and complexity of our students and their lives, technology as both a tool and a challenge, questions about the value of what we do and our growing prominence as an issue in political struggles create pressures to prove our worth and demonstrate the enduring importance of what we do.

Student Body and Educational Offerings

The university enrolls more than 13,000 students, including 7,000 undergraduate students, 3,700 graduate students and 1,700 law students, and more than 500 visiting students. All of the schools and colleges, except the Washington College of Law (WCL), have both undergraduate and graduate programs. Each of the university's seven schools has unique strengths. The School of Public Affairs (SPA) is one of the nation's oldest and includes one of the highest ranked public affairs programs in the country. The School of International Service (SIS) is ranked in the top ten worldwide for both undergraduate and graduate study. The Kogod School of Business (KSB) has been ranked by some of the top publications in the United States, including #21 for the undergraduate international business specialty and in the top 10th percentile for the MS in Taxation program. The School of Communication (SOC) has risen to prominence as a leader in professional education, with a focus on investigative journalism, documentary film and political communication, enhanced by a new PhD in Communication Studies. The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) provides the liberal arts foundation of the university and is home to renowned artists, scientists, educators, and scholars in the social sciences and humanities. The Washington College of Law is known for its highly ranked programs, including international and clinical education. It is recognized for the diversity of its student body and its commitment to the public interest. Together, these six schools and colleges offer 60 bachelor's degrees, 54 master's programs, 10 doctoral programs, and five law programs. Undergraduate and graduate certificate programs are also offered. A seventh school, the School of Professional and Extended Studies (SPExS) was created in 2012 to oversee a range of programs for non-matriculated students, including the university's Washington Semester Program, Washington Mentorship Program, Graduate Gateway Program, and Washington Internships for Native Students (WINs). The new school will develop programs that meet the educational needs of pre-college students, undergraduate students within and outside of the United States, and working professionals.

Admission to the University is selective. Since the last self-study, AU's freshman admission rate has gone from 53% (in 2003) to a projected 44% in 2012. Many of AU's graduate programs also attract high quality students and many are considered among the best in the country. Students come from all 50 states, as well as the District of Columbia, and almost 140 countries. The profile of the student body has changed dramatically in recent years. The percentage of underrepresented minority undergraduate students has increased from 19.2% in 2008 to 30.8% 2011. The percentage of first generation students has increased from 3.6% to 9.5% and representation of Pell eligible

students has gone from 7.7% to 23.6%. Approximately 11% of the student body is composed of international students. While still small, a greater percentage of students come from the West and South regions of the country.

Graduate students account for almost 30% of the student body. The university added seven new master's programs since 2008, including an MS in sustainability management; an MA in political communication; an MA in comparative and international disability policy; an MS in audio technology; an MA in international media; an MA in media entrepreneurship; and an MA in social enterprise. The university now offers a doctoral degree in clinical psychology and a doctoral degree in behavior, cognition, and neuroscience. It offered a doctoral degree in communication for the first time in 2011. Law students make up approximately 13% of the student body.

Administration, Faculty and Staff

American University is led by President Neil Kerwin, an alumnus of the university who became interim president in 2005 and was appointed as the permanent chief executive officer in 2007. Dr. Kerwin has been a member of the faculty since 1975. His Cabinet includes*:

- Dr. Scott A. Bass, Provost (2008)
- Dr. Teresa Flannery, Vice President of Communications (2008)
- Dr. Gail Short Hanson, Vice President of Campus Life (1997)
- Ms. Mary E. Kennard, Vice President and Chief Legal Counsel (1995)
- Dr. Thomas J. Minar, Vice President of Development and Alumni Relations (2008)
- Mr. Donald L. Myers, Chief Financial Officer, Vice President and Treasurer (1982); and
- Mr. David Taylor, Chief of Staff (2000).

** Date in parentheses is the year that the individual began service in the position.*

The Provost is assisted by the Vice Provost for Administration, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Enrollment, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research, and the Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs. In addition, the deans of the schools and colleges play a vital role not only in managing their own teaching units (departments or divisions), but also in working with the Provost and Vice Provosts to enhance administrative coordination and strategic collaboration across the different parts of the university.

As of fall 2012 the deans are:

College of Arts and Sciences:	Peter Starr
Kogod School of Business:	Michael Ginzberg
School of Communication:	Jeffrey Rutenbeck
School of International Service:	James Goldgeier
School of Public Affairs:	Barbara Romzeck
Washington College of Law:	Claudio Grossman

The heart of AU's mission is advanced by 789 faculty, including 341 tenured professors, 140 tenure-track, and 308 term faculty. In addition, there are 565 adjunct faculty, many of whom are practitioners in their field. There are 2581 staff, which includes graduate assistants, who also dedicate themselves to the work of the university. Known as a college-centered research university, AU values scholar-teachers who are fully engaged in research, creative or professional activities, and in undergraduate and graduate teaching. Our most distinguished and accomplished scholars also teach.

Financial Strength

While the world economic downturn has been a strain on many institutions of higher education, American University continues to thrive. AU has successfully met its enrollment targets for freshmen and has had success in other major enrollment categories as well. Standard and Poor reaffirmed AU's A+ rating in 2012 and Moody's recently reaffirmed AU's rating of A2 while upgrading the outlook from stable to positive. Overall, the university budgeted for \$548 million in revenue for Fiscal Year 2012 and we closed the budget with a small surplus.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE SELF-STUDY

American University has undergone significant transformations since the last self-study in 2004. It has a new president, provost, and a new organizational structure that includes additional leadership (vice provosts) in graduate studies and research and in undergraduate studies. By fall 2012, six of the seven schools and colleges will have deans who have been hired since 2009. The university has a new strategic plan, which has led to a significant number of new initiatives relating to every Middle States standard. Given the many changes and initiatives that have occurred over the last eight years, as well as the rapid changes that have occurred since the last Periodic Review Report in 2009, the university welcomes the opportunity to conduct a comprehensive self-study.

The university would like to use the self-study as a way to explore and expand upon the planning processes and projects currently underway. AU had been mindful of the changing demographics of the United States and the impact this is likely to have in higher education. It also recognizes the increasing role that technology, especially in terms of on-line learning, is likely to play in higher education in the years ahead. Demands for specific skills and knowledge are expected to

change over time and AU recognizes that it must be prepared to meet these needs. The changing nature of master's level graduate programs and the growing demand for more flexible, convenient delivery methods are other developments we continue to take into account as we move forward.

In just the past year, the university has taken a number of steps to address the changing nature of higher education. A committee has been working on exploring how to best enroll and support traditionally underrepresented students. An all day-faculty leadership retreat explored the future of master's and certificate education. Another group has studied how best to move forward with on-line learning. This spring there was a call for proposals to explore future interdisciplinary areas of inquiry to meet anticipated demands for skills and knowledge in 2030. The 2013 faculty retreat will explore issues of diversity and inclusion. With these initiatives in mind, and with the hope of informing strategic planning, AU's self-study will have an emphasis on the changing nature of higher education in the decades ahead. Ideally, the self-study will offer suggestions for how AU can more fully realize its potential between 2014 and 2024, when our next self-study is due. While most chapters will address the standards with this emphasis in mind, the last chapter (which covers Standard 13) will devote the most attention to this focus.

