SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK REPORT

in response to the *Systems Portfolio* of

UNIVERSITY OF INDIANAPOLIS

OCTOBER 4, 2006

SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK REPORT

In response to the *Systems Portfolio* of

UNIVERSITY OF INDIANAPOLIS

Academic
Quality Improvement
Program
The Higher Learning Commission NCA

October 4, 2006

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR UNIVERSITY OF INDIANAPOLIS

The following are summary comments on each of the AQIP Categories crafted by the Appraisal Team to highlight **University of Indianapolis's** achievements and to identify challenges yet to be met.

> After reviewing Category One, the team observes that University of Indianapolis relies heavily on quantitative measures. While measures such as the IDEA survey instrument are nationally normed, they do not offer qualitative measures of success at the program level. Opportunity exists for University of Indianapolis to close the feedback loop and use the accumulated results from normed assessments and analyze institutional data for continuous improvement.

> Category Two illustrates that University of Indianapolis is committed to evaluation through the establishment of Scorecards, use of the Walker Student Survey, and use of the NSSE; however, what remains unclear is how University of Indianapolis uses these results in the quality improvement process. Closing the feedback loop and involving the proper decision makers in the process will make more effective use of these evaluative measures.

> After reviewing Category Three, the team recognizes that University of Indianapolis has identified a variety of stakeholders, stakeholder needs, and a circular process for responding to stakeholder needs. Given University of Indianapolis's connection to the church and its commitment to Christian values, the team expected the United Methodist Church to be identified as a stakeholder. The team would have appreciated additional information on the role of faculty in identifying and responding to student needs and further explanation of how the circular process varies for diverse stakeholders. The team noted that the Walker Student Survey is not widely used by other educational institutions, and comparative data is, therefore, not readily available. The team would have welcomed more and clearer analysis of NSSE data and additional data on non-student stakeholders. The team would also have appreciated more explanation of how the targets for improvement were selected in light of the processes described.

> In Category Four, University of Indianapolis has made efforts to assess employee satisfaction, primarily through surveys. Improvements have been made to Employee Orientation based on constructive feedback. Though annual professional development funds are made available to faculty, the portfolio evidences a decrease in all measures of faculty scholarship since 1988. One critical service apparently lacking at University of Indianapolis is a centralized Human Resources office. Through such an office, many

assessments and services could be normalized across the institution. Also, diversity training is important but represents only one aspect of valuing people. It is not clear that the University has a comprehensive approach or understanding of what it means to "value people" from the context of an employer as opposed to that of a religious institution.

Upon review of Category Five, the team recognizes that University of Indianapolis has made significant efforts to provide multiple avenues for exchanging ideas and concerns and has established a new governance structure, including the Faculty Senate. The portfolio does not, however, clearly describe how shared-governance works in practice, how strategic directions and targets for improvement are established, and how the needs of stakeholders fit into the processes. The team is also concerned about a possible perception that the University is hierarchical and relies too heavily on income-generating indices of success.

In Category Six, University of Indianapolis gathers data related to Institutional Operations Support, but as in other areas of the portfolio, the process after data collection is unclear. Defining the recipients of data and process for planning performance improvement would be advantageous for the institution.

In Category Seven, University of Indianapolis has begun a number of initiatives to collect, analyze, report, and incorporate data into its planning and decision-making processes. There appears to be a strong awareness of the need for and the benefits of, a convenient process for gathering, analyzing, and applying such data. Central to the carrying out of these plans is the University's AQIP office, which has been designated as the locus of data integration as it develops. Plans exist for benchmarking University of Indianapolis against other institutions and some beginning efforts have been carried out. The report does not present a comprehensive picture of data-based results showing that the institution has been effective in meeting its goals. It is also unclear how data are gathered and analyzed and shared with stakeholders and used for institutional improvement or for comparison with other institutions. It has been difficult for the reviewers to find and understand the evidence for claims in the report for how well the institution is meeting its goals. Major opportunities exist for University of Indianapolis to further develop and implement its plans for improvement in data-collection, analysis, benchmarking, and use of effectiveness measures. Overall, University of Indianapolis appears to be at a developing stage in its use of data.

