Reaffirmation of Accreditation Recommendation

for

Indiana University Northwest

Gary, Indiana

of the 2008-09
Academic Quality improvement Program
Review Panel on Reaffirmation

The Higher Learning Commission
A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

March 2, 2009

AQIP Review Panel on Reaffirmation (lead reviewers starred)

*Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, WI

Nancy Foster, Chief Academic Officer, Baker College, Cadillac, MI

Jann Freed, Professor of Business Management, Central College, Pella, IA

Arnold Mokma, Associate Profesor Emeritus, Ohio State University-Agricultural Technical Institute, Wooster, OH

Mary Moore, Vice President for Research, Planning, and International Partnerships, University of Indianapolis, IN

John Nichols, NEH Distinguished Teaching Professor of Philosophy, Saint Joseph's College, Rensselaer, IN

*Adelaide Parsons, Emeritus Director of International Programs, Southeast Missouri State University, Cape Girardeau, MO

Beth Pellicciotti, Asst. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, IN

Kathleen Plinske, Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness, McHenry County College, Crystal Lake, IL

David Sill, Senior Scholar and Professor, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Edwardsville, IL [Panel Chair]

Kimberly Thompson, Director of Assessment and College Research, Regis University, Denver, CO

Richard Wagner, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dunwoody College of Technology, Minneapolis, MN

Linda Wellborn, Director of Graduate & Professional Studies, Evangel University, Springfield, MO

Contents

I. Context and Nature of Review

A. Review Purpose, Process, and Materials

AQIP Reaffirmation of Accreditation reviews are scheduled seven years in advance, when an institution first joins the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) or when an institution already participating in AQIP is reaffirmed via the AQIP Reaffirmation of Accreditation process.

In conducting these reviews, the AQIP Reaffirmation of review panel examines the following materials for each institution:

- Current Commission History file of institutional actions
- Current Commission Statement of Affiliation Status
- Current official Commission Organizational Profile
- Annual Updates of year's Action Projects
- Institutional websites
- Key correspondence between the institution and the Commission
- Last Comprehensive PEAQ Evaluation team report, institutional response, and Commission action letter
- Quality Checkup report
- Summary of Action Projects attempted
- Systems Appraisal Feedback Report
- Systems Portfolio(s), including update provided by the institution on September 1 of the review year
- Federal Compliance Materials

Two lead panelists from the AQIP Review Panel on Reaffirmation draft a recommendation that is reviewed and approved by the entire panel before it is forwarded to the Institutional Actions Council.

B. Organizational Context

IUN was first accredited at the Bachelor's level as operationally separate from Indiana University by the Commission on July 25, 1969. IUN was granted permission to offer degrees at the Master's level on March 28, 1973. The institution was admitted to AQIP on January 23, 2002. IUN participated in strategy forums on June 5-7, 2002, and January 23-25, 2007. Since admission to AQIP, the institution has officially declared and attempted 11 individual Action Projects, and has provided AQIP with Annual Updates of ongoing projects and received Annual Update Feedback Reports on these. The institution provided its Systems Portfolio for review in November 2005, and received a Systems Appraisal Feedback Report on April 11, 2006. AQIP conducted a Quality Checkup visit to the institution on March 26-28, 2008, and provided a report of the findings of the visiting team in March 2008.

C. Organizational Scope and Structure (including extended physical or distance education operations)

IUN, an urban, public, not-for profit institution affiliated with the Indiana University system (7 campuses total) serves a seven county area in Northwest Indiana that is diverse and highly industrialized. The institution is a comprehensive Carnegie Master's S institution with a total annual operating budget of $42 million and approximately 71 authorized degree programs (15 certificate programs, 13 associate degrees, 38 baccalaureate degrees and 5 graduate degrees). It also offers courses in Porter County, Portage, Indiana. The typical student varies from others in the IU system (47.3% are from the bottom half of their graduating class; 35% are from underrepresented populations; average age is 30; 85% of students work; 49.3% of students receive financial aid). Other institutions in IUN's service area include two four-year public institutions, one community college, two private four-year institutions, and several proprietary enterprises. Opportunities that were identified by IUN include accreditation of academic programs, new facilities, evidence-based system of accountability, centers of excellence, planning processes, diversity, and reorganization. Challenges include revenue source, increased competition for students, student access and success, and personnel stability (SP, SA, and OP).

