

Loyola University Maryland

Self-Study Design Template

- I. [Institutional Overview](#)
- II. [Institutional Priorities](#)
- III. [Intended Outcomes](#)
- IV. [Self-Study Approach](#)
- V. [Organizational Structure](#)
- VI. [Editorial Prerogative and Guidelines for Reporting](#)
- VII. [Organization of the Final Self-Study Report](#)
- VIII. [Verification of Compliance Strategy](#)
- IX. [Self-Study Timetable](#)
- X. [Communication Plan](#)
- XI. [Evaluation Team Profile](#)
- XII. [Evidence Inventory](#)

I. Institutional Overview

Mission

Loyola University Maryland is a Jesuit, Catholic university committed to the educational and spiritual traditions of the Society of Jesus and to the ideals of liberal education and the development of the whole person. Accordingly, the University will inspire students to learn, lead, and serve in a diverse and changing world.

Loyola seeks to prepare students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels for lives of meaningful professional service and leadership. At Loyola, this means the curriculum is rigorous and faculty expectations are high. Students are challenged to understand the ethical dimensions of personal and professional life and to examine their own values, attitudes, and beliefs.

In addition to academic coursework, the Jesuit mission is supported through a variety of programs and events sponsored by various University departments.

Vision Statement

The education of men and women of compassion and competence, imbued with the desire to seek in all things the greater glory of God, represents the enduring aspiration of Loyola University Maryland. That ideal, first elucidated by St. Ignatius of Loyola, founder of the Society of Jesus and namesake of our university, continues to guide Loyola as it strives to lead students, faculty, staff, alumni, and friends forward to the promise of an examined life of intellectual, social, and spiritual discernment.

In pursuing these goals, Loyola asserts a bold vision, which the University will attain by providing undergraduate students with a liberal education that transforms them, that ensures they place the

highest value on the intellectual life, and that instills in them an understanding that leadership and service to the world are intimately connected. Likewise, Loyola will be a recognized leader in graduate education, offering programs which are responsive to the needs of the professional and academic communities it serves, inspiring its graduate students to leadership, and inculcating in them the knowledge that service to the larger world is a defining measure of their professional responsibilities.

In all of this, Loyola will remain ever mindful of the Jesuit precept that the aim of all education ultimately is the ennoblement of the human spirit.

Brief History and Campus Locations

Then known as Loyola College, the University was founded in 1852 in downtown Baltimore, relocating to its current Evergreen Campus in 1921. The University first offered graduate educational programs in 1949, became coeducational in 1971 following a merger with Mount Saint Agnes College, and adopted its current designation as Loyola University Maryland in 2009.

Loyola University Maryland operates at four locations in the greater Baltimore metropolitan area. One, the Evergreen Campus, is a traditional main collegiate campus in northern Baltimore City and primarily houses Loyola's undergraduate programs. The Timonium and Columbia centers focus on graduate programs and boast convenient access for working professionals. The University also operates the Loyola Clinical Centers at Belvedere Square in Baltimore City and at the Columbia center.

Students and Programs

For the current academic year, academic year 2018 – 2019, the University records a total student headcount of 5,645 students (4,729 FTE) across all academic programs. The total undergraduate enrollment is 3,879 students and the total graduate enrollment is 1,766 students. More than 50% of students are women and more than 25% of students identify as students of color.

The University offers the following undergraduate degrees:

- Bachelor of Arts (B.A.; 24 fields);
- Bachelor of Science (B.S.; 8 fields);
- Bachelor of Science in Engineering (B.S.E.; 4 concentrations);
- Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.; 2 fields).

Additionally, the University offers a range of graduate programs in the following areas:

- Accounting
- Business and Management
- Education
- Emerging Media
- Data Science
- Psychology
- Speech-Language Pathology
- Theology

Strategic Plan

Unanimously endorsed by Loyola University Maryland’s board of trustees in October 2016 Loyola’s current strategic plan *The Ignatian Compass* represents the collective involvement and insights of more than 300 members of our community. Loyola’s voices have sounded hopes, ideas, concerns, and compassion, all of which have contributed to the development of The Ignatian Compass’s four institutional priorities: Ignatian Citizenship; Ignatian Educational Innovation; Ignatian Engagement; and Ignatian Institutional Vitality and Sustainability.

