PITTSBURGH
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

Self-Study Design Proposal

Submitted to the

Middle States Commission on Higher Education

November 2021

Table of Contents

I. Institutional Overview

Pittsburgh Theological Seminary (PTS) is a graduate institution affiliated with the Presbyterian Church (USA) that serves an increasingly ecumenical student body. The Seminary seeks to be culturally relevant as it attends to the formation of individuals for theologically reflective ministry and scholarship in service to the church of Jesus Christ, the public square, and the world at large. With its motto of "Preparing for ministry in the way of Jesus," the Seminary is called to serve a wider church, global and diverse, one that is exploring new forms of community and new horizons of mission. As with most mainline theological schools in North America, enrollment has declined gradually since the mid-2000s. In the last four years, however, enrollment at PTS has stabilized between 199 and 213. With a committed leadership team, an engaged board, a passionate and student-centered faculty and staff, a student body eager for intellectual and spiritual growth, a well-maintained physical plant, and an endowment of more than $200 million, PTS is well-resourced and poised for future growth.

History

Pittsburgh Theological Seminary traces its roots to 1794 and has operated in its current form and location since 1959, following the consolidation of two previously separate institutions—Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary of the United Presbyterian Church of North America and Western Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America—incident to the union of the two denominations in 1958.

Mission

Participating in God's ongoing mission in the world, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary is a community of Christ joining in the Spirit's work of forming and equipping people for ministries familiar and yet to unfold and communities present and yet to be gathered.

Academics

PTS is well known for its academic rigor and high standards for programs and courses. It currently enrolls 220 students in its four different degree programs: Master of Divinity (MDiv), Master of Arts in Pastoral Studies (MAPS), Master of Theological Studies (MTS), and Doctor of Ministry (DMin). Cooperative joint-degree programs with the University of Pittsburgh (masters/MSW) and Duquesne University (masters/JD) enhance the Seminary's educational opportunities. The MDiv and MAPS degrees can include an Anglican/Episcopal Track; all master's programs can include a certificate in Urban Ministry. The MDiv can include an emphasis in forming new faith communities. In addition, independent certificate programs are offered in Adaptive and Innovative Ministry, Missional Leadership, Theological Studies, and Urban Ministry. The academic programs are enriched through the Seminary's 30-year-old Metro-Urban Institute (MUI) as well as its World Mission Initiative (WMI) and Center for Adaptive and Innovative Ministry (AIM). Additionally, in January 2021, Presbyterian, Anglican/Episcopal, and Ecumenical Houses of Study were formed with programming in line with the aims and objectives of a faculty ecclesial formation task force. To support student success, the Center for Writing and Learning Support offers direct writing and learning support for all students. The Seminary's Continuing Education offerings attract between 2,000 and 2,500 clergy and lay registrations

annually, representing about 700 individuals. Nearly all of the programs are hosted in collaboration with either a community partner or another PTS program office. In the current year, most of the registrants represent new touch points for the Seminary, offering great potential for building new relationships. Through its degree programs and initiatives, the Seminary's students participate in learning contexts on five different continents. Graduates and constituents serve in a wide range of ministry settings and contexts. The Kelso Museum of Near Eastern Archeology and the Miller Summer Youth Institute are additional program enhancements.

Student Life

PTS students come from nearly 30 states and several countries. While the Seminary is affiliated with the Presbyterian Church (USA), the student body is denominationally diverse, consisting of Presbyterians, United Methodists, Baptists, Anglicans/Episcopalians, Orthodox, Lutherans, and representatives of a number of other traditions plus nondenominational students. The majority of seminarians are either recent college graduates or are called to the Seminary later in life as a second career. All master's-level students are members of the Student Association, which conducts student social and extracurricular activities. Several student organizations enrich student life, including Syngeneia (a fellowship for students of color), Rainbow Covenant (a fellowship of LGBTQI students and allies), Women's Caucus, and denominational fellowships. Worship is an integral part of life for PTS students. Mid-day worship services are offered twice weekly in addition to several prayer and Bible study groups that meet regularly. In a typical year, approximately 70 percent of students commute to campus. For those who choose the residential option, the Seminary offers 69 units of below-market, on-campus housing for both individual students and families. An additional three furnished units are available to Seminary guests. Sixteen hoteling rooms are available for board meetings and other events, bringing the on-campus total to 85 units. The adjacent Stanton Highland Apartments offer 18 units for families. A broad range of supplementary, market-rate housing is available in the surrounding residential neighborhood.

Faculty

The Seminary's academic offerings are taught by 14 full-time faculty. Academically accomplished, student-centered, and strongly committed to the Seminary's mission, vision, and values, the faculty is well-positioned to engage in and shape theological education in the 21st century. All full-time teaching faculty hold earned doctoral degrees. Faculty members are also steadfast in their service to the church, and 10 are ordained [Presbyterian Church (USA), United Church of Christ, The United Methodist Church, Baptist, and Reformed Church in America]. The Seminary has a strong commitment to support faculty, as evidenced by salary data, professional growth provisions, and a generous sabbatical policy. Faculty report high satisfaction with the level of the Seminary's support for professional development and activity. With a faculty whose breadth of denominational ties and theological perspectives parallel their diverse academic interests, and a student body representing diverse denominational affiliations, ethnicities, and geographic ties, members of the Seminary community value dialogue in community and seek to live lives consistent with the Christian faith.

Board of Directors

The 35-member Board of Directors reflects expertise in ministry, business, non-profit management, finance, human relations, and theological education. The local bishops of the Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh, the Western Pennsylvania Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, and The Western Pennsylvania Annual Conference of The United Methodist Church serve on the Board, as does the General Minister to the PC(USA) Pittsburgh Presbytery. Two of the Board members were long-time staff members of the Association of Theological Schools, including its former executive director. In FY 2020, Board giving was at 100 percent.

Campus

The Seminary's 10-acre urban campus is a collection of handsome buildings surrounded by mature trees. At the center of the campus is the Clifford E. Barbour Library, one of the largest freestanding seminary libraries in the United States and the most extensive theological library between Philadelphia and Chicago. The state-of-the-art library re-opened in 2018 after a $12 million renovation. George A. Long Hall is the administrative and teaching hub of the campus. It contains offices, classrooms, community spaces, and the Kelso Museum of Near Eastern Archeology. The John Knox Room, used for special events and educational seminars, provides technology for multimedia presentations. Wireless Internet access is available throughout the campus. The Hicks Family Memorial Chapel, with its tall steeple, is visible throughout the campus and serves as a gathering place for the PTS and broader community to worship God during two weekly services. These open services—which include faculty, staff, students, and denominational partners—provide opportunities to participate in various styles of worship. Chapel services have been conducted virtually during the pandemic. Student housing is available on campus in Calian Residence Hall, in the Fulton Apartments, or across the street at the Stanton Highland Apartments—which were recently sold to ACTION-Housing, an affordable housing nonprofit—where the Seminary maintains a master lease for 18 units. Calian Residence Hall offers single living quarters with private baths in addition to a physical fitness center, lounge spaces, and a shared kitchen. All apartments, which range from efficiencies to family-oriented, three- and four-bedroom units, are partially subsidized for PTS students. On campus units not needed by the Seminary community are licensed for use by actively registered graduate students from local universities as a revenue source.

Partnerships

The Seminary has enormous potential not only as an ecumenical theological school but also as a center for theological inquiry for the entire region. With its urban location and large, open campus, it also offers the opportunity to grow in importance as a community resource. In pursuit of enhancing enrollment, community learning and service opportunities, and the development of philanthropy, the Seminary seeks to broaden and deepen connections with a variety of regional, national, and international partners.

Recent Changes
Restructuring:

In addition to grave threats to life and health, the pandemic, particularly in its first several months, caused the Seminary severe economic disruption. During the spring and summer semesters of 2020, PTS faced unanticipated operational costs related to moving instruction online, having fewer tenants in campus housing, and canceling conferences, events, and guest housing. The future of revenue was uncertain. Even more centrally, the stock market was volatile, and the unpredictable gains and losses affected endowment value. By June 2020, PTS faced increased costs from this crisis, with fewer funds available to meet our operational needs.

Given this reality, PTS undertook a restructuring process shaped by three values:

- Maintain our commitment to delivering an outstanding education and experience for our degree and certificate students;
- Advance strategic priorities that will secure the Seminary's long-term vitality and promote the impact of our graduates on a changing world; and
- Expand our embrace of new paradigms in teaching and learning.

This process included:

- Reviewing institutional spending plans and trimming budgets accordingly.
- Freezing salaries through fiscal year 2020-2021.
- Instituting pay cuts ranging from 5-10 percent for some positions, with the president taking a 10 percent pay cut, Vice Presidents taking a 7 percent pay cut, and faculty and staff making more than $100,000 taking up to a 5 percent pay cut for the 2020-2021 fiscal year.
- Restructuring staff, which resulted in eliminating 8 full-time positions and 5 part-time positions (some of these positions because of retirements), and reconfiguring 10 positions (as a result of the eliminations).
- Eliminating food service through summer 2021, due to a limited number of faculty, staff, and students on campus.
- Cutting non-essential spending, including all non-essential Seminary related travel.
- Re-aligning program budgets to work within related endowments and restricted funds and significantly cutting the library acquisition budget.