D. Notification of Quality Checkup Visit and Solicitation of Third-Party Comment

A Quality Checkup site visit to the institution was conducted on March 26-28, 2008. In compliance with Commission requirements, the institution notified its constituencies and the public of this visit and solicited third party comments to be sent directly to the Commission. No third party comments were filed. The QCU Team felt that the institution met the requirements and complied with the Commission's and AQIP's expectations.

E. Compliance with Federal Requirements

The Quality Checkup team that conducted a site visit to the institution on March 26-28, 2008, examined evidence provided by the institution to support the Commission's federal compliance program. The Quality Checkup site visit team concluded that the institution was in compliance with the Commission's Federal Compliance Program.

F. Evidence of the Organization's Responsiveness to Previous Commission Concerns Regarding FULFILLMENT of the Criteria for Accreditation.

The Systems Appraisal Team identified two accreditation issues related to IUN: collection of learning assessment results related to general education and leadership gaps created by interim personnel in key leadership positions (SA, pp 6-7). The Quality Checkup team determined that the college is moving forward toward meeting the need for the assessment of learning in the area of general education by revising their general education program and tying its outcomes to directly measurable student outcomes. The team felt that there was no accreditation issue remaining in this area (QCU, pp. 3-4). The Quality Checkup team determined that the college was addressing the gaps in leadership by filling permanent positions and conducting searches for the remaining ones, developing a mental model for informing leadership changes, using groups such as ECHO to build greater collaboration among stakeholders, and developing a Leadership Academy which invests in training their personnel for positions. The Quality Checkup Team felt that this issue was no longer an accreditation issue but should be monitored as a strategic issue (QCU, pp. 4-5).

The Systems Appraisal Team identified the following strategic issues that needed to be addressed before the next AQIP review: stakeholder analysis, learning assessment model, strategic alignment, process documentation and results (SA, pp. 7-8). The Quality Checkup Team felt that IUN has made a serious commitment to develop their performance evaluation systems and also a flat enrollment model based upon the recommendations of an external consultant; however, work remains. Through realignment of its general education program and its assessment outcomes, IUN is moving forward; pockets of faculty and staff supporting assessment exist; however, the climate on campus is one of assessment being imposed on them by external forces. IUN needs to continue to build its efforts in this area (QCU, p. 6). Strategic alignment continues to be a challenge for IUN according to the QCU Team (QCU, p.6). There are once again pockets of individuals or a program which is interested in using uniform data collection and analysis of results; however, work remains to establish consistency across the campus. The QCU Team determined that IUN understands and takes seriously the need to clearly identify processes and then use the processes to improve the institution's decision making. The team determined that "A deeper understanding of a few key problematic processes may yield quick results if obvious improvements can be implemented" (QCU, p. 7). With the hiring of an Institutional Results (IR) person, IUN has focused on data collection and analysis, using the results to shape future directions of the campus; however, IUN is still in the beginning stages and needs to continue to strengthen this area (QCU, p. 8).

II. Fulfillment of the Criteria for Accreditation

CRITERION ONE: MISSION AND INTEGRITY. The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

A. Evidence that Core Components are met.

1. The mission of Indiana University Northwest is to provide a high quality and relevant education to the citizens of northwest Indiana, the most diverse and industrialized area of the state. The institution strives to create a community dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge and intellectual development, leading to undergraduate and selected graduate degrees in the liberal arts, sciences, and professional disciplines. The campus is strongly dedicated to the value of education, lifelong learning, diversity, celebration of cultures and opportunity for all, as well as to participating in the sustainable economic development of the region and of the state. Indiana University Northwest is committed to the health and well being of the communities it serves (IUN Website).

