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Overview of the Institution

A. Introduction

Universidad Politécnica de Puerto Rico (Polytechnic University of Puerto Rico _PUPR) is a private non-profit, co-educational institution specializing in Engineering, Architecture, Land Surveying and Mapping and Business Administration. Founded in September 1966, the campus is conveniently located in San Juan's financial district. In 2003, PUPR established a campus at Miami and another campus at Orlando, Florida, in 2004.

Within the USA and its territories the Universidad Politécnica de Puerto Rico (PUPR) is the largest private Hispanic University specializing in engineering and technology. The article "The Top Producers of Hispanic Engineers" from the Hispanic Engineer and Information Technology Magazine, states: "Texas, California, Puerto Rico, and Florida account for the majority of Hispanic engineering students at the 25 schools at the top in enrollment of Hispanic engineering majors in the U.S. The largest, the Polytechnic University in San Juan, has more than double the number of Hispanics enrolled as the next largest school."

Universidad Politécnica de Puerto Rico (PUPR) is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (2005), and the International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education (2005). In addition, all of our Engineering and the Land Surveying and Mapping Programs are accredited by the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET 2007). In 2000, our Architecture Program was accredited by the National Architecture Accrediting Board (NAAB) and in 2009 reaccreditation was extended for six additional years. Finally, our graduate Landscape Architecture Program was accredited in 2012 by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) for a six-year period.

B. Program Offerings


The Institution is planning to offer a Bachelor’s Degree in Education specialized in Sciences and Mathematics, a Bachelor's Degree of Interior Design, a division of five Associate Degrees in Engineering Technology and a doctoral program in Engineering, for the academic year 2013-2014.

C. Mission

The Board of Trustees of PUPR approved the following revision to the original institutional mission statement:

As an institution of higher education, Universidad Politécnica de Puerto Rico provides opportunities for individuals from diverse backgrounds in different locations using multiple methods of delivery to cultivate their potential for leadership, productivity and competitiveness with the purpose of providing greater social responsibility toward their communities, through exposure to intellectual, humanistic and technological advancement.

The most important features of this revision are the following:

a. The expression to provide opportunities for individuals from diverse backgrounds implies that PUPR is recruiting and admitting students from public high schools, from poor communities, adults who are unemployed or are planning to change their profession and those students who take and approve the high school equivalent examinations (GED). At least, 75% of our present student body falls under these categories.

b. The expression in different locations covers our branches in Orlando, Miami, Dominican Republic, and others that may be established in the future. At present, Orlando campus has 135 students, Miami campus has 150 and the Dominican Republic Program has 25 graduate students. The Dominican Republic Program has graduated approximately 50 students from its Master of Engineering Program.

c. The expression using multiple methods of delivery covers our distance learning courses and the use of blackboard platform and other technological advances to enhance the teaching learning process.

At present, PUPR has one of the most technological sophisticated distance learning infrastructure and personnel. Approximately 1,500 students are taking online courses. In addition, PUPR is also offering an online Master in Engineering Management. In addition, our Miami campus will gradually be offering only online courses; that is, it will become a virtual campus.
D. Governance

The following chart depicts the policy determination and governance structure of Universidad Politécnica de Puerto Rico.

Universidad Politécnica de Puerto Rico recognizes and follows one of the basic principles of higher education which is the distinction between policy determination and policy implementation or administration.

The policy determination structure is always constituted by collective bodies representing the institution’s constituencies. On the other hand, the policy implementation or administration is constituted by single officers.

In our case, the Policy Making Structure (from down-up) starts with the Academic Council with five standing committees. Recommendations from the subcommittees are raised to the Council as a whole. If the recommendations approved by the Council have economic or financial implications they are raised to the Administrative Board. If decisions of the Academic Council or the Administrative Board convey university-wide implications, then these are raised by the President to the Board of Trustees.
The Academic Council is constituted by 30 members who represent faculty, students and administration. The Administrative Board is formed by 11 members representing administrators and faculty. The Board of Trustees is constituted by eight members plus the president of the institution as “ex officio” member.

All members of the Board are elected for a five year term. Yet they could be re-elected for a second term. Any member can be dethroned by two thirds (2/3) of the total members of the Board. On the other hand, if a member of the Board does not attend three consecutive meetings without a reasonable reason, it is considered that he/she has resigned and will be immediately substituted following the recommendation of the Nomination and Appointment Committee.

The Board meets regularly six times a year and carries out as many extraordinary meetings as it deems necessary.

E. Administration

As already explained, contrary to the decision making bodies, the institution’s administration is constituted by single officers such as president, dean, or chairperson. The next chart illustrates the main administration structure of the institution.

**FIGURE 1 – OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT**
FIGURE II
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

Vice-President Administration and Finance

Associate VP Finance and Treasury
- Finance Supervisor
- Payroll
- Budget and Analysis
- Collection and Receivables

Associate VP Support Services
- Pmpis
- Accounting and Payroll

Associate VP Federal and State Grant Funds Administration
- Security
- Facilities
- Auxiliary Enterprises
- Purchasing
- Environmental Compliance
- Title IV Student Aid
- Federal Grants Funds
- State Grants Funds
FIGURE III
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT AND STUDENT SERVICES
FIGURE IV
OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
F. Enrollment

PUPR's total student enrollment for Fall 2011 reached 5,050, that is a decrease of 891 students (-15%) compared to Fall 2007 enrollment, when PUPR reached its highest historical total student enrollment (5,941). The main reasons for this decrease in total enrollment include demographic factors (decrease of PR’s birth rate, decrease in the number of high school graduates, increased migration from PR to the continental USA), economic factors (a persistent recession affecting PR’s economy since 2004), and changes in federal student economic aid.

STUDENT ENROLLMENT
G. Faculty

The following chart depicts the total number of PUPR's faculty members. In Fall 2005, it reached a record high of 300 faculty members, and decreased to 265 (-11.7%) in Fall 2011. The decrease is due to the decrease in total student enrollment presented in the previous section.

FACULTY
Faculty Teaching Load

The following chart illustrates the ratios of full-time faculty vs. part-time faculty for the past eighteen (18) years. The recent changes in these ratios also reflect the changes in PUPR’s total student enrollment.

**ACADEMIC LOAD**
Faculty Gender

The following chart describes the ratios of female faculty vs. male faculty for the past 10 years. PUPR’s faculty gender ratios are characteristic of the technical fields such as engineering and architecture in Puerto Rico.
Faculty Preparation

The following charts show the academic preparation of PUPR’s faculty and its ranks. Faculty members with only a bachelor’s degree do not have an academic position and can only be appointed as tutors.
H. Student Enrollment Management and Services

This unit includes Marketing, Recruitment and Admissions Office, Guidance and Counseling Office, Student Council, Student Organizations and Activities, Sports, Social and Cultural Activities. Other offices that contribute to student life and development are: the Office of Financial Aid, Registrar's Office, Veteran Affairs Office, Educational Technology Center, Health Services, Student Exchange Office, Honors Program, and Alumni.

Marketing, Recruitment and Admissions Office
The Marketing, Recruitment and Admissions Office receives, analyzes and processes all information related to the admission of students. In addition, it provides information about admission criteria and admission procedures.

Guidance and Counseling Office
The Guidance and Counseling Office offers students the opportunity to seek assistance, career information, and guidance in the personal, vocational, and educational aspects that may hinder the students from attaining a college education. It aims at assisting the students in making appropriate educational, vocational, and personal choices.

Honors Program
In a continuing effort to provide educational opportunities consistent with the ability of the individual student, the University invites a select group to enroll in and benefit from the Honors Program and corresponding scholarship. This program consists of seminars, special courses, and independent study. The special courses enable students who excel to be challenged to their full intellectual capacity. The program is designed both to broaden and deepen the student's intellectual abilities. At the advanced level, honor's students are encouraged to undertake faculty-guided independent research in their areas of special interest. These courses are conducted as seminars and involve topics at the forefront of current scientific interest.

Alumni
The Alumni Office is designed to provide and facilitate PUPR's graduates with an academic and professional link to the University. This office has been recently established. Previously, individual departments or university units made efforts to locate graduates and determine their whereabouts. At present, the Alumni Office is carrying out a university-wide attempt to keep graduates in touch with their Alma Mater.

Student Support Services Program
The Student Support Services Program (TRIO Programs) is sponsored by the US Department of Education. It provides tutorial services, counseling and cultural activities to two hundred and twenty-five (225) disadvantaged, low income, first generation and/or physically handicapped students. Its goal is to retain and graduate project participants enrolled at PUPR. The Program is divided into three primary components: tutorial, counseling, and cultural activities.
Student Developmental Studies and Retention Program

The Student Developmental Studies and Retention Program coordinate institutional resources for student development and retention using an integrated approach. The following areas are part of the Office: Developmental course in mathematics, physics, Spanish, English, and ATUL (Adjustment to University Life), tutorial program, professional counseling and psychological services. The main objective of these programs is to help students overcome their academic deficiencies as shown in their College Board examinations and the institutional placement tests in Mathematics, Spanish and English, designed and prepared in-house by the staff of Arts and Sciences.
Nature and Scope of the Self-Study Design

A. Introduction
On August 2012, the President of Universidad Politécnica de Puerto Rico, Mr. Ernesto Vázquez Barquet, sent a letter to the university community announcing the initiation of the institutional self-study process for our re-accreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. After consulting with members of the administration, deans and department chairpersons; the President appointed a Steering Committee as well as the Steering Committee Chairperson.

In the first meeting of the Steering Committee it was decided that, 1) one member of the Steering Committee would preside over a subcommittee representing each of the fourteen standards outlined in the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education. Standard 11 subcommittee was divided into two Task Forces: (a) Undergraduate and (b) Graduate Offerings. Standard 13 was divided into three Task Forces: a) Basic Skills, (b) Branch Campuses and (c) Distance Learning. 2) The chair of each subcommittee was instructed to invite faculty, administrative personnel, non-teaching personnel and students to become members of their respective subcommittees. 3) In order to assure faculty participation, a member of the faculty will serve as co-chairperson in each of the subcommittees and Task Forces and, 4) the president of PUPR invited members of the Board of Trustees to become part of the Steering Committee. Two members of the Board have accepted the invitation. The President of PUPR appointed the Vice President of Academic Affairs to preside over the Steering Committee.

The Self-Study Committee members were provided with the following documents:

   a. Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education
   b. Designs for Excellence
   c. Student Learning Assessment Options and Resources
   d. Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation
   f. Self-Study – Creating a Useful Process
   g. Team Visits – Conducting and Hosting an Evaluation Visit
   h. Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness: Understanding MSCHE Expectations
   i. Distance Education Program
   j. Evaluating Institutional Student Learning Assessment Process
   k. General Education Assessment Worksheet
   l. Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Student Learning Assessment Process
   m. Examples of Evidence of Student Learning
   n. Suggested Reading on Assessing Student - Learning in General Education Curricula
   o. Seminal Readings on Assessing Student Learning
   p. Suggested Readings on Assessing Institutional Effectiveness
   q. Information on Assessment Models and Best Practices
   r. The Librarian Role in Student Learning Assessment

In addition, the following documents could be found on the PUPR’s Web or through e-mail from the UPPR’s Office of Planning and Development: Revised Strategic Plan for

The Self-Study subcommittees were instructed to 1) establish the purpose and goals of each subcommittee 2) design and select the charges or research questions for each standard and 3) describe the methodologies to be used in addressing these charges.