Executive Transition and Cabinet Expansion:

The Seminary's new President, Asa Lee started June 7, 2021, and all three Vice President-level cabinet members were new appointments in the last six years: Vice President for Finance and Administration Tom Hinds, Vice President for Seminary Advancement Charles Fischer, and Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty Leanna Fuller. In addition, the cabinet was expanded in 2020 to include not only the Vice Presidents and the President, but also Senior Director of Communications Melissa Logan, Associate Dean for Student Services and Formation Ayana Teter, and Senior Director of Enrollment Services Tracy Riggle Young.

Faculty Development and Leadership:

Over the past four years, the faculty has become a collegial team of leaders working together to design and implement the new master's-level curricula, discussed below, and to address adaptive challenges as they arise. The faculty has also been actively engaged in working to transform itself through new hires.

Curriculum Revision:

The faculty worked to revise completely the Master of Divinity curriculum, which was launched during the 2018-2019 academic year. Designed to meet a new set of student learning outcomes, the updated curriculum is focused on vocation and provides increased emphasis on contextual learning. Enhanced by the Adaptive and Innovative Ministry, Urban Ministry, and new Missional Leadership certificate programs, the curriculum integrates traditional theological content with missional focus and facilitates learning in context.

Anti-Racism Initiatives:

To address the realities of racism and unacknowledged white privilege, the Seminary is engaged in an ongoing series of campus-wide readings and trainings. Since 2018, external consultants have worked with Board members, faculty, staff, and students through workshops designed to build awareness of systemic racism and implicit bias as well as the intersectionality of oppression. Also reflecting this commitment, the Seminary is targeting the hiring of faculty candidates who can meet the Seminary's identified strategic objectives. In addition, the Board of Directors recently approved a statement on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Houses of Study:

Presbyterian, Anglican/Episcopal, and Ecumenical Houses of Study were launched in January 2021 based upon concentrations offered at PTS. The PTS Houses of Study provide specific learning environments where students can deepen their capacity to reflect theologically upon their denominational traditions and further develop their sense of vocation. Rooted in the rich and vital relationships that exist between PTS and local denominational partners, the Houses of Study will create a space where this reflection happens in ongoing conversation with a student's faith community and faith tradition by providing denominational resources, Christian community, and ecclesial formation tailored to the on-going needs of each local ecclesial judicatory. As Seminary leadership continues to think about our commitment to "context as learning partner," relationships with regional ecclesial bodies will deepen and additional partnership-based Houses of Study will be organized. Student participation is voluntary.

Center for Writing and Learning Support:

Launched in 2017, the Center for Writing and Learning Support is committed to assisting theological writers at every stage, from students to faculty and staff. The Center also works with the Office of Continuing Education and the Barbour Library to develop programs for ministers and other community leaders that provide both vocational support and personal enrichment.

Library Renovation:

Completed in 2018, the $12 million modernization project created a state-of-the-art facility with innovative spaces and the latest in technological advances. Notable elements of the renovation include a two-story interior atrium with skylight, a designated 24-hour area with round-the-clock key card entry, a variety of meeting and classroom spaces, a study lounge for students with children, a café with healthy food choices, an ADA-compliant elevator, and two enclosed fireplaces.

Chapel Renovation:

Completed in 2018, renovations of the Hicks Chapel have brought it into full ADA compliance, offered acoustic improvements, and created a hospitable setting for worship by all members of the Seminary community.

Real Estate Sale:

In 2020, the Seminary sold three apartment buildings adjacent to campus to ACTION-Housing, an affordable housing non-profit, for $2.5 million. The sales agreement included a commitment to convert the buildings to affordable housing for the general public for 40 years and to make 18 units available to Seminary students should demand exceed the units still owned on campus.

COVID-19:

After pivoting nimbly in spring 2020 to move all teaching and learning online, the Seminary continues to take preventative measures to protect the well-being of its community amid the coronavirus outbreak. The cabinet meets weekly to monitor the changing situation, and weekly updates from the President keep the community informed. Most employees are working in the office three days a week, and instruction is hybrid to accommodate the broad needs of both faculty and student learners.

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

Conversation about institutional priorities began over the summer 2021 between the new President and new Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty and has intensified as members of the Seminary community returned to campus life in August and began meeting to prepare for the upcoming self-study process. Outward facing program directors, the cabinet, and the faculty each had an open conversation about institutional priorities for the self-study in light of their work already in progress. In addition to these conversations, a larger group including the cabinet and program directors was convened to surface priorities in a larger town-hall style setting. At each gathering, notes were taken and the Co-Chairs of the Self-Study Committee were either present for or informed of the conversation. The Self-Study Steering committee also took up the question of institutional priorities as it convened and began its work. Throughout the various conversations, three consistent threads emerged as essential to the achievement of our mission of forming and equipping people for ministries familiar and yet to unfold and communities present and yet to be gathered in this season.

Priority 1

Strengthen an institutional culture that prioritizes formative practices leading to student success.

PTS will identify and assess the range of practices that shape our common life and culture, for example, worship, communal meals, reflective pedagogical practices, mentoring within and outside the institution, intellectual inquiry, and community engagement. We will assess how practices form and equip students for success academically, professionally, spiritually, and interpersonally. Measures will include placement rates, ordination exam success, and evidence of self-awareness and leadership capacity. Practices will be evaluated for depth and consistency of participation, and their impact will be tracked across all programs of the institution. The investment of resources dedicated to formative practices and the engagement of students across the institution will be explored, assessed, and adjusted to empower increased student success.

Priority 2

Strengthen institutional effectiveness through transparent communication, systems and procedures for accountability, and the use of data to inform decision making.

PTS students are formed in community, so they are formed by the way the PTS community communicates, holds itself accountable, and makes decisions. This self-study will clarify the flow of power and responsibility and orient it, along with the flow of information, toward a dynamic, trustworthy, and empowering institutional culture. Structures for individual and communal accountability will be expanded, standardized, and clarified to foster both trust and collaboration across departments and at various institutional levels. These structures will include professional review processes, procedures for aligning institutional, departmental and individual employee goals, a strategic budgeting process, and goals tailored for each department based on the budgeting cycle. We will evaluate our processes of collecting and disseminating appropriate data, whether qualitative, quantitative, direct, and/or indirect, toward the goals of informed decision making and institutional effectiveness. Continued clarity around data and its use will enable PTS to act in well-aligned ways to be more agile, effective, and empowered as a student-serving institution. Given this, we will continue to assess the efficiency of our internal and external communication in order to build trust and enable collaboration across the institution to promote student success.

Priority 3

Cultivate, evaluate, and extend relationships with external partners and stakeholders.

PTS will connect in generative ways to relevant external partners and foster connections between internal stakeholders and those partners. Partnerships will be leveraged not only to prepare students for success beyond their time at PTS, but to offer a variety of formative perspectives for their learning in real time as a part of their studies. Forming and maintaining broad partnerships will facilitate intellectual freedom and content area specialization while supporting the particularity of student experience. As PTS makes partnership decisions across the institution, various offices will be empowered to initiate, maintain, and assess partnerships in a way that reflects emerging institutional identity, student needs, and community values as articulated through appropriate channels of

governance. Effective student service will be empowered across the institution through mapping where partnership decisions are currently made and by what metrics, evaluating which partnerships are thriving and generative, and discerning which are no longer helpful or appropriate. Dynamic and trusting partnerships with organizations such as judicatories, national denominational offices, local non-profits, community organizations, feeder churches, and local colleges and universities enable support for prospective students through program graduates. A working knowledge of the network of institutional partners will enable PTS to connect students, faculty, and staff with appropriate partners and align institutional movement strategically, leveraging connections for the good of PTS students in service to our mission.

These institutional priorities align with the PTS Mission statement in the following ways:

Elements of Mission Statement	Priority 1 *Strengthen an institutional culture that prioritizes formative practices leading to student success.*	Priority 2 *Strengthen institutional effectiveness through transparent communication, systems and procedures for accountability and the use of data to inform decision making.*	Priority 3 *Cultivate, evaluate, and extend relationships with external partners and stakeholders.*
Participating in God's ongoing mission in the world			X
A community of Christ	X	X	
Forming and equipping for ministries and communities present and future	X	X	X

In addition, the institutional priorities align with the Standards for Accreditation as follows:

Standards of Accreditation	Priority 1 *Strengthen an institutional culture that prioritizes formative practices leading to student success.*	Priority 2 *Strengthen institutional effectiveness through transparent communication, systems and procedures for accountability and the use of data to inform decision making.*	Priority 3 *Cultivate, evaluate, and extend relationships with external partners and stakeholders.*
I. Mission and Goals	x		x
II. Ethics and Integrity		x	x
III. Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience	x	x	x
IV. Support of the Student Experience	x	x	x
V. Educational Effectiveness Assessment	x	x	
VI. Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement	x	x	x
VII. Governance, Leadership, and Administration		x	

III. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

Pittsburgh Theological Seminary intends to achieve the following outcomes as a result of engaging in the self-study process:

1. Demonstrate how the institution currently meets the Commission's Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation.

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

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

4. Assess current needs and identify new opportunities for innovation that will inform our next strategic plan.

5. Strengthen the planning and assessment processes across the institution toward the goal of student learning and success.

IV. Self-Study Approach

Identify one of the following self-study approaches to be used to organize the Self-Study Report:

X Standards-Based Approach

☐Priorities-Based Approach

In consultation with our MSCHE liaison, the Seminary's President and other institutional leaders decided to proceed with a Standards-Based Self-Study. The approach will enable comprehensive attention to the criteria for each Standard, demonstrating compliance and highlighting areas for improvement and innovation.

V. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

Beginning in July 2021, the incoming President and the Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs/Dean of the Faculty met regularly to plan for the upcoming self-study process. By early September they identified Co-Chairs to begin work on organizing the Self-Study, pairing a faculty member and an administrator, and selected the members of the Steering Committee from among the faculty, administration/staff, Board members, and students.

Once the Steering Committee was established and had begun meeting, the Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs/Dean of the Faculty and the faculty Co-Chair of the Steering Committee met to identify potential Working Group members from among the faculty, staff, and students, paying attention to role in the institution, areas of experience and expertise, and availability for additional responsibility. Rosters were then shared with Working Group chairs for feedback and revision. Invitations were then extended to Working Group candidates in late September, and rosters for each were confirmed shortly thereafter.

The members of the Steering Committee are:

Co-Chair	Angela Dienhart Hancock	Associate Professor of Homiletics and Worship
Co-Chair	Karen Rohrer	Director of the Center for Adaptive and Innovative Ministry
Working Group 1 Chair (Mission/Goals/Integrity)	Edwin van Driel	Directors' Bicentennial Professor of Theology
Working Group 2 Chair (Student Learning/Faculty) *Evidence Inventory manager	Barbara Blodgett	Associate Dean for Academic Programs, Assessment, and Field Education
Working Group 3 Chair (Student Support/Student Services)	Erin Davenport	Director of Strategic Initiatives and Special Projects
Working Group 4 Chair (Planning, Assessment, Resources)	Tracy Riggle Young	Senior Director of Enrollment Services
Working Group 5 Chair (Governance)	Ken Woo	Associate Professor of Church History
Board Representative	Nancy Lowmaster	Pastor, Central Presbyterian Church, Geneseo, NY (and PTS alum)
Board Representative	Allan Irizarry-Graves	Youth and College Pastor at New Hope Baptist Church, North Little Rock/ Conway, Arkansas (and PTS alum)
Student Representative	Sarita Robinson	M.Div. student
Student Representative	Andy Hill	M.Div. student
Administrative Support *Evidence Inventory manager	Holly McKelvey	Administrative Assistant for Academic Support

The Steering Committee oversees the entire Self-Study process, ensuring that Working Groups have appropriate support for evaluation and assessment of Commission Standards and the priorities selected for analysis in the Self-Study document. The Committee will reduce unnecessary duplication of effort in the investigation of lines of inquiry through the evaluation of Inquiry Plans and open communication among Working Group chairs, and the Committee will engage in regular assessment of the progress of each Working Group. The Steering Committee is also responsible for the Self-Study Report as a whole, gathering feedback from various constituencies and making sure that the mission of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, the three priorities selected for the Self-Study, and the Commission's Standards are analyzed utilizing our existing evaluation and assessment information. Finally, the Steering Committee will prepare the campus for the Evaluation Team visit, a process that starts with clear and regular communication about the nature and purpose of accreditation and the Self-Study process all along the way.

Toward these ends, the specific charges to the Steering Committee are:

1. Develop a deep understanding of the Self-Study process, the accreditation cycle, and the MSCHE Standards.
2. Serve as ambassadors for the Self-Study process.
3. Determine the key priorities for the Self-Study and participate the development of the Self-Study design.
4. Charge Working Groups and coordinate their research, avoiding duplication of efforts.
5. Meet regularly to discuss Progress Reports submitted by the Working Groups, providing written feedback to Working Group chairs.
6. Establish a timeline for Self-Study tasks and ensure that deadlines are met.
7. Highlight opportunities for improvement and innovation in relation to the findings of the Self-Study.
8. Prepare and implement a comprehensive communication plan, making use of existing resources.
9. Monitor the progress of the Self-Study Report, regularly reviewing and editing drafts submitted by the Working Groups and others.
10. Arrange for institution-wide review of and response to a draft of the Self-Study.
11. Oversee the completion of the final Self-Study Report and other relevant documents.
12. Prepare the campus constituencies for the Evaluation Team visit.
13. Make arrangements to host the Evaluation Team.

Each Working Group is responsible for identifying, collecting, and analyzing evidence to demonstrate compliance with the criteria named in particular MSCHE Standards, reporting findings and making recommendations for improvement and innovation in relation to lines of inquiry to the Steering Committee via regular Progress Reports, and ultimately drafting a section (or sections) of the Self-Study Report.

Toward those ends, the general Working Group charges are:

1. Become well-acquainted with the Self-Study process and the MSCHE Standards, particularly those assigned to the Working Group.
2. Review the PTS mission statement and the priorities selected for the Self-Study, considering connections to the MSCHE Standards.
3. By December 15, 2021, draft and submit to the Steering Committee an Inquiry Plan, including a timeline, detailing when the Working Group will commence and complete its investigation of each line of inquiry.
4. By December 15, 2021, draft and submit to the Steering Committee an Evidence Report listing potential sources of evidence in relation to each line of inquiry, noting any concerns or gaps.
5. Hold regular meetings and keep a written record of what was discussed.
6. Engage in focused research in relation to the assigned lines of inquiry, examining documents and engaging individuals and constituencies as warranted to identify, collect, and analyze evidence to demonstrate compliance with the criteria named in the relevant Standards.

7. Generate Working Group Progress Reports that clearly address assigned lines of inquiry by Standard and institutional priority, identifying the methods and data used to support findings, naming institutional strengths, and recommending areas for improvement and/or innovation.
8. Submit a Working Group Progress Report to the Steering Committee for review within two days after each Working Group meeting and address Steering Committee questions and feedback in writing.
9. Draft relevant sections of the Self-Study Report, regularly integrating new material and responding to Steering Committee and other forms of feedback.
10. Contribute to the development of the Evidence Inventory.
11. Stick to the timeline!

The material below details the composition, individual charge, lines of inquiry, and potential sources of evidence for each of the five Working Groups.

Working Group 1

Working Group 1 Mission/Goals/Integrity	MSCHE Standard 1 and 2
Chair: Edwin van Driel	Directors' Bicentennial Professor of Theology
Scott Hagley	Associate Professor of Missiology
Tucker Ferda	Associate Professor of New Testament
Bala Khyllep	Associate Director of the World Mission Initiative
Christopher Taylor	Admissions Counselor (PTS Alum)
Kathleen Green	Human Resources Manager

Working Group 1 Charge

In execution of the general charge, Group I will be responsible to investigate MSCHE Standards I and II, as well as completing the Verification of Compliance Section, and addressing all three institutional priorities as they intersect with Standards I and II, according to the chart in Section II above.

Working Group I Lines of Inquiry

- In what way does our mission statement name our purpose within higher education?
- In what way does our mission statement name our purpose in relation to our students?
- How does our mission statement name what we intend to accomplish?
- What are our stated goals at the institutional-level?
- How are these goals linked to our mission?
- How do our goals specify how we will fulfill our mission?
- How do our mission/vision statements and strategic plan address student formation?

- How do our mission/vision statements and strategic plan address institutional effectiveness and communication?
- What do our mission/vision statements and strategic plan say about external relationships?
- What was the process by which our mission was developed? Who was involved in the process?
- What was the process by which our institution's stated goals were developed? Who was involved in the process?
- In what ways do these processes reflect transparent communication?
- In what ways were these processes data driven?
- What internal contexts are being addressed by our mission?
- What external contexts are being addressed by our mission?
- Which internal constituencies are addressed by our mission?
- Which external constituencies are addressed by our mission?
- What internal contexts are being addressed by our institution's stated goals?
- What external contexts are being addressed by our institution's stated goals?
- Which internal constituencies are addressed by our institution's stated goals?
- Which external constituencies are addressed by our institution's stated goals?
- When and how did the Board approve our mission?
- How does the Board express support for our mission?
- When and how did the Board approve our institution's stated goals?
- How does the Board express support for our institution's stated goals?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the faculty in making decisions related to planning?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the faculty in making decisions related to resource allocation?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the faculty in making decisions related to program and curricular development?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the faculty in determining student learning outcomes?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the administration in making decisions related to planning?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the administration in making decisions related to resource allocation?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the administration in making decisions related to program development?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the staff in making decisions related to planning?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the staff in making decisions related to resource allocation?

- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the staff in making decisions related to program development?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the Board in making decisions related to planning?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the Board in making decisions related to resource allocation?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the Board in making decisions related to program and curricular development?
- How do the institution's mission and stated goals guide the Board in making decisions related to the definition of institutional and educational outcomes?
- To what extent does the institution's mission include support of scholarly inquiry and creative activity?
- To what extent do the institution's stated goals include support of scholarly inquiry and creative activity?
- How is the support for scholarly inquiry and creative activity expressed in the institution's mission and stated goals at levels and of the type appropriate to the institution?
- How is the institution's mission publicized?
- How are the institution's stated goals publicized?
- How widely is the institution's mission known by the institution's internal stakeholders?
- How widely are the institution's stated goals known by the institution's internal stakeholders?
- What do the answers to these questions say about institutional effectiveness and clarity of communication?
- How and when is the institution's mission evaluated?
- How and when are the institution's stated goals evaluated?
- In what ways are these evaluations data driven?
- How realistic are our institutional goals?
- What measure does the institution use to determine whether its institutional goals are realistic?
- To what extent are our institutional goals appropriate to higher education?
- To what extent are our institutional goals consistent with the institution's mission?
- To what extent are our institutional goals focused on student learning and related outcomes?
- To what extent are our institutional goals focused on institutional improvement?
- To what extent are our institutional goals supported by administrative programs and services?
- To what extent are our institutional goals supported by educational programs and services?
- To what extent are our institutional goals supported by student support programs and services?
- What do our institutional goals say about student formation?
- To what extent is a coherent understanding of student formation embedded in our institutional goals?
- How comprehensive is the attention to student formation in our institutional goals?