2. Indiana University Northwest (IUN) is one of six regional campuses of the University of Indiana System. IUN is located in an urban neighborhood in Gary, Indiana, and serves more than 4,900 full-time and part-time students and offers 71 undergraduate and graduate programs. The primary emphasis at IUN is undergraduate education, with the campus granting primarily associate and bachelor's degrees (SA, p. 10). IUN also offers certificate programs and master's degrees.

3. The IU System is governed by a Board of Trustees. The IUN Chancellor reports to the

System President and many functions and processes have been centralized in the system. In general, administrative functions tend to be centralized and academic functions tend to be decentralized (SA, p. 10).

4. IUN serves a diverse study body of commuter students with the following student profile. More than half (53 percent) of the students attend full time; 85 percent of the students are working; 49 percent receive financial aid; 35 percent are from under-represented populations; 58 percent are first generation college students and 70 percent are female. Nearly all (97 percent) are Indiana residents and the average age is 30 (SA, p. 10).

5. IUN has developed a shared vision that is characterized by student-centeredness, academic excellence, a commitment to diversity, individual and community growth, employee contributions, and a conducive learning environment. Graduates are prepared for life-long learning, ethical practices, successful careers and effective citizenship. IUN collaborates and cooperates with other educational institutions, external partners, and the surrounding communities to enhance the overall quality of life (IUN Website).

6. IUN employs full-time faculty, part-time faculty, staff, administrators and student employees. The AQIP Quality Check-Up Visit team found IUN's faculty and staff to be extremely student-centered. Students were pleased with the quality of the education, including small class sizes and personal interactions with faculty, they were receiving at IUN and the quality of the support services. The team also reported good working relationships among the faculty and between the faculty and staff (AQIP Quality Check-Up Report, p. 11).

B. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention, but no specific Commission monitoring or reporting.

   None.

C. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require institutional attention and that actions taken and improvements achieved be described in the institution's Systems Portfolio before its next scheduled Systems Appraisal, to permit Commission follow-up.

   Enrollment has declined from nearly 6,000 students in 1992 to 4,794 in the fall of 2008. The six-year graduation rate of 27 percent is below the graduation rate of IUN's peer group and also indicates a considerable amount of student attrition. Given this enrollment decline, a high level of student attrition and the current economic downturn, it is unclear if IUN will be able to sustain its mission and operations with a decreasing student base. Course cancelations due to enrollment was reported as a student concern during the AQIP Quality Check-up Visit, and this is likely to continue if enrollment and retention/graduation rates do not increase (IUN Website, SA, p. 10 and AQIP Quality Check-Up report, p. 12). It is recommended that IUN report on progress with student enrollment and retention in the next AQIP Systems Portfolio, including the results of the Chancellor's Working Group on Enrollment.

D. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up via declaration of a specific Action Project(s) and the submission of Annual Updates.

   None.

Recommendation of the Panel

The criterion is met. Follow-up actions are indicated above.

CRITERION TWO: PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE. The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

A. Evidence that Core Components are met.

1. IUN's shared vision describes an anticipated state of the institution in 2010. In the vision documents, IUN commits itself to eight student-centered principles. In addition, IUN has identified campus climate and unique identity as two strategic foci of the vision (SA, p. 31).

2. IUN has developed a strategic planning framework that links facilities planning, IT planning, human resource planning and operations planning and the AQIP process (SA, p. 31; IUN Website).

3. The University has identified its strengths including accredited programs, new facilities and diversity as well as its numerous challenges including revenue uncertainty, increased competition, student access, student success and personnel instability. Numerous initiatives have been undertaken or are currently being undertaken to address these challenges (SA, p. 11, Quality Highlights Document, p. 1-4).