B. The Self-Study Model

After an analysis of the diverse self-study models, the Steering Committee selected the comprehensive model. As stated in the Designs for Excellence “a comprehensive self-study enables a college or university to appraise every aspect to its program and services, governing and supporting structures, resources and educational outcomes in relation to the institution’s mission and goals” (page 8). The Steering Committee concluded that after ten years of significant changes the institution should undergo “a reassessment of its mission, goals and objectives”, and “an in depth inquiry in each of the areas” covered under the fourteen standards stated in the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.

The context underlying PUPR’s present Self-Study Design was presented in our last Periodic Review Report. It was then stated that:

“The institution may be facing what some have called a perfect storm. PUPR identified its main threats; to wit: 1) present economic crisis – Puerto Rico’s recession started two years before the U.S.A., mainland and our recovery will take at least five years more than the U.S.A., 2) our present demography – Puerto Rico demography is similar to the population structure of a developed country; that is, an inverted pyramid in which the older segment is bigger than the younger one; 3) our student profile – A large segment of our students come from poor families and graduate from the deteriorated K-12 public system; and 4) competition from other universities and post-secondary institutions (in Puerto Rico there are close to 139 universities and 100 plus post-secondary and technical institutions trying to recruit the same high school graduates).

In addition to the external threats already mentioned, it should be stated that there are some new regulations of the U.S. Department of Education that have had an impact in decreasing PUPR’s enrollment. First, the scholarships denominated Smart and ACG were eliminated. Smart meant a reduction of $657,511 in scholarship funds and ACG conveyed a reduction of $268,309. SEOG was reduced by $84,955 and Study and Work was reduced by $38,477.

In addition, according to new regulations, 300 students on probation were not allowed to receive Pell Grants. These 300 students represented approximately $2.4 million reduction in annual university income. Finally, approximately 500,000 Puerto Ricans, mostly young, emigrated to the United States during the last three years.

These threats are reflected in our institution’s 1) decrease in enrollment, 2) decrease in annual fiscal resources, 3) low retention and graduation rates.

C. Goals of the Self-Study

The Steering Committee adopted as the Self-Study goals part of the proposed on page 51 of the Designs for Excellence, that is: 1) to analyze the external and internal institutional threats and weaknesses, as well as its strengths and opportunities in order to overcome the present financial crisis and maintain our high quality offerings and excellence in our graduates, 2) to identify institutional strengths and weaknesses relative to each accreditation standard and
use this information to make recommendations for improvement, 3) to identify the current range of assessment activities already institutionalized, 4) to provide MSCHE with the information and analysis necessary to decide about the institution’s re-accreditation, and 5) to revamp the Institution’s Development Strategic Plan according to the findings and recommendations stemming from the Self-Study.

D. Objectives of the Self-Study Design

The Steering Committee adopted some of the statements included in the Designs for Excellence (p.16) as part of the objectives of the Self-Study and added others that are logically deduced from the accreditation standards.

1. The objectives of the Self-Study are:
   a. carry out a thorough examination of the institutional mission, goals and objectives,
   b. review internal and external constraints that may impinge upon institutional development,
   c. review the institutional planning process and its effectiveness in determining resources allocation and institutional renewal,
   d. review the institutional efficiency in the utilization of its resources used to support its mission, goals and objectives,
   e. review the governance structure and processes of the institution and evaluate its adequacy in supporting the achievement of its mission, goals and objectives,
   f. analyze the changes in the administrative structure and recommend possible changes to make it more effective and efficient,
   g. assess institutional policies and practices related to its constituency in order to maintain its integrity, and
   h. revise the institutional assessment plan.

2. Specific Roles and Responsibilities of the Steering Committee
   a. Obtain, distribute, study and analyze all official documents related to the Self-Study from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education
   b. Monitor all the Self-Study processes
   c. Revise and approve the Self-Study Design
   d. Submit the Self-Study Design to MSCHE
   e. Establish the Self-Study Calendar
   f. Coordinate bimonthly meetings in which subcommittees and task forces report their progress and problems
   g. Provide the subcommittees and task forces with the resources to achieve their goals and objectives
   h. Establish an information center or document room to support the Subcommittees and Task Forces work
   i. Revise the Subcommittees and Task Forces Reports
   j. Revise and approve the Self-Study Final Report
   k. Submit the Self-Study Report to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, Team Chair and to the members of the Visiting Team
   l. React to the Visiting Team findings and recommendations
   m. Disseminate the Self-Study Report and the Visiting Team recommendations
3. **Roles of the Subcommittees and Task Forces**
   a. Study and analyze all official documents related to the Self-Study of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education related to the specific subcommittee.
   b. Establish the charges or research questions according to the Self-Study Standards and submit them to the Steering Committee for its approval.
   c. Carry out all the research, studies, surveys, etc., needed to clarify the charges within each standard.
   d. Submit bi-monthly reports to the Steering Committee.
   e. Submit a draft of its Final Report to the Steering Committee including strengths, weaknesses and recommendations on each standard.

4. **Roles of the Co-chair of the Subcommittees and Task Forces**
   The main purpose of creating a co-chair is to provide more participation to faculty since all co-chairs are faculty members. Among its roles are:
   a. to substitute for the chairperson in case of his/her absence to meetings,
   b. to assist the chairperson in carrying out all of its tasks and roles,
   c. to maintain the faculty of his/her department informed of the Self-Study processes, findings and recommendations, and
   d. to attend all meetings of the Steering Committee, his/her subcommittee or task force.
Charges of the Subcommittees

Standard 1 - Mission, Goals and Objectives

1. Composition of the Subcommittee:

   Chairperson - Cuauhtémoc Godoy, Ed.D., P.E., Associate Dean, School of Engineering and Geomatic Science, Acting Director, Industrial Engineering Department, and Professor

   Co-chair - Luis H. Rodríguez, J.D., Associate Professor, Business Administration Department

   Heyda Delgado, M.Ed., Director, Distance Education Center (CEDUP)

   Amado Vélez, MSCE, P.E., Assistant Director, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department, Associate Professor

   Wilfredo Torres, MEM, Director, Honors Program, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science Department

   Alejandro Suárez, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Chemical Engineering Department

2. Purpose:
The Mission and Goals Subcommittee will examine the University’s mission statement and related goals in several basic areas: adequacy and distinctiveness; clarity and congruence; integrity and utility; and assessment and outcomes. Of primary importance is an examination of the continued relevance of the current mission statement and determination of the need to revisit this document in light of the University’s current and future plans.

3. Research Questions:

   Based upon a review of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education and Designs of Excellence, as well as issues specific to PUPR, the following questions have been developed by the Mission and Goals Subcommittee and approved by the Institutional Self-Study Steering Committee.

   a. How well does the institution’s mission define its purpose within the context of higher education and identify whom the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish? Is there room for improvement?

   b. To what extent are the institution’s goals consistent with the institutional mission? Are they based upon the appropriate aspirations of the institution in service to its students, faculty, staff and community?

   c. To what extent do the mission and goals guide the decisions and actions of faculty, administration, staff and governing bodies related to planning, resources allocation, and program and curriculum development?

   d. How does the institution determine whether it is achieving each one of the institutional goals? How are the results used for improvement?

   e. To what extent are internal and external contexts, and input from the University constituents utilized to shape the mission and goals? Are goals sufficiently
flexible for the institution to be able to respond to threats, opportunities and changes? If not, what should be done to remediate this?

f. To what extent does the mission statement remain relevant in light of the University’s strategic planning activities? If the institution’s mission is not adequately guiding its activities, how could the institution’s constituencies be involved in re-thinking the mission and/or redirecting activities inconsistent with it?

g. How does the institution make sure that the students admitted will be able to achieve the institutional goals associated with them? Is the institution satisfied with its current results? If not, what are the plans for improvement?

4. Methodology:
The Subcommittee will rely upon surveys questions and interviews with major constituents and the review of relevant documents as primary sources of information to address the identified research questions. The results from these surveys will also guide the design for interviews and focus group sessions. Some of these surveys and interviews will address the relevance of the mission statement. Other interviews, paired with the review of relevant documents, will address the extent to which the Mission Statement influences the institution’s long-range direction and short-term decisions. The interviews, focus group sessions and survey results will allow the Subcommittee to gain an understanding of the perceptions and congruence between what is expressed and the active action in the fulfillment of the mission statement.

Standard 2 - Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal

1. Composition of the Subcommittee
   Chairperson - Amado Vélez, MSCE, P.E., Assistant Director, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department, Associate Professor
   Co-chair – Diana Rivera, M.Arch., Professor, School of Architecture
   Miriam Pabón, P.E., Dean, Graduate School
   Pedro Pérez, MIS, Director, Information Technology Office
   Ernesto Vázquez Martínez, MBA, Vice President for Administration and Finance
   Carlos Pérez, MBA, VP for Enrollment Management and Student Services
   Mira Colón, MLS, University Librarian
   Heyda Delgado, M.Ed., Director, Distance Education Center (CEDUP)
   Carlos Betancourt, M.Arch., Dean, School of Architecture
   Angel González, Ph.D., Director, Sponsored Research Office
   Carlos González, Ph.D., Dean, Engineering and Geomatic Sciences
   José Aponte, MBA, Investment Coordinator

2. Purpose
   The Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal Subcommittee (Standard 2) will examine and evaluate the effectiveness of the University’s strategic planning process in supporting the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution.
The Subcommittee will study the process by which resources are assigned and utilized at the different institutional levels (administrative and academic) while evaluating its effectiveness. The Subcommittee will assess the development and change processes geared towards improving institutional quality.

3. Research Questions
   a. How the University's strategic planning and resource allocation processes are consistent with its mission and goals?

   b. How is the Institutional Strategic Plan used to improve programs and services? Provide examples.

   c. Does the Institutional Strategic Plan remains flexible enough to respond to changes of the internal and external environment and to support renewal activities? Provide examples.

   d. Does the Institutional Strategic Plan is revised periodically? Provide evidence.

   e. How involved are the students, faculty, non-teaching personnel, and trustees in the creation, development and evaluation of the Institutional Strategic Plan? How involved are the aforementioned constituents in the improvement and development of academic programs?

   f. Is the Institutional Strategic Plan clearly and widely communicated to key stakeholders? Describe how, when, and by which means.

   g. Do the planning and resource allocation processes consider the current and future challenges and opportunities faced by the University? Provide examples.

   h. Are records maintained that provide evidence of institutional improvement efforts? Provide evidence.

   i. Does the institution have a planning office and does it have a systematic approach and means to collect and analyze information to evaluate its effectiveness and to enable it to make decisions? Present examples of such studies and how they were utilized by decision makers.