- How is our mission periodically assessed to ensure it is relevant and achievable?
- How are our institutional goals periodically assessed to ensure they are relevant and achievable?
- How does the institution express its commitment to academic freedom, intellectual freedom, freedom of expression, and respect for intellectual property rights?
- How does the institution foster respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration from a range of diverse backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives?
- What is the institutional grievance policy to address complaints or grievances raised by students?
    - o How does the institution document and disseminate this policy?
    - o How does the institution ensure that this policy is fair and impartial, and that grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably?
- What is the institutional grievance policy to address complaints or grievances raised by faculty?
    - o How does the institution document and disseminate this policy?
    - o How does the institution ensure that this policy is fair and impartial, and that grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably?
- What is the institutional grievance policy to address complaints or grievances raised by staff?
    - o How does the institution document and disseminate this policy?
    - o How does the institution ensure that this policy is fair and impartial, and that grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably?
- How do these policies support and encourage institutional effectiveness?
- How does the institution avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of such conflict among the members of the administration?
- How does the institution avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of such conflict among the members of the faculty?
- How does the institution avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of such conflict among the members of the staff?
- How does the institution avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of such conflict among the members of the student body?
- How does the institution avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of such conflict among the members of the Board?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of hiring for the members of its faculty?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of evaluation for the members of its faculty?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of promotion for the members of its faculty?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of discipline for the members of its faculty?

- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of separation for the members of its faculty?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of hiring for the members of its staff?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of evaluation for the members of its staff?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of promotion for the members of its staff?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of discipline for the members of its staff?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of separation for the members of its staff?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of hiring for the members of its administration?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of evaluation for the members of its administration?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of discipline for the members of its administration?
- How does the institution ensure fair and impartial practices of separation for the members of its administration?
- How does the institution ensure honesty and truthfulness in public relations announcements and advertisements?
- How does the institution ensure honesty and truthfulness in recruiting and admissions materials and practices?
- To what extent is the institution honest and truthful in internal communications?
- How do affordability and accessibility relate to the institution's mission?
- What services and programs promote affordability and accessibility?
- In what ways are these programs consistent with the institution's mission?
- What federal reporting policies, regulations, and requirements apply to the institution with regard to the full disclosure of information on institution-wide assessments, graduation, retention, certification and licensure, or licensing board pass rates?
- How is the institution in compliance with these policies, regulations, and requirements?
- What state reporting policies, regulations, and requirements apply to the institution with regard to the full disclosure of information on institution-wide assessments, graduation, retention, certification and licensure, or licensing board pass rates?
- How is the institution in compliance with these policies, regulations, and requirements?
- What Commission reporting policies, regulations, and requirements apply to the institution with regard to the full disclosure of information on institution-wide assessments, graduation, retention, certification and licensure, or licensing board pass rates?
- How is the institution in compliance with these policies, regulations, and requirements?

- What do the Commission's Requirements of Affiliation ask of the institution?
- How is the institution in compliance with these requirements?
- What federal reporting policies, regulations, and requirements apply to the institution with regard to substantive changes affecting institutional mission, goals, programs, operations, sites, and other material issues which must be disclosed in a timely and accurate fashion?
- How is the institution in compliance with these policies, regulations, and requirements?
- What state reporting policies, regulations, and requirements apply to the institution with regard to substantive changes affecting institutional mission, goals, programs, operations, sites, and other material issues which must be disclosed in a timely and accurate fashion?
- How is the institution in compliance with these policies, regulations, and requirements?
- What Commission reporting policies, regulations, and requirements apply to the institution with regard to substantive changes affecting institutional mission, goals, programs, operations, sites, and other material issues which must be disclosed in a timely and accurate fashion?
- How is the institution in compliance with these policies, regulations, and requirements?
- What other Commission policies apply to the institution?
- How is the institution in compliance with these policies?
- What institutional policies, processes, and practices ensure periodic assessment of ethics and integrity?
- How are these institutional policies, processes, and practices implemented?

Relevant assessment information, institutional processes, documents, and procedures to be gathered, summarized, and used to support Working Group assertions and conclusions include:

Information from the President's and Dean's Office; Human Resource practices and documentation; Seminary Constitution and Bylaws; Faculty Handbook; Student Handbook; Mission/Vision Statement; Strategic Plan; materials from the strategic planning process; Board Reports and minutes; Cabinet minutes; materials from the curriculum review; faculty meeting minutes; reports from the various institutions of the Seminary; minutes of/reports on Town Hall Meetings; any reports on/assessment of: the curriculum, Continuing Education, educational activities by MUI, WMI, AIM, The Kelso Museum, the work of the Registrar, Center for Writing and Learning Support, Worship Program, Financial Aid, Admissions Office, Barbour Library, Business Office, Field Education Office, IT, Advancement, Spiritual Care Team, or Office of the Associate Dean for Students and Formation; faculty assessment reports; Statement on Civic Engagement; Graduating Student Questionnaire; online communication of the Admissions Office; advertisements; online communication; social media; communication by the Advancement Office; communication by WMI, MUI, AIM; announcements by the PTS Board and administration.

Working Group 2

Working Group 2 Student Learning/Faculty	MSCHE Standard 3
Chair: Barbara Blodgett	Associate Dean for Academic Programs, Assessment, and Field Education
Jerome Creach	Robert C. Holland Professor of Old Testament
Erin Morey	MDiv Student
Jon Mathieu	Writer (PTS Alum)
Robin Menard	Communications and Marketing Specialist
Tisha Woo	User Services Librarian

Working Group 2 Charge

In execution of the general charge, Working Group 2 will be responsible to investigate MSCHE Standard III and address all three institutional priorities as they intersect with Standard III, according to the chart in Section II above.

Working Group 2 Lines of Inquiry

- In what ways are the lengths of our certificate programs appropriate to their objectives?
- In what way is the length of our MTS degree appropriate to its objectives?
- In what ways are the lengths of our MAPS, MDiv, and DMin degrees appropriate to their objectives?
- How do our certificates foster rigorous and coherent student learning experiences, and how do they promote synthesis of learning?
- How does our MTS degree foster rigorous and coherent student learning experiences?
  - o How does it promote synthesis of learning?
- How do our MDiv, MAPS, and DMin degrees foster rigorous and coherent student learning experiences?
  - o How do they promote synthesis of learning?
- Since our MDiv is our one degree lacking a capstone experience, in what other ways do we provide MDiv students with opportunities to synthesize their learning throughout the program?
- To what extent do PTS students learn from people who are rigorous and effective in teaching in all formats?
- To what extent do PTS students learn from people who are rigorous and effective in leading formative practices, for example, intellectual inquiry, close reading of texts, contextual analysis, and theological reflection?
- To what extent do PTS students learn from people who are rigorous and effective in teaching writing?
- To what extent do PTS students learn from people who are rigorous and effective in assessment of student learning and formation?

- To what extent do PTS students learn from people who are rigorous and effective in scholarly inquiry?
- To what extent do PTS students learn from people who are rigorous and effective in service to the institution and to the church?
- To what extent are those who design and deliver student learning experiences qualified for the positions they hold?
- Do we have a sufficient number of people to design and deliver student learning experiences?
- Given the recent growth in our DMin program, do we have a sufficient number of faculty to design and deliver that program?
- What is the ratio of the number of full-time salaried people vs. adjunct and contingent people, and is this ratio appropriate to our learning objectives?
- Who are PTS students learning with? i.e. by credit hour, how much learning are they doing with permanent full-time faculty, permanent part-time faculty, permanent PTS program directors not on the faculty, temporary PTS program directors not on the faculty, other PTS instructors, non-PTS contingent instructors? Are these numbers appropriate to our learning objectives?
- In what ways does PTS provide all those who design and deliver student learning experiences with sufficient opportunities, resources, and support for professional growth and innovation?
    - o Do they utilize them?
- In what ways are those who design and deliver student learning experiences reviewed regularly and equitably?
    - o In what ways are those reviews based on written, disseminated, clear, and fair criteria, expectations, policies, and procedures?
- In what ways are our academic programs of study clearly and accurately described in official publications?
- To what extent do our students understand and follow degree and program requirements?
- To what extent do our students understand expected time to completion?
- How are students supported in making sound decisions regarding their pace to completion?
- To what extent do we have sufficient learning opportunities to support the institution's programs of study?
- To what extent do we have sufficient learning opportunities to support students' academic progress, regularly offering required and elective courses?
    - o Field education placements?
    - o The Intercultural Development Inventory, intercultural learning trips, etc.?
- In what ways does PTS offer students in all its degree and certificate programs opportunities for research, scholarship, or independent thinking?
- To what extent do we have sufficient and appropriately qualified professionals to serve as advisors and readers for the final projects of the MAPS, MTS, and DMin degrees?
- To what extent do the educational offerings of the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education receive adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval?

- To what extent do the partners of our World Mission Institute, Metro-Urban Institute, and Center for Adaptive and Innovative Ministries receive adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval?
- To what extent do field education supervisors and sites receive adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval?
- In what ways are the educational offerings of Wesley Theological Seminary, University of Edinburgh, and the Newbigin House of Studies reviewed?
- To what extent do we have sufficient and appropriate external partnerships for all our degree and certificate programs, and to what extent are we prepared to periodically review existing providers and approve new ones?
- In what ways does PTS periodically assess the effectiveness of its student learning programs?