In Category 8, University of Indianapolis articulates a historic strategic planning process that appears to be poised for review and revision. As University of Indianapolis adopts

new planning models there is potential to align goals within the institution, to adequately capture process revisions, to provide better decision making related to strategy, and better evaluate results. University of Indianapolis faces possible challenges related to governance issues and setting strategic direction, but efforts like their Strategy Grid will help in providing a transparent system where stakeholders have opportunity for input. University of Indianapolis is encouraged to build on the opportunity presented by the recent change in leadership, to deploy a better systemic process, to collect evidence of effectiveness by evaluating results, and to reflect on and improve their new strategic planning processes.

In Category 9, results from student surveys seem both positive and negative on related issues. University of Indianapolis could determine effective processes to address building more successful collaborative relationships by utilizing varied measures, analyzing the data and turning the results into improvement plans. The AQIP office will be an effective hub of information and planning.

Accreditation issues and Strategic challenges for **University of Indianapolis** are listed in detail within the Strategic and Accreditation Issues Analysis section of the Appraisal Feedback Report.

ELEMENTS OF **University of Indianapolis's** FEEDBACK REPORT

The *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* provides AQIP's official response to your *Systems Portfolio* by a team of readers trained in evaluation. After appraisers independently reviewed your document, the team reached consensus on essential elements of your institutional profile, strengths and opportunities for improvement by Category, and significant issues for your institution. These are presented in three sections of the Feedback Report: Accreditation Issues Analysis, Critical Characteristics Analysis, and Category Feedback. These components are interrelated in defining context, evaluating performance, surfacing critical issues, and assessing institutional performance.

It is important to remember that the Systems Appraisal Team had only your *Systems Portfolio* to guide their analysis of your institution's strengths and opportunities for improvement. Consequently, their report may omit important strengths — if you were too modest to stress them in your *Systems Portfolio*, or if your discussion and documentation of them was unconvincing. Similarly, the team may have pointed out areas of potential improvement that are already receiving the institution's attention. Again, the team used its best judgment in identifying improvement opportunities. If some of these areas of potential improvement are now strengths

rather than opportunities because of your own focused efforts, that is all to your credit. If the team was unsure about an area, we urged it to err on the side of giving your institution the best possible advice about where investing your efforts might pay off. If some of their advice comes after the fact, after you've already tackled an area, no harm is done.

Executive Summary. Summative statements agreed upon by the Systems Appraisal Team based upon the institution's achievements and challenges in regards to each of the nine AQIP Categories. Strategic challenges for the institution are listed in detail within the Strategic and Accreditation Issues Analysis section of the Appraisal Feedback Report.

Strategic and Accreditation Issues Analysis: Strategic issues are those most closely related to your institution's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning, and quality improvement goals. Accreditation issues are areas where you have not yet provided evidence that you meet the Commission's *Criteria for Accreditation*, or where the evidence you have presented suggests you may have difficulties, now or in the future, in meeting these expectations. If accreditation is essential for your institution then any accreditation issues identified are, by definition, also strategic. The Systems Appraisal Team identified both of these kinds of issues through analysis of your Organizational Overview and the feedback it provided for each Category, as well as by reviewing the Index to the *Criteria for Accreditation* that you provided along with your *Systems Portfolio*. This list of strategic issues offers a framework for addressing ongoing improvement of processes and systems, serving as an executive summary of the Report's key findings and recommendations.

Critical Characteristics: Your Systems Portfolio's Organizational Overview provides context for the team's knowledge of your institution's identity, mission objectives, strategic goals, and key factors related to improvement. Critical Characteristics are those features most important for understanding the institution's mission, environment, stakeholders, competitive position, goals, and processes. Characteristics having the greatest relevance to each Category are identified in the Report.

Category Feedback: The Report's feedback on each of AQIP's nine Categories specifically identifies strengths and opportunities for improvement. An **S** or **SS** identifies strengths, with the double letter signifying important achievements or capabilities upon which to build. Opportunities are designated by **O**, with **OO** indicating areas where attention may result in more significant improvement. Comments, which are keyed to your *Systems Portfolio*, offer brief analysis of each strength and opportunity. Organized by Category, and presenting the team's findings in detail, this section is the heart of the Report. At the end of the list of strengths and opportunities for each Category is the team's consensus assessment of the institution's stage of development on that particular Category. This section consists of a series of statements

reflecting the reviewers' assessment of the institution's current status in relation to critical quality characteristics: robustness of process design; utilization or deployment of processes; the existence of results, trends, and comparative data; the use of results data as feedback, and systematic processes for improvement of the activities that the Category covers. Since institutions are complex, maturity levels may vary from one Category to another.