4. Methodology
   The research questions generated by the Subcommittee and approved by the Institutional Self-Study Steering Committee will provide the basis for the self-study. The Subcommittee will study relevant documents including strategic plans, institutional data and budget documents; conduct interviews with constituents; design and conduct surveys to determine the general perception of the Institutional Strategic Plan and its relevance in the institutional development.
Standard 3 - Institutional Resources

1. Composition of the Subcommittee
   Chairperson - Olga Cancel, BBA, Associate Vice President for Federal and State Grant Funds Administration
   Co-chair - Luis H. Rodríguez, J.D, Associate Professor, Business Administration Department
   Luis G. Rodríguez, BA, Budget & Finance Coordinator
   Angel González, Ph. D., Director, Sponsored Research Office
   Sergio Villoldo, MBA, Director, Financial Aid Office
   Ana Castellano, MA, Director, Human Resources Office
   Iris Febo, MBA, Director, Accounting Office
   Alfredo Cruz, Ph.D., Graduate School Coordinator, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science Department (CECS)
   Carlos González, Ph. D., Dean, Engineering and Geomatic Sciences
   Rosa Rodríguez, Student, Graduate School

2. Purpose
   The Institutional Resources Subcommittee will examine, analyze and assess the adequacy of PUPR's human, financial, technical, facilities and resources, as well as how these resources help to achieve the institution's mission and goals.

3. Research Questions
   a. How does the financial resources allocation aligned with the institutional mission, goals and objectives? How does the budget process and allocation relate to the strategic plan? (Provide examples for both questions.)

   b. What strategies does the institution use to measure the efficient utilization of institutional resources and how do these strategies support the mission and objectives of the institution?

   c. How are the institutional priorities developed and established? Are they periodically reviewed? What evidence is there to indicate that the allocation of resources is consistent with the institutional priorities? Who participates in the formulation and review of these policies and procedures?

   d. In which ways the resources allocation of the facilities, staff and administration support the institution mission and outcomes expectations? Do they reflect the institution priorities? (Provide evidence for both questions.)

   e. How effective is the existing budget process? How are projections and forecasts developed? What policies and procedures are used for developing the budget and who participate in the process?

   f. What quantitative and qualitative measures are used to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the resource allocations processes? (Provide evidence.)

   g. How effective is the fund raising plan? Provide evidence that it has been evaluated.
h. How does the institution benefit from a comprehensive facilities or infrastructure master plan? (Provide a brief description of such plan.)

i. How does the student-learning resource achieve the institutional objectives? (Provide examples.)

j. How appropriate is the process for the acquisition and replacement of equipment? When was the last evaluation of this process? How are actual and future technology trends included in the process? What evaluation of the campus systems shows that the technological supports are adequate in student learning outcomes assessment? (Provide examples.)

4. Methodology
The Subcommittee will use the research questions as the basis for its study. The Subcommittee will carry out interviews with the appropriate constituencies, and review the documents related to budget and audits, and analysis of the administrative structure, policies and procedures to determine their adequacy.

Standard 4 - Leadership and Governance
1. Composition of the Subcommittee
   Chairperson - Héctor Cruzado, Ph.D., Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department
   Co-chair - Jaime Suárez, M.Arch., Professor, School of Architecture
   Virginia Dessús, Ph.D., Director, Humanistic Department
   Blanca Talaj, MSIE, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science Department
   José Borragearo, PE, Director, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department
   Héctor M. Rodríguez, Ph.D., Director, Mechanical Engineering Department
   Carlos Ortiz, Ph.D., Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science Department
   Vanessa Mullet, J.D, Secretary, Board of Trustees
   Daniel Lancelot Sebastian, Student, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department
   Jenitza Rodriguez Hernández, Student, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department, President, American Concrete Institute

2. Purpose
Leadership and Governance Subcommittee (Standard 4) is to assess the following areas:
   a. Governance and policy determination structure
   b. Efficiency and effectiveness of administrative leadership
   c. Efficiency and effectiveness of faculty leadership as shown in their participation in the Governance Structure
   d. Level of shared collegial governance and its autonomy
   e. Extent to which shared collegial governance focuses upon issues of mission, vision, and program planning and resources allocation
   f. The effectiveness and integrity of the Governing Board
g. The effectiveness and integrity of the Academic Council
h. The effectiveness and integrity of the Administrative Board

3. Research Questions
Based upon a review of the *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education and Designs for Excellence*, a number of focus areas have been set forth to provide direction to the Subcommittee. To assist in the investigation of this institutional process the Subcommittee has identified the following research questions.

a. Is there a clear structure of leadership, governance and decision making that supports institutional mission, goals, objectives and policies? How efficient and effective is this structure? When was the last evaluation carried out? (Provide a brief description of the findings.)

b. Are there written policies outlining governance responsibilities of administration and faculty and readily available to the campus community? What are these documents and where are they available? (Show proofs for both questions.)

c. Are there institutional forums or committees designed to guide and assist the development of institutional policies? How effective and efficient are they? Which are these forums? (Show evidence of its effectiveness.)

d. Which evidence can the institution provides to assert that the governance structure clearly identifies with and is committed to its goals and objectives?

e. How do governance structure assist in the achievement of the expected outcomes of the institution?

f. Does the Board of Trustees have sufficient independence to assure academic integrity and autonomy of the institution? (Give objectives examples.)

g. Does the Board of Trustees represent the diversity of the institution constituency? Do members have the necessary expertise to carry out their responsibilities? Is there a conflict of interest policy for the Board of Trustees? (Provide data to support your statements.)

h. Does the Board of Trustees participate in planning and maintaining the financial health of the institution while avoiding micromanagement? How does the Board participate in this area? Can you provide examples of micromanagement?

i. Does the Board of Trustees appoint the president, the academic and administrative officers? (Provide the list of appointments and dates.)

j. Does the Board of Trustees assess its effectiveness? How is it done? (Provide the findings.)
k. Are there mechanisms provided by the governing structure to allow for the input of students and faculty? How readily available are they? Are they formally established and in writing? (Provide examples of such inputs.)

l. To what extent is the Board of Trustees involved in generating resources needed to sustain and improve the institution?

m. Is there a process for orienting new members and providing continuing updates for current members of the Board of Trustees on the institution's mission, organization, and academic programs and objectives? (Provide list of meetings and dates.)

4. Methodology
   The following activities are designed to answer the above stated questions:
   a. Assessment of the level of efficiency and effectiveness of institutional bodies or committees designed to guide and develop institutional policies.
      - Review of the composition of the Board of Trustees and the Organizational Chart to identify its level of autonomy
      - Review of the process used to publish and disseminate institutional governance decisions
      - Review of the structure and processes to establish policies at the institution
   b. Study and review the regulations and procedures used by the leadership and governance components of the institution in order to establish policies and regulations by reviewing the following documents:
      - By-laws and procedure manuals of the Board of Trustees
      - By-laws of the Academic Council
      - By-laws of the Administrative Board
      - By-laws of the Student Council
      - Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs
      - Faculty Regulations and Manual
      - Non-faculty Regulations and Manual
      - Student Regulation and Manual
      - Certificate of Incorporation
   c. Review of the Evaluation Criteria for each governance structure including the appropriateness of its membership as representative of the different constituencies of the University.
   d. Determination of the Governance Structure's commitment to the mission, vision, goals and objectives of the institution.
      - Assessment of the meeting agendas, minutes and resolutions of at least the last two years of each of the policy making bodies (Board of Trustees, Administrative Board and Academic Council) to ascertain the level of addressing issues related to the mission, vision, and program planning and resources allocation.
e. Analysis of the relationship between the Board of Trustees, academic, student and administrative sectors of the institution.

f. Analysis of the quality of in-service training provided to the governing bodies, faculty and staff members in relation to:
   - By-Laws
   - Policy Manuals
   - Regulations
   - Other

g. Interview all relevant personnel:
   - Board of Trustees
   - President
   - Vice-Presidents
   - Deans
   - President of the Student Council
   - Faculty Committees

**Standard 5 - Administration**

1. **Composition of the Subcommittee**
   - **Chairperson** – Marisabel Rodríguez, MLA, Director, Landscape Architecture
   - **Co-chair** - Catalina Vicéns, Ph.D., Dean, Arts and Sciences
   - Rafael Nieves, Ph.D., Coordinator and Professor, Graduate School
   - Ernesto Vázquez Martínez, MBA, Vice President for Administration and Finance
   - Carlos Betancourt, M.Arch., Dean, School of Architecture
   - José O. Rivera, Ph.D. (in process), Dean, School of Management and Entrepreneurship
   - Wilfredo Torres, MEM, Director, Honors Program, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science Department
   - Ricardo Benero Rivera, Alumni, Graduate School
   - Javier Rivera, Student, Electrical Engineering Department

2. **Purpose**
   The purposes of the Administration Subcommittee are, among others:
   
a. to assess if the administrators perceive themselves as facilitators of the academic and student services provided by the institution,

b. to assess the present administrative structure and processes and its effectiveness in overseeing and facilitating the academic programs, finances, student services, research and planning, instructional technology, public relations, development and others, and

c. to evaluate if the administration is providing effective leadership in fostering all institutional endeavors.
3. **Research Questions**
   a. How would you define the president’s role? Is the role considered to be similar to other university presidents?

   b. Does the president and other administrative leaders (vice-presidents) possess the academic background, training and experience necessary to carry out their functions effectively and efficiently? How do they compare to similar universities?

   c. Does the administration have enough understanding of the institutional mission, goals and objectives? How did you reach your assertion?

   d. Does the president know the strategic plan and implement it accordingly? What research did you carry out to reach your conclusion?

   e. Does the president report and maintain the Governing Board informed? Which Governing Board documents you use to support your statement?

   f. Is the management information system adequate to provide accurate information for the institutional decision making processes? How was this conclusion reached?

   g. Are the lines of authority within the administrative structure well defined? Did PUPR compare it with similar universities?

   h. How is the administration evaluated? How often? How is the information obtained through the assessment of the administrators used? For what purposes?

   i. How well does the administration communicate with faculty, students and other constituencies?

   j. How well are the administrative clerical and technological personnel evaluated? When? How is the information obtained through the assessment used? For what purposes? Are they given opportunities for renewal?

   k. Has the organizational chart been revised? When? By whom? Does it actually reflect the desired administrative structure?

   l. Does the executive branch possess the leadership skills needed for decision making? How do those compare to similar universities? Describe them.