INTENDED OUTCOMES FOR THE SELF-STUDY

The self-study process offers American University an opportunity to review the accomplishments of the past 10 years and to reflect upon the overall strength of the institution. The university looks forward to this opportunity as a way to advance campus conversations about issues related to fulfilling its mission. The university expects to demonstrate that AU meets all Middle States standards for accreditation and will identify actions that can strengthen and enhance adherence to the standards. The primary goal of the self-study is to analyze, in an integrated way, the degree to which AU is fulfilling its mission, with a special emphasis on the degree to which AU is prepared to meet the challenges and opportunities in the decades ahead. To meet this goal, the self-study will result in a better understanding of how AU does the following:

- Addresses the changing demographics of the student populations (including - but not limited to - issues related to changes in the ethnic/racial make-up of the United States, regional shifts in the home states of graduating high school students, and the increase of Pell Eligible and first generation college students);

- Utilizes on-line, hybrid, and alternative methods of student learning;
- Responds to the needs of a changing workforce;
- Responds to the needs of a wide variety of students, including graduate students and students interested in non-degree opportunities;
- Offers experiential education opportunities that advance the mission on the institution; and
- Supports and advances student success, including how faculty and staff are positioned to help ensure success.

In addition, we will:

- Draw insights from the self-study that will inform our current strategic plan and related processes, with specific attention to recommendations and suggestions to refine the goals of the plan into more specific and measurable shorter term objectives
- Develop a report that can be shared with those interested in learning more about the university.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

Self-Study Committee

In November 2011, American University Provost Scott A. Bass appointed **Robert A. Blecker**, Professor of Economics, and **Karen Froslid Jones**, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, as co-chairs of the Middle States Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee. Both chairs have extensive experience with accreditation, assessment and self-study. Dr. Blecker was a member of the 2003-2004 Self-Study Steering Committee and co-chaired the Subcommittee on Graduate Education. In addition, he led his department's program review in 2008-2009, and has served as both a doctoral program director and a department chair. Ms. Froslid Jones co-chaired the last American University Middle States Self-Study and has been a regular presenter at Middle States training institutes on self-study. She has been a member of visiting teams for Middle States.

Blecker and Froslid Jones worked together with the President, Provost, Cabinet, Vice Provosts and Deans to formulate the broad outline for the self-study design, agreeing on a comprehensive approach to self-study with an emphasis on how AU plans to meet the challenges of the next

decade. This team also worked together to form the Self-Study Steering Committee. In addition to Blecker and Frosolid-Jones, members of the Steering Committee include:

- **Jorge Abud**, Assistant Vice President for Facilities Development and Real Estate (Finance and Treasurer) *
- **Sharon Alston**, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Enrollment (Enrollment Services)
- **Nana An**, Assistant Vice President of Budget & Finance Resource Center (Finance and Treasurer) *
- **Maggie Arnold**, Doctoral Candidate, College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) *
- **Fanta Aw**, Assistant Vice President of Campus Life and Director of International Student and Scholar Services (Campus Life)
- **Violeta Ettle**, Vice Provost for Academic Administration (Provost) *
- **Alberto Espinosa**, Associate Professor, Department of Information Technology (KSB)
- **Abbey Fagin**, Assistant Vice President of Development (Development) *
- **Leeanne Dunsmore**, Associate Dean, Graduate Admissions and Program Development, School of International Service (SIS)
- **Christine Farley**, Professor, Washington College of Law (WCL)
- **Adriana Ganci**, undergraduate student (SIS)*
- **James Girard**, Professor and Chair, Department of Chemistry (CAS)
- **Jon Gould**, Professor, Department of Justice, Law and Society, School of Public Affairs (SPA)
- **Larry Kirkman**, Dean, School of Communication (SOC)
- **Douglas Kudravetz**, Associate Vice President of Finance and Treasurer (Finance and Treasurer) *
- **Lisa Leff**, Associate Professor, Department of History (CAS)
- **Camille Lepre**, Assistant Vice President, Communications (Communications) *
- **Howard McCurdy**, Professor, Department of Public Administration and Policy (SPA)
- **David Pitts**, Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration and Policy (SPA)
- **Arthur Rothkopf**, member, Board of Trustees
- **Stephen Silvia**, Associate Professor (SIS)
- **Virginia (Lyn) Stallings**, Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies
- **David Swartz**, Assistant Vice President and Chief Information Officer (Finance and Treasurer) *
- **David Taylor**, Chief of Staff to the President

* *At-large member*

This is a large committee, but care has been taken to ensure that important stakeholders are represented. Every school and college is represented, as is every division (with the exception of the General Counsel's Office). The Steering Committee has representation from students and from the Board of Trustees. It includes members who are newer to the university, as well as members who have been with the university over 30 years. Most members will be in charge of co-chairing one of the subcommittees. Others are at-large members (listed with an asterisk). As such, they are not expected to head any particular subcommittee but they will provide their expertise to all subcommittees as issues arise. With the exception of students, other members will provide leadership for one of the subcommittees. The co-chairs will consult with members via email and

SharePoint in the unlikely situation where decisions are particularly time-sensitive but a full meeting is not possible.

The Steering Committee began meeting in February 2012 and discussed the model for self-study, the accreditation process, the standards for accreditation, the timeline, and workload expectations. They completed the initial self-study design in May 2012. The Committee's charge is as follows:

Charge of the Steering Committee

- Develop a comprehensive understanding of the entire accreditation process.
- Finalize the self-study model.
- Determine key study questions for the self-study.
- Finalize the structure of working groups.
- Craft the self-study design document.
- Coordinate and lead the work of the subcommittee groups, ensuring timely drafts of self-study chapters.
- Ensure that the self-study addresses the Standards in the *Characteristics of Excellence*, while at the same time addressing the study questions set forth in the self-study design.
- Communicate about the accreditation process to various campus constituencies, including faculty, staff, students, alumna, and university leadership.
- Read draft Subcommittee reports, provide timely feedback, and integrate chapters into a draft self-study report. Assume final editorial responsibility for the chapters.
- Encourage community feedback on the self-study draft and integrate community feedback.
- Assume ownership and editorial responsibility for the final self-study document.

Charge to the Subcommittees

The work of the self-study will be completed by seven main working groups that we are calling subcommittees. Subcommittee members are expected to:

- Become familiar with the Middle States standards for accreditation, known as the *Characteristics of Excellence*, with particular emphasis on the Standards covered by the Subcommittee.
- Become familiar with the overall Self-Study process as outlined in *Self-study: Creating a Useful Process and Report*.
- Become familiar with AU's 2009 Periodic Review Report as it relates to the Standards covered by the Subcommittee.
- Review the Standards, including both fundamental and optional elements, and gather information to document and assess the degree to which the standards are being met.
- Address the study questions outlined in the Self-Study Design.
- Coordinate the Subcommittee's work with other Subcommittee groups, as appropriate.