4. IUN continues to refine its strategic planning and action planning processes. Since the 1996 Systems Appraisal, the campus has continued the process of aligning its strategic goals with the various units. Individuals responsible for each major plan (human capital, student outcomes, etc.) have been identified and these individuals will report progress to the Strategic Planning Team (Quality Highlights Document, p. 3).

5. The University has defined four areas of strategic focus: Continuous Improvement, Budgeting, Enrollment and Emergency Preparedness. Brief plans for each of these areas are outlined in the 2008 Quality Highlights Document. Goals of the Budgeting focus include educating the campus on the budget process and allocating resources in alignment with the strategic plan for the campus (Quality Highlights document, p. 3).

B. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention, but no specific Commission monitoring or reporting.

None.

C. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require institutional attention and that actions taken and improvements achieved be described in the institution's Systems Portfolio before its next scheduled Systems Appraisal, to permit Commission follow-up.

The Systems Appraisal team found IUN to be lacking in "strategic alignment" with a number of varying and/or conflicting processes (SA, p.7). Although both the Quality Check-Up Team

and the Quality Highlights documents report improvements in this area, there still appears to be a number of long-term and short-term initiatives. It remains unclear how these initiatives link to the strategic plan, how resources are allocated to these initiatives or what results are expected from these initiatives. Limited information on strategic planning or results of previous planning efforts is available on the IUN website. It is recommended that the next Systems Portfolio include a complete description of the strategic planning process, including long-term and short-term goals, action plans, action plan owners, timeframes, resources allocations and performance targets.

D. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up via declaration of a specific Action Project(s) and the submission of Annual Updates.

None.

Recommendation of the Panel

The criterion is met. Follow-up actions are indicated above.

CRITERION THREE: STUDENT LEARNING AND EFFECTIVE TEACHING. The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

A. Evidence that Core Components are met.

1. IUN offers certificate programs, associate degree programs, baccalaureate and master's degree programs in a number of fields including arts and sciences, business, health and human services, education and pre-professional programs (IUN website). Each program is reviewed on a regular cycle in accordance with the University Handbook (SA, p. 13).

2. IUN has established nine general education goals and guidelines for the assessment of these goals. The graduate programs also share a common learning objective in addition to specific program objectives (SA, p. 13).

3. IUN has successfully completed four AQIP Action projects that deal with improving student learning and the campus learning environment, including projects on first-year experience, academic and career advising, student-center decision making (implementing a service philosophy) and campus diversity. The AQIP Quality Check-up Report validated the positive impacts of these projects (AQIP Action Project Review for Reaffirmation).

4. IUN creates and maintains a climate of respect for differing and diverse opinions through a Statement of Principles and a Shared Code of Conduct for faculty, staff and students. There are numerous examples of how this climate is effectively maintained on campus (SA, p. 13).

5. IUN serves a number of disadvantaged students. The campus provides several services for these students including academic assessment, developmental courses, financial aid, career exploration and skills inventory testing and a Critical Literacy Program (SA, p. 13).

6. IUN has a current AQIP Action Project to reform the general education curriculum to

provide a coherent educational experience that will lead to specific student learning outcomes in lifelong learning, ethical practices, successful careers and effective citizenship. This project was initiated in April of 2007 and appears to be a continuation of an earlier AQIP Action Project (AQIP Action Project Review for Reaffirmation).

7. IUN is also currently working on an AQIP Action Project on centralizing student learning outcome assessment. The primary goal of this project includes creating a centralized assessment system for student learning outcomes to enable the University to be able to collect, analyze and utilize assessment more effectively. This project was also initiated in April of 2007 (AQIP Action Project Review for Reaffirmation).

B. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention, but no specific Commission monitoring or reporting.

None.

C. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require institutional attention and that actions taken and improvements achieved be described in the institution's Systems Portfolio before its next scheduled Systems Appraisal, to permit Commission follow-up.

1. Assessment of student learning outcomes continues to be a challenge, particularly in the area of general education where Higher Learning Commission documents report concerns in this area dating back to the early 90s. Opportunity exists to strengthen Category One in the Systems Portfolio in the areas of measures, results, comparative data and improvements (SA, Quality Check-Up Report).

D. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up via declaration of a specific Action Project(s) and the submission of Annual Updates.

None.

Recommendation of the Panel

The Criterion is met. Follow-up Actions are indicated above.

CRITERION FOUR: ACQUISITION, DISCOVERY, AND APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE. The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

A. Evidence that Core Components are met.

1. IUN students are engaged in numerous co-curricular activities that help further the goals of lifelong learning, social responsibility and effective citizenship including CCDL, CRSV, the American Democracy Project, Leadership in SOBE and COAS student clubs (SA, p. 14).

2.   Training and development opportunities are made available to faculty and professional development opportunities are available for most employees (SA, p. 22).

3.   IUN encourages faculty to actively pursue scholarship and inquiry. A list of recent Refereed Publications and Creative Achievements appears on the IUN website. The College of Arts and Sciences sponsors an annual research conference (IUN website).

4.   IUN also encourages student research and has set up a fund to support undergraduate research. The purpose of the Undergraduate Research Fund at Indiana University Northwest is to encourage undergraduates to actively engage in research and creative activities as part of their undergraduate major experience. (IUN website).

5.   IUN ranks highest among regional IU campuses relative to grants and contracts. There are also internal grants that support faculty development (SA, p. 34 and IUN website).

6.   IUN offers continuing education opportunities and conferences for both internal and external audiences in areas such as education and health care (IUN website).

7.   IUN offers degree programs in fine arts and performing arts and has art galleries and an active theatre program that serves the campus and the community (IUN website).

8.   The Center for Regional Excellence has been established at IU Northwest to foster learning, scholarship, discovery, creativity, and service, in the areas of <u>Cultural Discovery and Learning</u> and <u>Sustainable Regional Vitality</u>, in collaboration with the communities served by IUN (IUN website).

B. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require institutional attention and that actions taken and improvements achieved be described in the institution's Systems Portfolio before its next scheduled Systems Appraisal, to permit Commission follow-up.

None.

C. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require institutional attention and that actions taken and improvements achieved be described in the institution's Systems Portfolio before its next scheduled Systems Appraisal, to permit Commission follow-up.

None.

D. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up via declaration of a specific Action Project(s) and the submission of Annual Updates.

None.

Recommendation of the Panel

The Criterion is met, and no specific Commission follow-up is recommended.

CRITERION FIVE: ENGAGEMENT AND SERVICE: As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

A. Evidence that Core Components are met.

1. IUN serves a diverse constituency of learners including large numbers of first generation students, students from under-represented populations, and students who were in the bottom half of their high school classes. Many students require developmental courses (SA, p. 10).

2. The Office of Institutional Research assesses student needs through the National Survey of Student Engagement. IUN uses other surveys on a regular basis to assess the needs and satisfaction levels of both students and employees (IUN website).

3. IUN has entered into collaborative efforts with Perdue University Calumet, Purdue University North Central, Ivy tech, and Valpariso, and partnerships are sought as a strategic priority (SA p. 33).

4. Key community engagement efforts are found within the various schools. For example, numerous school and community partnerships are coordinated through the School of Education (SA, p. 34, IUN website).

5. Given IUN's commitment to diversity, lifelong learning, and the communities it serves, it is crucial that students have opportunities to develop an awareness of these areas. Service-learning is one vehicle through which those opportunities are made available to students. Service learning is integrated into numerous IUN courses (IUN website).

B. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention, but no specific Commission monitoring or reporting.

None.

C. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require institutional attention and that actions taken and improvements achieved be described in the institution's Systems Portfolio before its next scheduled Systems Appraisal, to permit Commission follow-up.

None.

D. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up via declaration of a specific Action Project(s) and the submission of Annual Updates.

None.

Recommendation of the Panel

The Criterion is met, and no specific Commission follow-up is recommended.