STRATEGIC AND ACCREDITATION ISSUES

In conducting the Systems Appraisal, the team attempted to identify the broader issues that present the greatest challenges and opportunities for your institution in the coming years. These are all strategic issues, ones you need to grapple with as you identify your institution's strategies for confronting the future and becoming the institution you want to be. The team also examined whether any of these strategic issues put your institution into jeopardy of not meeting the Higher Learning Commission's accreditation expectations.

Issues Affecting Compliance with the *Criteria for Accreditation*. An important goal for the Systems Appraisal was to review your institution's compliance with the Higher Learning Commission's *Criteria for Accreditation*. The peer quality experts who served on the team were all trained in evaluating colleges and universities using the Commission's *Criteria*, and the Systems Appraisal process they followed included careful steps to ensure the team used the *Criteria* as a major factor in their review. As the team reviewed your presentation of your institutions under each AQIP Category, it searched for accreditation-related issues and concerns. In addition, the team used the *Index to the Criteria for Accreditation* that you provided with your Portfolio to perform a comprehensive review of the *Criteria* and each Core Component to ascertain whether you presented compelling evidence that your institution complies with each of these Commission expectations.

The Systems Appraisal team concluded that University of Indianapolis has presented evidence that it complies with each of the Five *Criteria for Accreditation* and each of their Core Components. Although the Systems Appraisal does not in itself constitute a review for continued accreditation, the team's conclusion upon reviewing your Portfolio against the Criteria will serve as a telling piece of evidence during the Commission's next scheduled AQIP review of your institution for Reaffirmation of Accreditation.

Issues Affecting Future Institutional Strategies. The Systems Appraisal Team identified the following strategic issues to assist University of Indianapolis in prioritizing and taking action on the important broad challenges and opportunities it faces. From these you may discover your

vital immediate priorities, shaping strategies that can lead to a quantum leap in the performance of your institution. Implementing these strategies may call for specific actions, so AQIP's expectation that your institution be engaged in three or four vital Action Projects at all times will help encourage your administrators, faculty, and staff to turn these strategic goals into real accomplishments. Knowing that University of Indianapolis will discuss these strategic issues, give priority to those it concludes are most critical, and take action promptly, the Systems Appraisal Team identified:

> University of Indianapolis seeks to teach knowledgeable, engaged students as articulated through its learning goals. However, University of Indianapolis presents relatively few direct measures of student learning outcomes. The data presented in the Portfolio appears to focus more on revenue production than on learning outcomes. University of Indianapolis is encouraged to closely review its overall assessment approach, systematize its processes, and begin to track results emergent from direct measures of the common student.

> University of Indianapolis is still building systematic processes as is evidenced from the lack of consistent detail and process related results in the portfolio. There seems to be a disconnect between improvements and processes/results. Processes should be established and results analyzed to identify targets for improvements. University of Indianapolis's targets for improvement seem to be ad hoc and do not necessarily seem to arise from the processes established or data collected. For example, in Category Three why is the issue of tuition introduced in the improvement section? Further, what processes and data led to a conclusion that a campaign to improve the University's image was an appropriate response to this concern? What processes and data led to the conclusion that parking was a concern? While the swipe card system is a good idea, what process and information led to establishing this priority?

> In the portfolio, the University of Indianapolis suggests a desire to review and improve its approach to human resources and its current professional development process. The University of Indianapolis may be well served by acting on a guiding philosophy of quality improvement as it begins to reframe its faculty and staff development and rank and tenure review efforts. Given the results related to employee satisfaction and research productivity, it is likely that this discussion is currently occurring. However, there has been a decline in faculty scholarship since 1998. Curiously, no process or data on faculty tenure or promotion is included in the report. An action project could be developed to examine the human resources processes including, compensation strategies, classification, career progression and the like.

The University of Indianapolis admits to not having a systematic campus-wide program to develop continuous improvement processes. University of Indianapolis could benefit from a systematic strategic planning process that involves stakeholders. The current system, as reported, may be perceived as lacking transparency. Additionally, the process of aligning resources to strategic priority needs to be more fully articulated, as well as the process of evaluating work toward those strategic priorities. Quality improvement can be more easily accomplished if the institution is moving in alignment with a strategic plan that stakeholders have bought into and that is linked to resources and evaluation of effort.