   m. Is there effective communication between members of the administration at all levels; upper and mid level management? What research was carried out to support your statement?
4. **Methodology**
   What follows are the main activities that will be carried out in order to answer the above mentioned research questions.
   a. Analysis of the present organizational chart and structure
   b. Analysis of the academic records and curriculum vitae of the main administrators
   c. Revision of the present assessment plan for administrators, clerical, technological and support personnel
   d. Survey of student and faculty satisfaction with the administrators of the diverse offices and units offering institutional services
   e. Interviews, surveys, focus groups
   f. Revision of annual reports submitted to the Board of Trustees
   g. Revision of job descriptions of administrators
   h. Revision of employees evaluations forms
   i. Focus groups about the administration of the institution
   j. Analysis of Employee Manuals
   k. Analysis of previous Self-Study

**Standard 6 - Integrity**

1. **Composition of the Subcommittee**
   - **Chairperson** - Mayra Lopez, MA, University Registrar
   - **Co-chair** - Wilfredo Torres, MEM, Director, Honors Program, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science Department
   - Edda Martinez, MBA, CPA, Associate Professor, School of Management and Entrepreneurship
   - Luis H. Rodríguez, JD, Associate Professor, Business Administration Department
   - Marilia Valentín, MBA, Director, Bursar Office
   - Carlos Pérez, MBA, VP for Enrollment Management and Student Services
   - Elsa N. Zayas, MA, Associate VP for Enrollment Management and Student Services
   - Teresa Cardona, BBA, Director, Admissions and Recruitment Office
   - Ana Castellano, MA, Director, Human Resources Office
   - Lourdes Alcrudo, BA, Director, Institutional Development

2. **Purpose**
   The Integrity Subcommittee will examine the ways in which the Campus demonstrates its honesty and openness, maintains its autonomy, protects academic and intellectual freedom, and creates and sustains an environment conducive to higher learning. The Subcommittee will evaluate these issues from the perspective of the primary university stakeholders: students, faculty, staff and alumni. It will analyze areas that it believe are most critical for advancing institutional integrity, student recruitment and admission; faculty and staff recruitment, retention, promotion and training; diversity; service to others; academic freedom, and curriculum development and counseling. The Subcommittee will evaluate if institutional information is provided in a manner that assures effective access to student, faculty and
employees, as well as the general public. It is understood that the charge requires a focused yet comprehensive approach. Altogether the institution will demonstrate its adherence to ethical standards is its own stated policies.

3. Research Questions
The following questions have been developed based upon a review of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education and Designs for Excellence.

a. How the institution keep its constituents and the public informed about its offerings, policies, regulations, and institution wide-assessment in a manner that ensures that students and public have access to such information?

b. How the institution demonstrate objectivity and equity in its procedures and requirements in the admission of students, selection of its faculty and establishment of its curricula? (Provide examples.)

c. What are the processes the institution uses to ensure equitable and appropriately consistent treatment in relation to student discipline and student evaluation?

d. What procedures does the University employ to foster a climate of respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration? How the university protects academic freedom?

e. In what institutional documents are students informed about: a) institutional policies that affect them and b) the procedures to bring possible violations to the attention of the institution? What office is principally responsible for assisting students who have these concerns? Are these documents widely disseminated?

f. How the institution maintain and use records of student complaints to improve the institutional approach to student concerns? How institution includes students participation in assessing and improving institutional procedures?

g. What are the institutional practices in the hiring, evaluation, and dismissal of employees? Are these practices appropriate, and who assess its appropriateness and effectiveness? How it is done? Who hires, evaluates, and dismiss employees?

h. How the institution disseminate faculty regulations, the institutional rules, requirements, and policies that apply to their rights, duties, and responsibilities?

i. When did all personnel receive the pertinent documents such as the Employee Manual so they are aware of their rights, duties and
responsibilities at any situation? (Provide examples of the practices mentioned above.)

j. How the student access the electronic catalogs? Who is responsible to verify how many students visit this site? If catalogs are only available electronically, where does the institution archive copies of the catalogs when sections or policies are updated?

k. What are the assessment processes for the periodic review of the integrity evidenced in institutional policies, processes, practices, and the manner in which these are implemented?

l. How is intellectual property protected?

4. Methodology
The Subcommittee will utilize the following approaches in the study: (1) examine selected materials and documents to evaluate accuracy, trustworthiness, and weaknesses; (2) conduct focus groups with key constituents on campus services, honesty on procedures, objectivity, respect for diversity, its needs and beliefs; (3) conduct interviews with key constituents of the campus to find out opinions regarding their personal experience as to what is expected from the institution according to the policies, procedures, and programs; (4) review to what extent the existent policies and procedures are being conducted according to the established standards, and (5) carry out surveys on the constituency opinion about the institution's integrity and openness and transparency about its policies and practices.

Standard 7 - Institutional Assessment
1. Composition of the Subcommittee
Chairperson – Omayra Rivera Castro, Ed.D., Institutional Researcher
Co-chair - Héctor Cruzado, Ph.D., Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department
Elsa N. Zayas, MA, Associate VP for Enrollment Management and Student Services
Gilberto A. Vélez, P.E., Director, Outcomes Assessment Office
Angie Escalante, MBA, Director, COOP Program and Placement Office
Héctor Rodríguez, Ph.D., Director, Mechanical Engineering Department
Aneysha Serrano, Student, Chemical Engineering Department

2. Purpose
The purpose of the Subcommittee is to determine if the Institutional Outcomes Assessment Plan includes evaluation of effectiveness in achieving the mission, goals, resources allocation, renewal process, and use of resources, leadership, administration and integrity. The Subcommittee decided to dedicate its efforts
exclusively to institutional outcomes assessment and leave the analysis of student learning assessment to the Subcommittee in charge of Standard 14.

3. Research Questions
   a. How does the institution's current Assessment Plan assure its overall effectiveness?

   b. What is the schedule in the Institutional Strategic Plan for the revision of the institutional mission, goals and objectives? What were the dates for such reviews during the last assessment cycle? What are the action items (i.e., action, due date, owner) during the last review? What is the current status for the action items?

   c. How does PUPR staff demonstrate its connection to the mission, vision and institutional goals. (Present the most convincing evidence.)

   d. What evidence exists that the institution's outcomes assessment process is coherent with its stated mission and goals?

   e. In which ways the institutional assessment process assess institutional offering, services, resources allocation, governance and administration? (Present the most convincing evidence.)

   f. What evidence exists that the institutional assessment process is used by the governance and leadership structures?

   g. What evidence exists that the institutional assessment process assesses the student admission and student transfer processes?

   h. How does the institutional assessment process take into consideration the application of policies and procedures regarding the conduct of students, faculty and staff?

   i. What evidence exist that the institutional assessment process provides staff and faculty recommendations for improvements?

   j. What role does the institutional assessment process have in the decisions pertaining to planning, budgeting, and resource allocation? (Present the most convincing evidence.)

   k. How is the institutional assessment process applied to the creation of new academic programs and projects? (Present the most convincing evidence.)

   l. How effective is the institutional assessment process in evaluating administrative and student support services? (Present the most convincing evidence.)
m. What evidence can PUPR present to demonstrate to all its constituents that the human, financial, technical, facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution’s mission and goals are available and accessible?

n. How effectively does the institution utilize the data and recommendations from the institutional assessment process to formulate or modify long-range strategic plans? (Present the most convincing evidence.)

4. Methodology
In order to evaluate the institution as a whole and its Assessment Plan, the Subcommittee will:

a. Study and analyze the finding of six (6) Subcommittees: Mission, Goals and Objectives, Planning and Resources Allocation, Institutional Resources, Leadership and Governance, Administration, and Integrity and how the Outcomes Assessment Plan incorporates these findings.

b. Carry out and analyze the following surveys:
   - Students
   - Student who drop-out
   - Alumni
   - Employers
   - Non-teaching personnel
   - Faculty
   - Campus climate

b. Review the Outcomes Assessment Plan

Standard 8 - Students Admission

1. Composition of the Subcommittee
   Chairperson – Elsa N. Zayas, MA, Associate VP for Enrollment Management and Student Services
   Co-chair – Milagros Martínez, Ph.D., Director, Center for University Progress (CPU), Associate Professor, Socio-Humanistic Department
   Teresa Cardona, BBA, Director, Admissions and Recruitment Office
   Mayra López, MA, University Registrar
   Claribel Díaz Díaz, M.Ed., Director, Guidance and Counseling Office
   Melina Mercado, MBA, Supervisor, Graduate School
   Virginia Dessús, Ph.D., Professor, Director, Socio-Humanistic Department
   Horacio García, MEM, Director, Mathematics and Science Department
   Fabián O. Nazario, Student, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department, President, American Society of Civil Engineering
   Gabriela A. Cruz, Student, Mechanical Engineering Department, President, Society of Women Engineers

2. Purpose
   The Student Admissions Subcommittee will examine policies, procedures and practices and determine its relatedness with the institution’s mission, that is, “if the
Institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals and abilities are congruent with its mission”. The students admitted within the criteria established by PUPR must have “a reasonable opportunity for success in meeting their educational goals including transfer, graduate studies, part-time course work, adult and non-degree students”, and all others enrolled at PUPR.

3. Research Questions

a. How do the establishment and implementation of PUPR admission policies support the mission and vision of the institution?

b. How do students admitted to PUPR fit the profile stated in the mission statement? Does PUPR has a specific profile of students that would comply with what is expressed in our Mission Statement? Does the profile include?

- Age
- Gender
- Previous schooling
- Previous academic achievement of undergraduate students
  - High School grade point average
  - College Board or SAT scores
- Previous academic achievement of graduate students
  - Grade point average
  - “Prueba de Admisión a Estudios Graduados” (PAEG) (Graduate Studies Admission Test (Spanish acronym PAEG score)
- Socioeconomic level
- Geographic origin in Puerto Rico
- Other geographic origin
  - Within the United States and its territories
  - Other countries
- Ethnicity
- Specific physical impairments (if any)
- Parents’ schooling

c. How does PUPR monitor these data to ascertain the match between the attributes of the admitted students and PUPR’s mission?

d. How does PUPR target students in our recruitment so as to fit our desired profile? Does it exclude some of the students that we should target?

e. How does the student profile influence the development and implementation of changes in policies, practices and support services?

f. How does the information provided to students help them in making informed decisions about their education at PUPR? How accurate and comprehensive is the information available on our academic programs, our placement testing, financial aid, scholarships and loans that we provide to the students?
g. How does PUPR Student Learning Assessment and Outcomes Assessment Office interrelate with the admissions process?

h. What method, if any, is used to determine if our admissions plan and processes are effective?

i. How do retention strategies address the needs of first year students?

j. What are the challenges and opportunities of our admissions goals?

k. How much information on actual outcomes is furnished to prospective students?

l. How do faculty, students and staff participate in the admissions process?

m. How does PUPR published and implemented policies and procedures regarding transfer and admission help student success?

n. How accurately does the information that PUPR give out to our constituency reflect the following?
   - previous academic achievement requirements for first time (freshman) students
   - transfer credit policies, including limits on total credit and required academic achievement levels
   - costs, admission fees, tuition, and other costs
   - availability of financial aid
   - placement and diagnostic testing
   - academic offerings
   - expected learning outcomes
   - extracurricular activities
   - other relevant information

o. What data are collected on students before, during and after admission? How is this information used to drive the admission efforts as well as programs and services at PUPR?

p. How is technology used in the admission process? By the prospective students? By the staff? How can PUPR improve the use of technology in its admissions procedures?

q. To what extent does PUPR offer “the same message” in its public relations and promotions and admissions efforts? How accurately are PUPR admissions policies reflected in its catalogs, web site and other public messages? How frequently is this information updated?

r. How does PUPR study costs compare with institutions with similar offerings? How are these costs limiting or providing opportunities to “individuals of diverse backgrounds”? Specifically, how does PUPR help individuals of limited
resources to cover the costs? How does PUPR make the availability of financial aid known to its prospective students?

s. How does PUPR human, physical, and financial resources provided to the Admissions Office compare with other universities like PUPR?