- Write a chapter for the self-study that answers the study questions and illustrates the degree to which Middle States standards are being met. Use the Style Guidelines outlined in this Design document.
- Based on the findings reported in the chapter, offer 2-3 specific, realistic recommendations that can be used to help American University better meet the Standards and advance the mission of the institution.
- Organize the supporting documentation so that the Steering Committee and visiting team can see the evidence used to come to the conclusions.
- Edit the draft chapter, as needed, based on feedback by the Steering Committee.
- Be willing to help with soliciting feedback on the overall self-study draft and be willing to meet with the visiting team, if needed.

Organization of Subcommittees: Covering the Standards

In order to ensure broad participation in the self-study process, the bulk of the initial review of the standards and the study questions will be completed by six separate subcommittees. Each subcommittee (see Table 1) will be responsible for producing a draft chapter for the report. The Steering Committee itself will write the chapter on “Advancing and Supporting AU’s Mission.”

The standards will be grouped so that the self-study can cover issues of importance to the university in a way that facilitates review of the strategic initiatives. The mission, goals, planning and resource standards will be explored together because the university places great importance on linking planning and budgeting. The leadership, governance, and administration standards lend themselves well to discussion together, especially because the university places great importance on the interrelationship between planning and budgeting. We have decided to devote a special chapter to looking specifically at standards 8 and 9 together as they relate to undergraduates because there are a number of initiatives on campus that already link these standards. As with the last self-study, we decided to explore undergraduate and graduate education separately. In our experience, the opportunities and challenges in the two education areas are quite different. Last, given the emphasis on the changing nature of higher education, we decided the issue of educational initiatives deserves more focus. Separating standard 13 into its own chapter provides AU with the opportunity to explore issues of on-line learning, additional locations, and the general role of off campus opportunities such as internships and study abroad. It will give the university an opportunity to explore the ways in which the new School of Professional and Extended Studies (SPExS) can meet the need for expanded learning opportunities. To facilitate the work of the visiting team the executive summary will include a review, by standard, of the major findings of the self-study. An

Excel document will give specific information on where each fundamental element is covered in the report.

Each subcommittee will be led by a team of 2-3 Steering Committee members. The Steering Committee itself will help to ensure that all standards are covered and it will help facilitate communication between subcommittees. Membership for the subcommittees has been designed to ensure as many diverse perspectives as possible. While there are a few members still to be named at the time of this design submission, most have already been asked and have agreed to serve. A complete list of subcommittee membership is available in Appendix B.

Table 1

Steering Committee

Oversees work of subcommittees



STUDY QUESTIONS

Each subcommittee is charged with covering specific standards and with addressing study questions that will advance the university's mission. Assessment is a common theme of all chapters. The subcommittees and the standards and questions they will cover are as follows:

I. Advancing and Supporting AU's Mission Subcommittee

Chairs: Robert Blecker, Karen Froslid Jones, and Nana An

Standards:

- 1. Mission and Goals**
- 2. Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal**
- 3. Institutional Resources**
- 7. Institutional Assessment**

1. How well do the Statement of Common Purpose (our Mission) and strategic plan serve the institution? Are the mission and strategic plan sufficiently flexible for the institution to be able to respond to internal and external opportunities and changes, including emerging academic disciplines, changing demographics, and new instructional methods and technologies? How well does the strategic plan position the university to meet the changing nature of higher education in the decade ahead?
2. To what extent was the strategic plan developed in a collaborative manner? To what extent was the plan informed by institutional assessment?
3. How well does the institution integrate and coordinate planning across and within different administrative divisions in support of the university's academic mission? To what extent are plans integrated with budgeting, financial and facilities planning?
4. How well do the deans and faculties of the individual schools and colleges contribute to strategic planning and institutional renewal, both within their academic units and in coordinating activities and programs across the university as a whole?
5. How well does the university communicate its mission and goals to faculty, students, staff, alumni, external constituencies and other university stakeholders? Are effective mechanisms in place for collaborative participation of university stakeholders in the development and implementation of goals? To what extent are the results of assessments communicated to internal and external constituencies?

6. What are the university's strengths and challenges in terms of human, financial, facilities, and technology resources? How well are these challenges, both short and long term, being addressed?
7. How well do central administrative services support the mission of the institution? In what ways could such services (such as information technology, human resources, procurement, etc.) be improved?
8. What processes are in place to ensure that the Campus Plan supports the teaching, research and service missions of the university? What measures are in place to evaluate the effectiveness of facilities planning and management?
9. What steps have been taken to assess progress on achieving university and unit goals? How effective is the assessment process in helping to identify university strengths and facilitate institutional renewal? Is the institution making effective use of the assessments that take place?

II. Leadership, Shared Governance and Administration Subcommittee

Chairs: Jim Girard, David Taylor, Arthur Rothkopf

Standards:

- 4. Leadership and Governance**
- 5. Administration**
- 6. Integrity**

1. To what extent does the leadership and administration have the background and qualifications necessary to advance the university's mission? What processes are in place to assess the effectiveness of the leadership and administration? Are the processes effective?
2. How is the leadership selected, trained, supported and evaluated (including senior leaders and department chairs)? Are the processes fair and transparent? What mechanisms are in place to solicit evaluative information about the leadership from the staff and faculty and to communicate it to appropriate audiences?
3. To what extent is there an environment for organization and faculty/staff development? Do faculty and staff participate in succession planning and the nurturing of future organizational leaders? How well does AU manage effective career progression for faculty and staff?
4. How have the governance changes (since the last self-study) affected AU? How do the current governance structures ensure institutional integrity and to what extent do they ensure appropriate levels of input and accountability?

5. How well articulated are the goals, procedures, and fiduciary responsibilities of the Board of Trustees? What process is used to assess the effectiveness of the Board?
6. How have the organizational changes made since the last self-study improved AU's institutional effectiveness? Do AU's organizational structure and decision making processes have the right balance of centralization and decentralization?
7. How well do communications processes work between the Board of Trustees and the AU community? How accessible is the Board, and can the faculty, staff and students communicate regularly with the Board? Is the Board regularly informed and updated on AU's mission, academic programs, objectives, and challenges?
8. Are adequate processes in place to assess the effectiveness of the university's leadership, governance, and administration? How involved are faculty, students, and other university stakeholders in the governance process? Is shared governance effective?
9. Does AU have fair and impartial processes in place to address grievances and issues related to the hiring and firing of employees?
10. To what extent is AU working to fulfill its goal of being a great place to work, where faculty and staff work collaboratively to create a vibrant climate of support, inclusion, and professional growth that advance's AU's mission? What processes and resources are in place to pursue and achieve this goal?
11. Does AU foster respect among students, faculty, staff, and the administration for a range of backgrounds, ideas and perspectives?