Relevant assessment information, institutional processes, documents, and procedures to be gathered, summarized, and used to support Working Group 2 assertions and conclusions include:

List of all those who teach courses, lead trips, and supervise in field education; minutes from faculty meetings; data on PTS faculty lines over time; purpose, outcomes, and catalog copy about the degrees; curricular outlines; assessment team reports; purpose, outcomes, and catalog copy about the certificates; assessment team reports; Association of Theological Schools (ATS) data on credit hours per degree across ATS schools; comparison data from other PC(USA) schools' websites, since ATS doesn't collect data on certificates; ATS data on credit hours per degree across ATS schools; ATS Educational Models and Practices Reports on the DMin and on the Accelerated MDiv; PC(USA) schools' data for MDiv from ATS; data from 10 Peer Schools as collected by the PTS Enrollment Office; curriculum outline; assessment team reports; faculty and adjunct faculty curriculum vitaes; course evaluations; periodic and tenure/promotion reviews; PTS Board reports; recent job announcement for SYI director; class enrollment multiplied by credit hour sorted by categories of instructors for the past ten years; focus groups with non-faculty; Field education supervisor training sessions; any training offered by WMI, MUI, and AIM; data on who is included in instructional support and development policies and educational technology support policies; budget data for professional support; Field Education Manual and final evaluations; similar policies and procedures for WMI, MUI, and AIM; Faculty Handbook; periodic and tenure/promotion reviews; Student Handbook, PTS website; other communications; focus group with students; focus group with Student Services Team; enrollment numbers; retention data; assignment descriptions, especially in elective courses; descriptions of the MAPS, MTS, and DMin final projects; list of personnel who serve as project readers and the projects they have advised/read for; curriculum vitaes compared to the projects they have advised/read; focus groups; institutional priority #3 itself.

Working Group 3

Working Group 3 Student Support/Services	MSCHE Standard 4
Chair: Erin Davenport	Director of Strategic Initiatives and Special Projects (PTS Alum)
John Burgess	James Henry Snowden Professor of Systematic Theology
Mark Russell	Research and Instruction Librarian
Carolyn Cranston	Director of Alumnae/i and Church Relations (PTS Alum)
Ashley Johnson	Admissions Counselor
Helen Blier	Director of Continuing Education
Ryan Jensema	Associate Director of Financial Aid
Simeon Rodgers	MDiv Student

Working Group 3 Charge

In execution of the general charge, Working Group 3 will be responsible to investigate MSCHE Standard IV and addressing all three institutional priorities as they intersect with Standard IV, according to the chart in Section II above.

Working Group 3 Lines of Inquiry

- To what extent do we recruit and admit students to our Masters programs whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals are congruent with our mission and educational offerings?
- To what extent do we recruit and admit students to our Doctor of Ministry program whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals are congruent with our mission and educational offerings?
- To what extent do we recruit and admit students to our Certificate programs whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals are congruent with our mission and educational offerings?
- To what extent are we committed to student retention, persistence, completion, and success through a coherent and effective support system sustained by qualified professionals?
- In what ways does the Center for Writing and Learning Support enhance the quality of the learning environment?
- In what ways does the Library enhance the quality of the learning environment?
- In what ways does Field Education enhance the quality of the learning environment?
- In what ways does Student Services enhance the quality of the learning environment?
- In what ways does the Center for Writing and Learning Support contribute to the educational experience?
- In what ways does the Library contribute to the educational experience?
- In what ways does Field Education contribute to the educational experience?
- In what ways does Student Services contribute to the educational experience?

- In what ways does the Center for Writing and Learning Support foster student success?
- In what ways does the Library foster student success?
- In what ways does Field Education foster student success?
- In what ways does Student Services foster student success?
- How do we use placement rates to assess student success?
- How do we use ordination exam success to assess student success?
- How do we assess evidence of self-awareness to encourage student success?
- How do we track "depth and consistency of formational practices" across all programs of the institution?
- How do we know that we have sufficient staff and resources dedicated to the effective implementation of formational practices across the institution?
    - To what extent do we have sufficient learning opportunities and resources to support multi-denominational engagement? i.e. To what extent are the newly launched Houses of Study, partnership with the Diocese of Pittsburgh, and partnership with Wesley Theological Seminary working in ways that support our objectives?
- What are our clearly stated, ethical policies and processes to admit students?
- What are our clearly stated, ethical policies and processes to retain students?
- What are our clearly stated, ethical policies and processes to facilitate success of students?
- How are those policies compatible with institutional mission?
- How do we provide transparent, accurate, and comprehensive information regarding the cost of attendance?
- How do we provide transparent, accurate, and comprehensive information regarding financial aid?
- How do we provide transparent, accurate, and comprehensive information regarding scholarships and grants?
- How do we provide transparent, accurate, and comprehensive information regarding loans and loan repayment?
- How do we provide transparent, accurate, and comprehensive information regarding refunds?
- How do we identify, place, and support students who are less well-prepared for study at the level for which they have been admitted?
- How do we use data in our support of students who are not adequately prepared for study at the level for which they have been admitted so that they attain appropriate educational goals?
- How do we offer orientation to enhance retention and guide students throughout their educational experience?
- How do we offer advisement programs to enhance retention and guide students throughout their educational experience?
- What counseling programs do we offer to enhance retention and guide students throughout their educational experience?
- How do these programs prioritize formation leading to student success?

- What processes do we have that are designed to enhance successful achievement of student goals for certificate and degree completion?
- What processes does PTS have that are designed to enhance student transfer to other institutions?
- What processes does PTS have that are designed to enhance student post-completion placement?
- Are these processes informed by data?
- What policies and procedures does PTS have regarding evaluation and acceptance of transfer credits?
- What are our policies and procedures regarding evaluation and acceptance of credits awarded through experiential learning?
- What are our policies and procedures regarding evaluation and acceptance of credits awarded through prior non-academic learning?
- What are our policies and procedures regarding evaluation and acceptance of credits awarded through competency-based assessment?
- What are our policies and procedures regarding evaluation and acceptance of credits awarded through other alternative learning approaches?
- How are these policies and procedures informed by data?
- How are they transparent and clearly communicated?
- What are our policies and procedures for the safe and secure maintenance and appropriate release of student information and records?
- Are our athletic, student life, and other extracurricular activities regulated by the same academic, fiscal, and administrative principles and procedures that govern all other programs?
- How do we cultivate external partnerships to create student experiences subject to same principles/procedures?
- How do we ensure adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval of student services designed, delivered, or assessed by third-party providers?
- How do we periodically assess the effectiveness of programs supporting the student experience?
- How does such assessment include the evaluation of external partnerships?
- How is the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of programs supporting the student experience data driven?

Relevant assessment information, institutional processes, documents, and procedures to be gathered, summarized, and used to support Working Group 3 assertions and conclusions include:
Student Handbook; Financial Aid policy; admissions policy; information on orientation programs from Associate Dean for Students and Formation; advisement information from Admissions and Registrar; information on transfer policies; information on placement; Registrar; Graduating Student Questionnaire; Reception policies; Business Office policies.

Working Group 4

Working Group 4 Planning/Assessment/Resources	MSCHE Standards 5 and 6
Chair: Tracy Riggle Young	Senior Director of Enrollment Services
Michelle Spomer	Donald G. Miller Librarian and Director of the Clifford E. Barbour Library
Roger Owens	Professor of Christian Spirituality and Ministry
Diane Poznick	Accountant/Student Accounts and Payroll
Dominick Oliver	Director of Development
Lisa Bunting	World Mission Initiative/Metro-Urban Institute Administrative and Program Assistant
Brian Fidell	Network Administrator
Anne Malone	Registrar and Student Support Specialist

Working Group 4 Charge

In execution of the general charge, Working Group 4 will be responsible to investigate MSCHE Standards V and VI, and addressing all three institutional priorities as they intersect with Standards V and VI, according to the chart in Section II above.

Working Group 4 Lines of Inquiry

- To what extent does our assessment of student learning/achievement demonstrate that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their program of study?
- To what extent does our assessment of student learning/achievement demonstrate that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their degree level?
- To what extent does our assessment of student learning/achievement demonstrate that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with the institution's mission?
- To what extent does our assessment of student learning/achievement demonstrate that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with appropriate expectations for institutions of higher education?
- What are our clearly stated educational goals at the institutional level?
- To what extent are those institution-wide goals interrelated with:
  - o one another,
  - o with relevant educational experiences,
  - o and with our mission?
- What are our clearly stated educational goals for each of our degree/program levels?
- To what extent are those degree/program goals interrelated with:

- o one another,
- o with relevant educational experiences,
- o and with our mission?
- How are organized and systematic assessments conducted by faculty to evaluate the extent of student achievement of institutional goals?
- How are organized and systematic assessments conducted by appropriate professionals evaluating the extent of student achievement of degree/program goals?
- How do we define meaningful curricular goals?
- What are our defensible standards for evaluating curricular goals?
- How do we evaluate whether students achieve these curricular goals?
- How do we articulate how we prepare students in a manner consistent with our mission for:
  - o successful careers,
  - o meaningful lives,
  - o and further education?
- What data provides evidence that these goals are being met?
- To what extent do we engage in and support assessment of student achievement?
- To what extent do we sustain assessment of student achievement?
- To what extent do we communicate results of assessment to stakeholders?
- To what extent do we consider and use assessment results for the improvement of educational effectiveness consistent with our mission?
- In what ways do we assist students in improving their learning?
- In what ways do we improve pedagogy?
- In what ways do we improve the curriculum?
- In what ways do we review academic programs?
- In what ways do we revise academic programs?
- In what ways do we review support services?
- In what ways do we revise support services?
- How do we plan a range of fitting professional development activities?
- To what extent do we conduct a range of fitting professional development activities?
- To what extent do we support a range of fitting professional development activities?
- How do we plan for academic programs?
- How do we plan for academic services?
- How do we budget for academic programs?
- How do we budget for academic services?
- How do we inform appropriate constituents about the institution?
- How do we inform appropriate constituents about our programs?
- How do we improve key indicators of success such as:
  - o retention,
  - o graduation,

- o   transfer rates,
- o   and placement rates?
- How do we implement other processes/procedures to improve educational programs?
- How do we implement other processes/procedures to improve educational services?
- Who delivers assessment services at PTS? Do we employ third-party providers to deliver assessment services?
    - o   If so, how do we review these third-party providers?
- How do we periodically assess the effectiveness of assessment processes used to improve educational effectiveness?
- How do we demonstrate institutional objectives that are:
    - o   clearly stated,
    - o   assessed appropriately,
    - o   linked to mission achievement,
    - o   linked to goal achievement,
    - o   reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results,
    - o   are used for planning,
    - o   are used for resource allocation?
- How do we demonstrate objectives for individual units that are:
    - o   clearly stated,
    - o   assessed appropriately,
    - o   linked to mission achievement,
    - o   linked to goal achievement,
    - o   reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results,
    - o   are used for planning,
    - o   are used for resource allocation?
- What clearly documented planning and improvement processes do we have that:
    - o   provide for constituent participation,
    - o   incorporate the use of assessment results?
- How do we communicate planning and improvement processes that:
    - o   provide for constituent participation,
    - o   incorporate the use of assessment results?
- How is our budgeting process:
    - o   aligned with institutional mission,
    - o   aligned with institutional goals,
    - o   evidence-based,
    - o   clearly linked to strategic plans and objectives?
- How do we know fiscal resources are adequate to support institutional operations wherever/however programs are delivered?
- How do we know human resources are adequate to support institutional operations wherever/however programs are delivered?

- How do we know physical infrastructure is adequate to support institutional operations wherever/however programs are delivered?
- How do we know technical infrastructure adequate to support institutional operations wherever/however programs are delivered?
- What are our well-defined decision-making processes?
- How do we clearly assign responsibility?
- How do we clearly assign accountability?
- What is our comprehensive plan for facilities?
- What is our comprehensive plan for infrastructure?
- What is our comprehensive plan for technology?
- How does this comprehensive planning include consideration of sustainability?
- How does this comprehensive planning include consideration of deferred maintenance?
- How is this comprehensive planning linked to strategic planning processes?
- How is this comprehensive planning linked to financial planning processes?
- How do we ensure an annual, independent audit?
- How does the audit confirm financial viability?
- How do we follow up with concerns cited in the audit?
- What are our strategies to measure:
    - adequacy of institutional resources,
    - efficient utilization of institutional resources?
- How do we assess the:
    - adequacy of institutional resources,
    - efficient utilization of institutional resources?
- How do we periodically assess the effectiveness of:
    - planning,
    - resource allocation,
    - institutional renewal processes,
    - availability of resources?

Relevant assessment information, institutional processes, documents, and procedures to be gathered, summarized, and used to support Working Group 4 assertions and conclusions include:

2016 MSCHE Recommendations, degree program goals (on websites; re-articulated on syllabi); Student Learning Outcomes (website & assessment tab of my.pts.edu); learning goals articulated on syllabi; program reviews every 3 years; evaluation of SLOs using artifact assessment approach; Job Description for Associate Dean for Academic Programs, Assessment, and Field Education; faculty meetings and academic affairs meeting minutes; MTS, MAPS and DMin final project assessments; Assessment Reports to the Board; student achievement blurb on Institutional Effectiveness page of the website; faculty referral data to Center for Writing and Learning Support; Center for Writing and Learning Support data on student improvement; notes on Wednesday faculty lunches focusing on pedagogy; annual budget proposal and review process; retention tracking spreadsheet; Student Information

Report data obtained by ATS; professional development opportunities on assessment; 2018 Strategic Plan; Cabinet Goals; department and individual goals documented in yearly performance reviews; Board Reports; Institutional Effectiveness Meeting minutes and documents (matrices, goal documents, etc); Institutional Master Planning Documents; Institutional Effectiveness tab of website & my.pts.edu; budget worksheets and review process documents; Human Resources documents (organizational charts, job descriptions, performance improvement plan documents); Facilities Master plan; Audit documents; minutes from Finance Committee of the Board.

Working Group 5

Working Group 5 Governance	MSCHE Standard 7
Chair: Kenneth Woo	Associate Professor of Church History
Jennifer Kaalund	Associate Professor of New Testament
Ruth Boykin	Associate Director of Metro-Urban Institute
Shan Overton	Director of Center for Writing and Learning Support
Hallie Isadore	Database and Donor Services Specialist
Christin Moreland	MDiv Student

Working Group 5 Charge

In execution of the general charge, Working Group 5 will be responsible to investigate MSCHE Standard VII and addressing institutional priority II as it intersects with Standard VII, according to the chart in Section II above.

Working Group 5 Lines of Inquiry

- What is the Seminary's structure for governance that outlines the roles, responsibilities, and systems and procedures for accountability for decision making by the Board?
- What is the Seminary's structure for governance that outlines the roles, responsibilities, and systems and procedures for accountability for decision making by the administration?
- What is the Seminary's structure for governance that outlines the roles, responsibilities, and systems and procedures for accountability for decision making by the faculty?
- What is the Seminary's structure for governance that outlines the roles, responsibilities, and systems and procedures for accountability for decision making by the staff?
- What is the Seminary's structure for governance that outlines the roles, responsibilities, and systems and procedures for accountability for decision making by the student body?
- What is the Seminary's structure for governance that relates the roles, responsibilities, and systems and procedures for accountability for decision making between the Board, administration, faculty, staff, and student body?
- To what extent is the Seminary's governance structure transparent?

- To what extent is the Seminary's governance structure clearly articulated and communicated effectively?
- How is the Seminary governed by a legally constituted governing body?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors serve the public interest?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors ensure that the Seminary clearly states its mission?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors ensure that the Seminary clearly states its goals?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors ensure that the Seminary fulfills its mission?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors ensure that the Seminary fulfills its goals?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors ensure that the Seminary fulfills its mission by strengthening an institutional culture that prioritizes formative practices leading to student success?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors ensure that the Seminary fulfills its mission by strengthening institutional effectiveness through transparent communication?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors ensure that the Seminary fulfills its mission by strengthening systems and procedures for accountability?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors ensure that the Seminary fulfills its mission by strengthening the use of data to inform decision making?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors ensure that the Seminary fulfills its mission by cultivating, evaluating, and extending relationships with external partners and stakeholders?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors take fiduciary responsibility for the institution?
- How is the PTS Board of Directors ultimately accountable for the Seminary's academic quality?
- How is the PTS Board of Directors ultimately accountable for the Seminary's planning?
- How is the PTS Board of Directors ultimately accountable for the Seminary's fiscal well-being?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors maintain sufficient independence to ensure the Seminary's integrity?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors maintain sufficient expertise to ensure the Seminary's integrity?
- How do members of the PTS Board of Directors ensure that political influences are not allowed to interfere with their governing responsibilities?
- How do members of the PTS Board of Directors ensure that financial influences are not allowed to interfere with their governing responsibilities?
- How do members of the PTS Board of Directors ensure that other influences are not allowed to interfere with their governing responsibilities?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors ensure that the Board does not interfere in the day-to-day operations of the Seminary?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors ensure that individual members of the Board do not interfere in the day-to-day operations of the Seminary?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors oversee at the policy level the quality of teaching and learning?

- To what extent does the PTS Board of Directors follow written procedures relating to the opening and closing of faculty lines?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors oversee at the policy level the quality of student formation and success?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors oversee at the policy level the approval of degree programs?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors oversee at the policy level the awarding of degrees?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors oversee at the policy level the establishment of personnel policies?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors oversee at the policy level the approval of policies and by-laws?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors oversee at the policy level the assurance of strong fiscal management?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors oversee at the policy level the assurance of transparent communication?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors oversee at the policy level the assurance of systems and procedures for accountability?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors oversee at the policy level the assurance of the use of data to inform decision making?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors play a policy-making role in financial affairs to ensure integrity and strong financial management?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors engage in a timely review of audited financial statements and/or other documents related to the fiscal viability of the institution?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors appoint and regularly evaluate the performance of the Seminary's President?
- How is the PTS Board of Directors informed in all its operations by principles of good practice in board governance?
- How is the PTS Board of Directors informed in all its operations by principles of transparent communication?
- How is the PTS Board of Directors informed in all its operations by systems and procedures for accountability?
- How is the PTS Board of Directors informed in all its operations by the use of data to inform decision making?
- What is the PTS Board of Directors established written conflict of interest policy?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors comply with a written conflict of interest policy?
- How does the PTS Board's conflict of interest policy ensure the impartiality of the Board in payment for services?
- How does the PTS Board's conflict of interest policy ensure the impartiality of the Board in contractual relationships?