II. Institutional Priorities to be Addressed in the Self-Study

Included in the table below, the Committee expects that each chapter, ordered towards a specific Standard for Accreditation, will primarily engage with these four identified institutional priorities:

<u>Chapters and MSCHE Standards for Accreditation</u>	<u>Institutional Priorities</u>			
	Ignatian Citizenship	Ignatian Educational Innovation	Ignatian Engagement	Ignatian Institutional Vitality and Sustainability
Chapter 1 – Mission and Goals	X		X	
Chapter 2 – Ethics and Integrity	X		X	X
Chapter 3 – Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience		X	X	
Chapter 4 – Support of the Student Experience	X	X		
Chapter 5 – Educational Effectiveness Assessment	X	X		
Chapter 6 – Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement				X
Chapter 7 – Governance, Leadership and Administration			X	X

As the University implements its strategic plan, *The Ignatian Compass*, the University community continues to engage and reflect upon how to best give life to the Plan's four priorities. Through regular deliberations amongst the president's cabinet, and with the guidance and input of the University's board of trustees, the University continues to advance the plan's four priorities by addressing seven institutional strategic *areas of focus*. As the University's president, Rev. Brian F. Linnane, S.J., described in his October 2018 State of the University address, these strategic areas of focus are:

- Ensuring Institutional Vitality and Fiscal Integrity - *What are we doing to fund our mission and invest in our people, programs, and facilities? We will determine the right enrollment size and mix, investigate new programs to meet market and mission, and demonstrate the value of a Loyola education that individuals will want to invest in as prospective students and philanthropists.*
- Improving Yield and Retention - *How are we "inspiring demand" for Loyola? We will identify ways to increase the desire for a Loyola education through new recruitment and marketing efforts. We will develop engagement strategies with counselors, alumni, parents, and students. We will develop transfer student initiatives. We will integrate career services into our recruitment efforts. We will implement improvement strategies to increase student retention.*
- Creating a Culture of Philanthropy - *How will we raise more money for Loyola and meaningfully engage our alumni? Through philanthropy we will provide access to students, fulfilling our Jesuit mission, and transform Loyola in significant ways. We will strengthen our outstanding academic and athletic programs, enhance what we can do in our Baltimore community, and increase scholarship opportunities for students.*
- Engaging Faculty and Staff - *How are we investing in the individuals who make Loyola a wonderful place to learn and work? We will develop initiatives to inspire and support the faculty, staff, and administrators who are central to our vibrant community. We will offer opportunities to engage with the mission and encourage participation through the office of mission integration, Campus Ministry, and the Center for Community Service and Justice.*
- Fostering Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion - *How will we become a more just, welcoming, inclusive community? We will expand the conversation around equity and inclusion to take a broader look at the climate on our campus. We will instill greater interfaith dialogue and understanding. We will promote inclusive academic excellence and deepen our collective understanding of high-impact practices and specific implications for the academic success of students of color. We will implement a multi-year plan for internationalization.*
- Cultivating Innovation and Entrepreneurship - *How will we continue to educate leaders for a diverse and ever-changing world? We will enhance the entrepreneurial ecosystem at Loyola and develop a Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship as we educate and prepare our students for the future. We will offer students the tools and practice to become change agents for our community and beyond.*

- Enhancing Brand - *How will we strengthen Loyola’s brand and the value of the Loyola degree? We will build a consensus and alignment on vision, mission, and purpose. We will drive and inspire internal pride and engagement. We will highlight the transformative experience of our students and promote the positive outcomes of our graduates. We will elevate Loyola’s reputation.*

The self-study will demonstrate how the University, vis-à-vis its efforts to advance the four institutional priorities of the strategic plan, complies with the Commission’s seven standards of accreditation. The *narrative structure* of the self-study will specifically incorporate the language of the seven areas of focus. The Committee is confident this approach will enable development of a cohesive narrative for a standards-based self-study.

III. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

Through its self-study, the University intends **to secure successful reaffirmation of its accreditation** from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. The University will develop its self-study **through an inclusive campus process** which focuses the University’s **continuous improvement and innovation**.

This opportunity for self-study allows the University the opportunity to assess progress on Loyola’s strategic priorities and areas of focus through the lens of the seven standards for accreditation. As Loyola’s priorities are mission based, the Committee will ensure that the University’s mission, broadly construed under Standard One, is integrated in to all portions of the self-study. Additionally, the self-study will reflect an institution-wide commitment to incorporating assessment into Loyola’s day-to-day operations.