III. Faculty Subcommittee

Chairs: Alberto Espinosa, Howard McCurdy, Steve Silvia

Standard:

10. Faculty

1. How well is the university achieving its goals in regard to recruiting, supporting, and retaining high quality faculty?
2. What progress is the university making in implementing fair and transparent standards for faculty actions, promotions, tenure, and grievances? How well are the new policies and procedures in this area working? Are the changes in the faculty manual sufficient to service faculty? Are there clear expectations regarding scholarship, teaching and service for all types of faculty at each stage in their careers?

3. How well is the university achieving its strategic goals in regard to promoting the scholarly productivity of the faculty, and what additional steps are required? How does AU faculty productivity compare to its peers? Are faculty receiving appropriate institutional support and encouragement for their professional advancement and development? Are there appropriate faculty workplaces to facilitate collaborative work? To what extent is there adequate library support?
4. To what extent is the university providing salaries that are comparable to its peers?
5. How well are we preparing faculty to teach in ever-changing environments? Are faculty prepared to teach students with diverse backgrounds? Do faculty have effective mechanisms to support effective teaching using both traditional and innovative teaching methods?
6. Given our long range goals, what is the appropriate size of the faculty and composition in terms of considerations such as diversity and the optimal balance between tenure-line, term, and adjunct faculty? How well is the university achieving its goals in regard to the balance between different types of faculty appointments and the various criteria in faculty hiring?
7. Given our long range goals, what is the appropriate composition of the faculty in terms of the arts and sciences? Do we have the right balance of faculty, in fields that will best serve the changing needs of the student population?
8. How well are faculty able to balance new administrative and governance responsibilities (e.g., assessment, program review and governance bodies at different levels), and increased research expectations with existing teaching and service obligations? What can the university do to achieve its strategic plan goals in regard to properly managing faculty workload and balancing work and life obligations?
9. How well are centers and institutes functioning to enhance faculty scholarship and collaboration across disciplines, schools, and colleges?

IV. Admitting, Supporting and Retaining Undergraduates Subcommittee

Chairs: Sharon Alston and Fanta Aw

Standards:

8. Admissions and Retention

9. Student Support Services

1. To what extent does AU's mission inform enrollment targets for first time full-time freshman and transfer numeric enrollment numbers? How well has the University met the enrollment targets?
2. How well do American University's admissions and financial aid policies support AU's goal of recruiting and retaining an academically excellent, diverse undergraduate student community that is reflective of the University's mission? How are admissions of enrollment-priority groups handled within this context? Are our marketing strategies appropriate given the changing demographics? Has the test optional admissions process been effective? How well are admissions policies assessed to ensure that admitted students are successful?
3. To what extent has the university assessed the factors that facilitate or impede the success and retention of students? In particular, how well does AU meet the needs of historically underrepresented students? What student support services are in place to ensure the retention and success of students? What student support services might we need to meet a changing population, such as additional transfer students?
4. How well does AU retain and graduate students? How do we compare to our peers?
5. How is pre-major and major academic advising organized across the five schools? To what extent are the differences across schools purposeful and reflective of programmatic differences in the schools? How well do current practices assist students in attaining their academic and career objectives?
6. How are students who are "at risk" —academically or personally—identified? To what extent are existing systems to address at-risk students effective?
7. To what extent is the university meeting the needs of transfer students? Are articulation agreements working?
8. How have the living/learning Residential Initiatives contributed to meeting university goals for undergraduate students? How is the success of the Residential Initiatives being measured and assessed? To what extent have they contributed to meeting university goals?

9. How well are special programs such as the 5-year BA/Master's program and the Honors program working?
10. How effective are the services that we provide to students? Are services such as AU Central, the Career Center, the Registrar's office, the library and other student services meeting the needs of AU's changing student population? To what extent are the services provided by Campus Life, Academic Affairs, and other divisions properly organized and coordinated?
11. What type of student development does the institution seek to foster? How effective are programs and services designed to support student development?
12. To what extent have learning outcomes been articulated by Campus Life and other student service providers? To what extent is there ongoing assessment of student support services, and are assessments results used for improvement?

V. Undergraduate Education Subcommittee

Chairs: Lisa Leff and Virginia (Lyn) Stallings

Standards:

11. Educational Offerings

12. General Education

14. Assessment of Student Learning

1. To what extent are the university's undergraduate educational offerings congruent with our mission? Are the offerings congruent with the changing role of government and the changing expectations of students and their parents? Does our undergraduate curriculum meet the needs of a changing workforce and expectations for graduate study?
2. To what extent does the university have processes and resources in place to enable it to meet the demands of future students and to address the changing nature of higher education and external constituencies?
3. Does the university have educational opportunities of the appropriate rigor and level of academic challenge? What is the appropriate role of the Honors Program, the three year-degree programs, 5-year BA/masters degree in assuring rigorous, meaningful academic experiences?

What assessments does the university use to ensure that this is so? How can academic excellence be enhanced?

4. Does the university have strong relationships between co-curricular and curricular learning opportunities? Does AU effectively integrate the many learning experiences available to its students?
5. What evidence exists that assessments are used to improve student learning outcomes? To what extent has assessment of student learning been a meaningful process for faculty, and in what ways could it be improved? Are resources adequate to assist faculty in assessment efforts?
6. To what extent is the university making effective use of electronic assessment mechanisms such as e-portfolios?
7. To what extent does the institution provide enriching educational experiences and facilitate meaningful student-faculty interaction?
8. In what ways has the General Education program been changed since the last self-study, and to what extent have assessments informed these changes? To what extent has the new general education program developed effective assessment strategies?
9. What evidence exists that students are meeting expected program and General Education learning outcomes?
10. How effective are programs such as General Education or University College in contributing to students' understanding of diverse cultures?

VI. Graduate Education Subcommittee

Chairs: Christine Farley, David Pitts

Standards (as they relate to graduate programs):

- 9. Admissions and Retention**
- 10. Student Support Services**
- 11. Educational Offerings**
- 14. Assessment of Student Learning**

1. To what extent are the university's graduate educational offerings congruent with our mission? Are the offerings congruent with the changing role of government and the changing expectations of students? Does our curriculum meet the needs of a changing workforce?