Most of the systems portfolio reviewers were surprised that University of Indianapolis did not refer to the United Methodist Church as a stakeholder in Category 3. Likewise, the portfolio does not address the importance of partnerships with the church in Category 9. This could be indicative of a relationship that is so integrated that the institution does not mention it (taken for granted) or it may suggest communication or other issues with external stakeholders such as the United Methodist Church. This may create obstacles/missed opportunities for recruiting students to come to University of Indianapolis.

The University of Indianapolis portfolio seems to lack a definition for the term "shared governance," and faculty and the normal consultative bodies and forums seem not to be consulted or engaged in many institutional-wide endeavors. Perhaps shared governance does exist at this institution in a formal sense which adds to the complexity of the University of Indianapolis's internal communication problems.

USING THE FEEDBACK REPORT

The AQIP *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* is intended to initiate action for improvement. It is therefore important that the Report produced by the Systems Appraisal Team stimulate review of organizational processes and systems. Though decisions about specific actions are each institution's, AQIP expects every institution to use its feedback to stimulate cycles of continual improvement. At the next Strategy Forum an AQIP institution attends, its peers will examine in detail how it is using the feedback from its Systems Appraisal.

An organization needs to examine its Report strategically to identify those areas that will yield greatest benefit if addressed. Some key questions that may arise in careful examination of the Report may be: How do the team's findings challenge our assumptions about ourselves? Given our mission and goals, which issues should we focus on? How will we employ results to

innovate, grow, and encourage a positive culture of improvement? How will we incorporate lessons learned from this review in our planning and operational processes? How will we revise the *Systems Portfolio* to reflect what we have learned?

How an organization interprets, communicates, and uses its feedback for improvement ought to support AQIP's core values, encouraging involvement, learning, collaboration and integrity. Based solely upon an organization's *Systems Portfolio*, the Report reflects a disciplined, external review of what an organization says about itself. The report should help an organization identify ways to improve its *Systems Portfolio* so it functions better to communicate accurately to internal and external audiences. But the Report's chief purpose is to help you to identify areas for improvement, and to act so that these areas actually improve. These improvements can then be incorporated into an updated *Systems Portfolio*, guaranteeing that future Systems Appraisals will reflect the progress an institution has made.

Within a year following the Systems Appraisal, an institution participates in another AQIP Strategy Forum, where the focus will be on what the institution has learned from its Appraisal (and from its other methods of identifying and prioritizing improvement opportunities, and what it has concluded are its major strategic priorities for the next few years. AQIP's goal is to help an institution to clarify the strategic issues most vital to its success, and then to support the institution as it addresses these priorities through Action Projects that will make a difference in institutional performance.

CRITICAL CHARACTERISTICS ANALYSIS

The purpose of this section is to identify what team members understood to be the critical and distinguishing characteristics of your institution. They are the shared understanding of the most important aspects of the University of Indianapolis, its current dynamics and the forces surrounding it, and its internal momentum and aspirations, at least as team members understood them. This section also demonstrates that the Systems Appraisal Team recognized and knew what makes University of Indianapolis distinctive. Should you find some characteristics that you think are critical and missing from this list, you may want to clarify and highlight these items when you revise your *Systems Portfolio* and other literature explaining your institution to the public.

Item   Critical Characteristic

01a   The University of Indianapolis (founded in 1902) is a private, nonprofit, coeducational, residential institution of higher education affiliated with the United Methodist Church.

01b   The University of Indianapolis is governed by a Board of Trustees comprised of members selected from the community, United Methodist Church, alumni, and at-large representation from the state and nation.

01c   The University's curriculum reflects a commitment to Christian values while stressing the ideals of critical, rational thought; independent, responsible inquiry; novel, creative expression; and sensitive, reflective morality.

01d   In keeping with its motto, "Education for Service," the University emphasizes application of knowledge and skills in an increasingly complex world including specialized masters degrees in nursing, accounting, business administration, health science, and occupational therapy along with doctoral degrees in health science, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and psychology train students for professions of service.

01e   The institution has established (in addition to general education) university-wide learning goals of critical thinking, creativity, performance, and social responsibility.

01f   There are two sources articulating the common learning goals for the university: the general education and the assessment plan.