IV. Self-Study Approach

The University’s self-study will be a standards-based approach, with a chapter dedicated to each standard of accreditation. Institutional areas of focus will be integrated throughout the self-study narrative. The narrative will reflect how each standard is advanced vis-à-vis one or more areas of focus. The evidence library will be organized by chapter cross referenced across standards where appropriate. Each standard will have a working group with primary responsibility for authorship of that portion of the self-study.

V. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

The *Committee on Institutional Effectiveness* is a standing committee of Loyola Conference, the University’s shared-governance body. The charge of the committee is as follows:

“The Committee on Institutional Effectiveness is charged with assisting the Loyola Conference in its role to oversee the University-wide issue of institutional accreditation. The committee will report on the University’s effectiveness at meeting its stated mission and goals through analyses of key measures informed by data and evidence. In doing so, the Committee on Institutional Effectiveness will report at least annually to the Loyola Conference on Loyola University

Maryland's adherence to the accreditation standards of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education and will serve as the steering committee during major accreditation events."

The Committee's co-chairs are the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and Chair of the Faculty, while the University's Director of Institutional Research serves as *ex officio* on the committee. The operations manager for the President's Office will serve as project manager and provide administrative and logistical support to the Committee during the self-study process. Membership on the committee is based upon occupancy of key institutional roles that align with the standards for accreditation. Current committee members are listed in the table below.

Name	Primary University Position/Title; (Role or Constituency Group, If Applicable)
Elizabeth Dahl, Co-Chair	Associate Professor of Chemistry; (Chair of the Faculty and Academic Senate)
John McKiernan, Co-Chair	Assistant Vice President and Assistant Secretary to the Board of Trustees; (Accreditation Liaison Officer)
Michelle Cheatem	Assistant Vice President for Student Development
Timothy Clark	Assistant Professor of Mathematics and Statistics; (Committee on the Assessment of Student Learning (CASL))
John Coppola	Associate Vice President for finance
Margaret Daley	Administrative Assistance for Engineering and Computer Science; (Staff Representative, Loyola Conference)
Elissa Derrickson	Dean of Undergraduate & Graduate Studies
Katrina Dumont	Assistant Director of Institutional Research
Tracey Frey	Program Director for Academic Assessment and Effectiveness
Sharon Higgins	Associate Vice President for Marketing and Communication
Gregory Hoplamazian	Associate Professor of Communication
Nicole Jacobs, <i>ex officio</i>	Director of Institutional Research
Patricia Kanashiro	Assistant Professor of Management and International Business; (Enhancement of Teaching and Learning Committee)

Name	Primary University Position/Title; (Role or Constituency Group, If Applicable)
Suzanne Keilson	Assistant Professor of Engineering; (Undergraduate Curriculum Committee)
Robert Kelly	Vice President and Special Assistant to the President
Tonya Lewis	Director of Graduate Programs, Loyola School of Education
Jonathan Malis	Assistant Professor of Fine Arts
Bahram Roughani	Associate Dean for Natural and Applied Sciences

Steering committee members will serve as co-chairs for seven distinct work groups, each responsible for demonstrating the University’s compliance with a specific standard. Each work group is charged:

[T]o support the work of the Committee on Institutional Effectiveness in assisting Loyola Conference in its role to oversee the University-wide issue of institutional accreditation. Work groups will report on the University’s effectiveness at meeting its stated mission and goals, as applied to demonstrating compliance with a specific Middle States Commission on Higher Education Standard for Accreditation.

Each work group is empowered to collect and analyze evidence related to a specific Standard, using this evidence to assess and demonstrate the University’s compliance with that specific Standard. Further, each work group is expected to write preliminary and final draft reports regarding the University’s compliance with a specific Standard, supported by evidence gathered and evaluated by the work group, using a narrative structure that connects and relates the University’s strategic priorities and areas of focus to the Standard. Such evidence gathering shall prioritize identifying and utilizing processes and work product already conducted and generated by Loyola’s extant committees and offices.

Each work group is expected to approach the self-study process in a spirit of collaboration and peer-support, engaging with other work groups and the Steering Committee as whole, on the interconnected natures of the University’s academic and administrative operations, broadly construed.