- How does the PTS Board's conflict of interest policy ensure the impartiality of the Board in employment?
- How does the PTS Board's conflict of interest policy ensure the impartiality of the Board in family interests?
- How does the PTS Board's conflict of interest policy ensure the impartiality of the Board in financial interests?
- How does the PTS Board's conflict of interest policy ensure the impartiality of the board in other interests that could pose or be perceived as conflicts of interest?
- How does the PTS Board of Directors support the President in maintaining the autonomy of the institution?
- Who is the Chief Executive Officer of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary?
- How is the President appointed by the PTS Board of Directors?
- How is the President evaluated by the PTS Board of Directors?
- How does the President report to the PTS Board of Directors?
- How is the chair the PTS Board of Directors selected?
- How does the board ensure that the President has appropriate credentials and professional experience consistent with the Seminary's mission?
- How does the Board of Directors ensure that the President has the authority required to fulfill the responsibilities of the position?
- How does the Board of Directors ensure that the President has the autonomy required to fulfill the responsibilities of the position?
- How does the Board of Directors ensure that the President has the authority and autonomy required to develop and implement institutional plans?
- To what extent does the President have the authority and autonomy required to staff the organization?
- To what extent does the President have the authority and autonomy required to identify and allocate resources?
- To what extent does the President have the authority and autonomy required to direct the Seminary toward attaining the goals and objectives set forth in its mission?
- To what extent does the President have the authority and autonomy required to direct the Seminary toward strengthening an institutional culture that prioritizes formative practices leading to student success?
- To what extent does the President have the authority and autonomy required to direct the Seminary toward strengthening institutional effectiveness through transparent communication?
- To what extent does the President have the authority and autonomy required to direct the Seminary toward strengthening institutional effectiveness through systems and procedures for accountability?

- To what extent does the President exercise the authority and autonomy required to direct the Seminary toward strengthening institutional effectiveness through the use of data to inform decision making?
- What qualified administrators does the President have to assist the President in discharging his/her/their duties effectively?
- Are there a sufficient number of qualified administrators to enable the President to discharge his/her/their duties effectively?
- To what extent is the President responsible for establishing procedures for assessing the Seminary's efficiency and effectiveness?
- How is the PTS administration's organizational structure clearly documented?
- How does the PTS administration's organizational structure clearly define reporting relationships?
- How does PTS ensure that its administration possesses an appropriately sized staff to assist the President in fulfilling the his/her/their roles and responsibilities?
- How does the Seminary ensure that the PTS administration possesses relevant experience to assist the President in fulfilling the his/her/their roles and responsibilities?
- How are the credentials and professional experience of the PTS administration members consistent with the mission of the organization?
- How are the credentials and professional experience of the PTS administration members consistent with their functional roles?
- How are the credentials and professional experience of the PTS administration members consistent with prioritizing formative practices and student success?
- How do the credentials and professional experience of the PTS administration members support the cultivation, evaluation, and extension of relationships with external partners and stakeholders?
- To what extent does the PTS administration possess the skills required to perform their duties?
  - o How do we know?
- To what extent does the PTS administration possess the assistance required to perform their duties?
  - o How do we know?
- To what extent does the PTS administration possess the technology required to perform their duties?
  - o How do we know?
- To what extent does the PTS administration possess the information systems expertise required to perform their duties?
  - o How do we know?
- How does the PTS administration regularly engage with faculty in advancing the Seminary's goals and objectives?
- How does the PTS administration regularly engage with students in advancing the Seminary's goals and objectives?

- To what extent does the PTS administration demonstrate prioritizing formative practices leading to student success?
- To what extent does the PTS administration demonstrate transparent communication in engaging with faculty?
- To what extent does the PTS administration demonstrate transparent communication in engaging with students?
- To what extent does the PTS administration demonstrate systems and procedures for accountability when engaging with faculty?
- To what extent does the PTS administration demonstrate systems and procedures for accountability when engaging with students?
- To what extent does the PTS administration possess systematic procedures for evaluating administrative units?
- What systematic procedures does the PTS administration have in place for using assessment data to enhance operations?
- How does the PTS administration demonstrate the general use of data to inform decision making in evaluating administrative units?
- How does the PTS administration demonstrate the general use of data to inform decision making in enhancing operations?
- How does the PTS administration demonstrate periodic assessment of the effectiveness of governance?
- How does the PTS administration demonstrate the use of data in the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of governance?
- How does the PTS administration demonstrate periodic assessment of the effectiveness of leadership?
- How does the PTS administration demonstrate use of data in the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of its leadership?
- How does the PTS administration demonstrate periodic assessment of the effectiveness of the administration?
- How does the PTS administration demonstrate the use of data in the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of the administration?

Relevant assessment information, institutional processes, documents, and procedures to be gathered, summarized, and used to support Working Group 5 assertions and conclusions include:

PTS Articles of Incorporation; PTS By-Laws; PTS Constitution; PTS Organizational Chart; Student Association Charter; Student Handbook; PTS Website; PTS Faculty Handbook; town hall materials; institutional focus groups; PTS Board Minutes; PTS Board Roster; PTS Publications; PTS Strategic Plan(s); PTS Strategic Planning Documents; PTS Board Committee Minutes; PTS Board Education Committee Minutes; PTS Board Property Committee Minutes; PTS Board Governance Committee Minutes; Annual Conflict of Interest Declarations; Conflict of Interest Policy; Conflict of Interest Complaints; Board member resumes; Cabinet minutes; Cabinet e-mails to community; Coronavirus

Response Team (CRT) minutes; CRT charter; CRT e-mails to community; faculty meeting minutes; staff and faculty focus groups; community surveys; curriculum review documents; HR policy manuals, PTS Board Finance Committee minutes; financial policy documents; budgeting documents; audit documents; documents related to the presidential search; documents related to presidential transition; President's CV; President's Job Description; PTS Mission, Vision, and Goals Statement; past accreditation documents; PTS staff resumes; IT Audit; Learning Management System search documents and materials; faculty retreat documents; faculty search documents; Student Association minutes; Student Services documents.

VI. Guidelines for Reporting

The Steering Committee will make use of the following processes to ensure the Working Groups stay on task:

- By December 15, 2021, each Working Group will submit an Inquiry Plan, including timeline, to the Steering Committee detailing when it will commence and complete its investigation of each line of inquiry.
- By December 15, 2021, each Working Group will submit an Evidence Report to the Steering Committee identifying potential sources of evidence in relation to each line of inquiry, noting any concerns or gaps.
- Beginning in January 2022, each Working Group will submit a Progress Report to the Steering Committee within two days after each of its bi-monthly meetings (see below for template of the Progress Report).
- Beginning in January 2022, the Steering Committee will review all Progress Reports, making sure Working Groups are keeping to their stated timelines, raising questions and/or asking for additional evidence as warranted.
- By the end of March 2022, Working Groups begin submitting drafts of the relevant section(s) of the Self-Study report to the Steering Committee for feedback.
- By the end of April 2022, Working Groups submit a final draft of the relevant section of the Self-Study Report.

Working Group Progress Report Template

Working Group:

Line of Inquiry investigated:

Investigator(s):

Evidence consulted:

Evidence for compliance with relevant Standard/criteria:

Evidence in relation to institutional priorities (if applicable):

Recommendations for improvement and/or innovation:

[this pattern repeats for each line of inquiry investigated]

VII. Organization of the Final Self-Study Report

Chapter 1: Executive Summary

Chapter 2: Introduction

- Institutional Overview
- Documentation of the Self-Study Process

Chapter 3: Standard I – Mission and Goals

Chapter 4: Standard II – Ethics and Integrity

Chapter 5: Standard III – Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

Chapter 6: Standard IV – Support of the Student Experience

Chapter 7: Standard V – Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Chapter 8: Standard VI – Planning Resources, and Institutional

Chapter 9: Standard VII – Governance, Leadership, and Administration

Chapter 10: Conclusion

Glossary of Terms

Appendices

VIII. Verification of Compliance Strategy

The Verification of Compliance will be led by the Self-Study Steering Committee Co-Chair Karen Rohrer, who will work closely with Holly McKelvey, the Administrative Assistant for Academic Support, and with members in Working Group I to demonstrate how Pittsburgh Theological Seminary complies with the accreditation-relevant federal regulations identified by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Other key Seminary departments will be asked to participate in this exercise throughout the self-study process. Working Group I's progress on this and the rest of their work will be held to account in the process described in Sections V and VI, and according to the time table in Section VIII.