4. Methodology

To assess if the institution’s compliance with it’s the admission policies, the Subcommittee will review the following:

- The accuracy and timeliness of information given to prospective students (new, first-time freshmen and transfer) to assist them in making informed decisions. This includes admissions policies, information regarding academic programs, student learning outcomes and financial aid among others.

- The Admissions Plan – to include evidence of ongoing assessment of student success and to evaluate the match between the attributes of admitted students and PUPR’s mission and goals.

- The enrollment management plan student files and other relevant information. In addition, the Subcommittee will collect all catalogs, publications, pamphlets and other sources of information available to prospective students as well as all internal documents or studies necessary to answer the questions listed above and any others that may come up as the study process develops. The Subcommittee will divide into teams to collect any additional materials, and conduct any required interviews and surveys. The Subcommittee will review all documents and supporting materials. It will also carry out surveys, interviews, and use focus groups to collect information and assess the admission policy and processes.

Standard 9 - Student Support Services

1. Composition of the Subcommittee

Chairperson - Carlos Pérez, MBA, VP for Enrollment Management and Student Services

Co-chair - Nidnal Ramírez, MA, Associate Professor, Socio-Humanistic Department
Elsa N. Zayas, MA, Associate VP for Enrollment Management and Student Services
Sergio Villoldo, MBA, Director, Financial Aid Office
Angie Escalante, MBA, Director, COOP Program and Placement Office
Mirta Colón, BA, MLS, University Librarian
José L. Mojica, MA, Director, Student Support Services Program
Milagros Martinez, PhD, Director, Center for University Progress (CPU), Associate Professor, Socio-Humanistic Department

2. Purpose

The Student Support Services Subcommittee will examine and assess the effectiveness of PUPR’s system of student support services. It will determine the congruency with respect to the University’s mission and its services to a student’s development and
enhancement of his/her learning process and outcomes. Student support services provided by the following offices will be assessed: Admissions, Library, Athletics, Student Activities, Counseling, Financial Aid, Health Services, Services for Students with Disabilities, Registrar, Safety and Security, and Alumni.

3. Research Questions
   a. How do the programs and services offered by each area support PUPR’s mission and their specific efforts to enhance academic excellence?
   b. How do the credentials and experience of the personnel who provide student services at our institution compare with other as its kind.
   c. How are the students informed of the services available at the institution?
   d. How effective are services areas responding to changes in students’ needs?
   e. How is student input used to improve the services rendered to them?
   f. How are student grievance policies and procedures handled and communicated?
   g. What policies and procedures are in place to secure and maintain student records?
   h. What are the policies for the release of student information?
   i. How does the institution keep contact and follow-up on alumni?
   j. How can you assert that our student services effectively contribute to increase retention?
   k. How do our athletic programs regulations compare with those who govern other institutional programs?

4. Methodology
   Unit’s offerings student services will be assessed through interviews, questionnaires, focus groups, and written reports. The findings will be analyzed and used to improve student services.

Standard 10 - Faculty
1. Composition of the Subcommittee
   Chairperson – Miriam Pabón, P.E., Dean, Graduate School
   Co-chair - Iris Miranda, MA, Instructor, Socio-humanistic Department
   Edda Martínez, MBA, CPA, Associate Professor, School of Management and Entrepreneurship
   Catalina Vícen, Ph.D., Dean, Arts and Sciences
   Emilia Rodríguez, MA, Associate Professor, Mathematics and Science Department
   Jaime Suárez, M.Arch., Professor, School of Architecture
   Elba Herrera, MS, Director, Chemical Engineering Department
Pedro Díaz, Student, Graduate School
Rosiris Valentín Tirado, Student, Graduate School

2. Purpose
The Faculty Subcommittee will examine the effectiveness of the faculty in fulfilling its primary responsibility of teaching, research and community services as well as its contribution to the overall development of the students. The Subcommittee will assess the processes used in faculty hiring and evaluation. The faculty's role in university governance, planning, and curriculum review will be assessed. The Subcommittee will examine the role of the faculty in keeping PUPR's academic offerings linked to its mission. The Subcommittee will present a documented analysis on this area and provide recommendations for improvements.

3. Research Questions
a. How do faculty and other professionals are prepared and qualified for the positions they hold? How are the roles and responsibilities defined for faculty members? Are there sufficient faculty members to fulfill those roles appropriately?

b. How do faculty participate in the development and updating of the curricula? What should be the responsibility of the faculty in the design, creation and development of the curricula?

c. How do faculty and other professionals demonstrate excellence and continued professional growth with the teaching-learning process and other academic activities?

d. In which ways does the Institution provide advancement and development activities for faculty?

e. How standards and procedures for appointment, promotion, tenure, grievance, discipline and dismissal of faculty and other professionals compare with that of other similar institutions?

f. What specific criteria and procedures are followed for faculty performance evaluation?

g. How the criteria used to evaluate the appointment, supervision, and review of teaching effectiveness of part time, adjunct, and other faculty compare with those for full time professors?

h. How does the institution promote adherence to the principle of academic freedom?

i. How the assessment of policies and procedures ensure the use of qualified professionals to support the institutional programs?

4. Methodology
Each member of the Subcommittee will be responsible for certain questions and for researching answers. The Subcommittee will use various internal supporting documents,
manuals, existing analyses, etc. Surveys and interviews may be used if deemed necessary by the Subcommittee. Any such instrument will be submitted to the Steering Committee for review in order to avoid duplicative efforts.

Standard 11 - (Graduate Program Task Force) Educational Offerings

1. Composition of the Subcommittee
   Chairperson – Luis M. Vicente, Ph.D., Coordinator and Professor, Graduate School
   Co-chair - Marvi Teixeira, Ph.D., Professor, Graduate School
   Miriam Pabón, P.E., Dean, Graduate School
   Jorge Ayala, Ph.D., Professor, Graduate School
   Alfredo Cruz, Ph.D., Coordinator and Professor, Graduate School
   Héctor Cruzado, Ph.D., Coordinator and Professor, Graduate School
   Rafaela Gonzalez, MLS, Reference Librarian
   Viktor Zaharov, Ph.D., Professor, Graduate School
   Christian Villalta Calderón, Ph.D., Professor, Graduate School
   Christina Reyes, Student, Secretary, Institute of Electronic and Electrical Engineer
   Neldeliz Sol, Student

2. Purpose
   The Educational Offerings Committee (graduate programs) Standard XI will examine the content of the PUPR's graduate programs and the effectiveness and efficiency of the resources (human, financial, physical and technological) used to support them. Content and resources will be viewed in relation to the university's mission, objectives, and goals. The Task Force will also study to what extent these programs serve the university's goals in developing the professional competence of its graduate students.

3. Research Questions
   a. Have the institution evaluated the Graduate School academic programs consistency with the institution mission?

   b. Do the graduate programs promote logical and ordered learning experiences?

   c. How can you provide evidence that the graduate programs goals are stated in terms of student learning outcomes?

   d. What are the co-curricular and extra-curricular activities that contribute to the total educational experience of the graduate school?

   e. How excellent are the graduate programs periodic assessment and do they lead to improvements in all student development activities?

   f. How effectively is the University supporting its graduate programs academically, financially and with other resources such as facilities, library and library personnel, and educational technology?
g. Can the institution provide evidence that the graduate programs' curriculum syllabi integrate activities that denote collaboration among professional library personnel and faculty, towards the development of information literacy in students?

h. What are the learning resources available to graduate students for acquiring academic information? How are the learning resources accessible to students? How is their use encouraged?

i. How effectively have new modes of instruction and technology been incorporated into the graduate programs?

j. What methods does the Graduate School use to compare or assess the quality of the teaching process in all program's courses regardless of location or delivery mode?

k. How are the Graduate School policies and procedures regarding transfer of credits publicly communicated?

l. How are those university policies designed to maintain academics expectations and maximize the learning opportunities for students who may change majors or concentrations?

m. Which evidence can you provide on how the Graduate School's course syllabi incorporate expected learning outcomes?

n. How are the program outcomes assessment results for the graduate programs used to improve student learning and program effectiveness? Provide examples.

o. How do graduate curricula promote the development of research and independent thinking?

p. How effective are students mentored regarding degree and program requirements?

q. How appropriate are the faculty's credentials in each graduate program to the corresponding program curricula? (Provide evidence.)

4. Methodology
The research questions generated by the Subcommittee and approved by the Institutional Self-study Steering Committee will provide the basis for our study.

- The Subcommittee will review the following documents available from the different graduate programs:
  - Results of Graduate Outcome Assessment
    - Design Project Evaluation Rubric
    - Exit Survey
    - Alumni Survey
    - Employer Survey
    - Faculty Evaluation Forms
- Graduate Program Catalog
- Graduate Courses Syllabi
- Graduate Program Course Flowchart
- Thesis Format Policy documentation
- Continuous Enrollment Policy
- Graduate faculty curricula vitae and academic credentials
- Program changes submitted to the Academic Council

- Information will be obtained through interviews with senior academic administrators including the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Vice President of Finance.

- The Task Force will conduct focus groups meetings among deans, graduate program administrators, faculty, graduate students, alumni, and directors of support departments (CTE, CEDUP, and Library) to obtain additional perspectives of graduate programs.

**Standard 11 - (Undergraduate Program Task Force) Educational Offerings**

1. **Composition of the Subcommittee**
   Chairperson – Marisol Rodríguez, Ph.D. (in process), Director, Geomatic Science Department
   Co-chair - Maribel Ríos, M.Ed., Professor, Associate Dean, School of Architecture
   José Borragero, P.E., Director, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department
   Elba Herrera, MS, Director, Chemical Engineering Department
   Wilfredo Torres, MEM, Director, Honors Program, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science Department
   Marisabel Rodríguez, MLA, Director, Landscape Architecture
   Carlos Pons, Ph.D., Assistant Director, Industrial Engineering Department and Professor
   Othoniel Rodríguez, Ph.D., P.E., Director, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science Department

2. **Purpose**
   The Educational offerings Task Force for Undergraduate Programs will evaluate the content, rigor, depth and coherence of the undergraduate academic programs offered by PUPR. The integration between the institution and the individual program missions, educational objectives and outcomes will be assessed. The Subcommittee will examine the sufficiency and effectiveness of the resources used to support each program.