2. How well are graduate programs positioned to anticipate changing student demographics and successfully recruit from these changing talent pools over the next ten years? To what extent do admissions policies ensure that we admit students who will be successful at AU?
3. How effectively are graduate programs preparing students to compete successfully for jobs in a changing economy? How successful have AU's graduate programs been in preparing and helping students to secure jobs appropriate for their degrees?
4. Are graduate programs adapting to changing methods of service delivery, as appropriate? Are units considering online, hybrid, and other "nontraditional" formats in subject areas amenable to these options?
5. What are the factors that facilitate or impede the effective recruitment of talented graduate students? What is the most effective distribution of graduate financial aid between masters and doctoral students and across units? How well do our graduate programs assist students to limit their student debt?
6. Does AU facilitate the progress of its doctoral students such that they complete their degrees in a timely manner? Are students provided with adequate resources to develop the skills and knowledge that prepare them for a range of careers? Are faculty incentivized to spend the time necessary to effectively mentor doctoral students (e.g., being available to students, coauthoring manuscripts, serving on dissertation committees, including students in proposals for funded research)?
7. Are units across campus collaborating to avoid redundancies in graduate-level instruction and provide cross-disciplinary research opportunities for graduate students?
8. What is the best balance between (a) decentralizing responsibility for graduate education to individual units and (b) centralizing graduate education at the university level? Is the university well served by not having a graduate school?
9. How well do the new graduate academic regulations serve the university?
10. How well do the university's colleges, schools, and graduate fields define clear learning goals for their graduate students, carefully articulating what students should know or be able to do at the conclusion of individual courses, in their major fields of study, and when they have completed their degrees? How and how well are those learning goals communicated to prospective and current students?

11. How well do graduate programs integrate assessment into existing processes? What are the best methods for ensuring that assessment results are useful – and used – for improving the outcomes of graduate programs?

VII. Educational Initiatives: Addressing the Changing Nature of Higher Education

Chairs: Leanne Dunsmore, Jon Gould, Larry Kirkman

Standard:

13. Related Educational Activities

This chapter covers a broad range of educational initiatives that are transforming the traditional learning experience, including aspects of educational offerings that might be thought to extend beyond the specific fundamental elements of Standard 13. While all chapters of the self-study address the emphasis on the changing nature of higher education, the final chapter looks at some of the more overarching issues that are likely to impact undergraduate and graduate education in the years to come.

1. What are the major challenges facing higher education today and in the foreseeable future? How are they likely to impact American University? How well do planning processes help address these challenges? What kinds of initiatives is the university pursuing or should it pursue in order to meet them?
2. To what extent does AU have the proper balance of instructional delivery modes (e.g., on-line, in-class, asynchronous, hybrid, etc.) for communicating knowledge to students?
3. How effective are American University's on-line programs in providing greater flexibility in instruction and bringing new perspectives into our academic programs? To what extent are curricula for the institution's on-line learning offerings coherent, cohesive, and comparable in academic rigor to programs offered in traditional instructional form? How do we ensure that expanded distance learning reflects the missions and standards of our schools and colleges?
4. What are the expectations for the new School of Professional and Extended Studies? How can it best enhance the current educational offerings? By what standards should its success be assessed?
5. How do we ensure the quality and availability of internships and practica, both credit and noncredit? How do we ensure the integration of these experiences into the core curriculum, to

prepare students for careers in the 21st century and as opportunities for connecting theories and research to practical experience?

6. How effectively does American University deliver educational experiences that take students outside of the traditional classroom, for example class projects with external partners, community service learning, and co-curricular offerings? How effectively has American University positioned its commitment to professional and experiential education in an environment of increasing external competition in the Washington DC area and the need to demonstrate employment outcomes to prospective students?
7. How clear are the policies and procedures governing experiential learning? By what methods do the schools and colleges assess the appropriateness of granting academic credit for professional experiences and ensure their integration into the core curriculum?
8. To what extent are American University's programs for professional development (including certificates, weekend programs, executive education, and non-traditional sequencing of coursework for masters' degrees) serving new student markets with distinct academic needs? How well do such programs fit the university's mission and advance the institution as a whole? Are the programs achieving defined academic goals and outcomes? How is the institution leveraging its resources in response to the needs of these working professionals? Are we effectively meeting the needs of the adult market in a way that is consistent with AU's mission?
9. How effective are off campus educational offerings (including study abroad programs offered through partnerships with international entities, dual-degree programs, and programs in other states)? How well are these programs integrated into the academic missions of the schools and colleges? How effective is the institutional oversight of programs offered through partnerships with domestic and international entities? What is the impact of these programs on the institution's human, fiscal, technological, and other resources? What is the proper role of such offerings in the years ahead?

INVENTORY OF SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

An inventory of support documents is provided in Appendix A. These documents are meant to form the initial set of resources for each of the subcommittees. During the summer, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) will meet with each of the subcommittee co-chairs to review the study questions and the Standards for accreditation. OIRA will:

- Standardize the historical information so that five years of data is available, as appropriate.
- Organize and information by the fundamental elements for each Standard, using an Excel spreadsheet. (This was used in the last self-study and was very helpful.)
- Make the data and information available on a password-protected Microsoft SharePoint site.

EDITORIAL STYLE AND FORMAT

While the Steering Committee will be responsible for the final self-study report, each subcommittee is responsible for writing a chapter in the draft self-study document. In order to ensure that each chapter is well-written, concise and fits well with the self-study document as a whole, each subcommittee has been asked to assign one person as the primary writer of the draft chapter. These individuals will work with the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment and University Publications to ensure that each chapter meets strict specifications.

The self-study will follow the guidelines set out by the University's *Style Guide*, a document that provides detailed information on how to prepare university documents for publication. Staff members from University Publications have been assigned to assist the Steering Committee with its style and publication needs. Some of the specifications for completed draft chapters include the following:

- Microsoft Word for the chapter, with Microsoft Excel for tables
- 12-point Garamond font
- double-spaced lines
- left-justified paragraphs
- 1 inch margins
- indented paragraphs set to five characters (.3")
- present tense with active voice

- *Chicago Manual of Style* footnotes.
- Main headers should be bold and capitalized. Second level headers bold and upper- and lower-cased. Third level headers should be bold, indented, and underlined. (Avoid further breakdown of headers.)
- Data tables inserted into the report should include historical information from 2009-2013 (although discussions about data can refer to the progress made since the last self-study, in 2014.)
- Each chapter can include 2-3 text boxes as a way to highlight or illustrate an important point.
- Each chapter should be 15-25 pages in length, depending on the number of standards covered.

In addition to the technical guidelines, the Steering Committee has asked that each subcommittee pay careful attention to the general format of the report. Subcommittees will submit a detailed chapter outline to the Steering Committee by October 2013. Each subcommittee has been asked to include the following:

- 1) Introduction
 - a) a brief description of the areas or issues being covered in the chapter
 - b) approach and methods used to carry out the study (significant documents used, sources of evidence, etc.)
- 2) Overview
 - a) descriptive background necessary to put issues in context
- 3) Analysis of charges and appropriate *Characteristics of Excellence*
 - a) evidence that demonstrates that American University meets the standard(s) in question, including analysis and answers to the study questions
 - b) Key evidence that points to challenges and opportunities for improvement.
- 4) Conclusion
 - a) summary of the overall findings, including the implications they have on fulfilling AU's mission and the *Characteristics of Excellence* (must follow logically from the analysis presented in the previous section)
- 5) Recommendations

a) a short description of approximately 2 or 3 of the major recommendations that stem from the findings (these items are likely to be ones that require long-term attention and are likely to be incorporated into strategic planning initiatives)

Note: All actions must be directly related to either the study questions provided in the Self-Study Design or to elements of the Characteristics of Excellence.