Summary of panel recommendations regarding fulfillment of the Criteria for Accreditation

The Criteria are all met. The Reaffirmation Panel recommends that actions taken and

improvements achieved for the issues described in sections C for Criteria One, Two, and Three be described in the institution's Systems Portfolio before its next scheduled Systems Appraisal, to permit Commission follow-up.

III. Participation in the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP)

A. Comments and counsel on specific improvement projects

IUN has completed 7 action projects related to increasing technological access to faculty, staff and students (2002), improving academic advising and career planning (2002), intervention for first year students/designing a freshman year experience (2002), student centered decision making (2006), general education reform/enhancing student learning outcomes (2006), commitment to diversity in faculty, students, staff and administration (2006), and measuring institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement. As noted in the Systems Appraisal, these projects were undertaken and completed; however, it is unclear as to their impact on the culture of assessment and continuous improvement on campus.

IUN's current projects (creating a culture of continuous improvement begun in 2007, general education reform in 2007, and centralizing student learning outcomes assessment in 2007) are related to their earlier retired projects and to the accreditation and strategic concerns of the Systems Appraisal. The Quality Checkup Team noted that IUN is making progress in addressing basic concerns related to continuous improvement including the development of processes and results collection and analysis, leadership, assessment, among other areas. The institution appears to continue to struggle with developing a campus wide climate open to the use of assessment to inform decision making, the identification of processes that enhance learning, decision making, stakeholder relationships, and leadership among others.   The institution is encouraged to continue to identify action projects AND to implement them as they share the successes of AQIP in serving their students and other stakeholders.

B. Comments and counsel on key institutional processes and systems

Evidence from the Systems Portfolio Feedback Report and comments of the Quality Checkup team indicate strengths and opportunities for growth in several of the AQIP categories.

In relation to AQIP Category 1, Helping Students Learn, IUN has identified 9 general education goals, which they are revising and aligning with direct student learning outcomes; further the academic programs are reviewed every 5-7 years for alignment with the mission, goals, and program objectives.   The next Systems Portfolio should demonstrate evidence that the Institution has identified and implemented an assessment program for general education and that they are developing a framework for continuous improvement in the areas of measures, results, comparative data and improvements (SA, Quality Checkup Report).

In Category 2, IUN communicates its expectations related to its learning objectives to its stakeholders; however, the next Systems Appraisal should address the processes used to involve stakeholders in the identification of the student and program needs and provide results to support the changes made.

In Category 3, IUN has categorized its stakeholders into one of three groups. It has begun to use data to identify stakeholder needs, such as in the Critical Literacy Program, linking them to

community groups like the region's Quality of Life Council. Processes for identifying stakeholders, results to assess the effectiveness of these processes and discussion of how the results affect change should be apparent in the next Systems Portfolio.

In Category 4, it was not apparent that IUN has followed up on the numerous opportunities for improvement relative to human resource development that were outlined in the AQIP Systems Appraisal Feedback report, including an examination of the faculty evaluation system, the employee reward and recognition system, comprehensive training and development opportunities for all employee groups and a lack of data on valuing employees (SA, p. 22 and 23). The Quality Checkup Team noted that IUN was making progress in identifying and developing processes to fill positions, training people internally for roles as leaders in the future (Leadership Academy), and developing collaborative processes such as the ECHO group (QCU, pp. 4-5). While the Chancellor and President of the Faculty Organization are working collaboratively to identify hiring processes, much remains to be done in establishing a climate of two way exchange of ideas between faculty and administration (QCU, p. 12). The next Systems Portfolio should reflect additional movement in this area, especially in the faculty evaluation systems, additional comprehensive training and development opportunities, a reward and recognition system, and data on valuing employees.

Although IUN recognizes the need for hiring a diverse faculty, administration, and staff, and has begun to identify hiring processes that support their hiring, the cycle of process, results and implementing change in the processes remains weak (SA, pp.22-23).