3. **Research Questions**
   a. How are the programs’ mission, educational objectives, and outcomes aligned with the college and university mission goals?

   b. How is each program curriculum aligned with the program educational outcomes?

   c. How can it be demonstrated that the programs offerings are sufficient in content, breath, and length and that are conducted with appropriate rigor?
d. How are the programs designed to foster a coherent student learning experience and promote synthesis of learning?

e. How does each program provide for a balance between the general education and areas of specialization?

f. How can it be demonstrated that the course syllabi clearly state the program educational objectives and outcomes?

g. How are the program curricula, educational objectives and student learning outcomes related? How are they assessed?

h. How are the evaluation results of curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences used to improve student learning and program effectiveness?

i. How do programs receive input from external advisory boards in the development of their mission, educational objectives, and outcomes?

j. How are the programs revised? Do faculty members participate in this process?

k. How do academic advising, mentoring, and tutoring programs support the student’s educational progress?

l. How can the institution demonstrate that the library’s learning resources, facilities, instructional equipment, services, and professional staff are aligned with the needs of the institution’s academic programs and the student learning process?

m. How is the process to develop new courses and changes in existing curricula performed? Does it provide for faculty participation?

n. What are the admission policies and procedures for transfer students? How do they assure that transfer students achieve the same educational objectives as non-transfer students?

o. How do professional library staff and faculty collaborate in the integration of activities into the curriculum to foster and develop information literacy skills?

p. How does the institution provide a comparable quality of teaching/instruction, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness for courses and programs regardless of location or delivery mode?

q. How does the institution demonstrate that its practices and policies fulfill the needs of adult learners?

4. Methodology
The research questions generated by the Educational Offerings Task Force for Undergraduate Programs and approved by the Steering Committee provide the basis for this study. The questions will be explored using several methods. The Subcommittee
will conduct an extensive review of the documents available from the different programs and the Institutional Planning and Research Office. Interviews will be performed with the different academic administrators. In addition, focus groups meetings will be scheduled with faculty members, advisory board members, and students to obtain additional perspectives. These interviews and meetings will provide insight into issues that cannot be obtained from written documents alone.

Standard 12 - General Education

1. Composition of the Subcommittee
   Chairperson – Catalina Vicéns, Ph.D., Dean, Arts and Sciences
   Co-chair - Virginia Deessú, Ph.D., Professor, Director, Socio-Humanistic Department
   Nidhal Ramírez, MA, Associate Professor, Socio-Humanistic Department
   Roberto Colón, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Mathematics and Science Department
   Horacio García, MEM, Associate Professor, Director, Mathematics and Science Department
   Emilia Rodríguez, MA, Associate Professor, Mathematics and Science Department
   Carolina Diez de Andino, D.Ed, Lecturer II English, Socio-Humanistic Department
   Martha Dumois, Ph.D. (in process), Assistant Professor, Mathematics and Science Department
   Carmen Lara, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Mathematics and Science Department
   Mildred Agosto, MPH, Assistant Professor, Mathematics and Science Department
   Wilson Rivera, Student, Civil Engineering
   Bárbara Pérez, Student, Mechanical Engineering

2. Purpose
   The purpose of the General Education Subcommittee is to examine the institutional general education offerings in order to assess their effectiveness in supporting each undergraduate degree program, and to determine if they reflect the educational mission, goals, and objectives of the institution. Specifically, the Subcommittee will examine if these offerings provide students with college level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis, technological competency and information literacy. The Subcommittee will present a documented analysis of the General Education Component and will provide recommendations for its improvement.

3. Research Questions
   a. What is the scope of the general education component?

   b. To what extent do the general education offerings establish a balance between specialized and more general knowledge?

   c. Does the general education component incorporate the study of values, ethics and diverse perspectives?

   d. How does the general education component enable students to develop communication skills, scientific and quantitative reasoning, technological
competencies and information literacy, including critical analysis and reasoning? (Provide examples.)

e. How clearly and accurately the general education requirements are described in the official publications of the institution? How clearly are they explained in the catalog of the institution?

f. How is the assessment of general education outcomes carried out within the institution’s overall plan for student learning evaluations? How are the results of this process used for curricular improvement?

g. To what extent has the general education component been revised by the faculty? What are the mechanisms used for such revision?

h. To what degree does the institution provide support for the general education component? What are the faculty incentives, physical facilities, technological resources and budget allocation?

i. How does the general education program support and explain the rationale for its curriculum and its benefits?

j. Does the General Education component contribute to the enhancement of the cultural, ethical and social awareness of the students?

4. Methodology
The committee will have periodic meetings. Each member of the group will be responsible for some of the key questions. The team will discuss these using different internal documents, manuals, institutional analysis, surveys and interviews.

Standard 13 - (Developmental Studies and Retention Program Task Force) Related Activities

1. Composition of the Subcommittee
   Chairperson – Mlagros Martínez, Ph.D., Director, Center for University Progress (CPU), Associate Professor, Socio-Humanistic Department
   Co-chair - Virginia Dessús, Ph.D., Professor, Director Socio-Humanistic Department
   Lynda Vélez, MA, Assistant Professor, Socio-Humanistic Department
   Nidnal Ramírez, MA, Associate Professor, Socio-Humanistic Department
   Angel Vélez, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Mathematics and Science Department
   Horacio García, MEM, Associate Professor, Director Mathematics and Science Department
   Iris Miranda, MA, Instructor, Socio-Humanistic Department
   Dominic Forina, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Socio-Humanistic Department
   Karen Maldonado López, Student, Industrial Engineering Department
   Abdiel Vélez González, Student, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department

2. Purpose
This Subcommittee will examine and assess the developmental studies component and how it develops students’ basic skills and its contribution to students’ retention. It will
analyze the congruency of developmental program with our mission and goals. Also, it
will examine how support services provided to students at risk contribute to their
success at the institution.

3. Research Questions
   a. What procedures are used to identify students at risk? (Describe how placement
criteria are determined.)
   b. Once identified, how well does the PUPR provide students at risk with appropriate
developmental courses and support services?
   c. Does the institution provide evidence that developmental courses and services have
a positive impact on students’ retention, persistence and graduation? How well are
developmental programs assessed?
   d. What other academic support programs and services are available for them? How
are they evaluated?
   e. How clearly and accurately the support programs or services are described in the
PUPR official publications (catalog)?
   f. How qualified and trained are the faculty members, who provide services to
students at the developmental courses? How adequate are their methodologies and
activities to enhance students skills?

4. Methodology
   This Subcommittee will use diverse methods to evaluate aspects related to basic skills
development, among them are:
   a. analysis of Placement Test, College Board Examination and Advance Placement
tests scores,
   b. analysis of retention rates of students enrolled in basic skills and developmental
courses,
   c. interviews and surveys concerning students’ satisfaction with basic skills or
developmental courses and other support services such as tutoring, guidance and
counseling, and
   d. faculty development information concerning the use of technology and
methodologies in actual teaching.

Standard 13 - (Distance Education Task Force) Related Activities
1. Composition of the Subcommittee
   Chairperson – Heyda Delgado, M,Ed., Director, Distance Education Center (CEDUP)
   Rosa Belvis, MBA, Quality Assurance, Distance Education Center (CEDUP)
   Leticia Pagán, Ph.D., Professor, Graduate School
   Dr. Virginia Dessús, Ph.D., Professor, Director, Socio-Humanistic Department
Cuauhtémoc Godoy, Ed.D., P.E., Professor, Associate Dean, School of Engineering and Geomatic Science, Acting Director, Industrial Engineering Department
José O. Rivera- Ph.D., (in process), Dean, School of Management and Entrepreneurship
Diana Rivera- M.Arch., Professor, School of Architecture
Marisabel Rodríguez, MLA, Director, Landscape Architecture
Angel Vélez, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Mathematics and Science Department
Eloy Nieves, Student
Diana Darabei, Student, Graduate School

2. Purpose
The Related Educational Activities Task Force – (Standard 13) Distance Education will examine and evaluate the educational effectiveness of distance education at the PUPR. This will include examining the consistency with the mission statement of the institution and its organizational structures and procedures. It will also evaluate if the financial, staff, and technological support is appropriate; if the curriculum design, the faculty training and support is adequate, if the student support services are appropriate, if learning outcomes are being achieved and if they are comparable to those of traditional programs.

3. Research Questions
a. How consistent is the Distance Education Center (CEDUP) mission with that of the University?

b. How does the institution’s Development Plan includes online or distance learning offerings?

c. How are the organizational structure, policies and procedures defined and how appropriate are they for continuous development of the Distance for Education Center (CEDUP), as well as the applicable legal and regulatory requirement properly addressed?

d. How effective are the institution’s resources in supporting and expanding its online learning offerings and its continuing development?

e. How adequate are the library and learning resources for distance learning students and the faculty?

f. How consistent are the distance learning courses, educational objectives and outcomes consistent with regular programs?

g. How adequate is the description of the distance education platform described in the published materials well understood by the students and faculty?

h. How is the student engaged in the learning process and assessed?

i. How does the institution evaluate and promote the students’ and faculty-students’ interaction?
j. What means do the institution use to assure the integrity of its online offerings?

4. **Methodology**

The research questions generated by the Task Force and approved by the Self-Study Steering Committee will provide the basis for our study. The Task Force will examine relevant documents, and conduct interviews with students, faculty and administrators. It will also carry out surveys within its constituency, and conduct discussion forums between faculty and students with experience in distance education.

**Standard 13 – (Miami Branch Campus Task Force) Related Activities**

1. **Composition of the Subcommittee**

   - **Chairperson** – Martin V. Arroyo-Feliciano, MBA, Director, Miami Campus
   - **Co-chair** – Ernesto Castro, MBA, Academic Dean, Miami Campus
   - Ulises Guigou – Professor
   - Karen Valdés – Professor
   - Manuel Sique – Faculty Representative

2. **Purpose**

   This Committee was organized to examine the academic programs offered and the services provided to students at the Miami Branch Campus of the Polytechnic University of Puerto Rico. The review conducted will allow us to obtain reasonable assurance that the Miami Campus complies with the standards for quality of instruction, academic rigor and educational effectiveness, similar to the programs offered throughout the institution.

3. **Research Questions**

   a. How do the Miami Campus programs meet the standards of quality in academic and support as compared to the Main Campus?

   b. How do student learning outcomes at the Miami Campus compare with those of the Main Campus?

   c. How adequate are the support services provided to students and faculty?

   d. How are the administration of the Miami Campus assures that their programs are similar to those of the Main Campus?

   e. What is the profile of the faculty, administrative staff and students? How do these profiles compare to those of the Main Campus?

   f. How do the distance teaching/learning resources of the Miami Branch Campus compare with those of the Main Campus in quality?

   g. How the quality assessment measure of the distance teaching/learning process compare with those of the Main Campus?
h. How adequate is the outcomes and student learning assessment plan of the Miami Campus?

i. How findings are used to develop or revise the academic programs?

j. How does the Miami Branch Campus provide for the participation of faculty and students, in the institutional planning, evaluation, and governance processes?