The Steering Committee plans to make a draft copy of its report available to the entire university community in early fall 2013. The final document will be produced by University Publications. Following the university's green initiatives, every effort will be made to distribute electronic rather than print copies of the report to the university community. AU has had a Middle States website for about 10 years; this site will continue to be used to post updates on the Middle States self-study process.

SELF-STUDY TIMELINE

2011

Nov. Faculty co-chair and administrative co-chair of self-study selected.
AU representatives attend Middle States Self-Study Institute in Philadelphia.

2012

Dec. - Feb. Provost appoints self-study steering committee
Co-chairs work with President, Provost, Cabinet, Vice Provosts, and Deans to decide general organization of the self-study

Feb. Steering Committee meets for first time. Schedule for Steering Committee is developed.

March – April Steering Committee prepares *Design for Self-Study*. The Committee prepares charges for each subcommittee and finalizes subcommittee membership.
Co-chair meets with University Publications, Web developers, and event personnel to orient them to Self-Study process.
Provost, self-study co-chairs, and others begin regular updates to Cabinet, Division directors, governance bodies and others about self-study process.

May May 2, *Design* is sent to Middle States representative. May 16, visit by Middle States representative.

June-Aug. Submission of final *Design* to MSCHE.
Prepare preliminary materials for Chapter One: Introduction

Compile support materials for each Subcommittee.
 Organize SharePoint sites and revise Middle States website.
 Orientation provided for administrative support personnel working with each subcommittee. Personnel work with Subcommittee Co-Chairs to organize and plan meeting schedule.

Sept. – Dec. Subcommittee members oriented. Subcommittees meet to draft their chapters. The Steering Committee meets every three weeks to review subcommittee progress, finalize the draft of chapter one (introduction) and draft the introductory chapter on Mission, Planning and Resources. The Steering Committee sets final deadlines for each of the draft chapters.

2013

Jan. – Feb. Subcommittees finalize their reports.

Feb. – Jun. Steering Committee meets every two weeks to review draft chapters and to compile the first draft of self-study report. The Subcommittees meet, as necessary, to address Steering Committee questions and comments.

Summer The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and University Publications complete revisions. A sub team of Steering Committee members meet to plan public comment meetings, communications, etc. Institutional Research and Assessment works with the President’s Office, IT personnel and University Communications to coordinate logistics for the comment period. Public comment feedback mechanisms (emails, websites, etc.) are activated (similar to the processes used to solicit feedback for the Strategic Plan.)

Sept. – Oct. The draft report is distributed to the university community and others via electronic means. Hard copies are available upon request and at key sites (such as the university libraries, residence halls, and Mary Graydon Center.) Public comments on Self-Study report. In addition to hosting two town hall meetings, steering committee representatives meet with:

- Board of Trustees
- Cabinet
- President’s Council
- Provost’s Council
- Division staff meetings
- Faculty Senate
- Staff Council
- Graduate Leadership Council
- Student Council
- School/College Faculty Meetings

Oct.-Nov. Steering Committee begins to revise report based on community feedback. AU hosts the visiting team chair.

Nov.-Dec. Accommodations for visiting team finalized.

2014

Jan.-Feb.	Steering Committee prepares final self-study report. Final approval provided by Board of Trustees. University Publications publishes final document. Submit final Self-Study report to Middle States six weeks prior to site visit. Put together meeting schedule for site visit.
March or April	Middle States site visit
Apr. – May	Follow-up.
June	Committee on Evaluation Reports meets in Philadelphia and MSCHE Full Commission meets.
July	Review Commission Action

PROFILE OF THE VISITING TEAM

We hope that the visiting evaluation team will have experience in, and an understanding of, the opportunities and challenges that confront American University. Some aspects of the university that might be helpful to consider when selecting members of the visiting team include the following: American University is located in a metropolitan setting in a residential section of the nation's capital providing a unique opportunity for shaping academic offerings. AU does not have a medical or engineering school, but it does have major professional schools dedicated to law, business, communication, public policy, and international relations, as well as strong programs in the arts, humanities, and social and natural sciences. The most popular undergraduate majors are international studies, business administration, political science, public communication, psychology, performing arts, economics, and film and media arts. The largest masters' and professional programs include law, business administration, public administration, communication, international affairs, and education, while the largest doctoral programs are in economics, psychology, history, anthropology, and international relations. Hopefully, consideration of the setting and academic profile will influence the final visiting team selection. Further, given the changing nature of AU's student body, experience with a diverse student population would also be helpful.

Although AU is officially listed in the Carnegie classification of Doctoral Research University, we do not consider this designation to be a good representation of our peer group. We identify with

the major research institutions and among that group have particular affinity with those that consider themselves college-centered research universities—in other words, schools that put an important emphasis on all levels of scholarship, but also emphasize high quality research-active faculty educating undergraduate students. Four-year, private, selective institutions that share some of AU’s characteristics in the Middle States region include Carnegie Mellon, Fordham University, Johns Hopkins University, Lehigh University, Princeton University, Syracuse University, and the University of Pennsylvania. If the list of institutions could be broadened to include NEASC institutions schools such as Boston College, Brandeis University, and Tufts University would be strong candidates. In many ways, it is very appropriate that team members be chosen from these schools, especially because these New England institutions are good examples of college-centered research universities and may provide invaluable insight to AU’s Strategic Plan and institutional vision.

In order for the external evaluation to be of the greatest benefit to American University in fostering the articulation and achievement of its strategic goals, it would be most helpful if the chair (or co-chairs) of the evaluation team would be a president, president emeritus, provost, or provost emeritus of a selective, private, doctoral research university of the caliber stated above. The university is open to the possibility of having co-chairs, especially if such an arrangement facilitates the participation of someone who has led the effort to build a college-centered research university even if that person comes from outside the Middle States region. Because American University is at a critical point in its effort to build such an institution, it would be particularly helpful for the visiting team to have a chair or co-chair who has led a similar effort at another major national research university.