Faculty, staff, and administrative work group members are identified, primarily, through nominations from the Steering Committee and the President’s cabinet. When appropriate student members of work groups are identified by the undergraduate *Student Government Association* and the *Graduate Student Organization*, in consultation with those groups’ administrative advisors and the University’s academic deans.

In addition to formal work group membership, other members of the Loyola community will be periodically invited to serve as resources, bringing special experience or expertise to each work group’s process.

Current work group rosters are below. Members of the steering committee are underlined. Each entry also includes a brief description of each work group's self-identified *Related Institutional Priorities, Lines of Inquiry*, and identified *Evidence and Resources*.

Standard One: Mission and Goals

- Margaret Daley, Administrative Assistant for Engineering and Computer science
- Kate Figiel- Miller, Assistant Director of Service-Learning
- Jonathan Malis, Assistant Professor of Fine Arts
- John McKiernan, Assistant Vice President and Accreditation Liaison Officer
- Rev. John Savard, S.J., rector, Loyola University Maryland Jesuit Community and lecturer in Educational Specialties

Related Institutional Priorities: Ignatian Engagement; Ignatian Citizenship

Lines of Inquiry:

- To what extent does Loyola University Maryland meet Standard I?
- How does the University consider, identify, articulate, and prioritize its mission and goals?
- How does the University periodically assess identified mission and goals with eyes toward, relevance, achievability, and opportunity for enhancement?

Evidence and Resources:

The work group will meet in person or virtually at least one time per month. It will begin by brainstorming and considering the different ways to assess the University's identified mission and goals, with focus on articulation of mission to the community, prioritization of goals, and opportunities for the assessment of these efforts. The group will identify the information and resources needed, relying on the institutional knowledge of group members. Work will be divided among group members to gather the evidence necessary to support the attributes and activities identified in Standard I.

Standard Two: Ethics and Integrity

- Rita Buettner, Director of University Communications
- Elizabeth Dahl, Associate Professor of Chemistry
- Katrina Dumont, Assistant Director, Office of Institutional Research
- Sharon Higgins, Associate Vice President for Marketing and Communications
- Colleen Riopko, Director of Alumni Engagement
- Sharon Schillinger, Director of Benefits and Wellness
- Danielle Ballantyne, Associate Director for Financial Aid

Related Institutional Priorities: Ignatian Citizenship; Ignatian Engagement; Ignatian Institutional Vitality and Sustainability

Lines of Inquiry:

- To what extent does Loyola University Maryland meet the criteria for Standard II?
- What opportunities exist for Loyola University Maryland to improve its work in support of Standard II?
- How does the University periodically assess ethics and integrity in its institutional policies, processes, and practices, and the manner in which these are implemented?
- How has the University placed emphasis on ethics and integrity in the goals established for the strategic plan priorities?

Evidence and Resources:

The work group will meet in person or virtually at least one time per month. It will begin by considering the different ways Loyola measures ethics and integrity in both its strategic planning and day-to-day operations. The group will identify the information and resources needed, relying on the institutional knowledge of group members. Work will be divided among group members to gather the evidence necessary to support the attributes and activities identified in Standard II.

Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

- Birgit Albrecht, Dean Class of 2021
- Patrick Dempsey, Director of Digital Teaching and Learning
- Oliver Kish (SGA Director of Academic Affairs)
- Tonya Lewis, Director Graduate Programs, School of Education
- Bahram Roughani, Associate Dean for the Natural and Applied Sciences

Related Institutional Priorities: Ignatian Educational Innovation; Ignatian Engagement

Lines of Inquiry:

- How does the University demonstrate that students are challenged with rigor and coherence while honoring traditional Jesuit values and strong core curriculum to empower students to live, learn, and lead in a diverse and changing world?
- How does the Loyola assess the design and delivery of the student learning experience and curriculum?
- How does the university support innovation and delivery of liberal arts education ?
- How does Loyola University Maryland ensure advising and transitional programs foster mentorship and that addresses the current and emerging needs of students?

Evidence and Resources: The work group will rely upon existing committees and offices for the collection of evidence and analysis. Those committees and offices include the Committee on the Assessment of Student Learning (CASL), the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning Committee, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC), the Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC), the

National Fellowships Office, Messina's assessment office, the Career Center, and the academic departments.

Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience

- Teddi Burns, Associate Athletic Director and Senior Women's Administrator
- Maureen Bush, Executive Director of Graduate Admissions
- Michelle Cheatem, Assistant Vice President for Student Development
- Elissa Derrickson, Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies
- Mark Lee, Director of Technology and Graduate Student Services
- Jennifer Louden, Dean of Undergraduate Admissions
- Jason Parcover, Director of the Counseling Center

Related Institutional Priorities: Ignatian Citizenship; Ignatian Educational Innovation

Lines of Inquiry:

- To what extent does Loyola University Maryland meet the criteria for Standard IV?
- What opportunities exist for Loyola University Maryland to improve its work in support of Standard IV?
- How does the University periodically assess support of the student experience in its institutional policies, processes, and practices, and the manner in which these are implemented?
- How has the University placed emphasis on the support of the student experience in the goals established for the strategic plan priorities?

Evidence and Resources: The committee will meet monthly. During the first meeting, the co-chairs will discuss the committee charge, review the standard, and begin to discuss avenues for locating evidence that supports the standard. Each committee member will be assigned an area of focus within the standard to research and begin the process of collecting evidence. This assignment will be based on the member's expertise and role within the University.

Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

- Timothy Clark, Assistant Professor of Mathematics and Statistics
- Patricia Kanashiro, Assistant Professor of Management and International Business
- Tracey Frey, Program Director for Academic Assessment and Effectiveness

Related institutional priorities: Ignatian Citizenship; Ignatian Educational Innovation

Lines of Inquiry:

- To what extent does Loyola demonstrate through evidence that Loyola's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their program of study, degree level, and Loyola's mission?
- How does Loyola demonstrate that the University's educational goals meet expectations of higher education?
- How do the University's goals for academic excellence and student success support Loyola's mission and strategic priorities?
- What opportunities exist for Loyola to improve its work in support of educational effectiveness assessment?

Evidence and Resources: The work group will rely upon existing committees and offices for the collection of evidence and analysis. Those committees and offices include the Committee on the Assessment of Student Learning (CASL), the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning Committee, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC), the Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC), the National Fellowships Office, Messina's assessment office, the Career Center, and the academic departments.

Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

- Adrian Black - Director, Public Safety
- John Coppola, Associate Vice President for Finance
- Karen Feeley, Director, Employee Engagement
- Greg Hoplamazian, Associate Professor of Communication
- Cheryl Moore-Thomas, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Diversity
- Brian Oakes, Assistant Vice President for Advancement
- Randall Saba, Interim Assistant CIO
- Kiki Williams, Director of Facilities Management

Related Institutional Priorities: Ignatian Institutional Vitality and Sustainability

Lines of Inquiry:

- To what extent does Loyola University Maryland establish and meet the objectives for the university and for individual units?
- Does Loyola University Maryland possess or plan for adequate financial and human resources to meet the institution's or individual unit's objectives?
- How does the university measure and assess effective utilization of resources?
- How does the University plan for sustained maintenance of technology, facilities, and infrastructure that is tied to Loyola's strategic planning process?

Evidence and Resources:

The work group will meet in person or virtually at least one time per month. It will begin by brainstorming and considering the different ways to identify evidence for the four primary objectives listed above. Additionally, it will identify people outside the working group who can assist the group in answering inquiries for Standard VI.

Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

- Kim Derrickson, Associate Vice President for Academic Budgeting, Data, and Governance
- Suzanne Keilson, Assistant Professor of Engineering
- Robert Kelly, Vice President and Special Assistant to the President
- John McKiernan, Assistant Vice President and Accreditation Liaison Officer

Related Institutional Priorities: Ignatian Institutional Vitality; Ignatian Engagement

Lines of Inquiry:

- To what extent does Loyola University Maryland meet the criteria for Standard VII?
- How do the University's governance bodies and structures provide, as appropriate, fiduciary guidance, support, and accountability for the president and senior academic and administrative leadership?
- How do the University's governance bodies and structures provide policy-level oversight of the University's academic enterprise, fiscal integrity, and administrative operations?
- How are the University governance bodies and policies periodically assessed and evaluated? How are results of such assessments and evaluations utilized to improve the functioning and structures of the University's governance bodies and policies.

Evidence and Resources:

The work group will meet in person or virtually at least one time per month. It will begin by brainstorming and considering the different ways to assess the University's identified mission and goals, with focus on articulation of mission to the community, prioritization of goals, and opportunities for the assessment of these efforts. The group will identify the information and resources needed, relying on the institutional knowledge of group members. Work will be divided among group members to gather the evidence necessary to support the attributes and activities identified in Standard VII.