4. Methodology
The inquiries herein presented will serve as the frame of reference and guidance for the activities to be executed by the Self-Study Committee, while conducting the evaluation of the Miami Branch Campus. Information and data collection methods will vary according to the nature of the specific areas. Among them, we suggest the use of interviews, questionnaires to students, faculty, staff, and alumni; and the review of supporting documents, analysis of survey results and questionnaires received from participants.

**Standard 13 – (Orlando Branch Campus Task Force) Related Activities**

1. Composition of the Subcommittee
   **Chairperson** – Sylvia Cáceres, Ph.D., Chancellor, Orlando Campus
   **Co-chair** - Wilfred Fonseca, Ph.D., Academic Director, Orlando Campus
   Auriestela Mueses, Ph.D., Professor
   Wilfredo Cruz, Student
   Dayanamai Camacho, Student

2. Purpose
The purpose of the Subcommittee is to examine program offerings and services being provided by Polytechnic University of Puerto Rico – Orlando Campus. Preview will be conducted to ensure that the branch campus meets all standards for quality of instruction, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness comparable to those of other institutional offerings.

3. Research Questions
   a. How do the Orlando Campus programs meet the standards of quality in it’s the academic at the same level of the Main Campus?

   b. How do the student learning outcomes compare with similar programs at other and the Mair. Campus?

   c. Which programs/degrees does the Orlando Campus offer? How do the programs compare to that of the Main Campus?

   d. What is the student, faculty, and administrative personnel’s profile? How do these profiles compare with that of the Main Campus?

   e. How does the Orlando Campus Mission Statement compare with that of the Main Campus?
f. Does the outcomes and student learning assessment plan of the Orlando Campus compare with that of the Main Campus?

g. How findings are used to improve the academic offerings?

h. How does the Orlando Campus provide for faculty and student participation in institutional evaluation, planning and governance?

4. Methodology

The questions listed above will serve as a guide for this Task Force’s analysis. Methods of collecting information to address these questions will include: interviews, review of supporting documentation, review of results of surveys/questionnaires administered by the campus subcommittee and analysis of findings.

Standard 14 - Assessment of Student Learning

1. Composition of the Subcommittee

Chairperson — Gilberto A. Vélez, P.E., Director, Outcomes Assessment Office
José Riollano, MSE, Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science Department
Roberto Colón, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Mathematics and Science Department
Omaira Collazos, Ph.D., Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department
María García Sandoval, Ph.D., Professor, Industrial Engineering Department
Eduardo Cabrera, MS, Associate Professor, Mechanical Engineering Department
Edda Martínez, MBA, CPA, Associate Professor, School of Management and Entrepreneurship
Ana G. Alicea, MA, Associate Professor, Socio-Humanistic Department
Digna Delgado, MLS, Information Literacy Coordinator and Chief of Public Services
Nadya K. Nenadich, MS, Professor, School of Architecture
José A. Martínez, MSCE, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering Department
Blanca Tallaj, MSIE, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Computer Science Department
Zuleica Lozada, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Chemical Engineering Department
Edgar Torres, Ph.D., Professor, Graduate School
Prof. Maribel Rijos, M.Ed., Professor, Associate Dean, School of Architecture
Gianira Molinary, Florida Campus
Ninoshka Rodriguez Avilées, Student, Chemical Engineering Department, President, Institute of Chemical Engineers
Jacqueline Collazo, Student, Graduate School

2. Purpose

The purpose of the Student Learning Assessment Subcommittee is to examine if PUPR’s students acquire knowledge and develop skills, competencies and values consistent with institutional goals, and if upon graduation they have achieved the appropriate goals of higher educational. Therefore, assessing student learning means that the student is the primary focus of inquiry.
Nevertheless, student learning is intricately linked with the teaching process and that's why the teaching-learning process will be assessed at three levels: course level, component level and program level.

The award of a degree takes place after the student passes a specified number of courses and credit-hours. PUPR considers essential to assess each course of every program offered.

The effectiveness of individual courses will be assessed by evaluating nine different groups of course components, such as mathematics and sciences, physics, socio-humanistic studies and languages and sequences such as ethics, engineering economics, engineering, and interior design, aesthetics and others.

The Subcommittee will revise the Learning Assessment Plan and activities and how the findings are used to improve the curriculum and student achievement.

3. Research Questions
Based upon review of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education and the Designs for Excellence, the following questions have been developed by the Student Learning Assessment Subcommittee.

a. How is PUPR building the inventory to demonstrate a documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning that is of sufficient quality that results can be used with confidence to inform decisions?

b. How is PUPR accumulating sufficient data to demonstrate clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes that are consonant with the institutional mission?

c. How is PUPR handling enough data to demonstrate assessment results that provide sufficient, convincing evidence that students are achieving key program learning outcomes?

d. How can the institution demonstrate with accumulated data that it has a documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning that include sufficient simplicity, practicality, detail, and ownership to be sustainable?

e. How can the institution demonstrate with accumulated data that it has a documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning that includes the periodic evaluation of the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of PUPR’s student learning assessment processes?

f. How can PUPR demonstrate with accumulated data clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes at all levels and for all programs that aim to foster student learning and development?

g. How can PUPR demonstrate with accumulated data a documented, organized and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning that includes
support and collaboration of faculty and administration in assessing student learning and responding to assessment results?

h. How PUPR can demonstrate with sufficient data gathered evidence that student learning assessment information is shared and discussed with appropriate constituents and is used to improve teaching and learning?

i. How can PUPR demonstrate with sufficient gathered data a documented, organized, and sustained assessment process that includes direct and objective evidence of student learning?

j. How can PUPR demonstrate clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes that are consonant with the standards of higher education and relevant disciplines?

k. What classroom techniques, tools and methods are used by faculty to assess student learning? What are the results or findings? How are these findings used to improve teaching?

l. What are the assessment techniques, tools and methods implemented to evaluate a curriculum component or sequence? What are the results? How are they used to improve the curriculum? Are all these elements reflected in the annual budget?

m. How does PUPR incorporate technological advancements into the process of teaching, learning and assessment at the institutional level?

n. How PUPR provides for staff development and resources to implement new teaching practices? How effective they are?

o. How does PUPR share and widely discuss the assessment processes with the appropriate constituents?

4. Methodology
   The research questions generated by the Student Learning Assessment Subcommittee and approved by the Institutional Self-Study Steering Committee provide the basis for the Self-Study. The Subcommittee will utilize the following approaches in the study:
   a. recommend the use of rubrics, portfolios and other diverse instruments to assess student learning outcomes,
   b. study and analyze the results of such instrument for assessing student learning outcomes, 
   c. analyze the data obtained in the above activities to discover the most relevant problems in student learning, 
   d. identify ways and plan activities to overcome the problems related to student learning assessment ascertained from diverse studies,
e. identify sources of financial aid to implement the activities to solve student learning problems, and

f. involve students in all the phases of the student learning assessment process.
# Inventory of Support Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I Mission, Goals and Objectives</th>
<th>XI-A Education Offerings - Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal</td>
<td>XI-B Educational Offerings - Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Institutional Resources</td>
<td>XII General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Leadership and Governance</td>
<td>XIII-A Basic Skills and Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Administration</td>
<td>XIII-B Branch Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Integrity</td>
<td>XIII-C Distance Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Institutional Assessment</td>
<td>XIV Assessment of Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII Students Admissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Student Support Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STANDARD COMMITTEE THAT REVIEWED IT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents to Review</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI-A</th>
<th>XI-B</th>
<th>XII</th>
<th>XIII-A</th>
<th>XIII-B</th>
<th>XIII-C</th>
<th>XIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Characteristic of Excellence on Higher Education</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Design for Excellence</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluation of Institutions Operating Interregional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Range of Commission Actions on Accreditation</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Outcomes Assessment Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student Learning Assessment Options and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents to Review</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X1-A</td>
<td>X1-B</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>XIII-A</td>
<td>XIII-B</td>
<td>XIII-C</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Student Learning Assessment Options and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-Study – Creating a useful process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Functions of Boards of Trustees in Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Selection of Evaluation Teams and Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Distance Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12. Guidelines for Librarian Evaluators                                           |   |   |    |    |   |    |     |      |    |   |      |      |     |        |        |       |   *
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XI-A Education Offerings - Undergraduate
XI-B Educational Offerings - Graduate
XII General Education
XIII-A Basic Skills and Retention
XIII-B Branch Campus
XIII-C Distance Learning
XIV Assessment of Student Learning
## Mission, Goals and Objectives