IX. Self-Study Timetable

Date(s)	Activity/Task
September 2021	Self-Study Institute recordings viewed by co-chairs
August-September 2021	Assemble Steering Committee Remote meeting with Commission staff liaison Begin to draft Self-Study Design
September-October 2021	Assemble Working Groups Submit draft SSD by October 22 (2 weeks prior to SSPV)
November 2021	Commission staff liaison Self-Study Preparation Visit (November 5)
November 2021	Revisions and acceptance of SSD
November-December 2021	Working Groups convene to plan work Working Groups draft and submit Inquiry Plan and Evidence Report to Steering Committee by December 15
January-April 2022	Working Groups gather and analyze data and submit biweekly progress reports to Steering Committee
February-March 2022	Self-Study Evaluation Team Chair chosen Visit dates chosen Accepted SSD sent to Chair
Week of February 14	Communications Team surveys faculty, staff, and students to assess effectiveness of communication strategy
April-May 2022	Working Groups draft and revise assigned sections of the Self-Study Report
May 2022	Communications Team surveys Board members (in conjunction with the May Board Meeting) to assess effectiveness of communication strategy
June-July 2022	Revising Self-Study Report draft
August-September 2022	Share draft with constituencies for feedback
September-November 2022	Self-Study Report draft sent to Team Chair (two weeks before visit) Team Chair's Preliminary Visit
November 2022	Communications Team surveys faculty, staff, students and Board members to assess readiness for team visit.
December 2022-January 2023	Self-Study Report finalized based on Team Chair feedback and shared with campus
February 2023	Final Self-Study Report/Verification of Compliance/Evidence Inventory uploaded to MSCHE portal (six weeks before team visit)
April 2023	Self-Study Evaluation Team Visit Team Report Institutional Response
June/November 2023	Commission meets to determine action

X. Communication Plan

Purpose	Audience(s)	Methods	Timing	Person(s) responsible
Communicate securely/share data	**Steering Committee (SC) Working Group (WG) members**	Establish Accreditation 2023 portal on my.pts where all relevant documents will be stored; includes a discussion forum. Regular emails between SC members and from WG chairs to group members.	From September 2021 on.	Holly McKelvey Self-Study (SS) Co-Chairs WG Chairs IT Director
Inform/update	**General Public**	Add page devoted to information about the Self-Study on website. A regular feature of President's monthly Communique. Include updates on PTS Facebook page. Possible brief videos featuring student, Board, alums, faculty introducing/updating re: some dimension of the Self-Study. Create graphic representation of structure of Self-Study; use on all SS related communication.	Launch in mid-November. Update monthly	SS Co-Chairs Director of Communication President
Inform/update	**Alumni/ae**	Alumni newsletter. Include in announcements at Alumni events. A regular feature of President's monthly Communique. Include updates on PTS Facebook page.	Launch after November Board meeting. Update monthly.	Alumni Council chair Director of Alumni and Church Relations Director of Communications
Inform/update	**PTS Board**	Regular agenda item at bi-annual Board meetings. Include Standard-specific update in meetings of each Board. Committee and to Black Board Members group. Add to orientation of new Board members. A regular feature of President's monthly Communique. Include updates on PTS Facebook page.	First presentation of Self-Study process to Board Nov. 2021; included in subsequent meetings. Include in agenda for Board. Committees after Nov. 2021 introduction.	President Board Committee chairs SC members on the PTS Board are ambassadors for process.

Inform/update	**Students**	Regular agenda item in Student Association meetings. A regular feature of President's monthly Communique. Include updates on PTS Facebook page. Email updates. Featured at orientation events for students in all programs, including DMin and AIM.	Introduce in mid-November. Update monthly.	Student Association leaders. SC & WG members are ambassadors for process. Dean of Students Directors of DMin, AIM programs.
Inform/update	**Faculty**	Regular agenda item for faculty meetings. A regular feature of President's monthly Communique. Include updates on PTS Facebook page. Email updates.	Discussion of Self-Study initiated at Fall 2021 Faculty Retreat.	President/Dean SC & WG members are ambassadors for process.
Inform/update	**Staff**	Regular item on the agenda for all town halls, cabinet meetings (then reported out), and the monthly "Community News" publication + Informal communication. A regular feature of President's monthly Communique. Include updates on PTS Facebook page. Email updates.	Introduce in mid-November. Update monthly.	Director of Communication President/Dean SC & WG members are ambassadors for process.
Inform/update	**Continuing Education + Certificate Program participants**	Included in regular communication with respective constituencies. A regular feature of President's monthly Communique. Include updates on PTS Facebook page.	Introduce in mid-November. Update monthly.	President CE and certificate program directors SC & WG members are ambassadors for process. Director of Communications
Gather input/ request feedback	**PTS Board**	Board committee chairs/members review relevant chapters of Self-Study Report draft, offer feedback.	May 2022	President SS Co-Chairs SC & WG members are ambassadors for process.
Gather input/ request feedback	**Staff Faculty**	Joint-planning meetings (select).	Monthly	President SC & WG members are ambassadors for process.

Gather input/ request feedback	**Staff Faculty Students**	Share draft of Self-Study report. Invite feedback.	April 2022	SS Co-Chairs; Director of Communication President
Gather input/ request feedback	**Students**	If Focus Groups convened in re: particular lines of inquiry, include orientation to Self-Study process.	Spring 2022	SC & WG members
Evaluate effectiveness of communication strategy	**Steering Committee**	Based on assessment data (flash polls, site traffic) evaluate effectiveness of communication methods and adjust as needed.	Beginning after Nov. Board meeting, evaluate monthly in SC meeting. Week of February 14, 2022, survey faculty, staff, students; May 2022, survey of Board; November 2022, survey all to assess team visit readiness.	SS Co-Chairs SC Comm team Director of Communication

XI. Evaluation Team Profile

Because Pittsburgh Theological Seminary (PTS) is a small stand-alone theological seminary/divinity school, we seek an evaluation team with diverse experience in and with theological education. While not entirely unique, theological seminaries are highly specialized institutions with unique constituencies that include denominational relationships and religious communities as key partners. With that broad definitional framework, PTS offers the following characteristics for the Evaluation Team for the Commission's consideration.

Team Chair

As identified in our proposal, PTS intends to assess the effectiveness of our changing cultures around student experiences, partner engagement, and institutional effectiveness in communication and strategic management. A team chair who understands these areas from the experiences of living them out is essential for us. Additionally, the person selected should be one with the administrative and academic acumen to know the ecology of theological education and its uniqueness in higher education. Such knowledge includes having a long tenure in seminary administration, tenure on the faculty and/or administration in seminary/divinity school settings, and knowledge of the current state

of the Protestant church in America and the challenges facing it. This individual should have experience with leading culture change in the context of higher theological education. We prefer a chair who has had experience as a chief executive office (president) or chief academic officer (academic dean) within theological education.

Team Members

Examining our institutional priorities alongside what we feel works best in our context, the Seminary believes that team members with diverse experiences in theological education would be most beneficial. Given our institutional makeup, evaluators who cover the following areas are greatly desired:

- *Student Services:* Because one of our key priorities is assessing our student formation and success programs, we desire evaluators who have proven experience in student affairs work. More specifically, we hope to have evaluators with experience in student services work that encompasses advising, character and moral development, campus culture, and general policy management all in the context of theological education.
- *Senior Project Management:* This area is not unique to theological education, but it is something that is identified in Institutional Priority Two. We seek evaluators with project management experience that helps to assess our capacity for mission cohesion and alignment. Evaluators who have served as chief administrative officers, project directors, or leaders in institutional effectiveness all would be helpful to our process.
- *Diversity Officers:* One of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary's aims is to lean into the growing diversity of the student and staff body. While the Seminary is doing good work in this area, we believe evaluators with experience in diverse educational settings or serving to ensure the diversity of those educational settings is an important quality. Recognizing that different institutions have various titles for these roles, we prioritize the work of creating and sustaining diversity over the title of "Diversity" in selecting individual evaluators.
- *Academic Affairs and Student Learning*: Student learning is central to the PTS mission. Someone with experience as a faculty member, program director, or institutional program officer would be an invaluable asset in relation to our assessment of the relationship between the student learning experience and the faculty execution of the educational mission of the Seminary.
- *Financial Issues:* We hope to have an evaluator who understands and has significant experience working with large endowments and well-endowed institutions.

Institutional Peers

Following schools are considered peers of the Seminary as it is currently organized:

- Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey
- Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, DC
- Lancaster Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pennsylvania
- New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, New Jersey
- Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York

- United Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

Aspirational Peers

Following schools are considered aspirational peers of the Seminary:

- Princeton Theological Seminary
- Wesley Theological Seminary
- Luther Seminary, Minneapolis, MN

Competitor Institutions

None

Conflicts of Interest

Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, DC: PTS President, Asa Lee was formerly a Vice President for Campus Administration, Associate Dean for Community Life, and Director of African American studies at Wesley before he joined PTS as president in July of 2021. Additionally, PTS partners with Wesley to train PTS students who are Methodist through a Wesley program.

Top Programs

- The PTS Doctor of Ministry currently enrolls 133 students.
- The PTS Master of Divinity currently enrolls 70 students.

XII. Evidence Inventory

In the interest of creating and maintaining the collection of documentation support for the Self-Study for eventual upload to the MSCHE evidence portal, we have developed the following strategy:

As a Working Group submits Progress Reports and develops a draft of its chapter in the Self-Study report, its chair will submit each piece of evidence the group intends to reference (whether a document, PTS website, other URL, interview transcript, etc.) to Holly McKelvey, Administrative Assistant to the Steering Committee. Ms. McKelvey will assign an official name to each piece of evidence and convey that name back to the Working Group Chair. The Chair will be responsible for consistently referencing evidence correctly in the group's reporting.

As work on the Self-Study proceeds, Ms. McKelvey will compile an inventory in my.pts.edu of all the evidence. The inventory of evidence will be arranged alphabetically by the names she has assigned. As necessary, she will add a brief description of a piece of evidence to its entry in the inventory, in case other Working Group members know it by other names. If multiple groups use the same pieces of evidence, she will create a chart cross-referencing the alphabetical list by the Working Groups.

As the investigative work of the Working Group continues and drafts of the Self-Study report are refined, so too will the evidence inventory.

Throughout the process, Holly McKelvey and Barbara Blodgett will check that evidence is used appropriately and that unnecessary duplication of evidence use is avoided.