VI. Editorial Prerogative and Guidelines for Reporting

Recognizing that an inclusive, collaborative process of the scope and complexity of an institutional self-study will generate a significant volume of ideas, potential initiatives, and recommendations the Steering Committee reserves final editorial prerogative for all content of the self-study to itself.

All ideas, potential initiatives, and recommendations generated through the self-study process will be preserved, regardless of final inclusion in the final self-study, and shared with the President and the president’s cabinet for consideration.

The Steering Committee co-chairs, in consultation with the University’s office of marketing and communications and appropriate members of the Steering Committee, reserve final decisions regarding style, grammar, punctuation, formatting, and similar technical aspects of the self-study report to themselves.

Work groups for each standard should submit a final report of not more than 15 pages, single-spaced, bookmarked in Microsoft Word, Calibri (body) 12-point, and written for a general audience. Each report should state logical, objective conclusions based upon analysis of evidence presented in the report.

Additional style guidelines and conventions include:

- Data tables may be included in the text, as appropriate. Alternatively, tables can be compiled in an appendix. Visual aids such as pie charts and graphs should be designed in color.
- Appendices to each report should include any visual aids or data that would not fit within the text of the report.
- Do not use abbreviations, such as SOE, in the body of the text; use only one space between sentences; lists should be bulleted, not numerical, unless reflecting a numeric ranking or prioritization; use endnotes for citations, not footnotes; do not use parentheses or dashes.

Use	Instead Of
the University, the Department	we, our
Loyola or the University	Loyola University (as a shorthand for Loyola University Maryland)
Psychology Department	psychology department
online	on-line
internet	web
website	web site
Second Annual	2nd Annual
Class of 2010	class of 2010
high school	high-school
“Period.”	“Period”.
ongoing	on-going
Fall 2019	fall 2019
2019-20	2019-2020
3-year plan	three-year plan
one, two, three . . . nine	1, 2, 3 . . .9
10, 11, 12 . . . ∞	ten, ..., unless the numeral begins a sentence
“Titles of Lectures”	
<i>Titles of Books</i>	

During the spring of 2019, the steering committee co-chairs will continue to work with colleagues in the Office of Technology Services, which oversees the University’s accessibility protocols and norms, to develop report templates that will ensure the consistency, and accessibility, of deliverables from individual work groups as the work groups author their respective chapters during the summer and fall of 2019 and spring of 2020.

The timeline for work group action and deliverables will be:

Period	Principle Events
Spring Semester 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constitute individual work groups for each standard and begin work-group conversations about compliance, areas for improvement, and potential evidentiary resources
<i>Spring 2019 – December 2019</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work groups begin research and drafting of reports for each standard Work group meeting scheduled periodically in between Steering Committee Meetings
<i>By Monday, December 2, 2019</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work groups deliver preliminary draft of report to steering committee
<i>January 2020</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steering committee provides work groups with feedback on preliminary drafts
<i>Spring Semester 2020</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work groups revise draft reports based upon feedback from the steering committee
<i>By Friday, May 1, 2020</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work groups submit final draft reports to the steering committee
<i>May 2020 through Summer 2020</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steering committee revises work group reports and the self-study
<i>Fall Semester 2020</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team chair’s preliminary visit Steering committee revise self-study based upon feedback from team chair’s preliminary visit
<i>By Monday, November 30, 2020</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steering committee complete revisions to self-study based upon feedback from team chair’s preliminary visit
<i>January, 2021</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steering committee reviews, evaluates, and finalizes self-study for upload to Middle States portal not later than 6 weeks in advance of schedule team visit

VII. Organization of the Final Self-Study Report

The University’s final self-study will include seven chapters, introductory and conclusory sections, along with an executive summary. The final self-study will link through to the evidence inventory. The anticipated final structure of the self-study is:

- Executive summary of the self-study process, conclusions, and recommendations
- Introduction of the institution, steering committee, and self-study process
- Chapter 1 – Mission and Goals
- Chapter 2 – Ethics and Integrity
- Chapter 3 – Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience
- Chapter 4 – Support of the Student Experience
- Chapter 5 – Educational Effectiveness Assessment
- Chapter 6 – Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement
- Chapter 7 – Governance, Leadership and Administration
- Concluding section summarizing the significant findings of the self-study process

VIII. Verification of Compliance Strategy

The steering committee co-chairs will assume primary responsibility for ensuring verification of compliance, working closely with members of the steering committee to ensure timely completion of this task. The co-chairs may delegate specific items to colleagues on the steering committee, or other University offices (e.g. – office of institutional research, office of academic affairs) as necessary and appropriate.