- XI-A Education Offerings - Undergraduate

## Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal

- XI-B Educational Offerings - Graduate

## Institutional Resources

- XII General Education

## Leadership and Governance

- XIII-A Basic Skills and Retention

## Administration

- XIII-B Branch Campus

## Integrity

- XIII-C Distance Learning

## Institutional Assessment

- XIV Assessment of Student Learning

## Student Support Services

- X Faculty

### STANDARD COMMITTEE THAT REVIEWED IT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents to Review</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI-A</th>
<th>XI-B</th>
<th>XII</th>
<th>XIII-A</th>
<th>XIII-B</th>
<th>XIII-C</th>
<th>XIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Handbook for Graduate Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Guidelines for Distance Learning Prog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Framework for Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The Librarian role in Student Learning Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Information on Assessment Model and Best Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Off Campus Offerings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. What is Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Distance Learning Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents to Review</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XI-A</td>
<td>XI-B</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>XIII-A</td>
<td>XIII-B</td>
<td>XIII-C</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. PUPR Self-Study 2005</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. PUPR Periodic Review Report 2010</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Mission Statement PUPR</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Monitoring Report 2012</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. PUPR Strategic Development Plan</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Rubrics to Evaluating Institutional Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Suggested Readings on Assessing Institutional Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents to Review</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X1-A</td>
<td>XI-B</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>XIII-A</td>
<td>XIII-B</td>
<td>XIII-C</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. PUPR Catalog</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. PUPR Annual Audited Financial Statement</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Composition and Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of the Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Composition and By-laws of the Academic Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Faculty Handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Student Handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Organization Chart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Governance Chart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD COMMITTEE THAT REVIEWED IT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents to Review</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X1-A</th>
<th>XI-B</th>
<th>XII</th>
<th>XIII-A</th>
<th>XIII-B</th>
<th>XIII-C</th>
<th>XIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Seminal Readings on Assessing Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Fact Book 2001-2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Annual Institution Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. IPEDS – Institutional Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Outcomes Assessment Plan (PUPR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Student Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Faculty Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Enrollment Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents to Review</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XI-A</td>
<td>XI-B</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>XIII-A</td>
<td>XIII-B</td>
<td>XIII-C</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Surveys:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Student Satisfaction with PUPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Non-teaching Satisfaction with PUPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Faculty Evaluation of PUPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Employees Satisfaction with Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Student Satisfaction with Registration Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Student Satisfaction with Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD COMMITTEE THAT REVIEWED IT
I Mission, Goals and Objectives
II Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal
III Institutional Resources
IV Leadership and Governance
V Administration
VI Integrity
VII Institutional Assessment
VIII Students Admissions
IX Student Support Services
X Faculty
XI-A Education Offerings - Undergraduate
XI-B Educational Offerings - Graduate
XII General Education
XIII-A Basic Skills and Retention
XIII-B Branch Campus
XIII-C Distance Learning
XIV Assessment of Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents to Review</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI-A</th>
<th>XI-B</th>
<th>XII</th>
<th>XIII-A</th>
<th>XIII-B</th>
<th>XIII-C</th>
<th>XIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g. Alumni Evaluation of PUPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Exit Interviews – Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Student Evaluation of Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Grade Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Reasons for Withdrawals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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## Time Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Steering Committee</td>
<td>Aug. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Subcommittees</td>
<td>Aug. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittees Begin their Participation in Designing the Self-Study</td>
<td>Sept. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study Design Preliminary Report Raised from Subcommittees</td>
<td>Feb. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee Revise Changes of Subcommittees and Writes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Draft of Self-Study Design</td>
<td>Feb. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study Design Edited and Approved by Steering Committee</td>
<td>Mar. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCHE Self-Study Visit</td>
<td>Apr. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Self-Study Design Submitted to MSCHE for Approval</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study Subcommittees Initiate Self-Study Based on the Approval of Self-Study Design by MSCHE</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Team Chair by MSCHE</td>
<td>Jan. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee Receives Self-Study Subcommittee Drafts</td>
<td>Feb. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Evaluation Team Members by MSCHE</td>
<td>Feb.-Apr. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Self-Study Draft</td>
<td>Aug. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team’s Chair Preliminary Visit</td>
<td>Oct. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Self-Study Report Mailed Team and CHE</td>
<td>Feb. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Team Visit</td>
<td>Mar. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Team Report to the Institution</td>
<td>Apr. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Response</td>
<td>Apr. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair’s Confidential Brief to MSCHE</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Action</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Editorial Style and Format

Each subcommittee and task force should submit progress reports to the Steering Committee every two months. The subcommittees should use the Self-Study Design as guide for their bimonthly and final reports.

- Mechanics for Writing
  - Use active voice versus passive
  - Use third person versus active
  - Refer to positions and offices versus names of individuals
    - Use spell check
    - Avoid hyphens at the right hand margin
    - Avoid unnecessary abbreviations
    - Italicize books and other publications
    - Concise writing
    - Coherence with the subcommittee outline
    - Logical conclusion based on evidence
    - A maximum of 15 double space pages per Standard for the Final Report

- Technical Guidelines
  - Use Microsoft Word, 12 Garamond font
  - Submit drafts in double-space; final report in single-space
  - Double space between paragraphs
  - Fully justify text in paragraphs
  - Center primary headings with all letters in bold caps in 14-point font
  - Left justify secondary headings with all letters in bold caps in 12-point font
  - Left justify tertiary headings in bold letters with the first letter of important words capitalized
  - Use EXCEL spreadsheets

The Steering Committee has appointed an Editing Committee to ascertain the adequacy and integrity of the Final Report. The Final Report will present the past and present story of the University. It will include institutional successes, problems, strengths, weaknesses and plan for its feature development.
Organization of the Self-Study

Executive Summary

Chapter I – Structure and Process of the Self-Study
   A. Introduction
   B. Nature and Design of the Self-Study
   C. Members of the Steering Committee and the Subcommittees
   D. Structure of the Self-Study

Chapter II – Mission, Goals and Objectives
   A. Introduction
   B. Assessment of Mission, Vision, Goals and Objectives – Outcomes
   C. Revised Mission, Vision, Goals and Objectives
   D. Strengths and Weaknesses
   E. Recommendations

Chapter III – Planning, Resource Allocations and Institutional Renewal
   A. Assessment of the Development Strategic Plan
   B. Assessment of Resource Allocation based on the Institution’s Mission
   C. Assessment of Institutional Renewal
   D. Assessment and Changes of Institutional Goals and Objectives
   E. Strengths and Weaknesses
   F. Recommendations

Chapter IV – Institutional Resources
   A. Introduction
   B. Assessment of the Availability and Accessibility of Institutional Resources
   C. Assessment of the Effectiveness and Efficiency in the Allocation and Use of Resources in Achieving the Institution’s Mission and Goals
   D. Developments in Physical Facilities, Learning Resources, Laboratory Equipment
   E. Independent Audits and How its Findings are Used to Improve Financial Planning
   F. Assessment of the Institution Linkages to Government and Industries
   G. Strengths and Weaknesses
   H. Recommendations

Chapter V – Leadership and Governance
   A. Introduction
   B. Changes in the Governance Structure and Processes
   C. Assessment of the Present Governance and Decision Making Structure and Process to Assure Participation of the Institution Constituency
D. Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Present Governance Structure and Process in Assuring Institutional Autonomy and Integrity and the Development of Leadership
E. Strengths and Weaknesses
F. Recommendations

Chapter VI – Administration Introduction
A. Changes in the Organizational Structure
B. Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Administration in Facilitating the Teaching Learning Process
C. Evaluation of the Administrative Staff by Students
D. Strengths and Weaknesses
E. Recommendations

Chapter VII – Integrity
A. Introduction
B. How Integrity is Reflected in:
   1. Establishing Goals
   2. Selecting and Evaluating Faculty and Non-Teaching Personnel
   3. Admission of Students
   4. Designing and Changing Curriculum and Programs
   5. Providing Services
   6. Advertising and Recruitment of Students
   7. Distance Learning
C. How The Institution Maintains Academic Freedom and Respect for Diversity
D. Communication with the Public and Other Constituency
E. Grievances Procedures
F. Assessment of Institutional Policies, Processes and Practices in Relation to the Maintenance of Integrity
G. Strengths and Weaknesses
H. Recommendations
I. Strengths and Weaknesses
J. Recommendations

Chapter VIII – Institutional Assessment
A. Introduction
B. Development of the Assessment Plan
C. Effectiveness of the Assessment Plan in relation to:
   1. Mission
   2. Planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal
   3. Use of institutional resources
   4. Leadership and governance
   5. Integrity
D. Summary of findings
E. Strengths and weaknesses
F. Recommendations
Chapter IX – Student Admissions
   A. Introduction
   B. Relationship between admission policies and the institutional mission
   C. Diagnostic and placement practices
   D. Student right to know and other information
   E. Assessment of student success (match between mission and attributes of admitted students)
   F. Strengths and weaknesses
   G. Recommendations

Chapter X – Student Support Services
   A. Introduction
   B. Changes in student support services
   C. Assessment outcomes of:
      1. Administrative staff
      2. Advisement procedures
      3. Socio cultural activities
      4. Financial aid services
      5. Grievances procedures
      6. Student information processes
      7. Instructional technology and library services
   D. Revision of Students Handbook
   E. The Catalogue – changes and revisions
   F. Strengths and weaknesses
   G. Recommendations

Chapter XI – Faculty
   A. Changes in faculty profile
   B. Faculty participation in curricular changes
   C. Faculty development
   D. Changes and faculty policies
   E. Faculty evaluations by students
   F. Academic freedom
   G. Faculty participation in Student Learning Outcomes
   H. Strengths and weaknesses
   I. Recommendations

Chapter XII – Educational Offerings (Undergraduate)
   A. Introduction
   B. The mission and academic offerings
   C. Changes in curricula and programs
   D. Assessment of program goals and student learning
   E. Extra and co-curricular experiences
   F. Assessment outcomes of learning resources and library staff, library consortiums
   G. Assessment outcomes of transfer of credit policies
   H. Assessment outcomes of course syllabi in relation to learning outcomes
I. Strengths and weaknesses
J. Recommendations

Chapter XIII – General Education
A. Introduction
B. Analysis of the general education philosophy
C. Evaluation the number quantity and quality courses of General Education
D. Assessment outcomes of student proficiency in oral and written communication in both English and Spanish
E. Communication of General Education benefits to students and parents and other constituency
F. Assessment outcomes of the General Education Component
G. Strengths and weaknesses
H. Recommendations

Chapter XIV – Basic Skills and Retention Program
A. Introduction
B. Changes in the Program
C. Assessment outcomes of the Program
   1. Developmental courses
   2. Tutoring
   3. Counseling
   4. Student tracking, persistence and retention
D. Strengths and weaknesses
E. Recommendation

Chapter XV – Miami Branch Campus
A. Introduction
B. Administration
C. Programs
D. Student profile
E. Faculty Profile
F. Physical learning and technological resources
G. Student support services
H. Outcomes Assessment Plan
I. Faculty participation
J. Plans for the future
K. Strengths and weaknesses
L. Recommendations

Chapter XVI – Orlando Branch Campus
A. Introduction
B. Administration
C. Programs
D. Student profile
E. Faculty Profile
F. Physical learning and technological resources
G. Student support services
H. Outcomes Assessment Plan
I. Faculty participation
J. Plans for the future
K. Strengths and weaknesses
L. Recommendations

Chapter XVII – Distance Learning
A. Introduction
B. Educational offerings
C. Faculty
D. Infrastructure
E. Learning resources
F. Student services
G. Resources
H. Assessment outcomes of the Distance Learning Program
I. Strengths and weaknesses
J. Recommendations

Chapter XVIII – Assessment of Student Learning
A. Introduction
B. The student learning assessment – Plan and methodology
C. Student learning assessment (information – documentation)
D. Student learning assessment and improvement of:
   1. Teaching process
   2. Curriculum improvement
   3. Revision of academic support services
   4. Faculty development
   5. Planning, budgeting and budget allocation
E. Strengths and weaknesses
F. Recommendations
PROFILE OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

Polytechnic University of Puerto Rico has always been satisfied with Middle States Commission on Higher Education selection of previous evaluation teams. The institution expects that, as in previous evaluations, the members of the Evaluation Team will:

1. have experience and training as a member of MSCHE evaluation team,
2. have experience as a member of ABET Evaluation Team,
3. have acceptable teaching experience,
4. be knowledgeable of the academic offerings at PUPR,
5. be cognizant of the socio cultural differences of PUPR’s student population, especially the underprivileged and the adult segments,
6. understand and have a positive attitude toward diversity especially underprivileged Hispanics,
7. adhere to the Commission Standards as stated in the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education,
8. be able to help PUPR in its development and enhancing its present academic offerings and support services, and
9. be fluent in the Spanish language (at least one member).

In addition the Visiting Team should include at least one member with experience in graduate studies, and another with experience in student learning assessment.