In Category 5, the QCU notes that IUN has filled key positions with permanent employees rather than interims and is in the process of filling others and is improving communication, especially about the AQIP process and assessment through workshops and a variety of means of communication. Succession in leadership, smooth transition when leaders change, and input from the stakeholders on the selection of leaders remain a concern.

In Category 6, IUN completed an action project that identified entering students who needed additional academic assistance and the type of assistance that they needed. Their performance appears to have improved. Day-to-day management operations are in place in some areas of the campus; however, how or if they have been standardized across the campus is not clear.

Category 7, measuring effectiveness is an area of concern at IUN. Both the SA Report and the QCU identified the need for campus wide commitment to the collection of data and its use to shape change on the campus as areas of strategic concern. Campus wide acceptance of the need to measure effectiveness remains an area that requires attention.

In Category 8, the strategic planning process in place connects facilities planning, information technology planning, and personnel resources. IUN has committed itself to the continuous improvement process; however, the commitment has not become campus wide or embedded itself into the culture of the institution. Pockets of supporters have been identified. The anticipated departure of the senior administrator who supports AQIP is a matter of concern in terms of continued support for AQIP. The next Systems Portfolio should include a complete description of the strategic planning process, including long-term and short-term goals, action plans, action plan owners, timeframes, resources allocations and performance targets.

March 2, 2009

In Category 9, IUN's partnerships are centered in particular schools of the University. Using strategic planning and other ties to units across campus, different areas are working together to strengthen their relationships with external partners. The cycle of identifying and prioritizing partnership development, results collection and analysis of the results to shape change in the relationships would assist IUN in focusing its resources.

C. Comments and counsel on the institution's culture of quality and its quality program or infrastructure.

IUN joined AQIP in 2002 and has been involved in two Strategy Forums and 11 AQIP Action Projects since that time. The College completed its Systems Portfolio and has received its first Systems Appraisal and Quality Checkup Visit.

As evidenced by the Systems Appraisal and Quality Checkup Report, IUN is partially committed to AQIP as its primary vehicle for continuous quality improvement. Pockets of individuals exist who are committed to identifying the processes, centralized data collection, use of results to inform change, and developing a climate of continuous improvement. However, the campus as a whole does not necessarily embrace the need for continuous improve, and in fact, some view assessment, for example, as an outside force imposed upon them (QCU, pp. 3-7).

IUN is encouraged to continue to hold workshops on AQIP, general education assessment, and related areas as a means to build the needed commitment to continuous quality improvement (QCU, p. 8). While the QCU Team noted that progress has been made towards continuous quality improvement since the Portfolio was submitted, the retirement of their senior administrator who is a proponent of AQIP could affect the future of the institution and its development as an AQIP campus.

IUN is encouraged to continue on its journey toward continuous improvement. By continuing to commit itself to identifying and documenting key processes, measuring results, and identifying improvements with measurable outcomes, the Institution will be well-positioned to continue to improve service to its students, employees and external stakeholders.

Summary of panel comments and counsel about the organization's commitment to continuous quality improvement and its participation in AQIP.

It is hoped that by the next systems appraisal and Quality Checkup Visit that IUN will have acknowledged, demonstrated an understanding of and accepted campus wide the importance of and the need for a "deep culture of continuous quality improvement as THE organizing principle for the Institution," and "that communication strategies and professional development regarding continuous quality, process improvement, results management, and systems thinking training will improve student learning, campus life and campus culture." The institution is acknowledged for undertaking the most current projects and for staying with the AQIP program. By the time of the next systems appraisal, the review team would hope to see, a campus wide commitment to AQIP, processes in place for each of the AQIP criterion, and results being collected and used to shape change. Perhaps the most essential outcome that IUN would realize from strengthening AQIP's presence on campus is that their position among their competitors has improved and the stakeholders surrounding them acknowledge that they are indeed a "jewel" (QCU, p. 13). Should IUN not show improvement in the acceptance, development and implementation of the AQIP process on their campus in their next AQIP Systems Portfolio, they might reconsider their participation in AQIP.