IX. Self-Study Timetable (Including Work Group Deliverables and Communications)

Following institutional attendance at the Commission’s November 2018 Self-Study Institute, the timeline for the self-study, including deadlines for work-group deliverables, along with campus communications/education activities will be:

Period	Principle Events	Communications
Fall Semester 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSCHE Self-Study Institute • Constitute Committee on Institutional Effectiveness 	
Spring Semester 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial meetings of Committee, with focus on introduction to standards and self-study design document development • Constitute individual work groups for each standard and begin work-group conversations about compliance, areas for improvement, and potential evidentiary resources • Develop evidence inventory protocols and norms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and begin soft roll-out of campus communication and education strategy, • Including President’s campus announcement of self-study • Co-chairs to present to governance bodies, academic units, and student leadership on self-study

Period	Principle Events	Communications
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visit from MSCHE vice-president liaison • Notice self-study design document to internal governance (not a requirement for MSCHE) • Acceptance of self-study design document by MSCHE vice-president liaison 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus open-forum on self-study coinciding with visit from MSCHE vice-president liaison
Summer 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gather and properly catalogue evidence inventory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop “continuing education and update” to engage and update constituencies on a dynamic self-study process
<i>September – December 2019</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work groups begin research and drafting of reports for each standard • Work group meeting scheduled periodically in between Steering Committee Meetings • Regular (approximately every 3 weeks) meeting of Steering Committee to assess progress, identify issues/bottlenecks • Co-chairs to engage regularly regarding Committee progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin roll-out of dynamic “continuing education and update” plan to campus constituencies • Co-chairs to resume periodic updates to Board of Trustees, President’s Cabinet, Shared Governance, and campus constituencies
<i>December 2019</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work groups deliver preliminary draft of report to steering committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing as discussed above
<i>January 2020</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering committee reviews preliminary drafts of reports submitted • Steering committee begins preliminary draft of introduction, conclusion • Steering committee provides work groups with feedback on preliminary drafts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus update regarding key/strategic issues identified in preliminary feedback

Period	Principle Events	Communications
Spring Semester 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work groups revise reports based upon feedback from steering committee • Co-chairs coordinate with MSCHE on selection of visit team, visit chair, and dates for chairs and team’s visit • Steering committee produces a draft of complete self-study • Notice of draft of complete self-study to internal governance (not an MSCHE requirement) • Provide complete self-study draft to University president for review and comment • Provide self-study design template to team chair for review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-chairs to update Board of Trustees, President’s Cabinet, Shared Governance, and other Campus Constituencies of on-going final revisions and forthcoming draft of complete self-study
Summer 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-chairs to coordinate team chair preliminary visit and team visit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share draft self-study with campus community for review and comment
Fall Semester 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary visit from team chair • Receive feedback on self-study report from team chair • Steering committee and work groups revise report based upon feedback from team chair 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide board of trustees with draft self-study for their review and comment at October meeting • Campus conversation/open forum with Co-chairs
December 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete revisions to self-study based on team chair feedback 	
January 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final review of self-study by steering committee • Co-chairs and university copy editors do final proofread of self-study 	

Period	Principle Events	Communications
Spring Semester 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upload self-study and all supporting documentation to MSCHE portal six weeks before team visit • Site team visit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution of self-study design document to campus community • Co-chairs continue communications, outreach, education to campus community in advance of Site team visit
Spring – Fall 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team Report • Institutional Response • MSCHE determines action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President announces MSCHE actions to campus community

X. Communication Plan

The Committee, which includes both faculty from the University’s department of communications and the University’s associate vice president for marketing and communications, will engage in a campus-wide communication and education effort around institutional effectiveness and the accreditation/self-study process. To ensure the self-study process is inclusive of a range of campus constituencies, including students, faculty, and staff/administrators, the Committee will engage in a wide variety of in-person, electronic, and (where necessary) print communications.

Thematically, this campus-education effort will focus on questions such as:

- What is the Middle States Commission on Higher Education?
- What are the Seven Standards for Accreditation?
- Why is accreditation important to Loyola? Philosophically? Operationally? Financially?
- What should the campus community expect during the process, and how may interested members/groups take an active role?