APPENDIX A: INVENTORY OF SELECT SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

Inventory of Documents to Support Accreditation	Mission & Goals	Planning, Resource Allocation, & Institutional Renewal	Institutional Resources	Leadership & Governance	Administration	Integrity	Institutional Assessment	Student Admissions and Retention	Student Support Services	Faculty	Educational Offerings	General Education	Related Educational Activities	Assessment of Student Learning
	Middle States Standard													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Documents														
ACCREDITATION REPORTS														
Periodic Review Report for MSCHE in 2009	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PRR Reviewer's Report, 2009	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Self Study for MSCHE in 2003-2004	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Visiting Team's Report on Self Study	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
AU's Response to Team Report, 2004	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Specialized Accreditation Reports (Including NASPA, ABA, APA, NCATE, AACSB)								X	X	X	X		X	X
NCAA Division I Athletics Recertification Self-Study								X	X					
BASIC FACTS/DATA														
Common Data Set							X		X	X	X			
Academic Data Reference Book		X	X					X		X	X		X	
University Organization (Org charts)					X									
Rankings Information (US News, etc.)							X				X			
ADMINISTRATION/PERSONNEL														
Job Description of the President				X										
Job descriptions of executive staff, top administrators					X									
HR Recruitment		X												
Staff Development Program materials													X	X
"Know Your Benefits" Guide				X	X					X				
AU PLANNING DOCUMENTS														
AU Strategic Plan	X	X	X				X							X
Strategic Plan Website	X	X												
Strategic Plans for Colleges/Schools	X	X					X							X
Strategic Plans for Divisions	X	X					X							X
Annual Reports from colleges/schools	X													X
Annual Reports from Divisions	X													X
AU Master (facilities) Plan	X	X	X				X	X	X					
Housing Strategic Plan									X					
Dining Strategic Plan						X			X					
Reports on Status of Strategic Plan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Emergency Preparedness Plan		X												
Enterprise Group information technology planning reports		X	X				X							
POLICIES/HANDBOOKS/MANUALS														
Catalog	X					X			X	X	X	X		
Faculty Handbooks (Faculty manual, Library manual, WCL manual, WCL Library manual)			X	X	X					X				
Academic Regulations				X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Employee Manual			X	X	X									
Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution Services						X			X					
Orientation materials/handbooks for new staff and faculty			X		X					X				
Student Handbook					X			X	X		X			

Inventory of Documents to Support Accreditation	Mission & Goals	Planning, Resource Allocation, & Institutional Renewal	Institutional Resources	Leadership & Governance	Administration	Integrity	Institutional Assessment	Student Admissions and Retention	Student Support Services	Faculty	Educational Offerings	General Education	Related Educational Activities	Assessment of Student Learning
	Middle States Standard													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Documents														
POLICIES/HANDBOOKS/MANUALS (Cont.)														
Conflict of Interest Statement for AU						X				X				
Academic Integrity Code						X				X	X		X	
AU Copyright Policy						X				X				
Inventions and Related Property Rights						X				X				X
Undergraduate Academic Regulations						X			X	X	X	X		
Graduate Academic Regulations						X			X	X	X	X		
Office of Research Integrity and Assurance			X			X				X				
Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects						X				X				
Affirmative Action Plan			X			X				X				
Student Record Privacy Statement						X			X					
AU Policy on Access to Student Information						X			X					
Statements concerning transfer credit policies						X		X			X			
HR Benefits Manual			X											
Statement on Social Responsibility and Business Practices	X	X	X			X								
ACADEMIC CURRICULUM/ENROLLMENT														
AU course information											X	X	X	X
AU Programs (incl. added/dropped since last self-study.)											X	X		X
On-line learning reports			X				X				X	X	X	X
Enrollment/Budget Reports			X				X	X			X			
Study Abroad Locations/Offerings			X						X		X		X	X
Descriptions of Univ. College, Learning Communities, Honors programs, etc.							X		X		X			X
Retention and Graduation rates							X		X		X		X	X
Washington Professional and Extended Studies (SPEXs) curriculum/offerings											X		X	X
Materials related to on-line/off-campus degree programs		X					X				X		X	X
AU2030 Proposals		X					X				X		X	X
GOVERNANCE														
Minutes of the Faculty Senate				X		X				X	X			
Minutes of the President's Council				X		X				X				
Minutes of the Student Government				X		X			X					
Minutes of the Staff Council				X		X								
Minutes of the Graduate Leadership Council				X		X			X					
Board of Trustees Membership and Bios				X		X								
Board of Trustees orientation materials				X		X								
Conflict of Interest Statements				X		X								
Governance Report				X		X								
Trustee Minutes				X		X								

Inventory of Documents to Support Accreditation	Mission & Goals	Planning, Resource Allocation, & Institutional Renewal	Institutional Resources	Leadership & Governance	Administration	Integrity	Institutional Assessment	Student Admissions and Retention	Student Support Services	Faculty	Educational Offerings	General Education	Related Educational Activities	Assessment of Student Learning
	Middle States Standard													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Documents														
INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT/SURVEYS														
Academic Program Review Reports		X					X	X	X		X			X
Honors Program Review							X	X	X		X			
General Education Program Review							X	X	X		X			
Survey of AU Practices Related to the Assessment of Undergraduate Learning, Summer 2012							X				X			
Campus Climate Survey							X		X		X			
Graduation Census							X		X		X			
Summaries of Student Evaluation of Teaching										X	X			
CIRP Freshman Survey							X	X			X			
HERI Faculty Survey							X			X				
Best Places to work survey			X				X			X				
Diversity Survey			X				X			X				
Unit-based and other surveys of students							X							
AU Police, Annual Security Report						X	X		X					
NSSE							X	X		X	X	X	X	X
LibQual Survey (Library Survey)							X		X	X	X		X	X
Alumni Survey			X				X				X			X
NRC Doctoral Review Results							X	X	X	X	X			
ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID														
AU Admissions Viewbook	X							X			X			
Graduate Program Admissions Materials								X			X			
Admissions applications, admit, deposit statistics								X			X			
Profile of Entering Classes, 2009-2012								X			X			
AU Undergraduate Admissions Office / Financial Aid								X			X			
Freshman Admission Requirements								X			X			
Financial Aid statistics								X			X			
Enrollment strategic plans								X			X			
Retention studies							X	X			X			X
Test Optional Study/Report/Statistics							X	X			X			X
Transfer articulation agreement information								X			X			
AU Welcome Center facilities information								X						
AU FINANCES														
AU Annual Report	X	X												
AU Budget		X	X											
Town Hall Budget Presentations		X	X											
A NewAU Campaign		X	X											
IPEDS Financial Aid Reports			X					X	X		X			
Documentation on Fundraising and Development (AU and units)			X	X	X									
Office of Sponsored Programs grants and contract reports			X							X				
Moody's and S&P Reports			X	X	X									