Operationally, this effort will target broad constituencies in manners according to best practices for engaging such groups:

- Students – periodic updates to the appropriate undergraduate and graduate student government associations; updates through the University’s student-run radio channel; information sessions and electronic postings at popular campus venues (e.g. – Starbucks, dining hall, recreation center...)
- Faculty – periodic updates to faculty bodies (e.g. – Academic Senate, all-chairs meetings, school/department specific meetings); leverage faculty on steering committee to engage peers; updates to the provost and academic deans vis-à-vis the President’s Cabinet

- Staff/Administrators – periodic updates to Staff Council; utilization of Loyola’s daily electronic updates (“Loyola Today”) and feature video spotlights (“The Buzz”)
- Governance (e.g. – Board of Trustees, President and Cabinet, Loyola Conference...) – Committee co-chairs will assume primary responsibility for periodic update of these groups; the ALO is also a direct-report to the President, sits on the Cabinet, and serves as the assistant secretary to the University’s board

The Committee will also work to ensure that presidential communications, including the annual State of the University address and other campus messaging, include periodic updates on the self-study as appropriate.

XI. Evaluation Team Profile

The Committee requests the president of a similarly situated Roman Catholic (Jesuit if available) university serve as the team chair. The current presidents of the following institutions are offered as *examples* for the Commission’s review:

- Canisius College: John J. Hurley, J.D.
- La Salle University: Colleen M. Hanycz, Ph.D.
- Le Moyne College: Linda M. LeMura, Ph.D.
- Saint Peter's University: Eugene J. Cornacchia, Ph.D.

Additionally, the Committee requests a diverse team, reflecting breadth of both experience and demographics, who understand the challenges, strengths, and opportunities for primarily undergraduate instructional liberal arts universities. The Committee prefers a team with a substantial membership of individuals well-grounded in the mission of a faith-based, primarily undergraduate, liberal arts university.

The Loyola information found below may be helpful to the Commission when considering Loyola’s preferences for the Evaluation Team and selecting membership.

Carnegie Classification	
Level:	4-year or above
Control:	Private not-for-profit
Student Population (Fall 2018):	5,645
Basic Category:	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs
Undergraduate Instructional Program:	Balanced arts & sciences/professions, some graduate coexistence
Graduate Instructional Program:	Research Doctoral: Single program-Other
Enrollment Profile:	High undergraduate
Undergraduate Profile:	Four-year, full-time, inclusive, lower transfer-in
Size and Setting:	Four-year, medium, highly residential

Representative institutions with the same Carnegie Classification and urbanicity as Loyola University Maryland include:

- Canisius College
- La Salle University
- Manhattan College
- Point Park University
- Saint Joseph's University
- Saint Peter's University

Canisius College, La Salle University, St. Joseph's University and St. Peter's University fit the Committee's desire to include those familiar with a Catholic institution, while Le Moyne College and La Salle University also mirror Loyola's commitment to civic engagement and a constant challenge to improve.

Finally, the Committee prefers team members who recognize the diversity of educational opportunities in Maryland. Inclusion of individuals from relatively small, non R1, public colleges and universities that do not directly compete with Loyola, such as Frostburg State University or Salisbury University, would be preferred.

XII. Evidence Inventory

The evidence inventory consists of two primary master lists. One list is an inventory of documents acquired (or to be acquired) during the self-study design and authorship processes. The other list serves as an acronym key for the self-study.

Documents will be organized alphabetically by name, with the ALO assuming primary responsibility for standardization of naming practices and ensuring the documents held in the inventory are the most recent versions in use across the University.

Inventory protocols developed with the assistance of the librarian-trained Assistant Director for Institutional Research will include the following to ensure easy navigation of the evidence inventory:

- Common Name (Acronym)
 - Description of Document: Briefly describe what the document contains (purpose, source, use...)
 - Responsible Office: Creator and/or keeper of information
 - Data Location: link to website, on Steering Committee shared drive...
 - Last Updated: indicate when last created/revise and if it's on a cycle (term, annual, every x years...)
 - Use: list which standard groups are using this information

The evidence inventory will be maintained on the Steering Committee's Microsoft Team Site, with individual work group members able to upload documents to a "preliminary upload" folder for review and addition to the inventory document by the ALO.