Inventory of Documents to Support Accreditation	Mission & Goals	Planning, Resource Allocation, & Institutional Renewal	Institutional Resources	Leadership & Governance	Administration	Integrity	Institutional Assessment	Student Admissions and Retention	Student Support Services	Faculty	Educational Offerings	General Education	Related Educational Activities	Assessment of Student Learning
	Middle States Standard													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Documents														
FACULTY														
Center for Teaching, Research & Learning (CTRL)									X	X				
Faculty Retreat reports/materials							X			X				
Ann Ferren Teaching Conference materials										X				X
CTRL Workshop Material										X				
Faculty Composition										X				
Faculty Compensation										X			X	
Faculty Load										X				X
Student Evaluations of Teaching (changes/results)							X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Academic Analytics Reports on Faculty Productivity										X				X
Faculty Activity Reports (FARS)										X				X
STUDENT/LIBRARY SERVICES														
Student Support Center									X					
Disability Support Services									X					
Campus Life Mission and Goals	X	X							X					
Kay Spiritual Life Center									X					
Greek Life							X		X					
Community Service Center							X		X					
Bender Library Resources							X		X	X	X		X	
Undergraduate Experience Council reports							X	X	X					
Enrollment Management and Marketing Task Force reports							X	X	X					
Annual Reports from Campus Life Offices							X	X	X					
NCAA Annual Reporting							X	X	X		X			
ASSESSING LEARNING/EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES														
Freshman Graduation Rates							X				X			X
Summary of assessment tools in place									X		X	X		X
Course and program development guidelines & procedures		X					X			X	X	X	X	X
Curriculum committee reports										X	X			X
Committee on Learning Assessment Reports										X	X			X
Schedule for implementing assessment plans in the future											X	X		X
Program (Gen Ed, College Writing, etc.) assessments											X	X		X
Policies and guidelines related to assessing student learning											X			X
Resources for faculty training in assessment											X			X
AU Assessment Plan (includes policies/processes)		X					X			X	X	X	X	X
Assessment workshop materials							X			X	X	X	X	X
Assessment Website							X			X	X	X	X	X
Campus Life assessment plans/outcomes/reports							X	X	X					X
TracDat Reports on Assessment (plans, assessment results, reports, feedback, etc.)											X			X

APPENDIX B:
SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS¹

I. Advancing and Supporting AU's Mission Subcommittee

- The Middle States Self-Study Steering Committee

II. Leadership, Shared Governance, and Administration Subcommittee

- **David Taylor**, Chief of Staff, President *
- **Arthur Rothkopf**, Trustee *
- **James Girard**, Professor, Chemistry, CAS *
- **Anthony Ahrens**, Associate Professor, Psychology, CAS
- **Barlow Burke**, Professor and incoming Faculty Senate Chair, WCL
- **Doug Kudravitz**, Associate Vice President of Finance and Assistant Treasurer, Finance
- **Beth Muha**, Assistant Vice President of Human Resources, Finance
- **Ulysses J. Sofia**, Professor and Associate Dean of Research, Physics and Computer Science, CAS
- **Emily Yu**, President, Student Government (Undergraduate)
- **Staff Council President 2012** (To be Determined)
- **Lauren Lane**, Graduate Leadership Council President

III. Faculty Subcommittee

- **Howard McCurdy**, Professor, Public Administration, SPA *
- **Alberto Espinosa**, Associate Professor, Information Technology, KSB *
- **Stephen Silvia**, Associate Professor, SIS *
- **Naomi Baron**, Professor and Executive Director, Center for Teaching Research and Learning, CAS
- **Robin Beads**, Associate Director OIRA, Provost
- **Kimberly Cowell-Meyers**, Assistant Professor, Government, SPA
- **Robert Dinerstein**, Professor, WCL
- **Phyllis Peres**, Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs, Provost
- **Gwendolyn Reece**, Associate Librarian, University Library
- **Colin Saldanha**, Professor, Biology, CAS
- **Lacey Wootton**, Instructor, Literature, CAS

¹ At-large Steering Committee members will assist, as needed on subcommittees.

IV. Admitting, Supporting, and Retaining Undergraduates Subcommittee

- **Fanta Aw**, Assistant Vice President of Campus Life and Director of International Student and Scholar Services, Campus Life*
- **Sharon Alston**, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Enrollment*
- **Funches Cheria**, Undergraduate Student, SPA
- **Jimmy Ellis**, Manager, Student Retention and Success, Provost
- **Keith Gill**, Director, Athletics and Recreation, President
- **Jill Heitzmann**, Senior Advisor, Undergraduate Recruitment and Retention, SOC
- **Rob Hradsky**, Assistant Vice President and Dean of Students, Campus Life
- **Leena Jayaswal**, Associate Professor, SOC
- **Shirleyne McDonald**, Associate Director of Financial Aid, Office of Financial Aid
- **Chris Moody**, Executive Director, Housing and Dining, Campus Life
- **Nancy Snider**, Musician in Residence and Director, Music Program, CAS
- **Meg Weekes**, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, SPA

V. Undergraduates Education Subcommittee

- **Lyn Stallings**, Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Students and Associate Professors, Provost *
- **Lisa Leff**, Associate Professor, History, CAS*
- **Melissa Becher**, Associate Librarian, University Library
- **Joe Campbell**, Professor, SOC
- **Adriana Ganci**, Undergraduate Student, SIS
- **Patrick Jackson**, Associate Professor and Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies, SIS
- **Kiho Kim**, Associate Professor, Environmental Science, CAS
- **Rose Ann Robertson**, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, CAS
- **Cathy Schaeff**, Associate Professor, Biology, CAS
- **Larry Thomas**, Director, Fredrick Douglass Distinguished Scholars Program, Provost
- **Bob Thompson**, Senior Associate Dean, KSB
- **Paula Warrick**, Director, Office of Merit Awards, Provost

* Indicates a Steering Committee member who is co-chairing the subcommittee.

VI. Graduate Education Subcommittee

- **Christine Farley**, Professor, WCL *
- **David Pitts**, Assistant Professor, Public Administration, SPA *
- **Maggie Arnold**, Doctoral Candidate, Clinical Psychology, CAS
- **Terry Davidson**, Professor, Psychology, CAS
- **David Kaib**, Senior Research Analyst (and Alumni), Provost
- **Kathryn Montgomery**, Professor, SOC
- **Shoon Murray**, Associate Professor, United States Foreign Policy, SIS
- **Robin Chin Roemer**, Assistant Librarian, University Library
- **Jon Tubman**, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies & Research, Provost
- **Paul Winters**, Associate Professor, Economics, CAS

VII. Educational Initiatives: Addressing the Changing Nature of Higher Education Subcommittee

- **Larry Kirkman**, Professor and Dean of The School of Communications, SOC *
- **Leeanne Dunsmore**, Assoc. Dean of Graduate Admissions and Program Development, SIS *
- **Jon Gould**, Professor and Director, Washington Institute for Public and International Affairs Research, SPA *
- **Carl Beimfohr**, Associate Dean for Administration and Planning, SOC
- **Sarah Irvine Belson**, Dean School of Education, Teaching, and Health, CAS
- **Derrick Cogburn**, Associate Professor, SIS
- **Sara Dumont**, Director, AU Abroad
- **Eric Hershberg**, Director, Center for Latin American and Latino Studies, SPA
- **Alex Hodges**, Associate Librarian, University Librarian
- **Jill Klein**, Executive in Residence, Information Technology, KSB
- **Sherburne Laughlin**, Director Arts Management Program, CAS
- **Sarah Menke-Fish**, Assistant Professor, SOC
- **Tony Varona**, Professor and Associate Dean for faculty and Academic Affairs, WCL