02a   Indianapolis University offers degree programs in more than 65 fields of study, including 9 associate, 70 bachelor, 22 master, and five doctoral degree programs.

02b   The University of Indianapolis programs serve a broad range of students from traditional aged to adult learners, as well as both resident and commuter students.

02c   Academic programs are offered in full- and part-time formats and in full-term, weekend and accelerated formats. Web-based and distance learning courses are available at all levels.

02d   A five-year business plan (adopted in 2003), springing from the Strategic Plan, gives explicit objectives to establish recognized centers of excellence on both regional and national levels by 2007.

02e   The institution holds internationalization of its campuses to be a high value. The institution sees its international partner sites as central to its mission and operation.

03a   The University has a total of 4,462 students (3,361 undergraduates and 1,101 graduates). Twenty-nine percent of the undergraduate students are part-time; and 61% of graduate students are part-time.

03b   Eighty-four percent of traditional aged undergraduates are from Indiana; twelve percent are from out-of-state; four percent are international students. Students in the School of Adult learning are from the Indianapolis metropolitan area.

11

04a   The University seeks partnerships at city, state, national and global levels by focusing on three key collaborative areas: the first is through the development of internships, clinical training, field placements, and service learning; the second is through the development of the centers of excellence (Center of Excellence in Leadership and Learning (CELL), which works with area school districts, and Center for Aging and Community (CAC)); the third collaborative area is international partner sites.

O4b   The University of Indianapolis operates a 65 acre campus located on the south side of Indianapolis. The campus consists of 30 buildings, including residence halls. The University has international partner sites.

04c   The University has a number of strategies for creating a diverse, accepting learning community.

05a   The University of Indianapolis employs both full- (166) and part-time faculty (250), full and part-time non-exempt staff (162), and full-time exempt staff (153).

05b   In 2004, the institution established a governance structure based on an elected faculty Senate.

06a   The University has 222 computers in nine labs available for students, and it uses Blackboard as a teaching tool. Technology is an important part of campus- based offerings through the extensive use of web-enhanced course offerings (although it does not offer any degree programs completely online at this time).

06b   The University operates a public radio station broadcasting in high definition, a television studio, an observatory and a museum.

06c   In addition to accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission, the University Senate of the United Methodist Church accredits the University and individual programs are accredited by their professional organizations.

07a   The University identifies its competition as: Butler University, Indiana University Purdue, University Indianapolis, and Ball State University. There is no degree program offered that is unique to the university, so it must differentiate itself from the competition in other ways (unique formats, class sizes, and quality instruction).

08   The University of Indianapolis is a growing institution, and it faces all the accompanying challenges of a growing institution.

CATEGORY FEEDBACK

In the following sections, each of which deals with strengths and opportunities for improvement for one of the nine AQIP Categories, selected *Critical Characteristics* are again highlighted, and those the Systems Appraisal Team believed were critical keys to reviewing that particular AQIP Category. The symbols used in these "strengths and opportunities" sections for each Category stand for *outstanding strength* (SS), *strength* (S), *opportunity for improvement* (O) and *pressing or outstanding opportunity for improvement* (OO). The choice of symbol for each item represents the consensus evaluation of the Systems Appraisal Team members, and deserves your thoughtful consideration. Comments marked SS or OO may need immediate attention, either to ensure the institution preserves and maximizes the value of its greatest strengths, or to devote immediate attention to its greatest opportunities for improvement.

AQIP CATEGORY 1: HELPING STUDENTS LEARN

Helping Students Learn identifies the shared purpose of all higher education organizations, and is accordingly the pivot of any institutional analysis. This Category focuses on the teaching-learning process within a formal instructional context, yet also addresses how your entire institution contributes to helping students learn and overall student development. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to learning objectives, mission-driven student learning and development, intellectual climate, academic programs and courses, student preparation, key issues such as technology and diversity, program and course delivery, faculty and staff roles, teaching and learning effectiveness, course sequencing and scheduling, learning and co-curricular support, student assessment, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Indianapolis that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 1, Helping Students Learn:

Item   Critical Characteristic

01a   The University of Indianapolis (founded in 1902) is a private, nonprofit, coeducational, residential institution of higher education affiliated with the United Methodist Church.

01c   The University of Indianapolis's curriculum reflects a commitment to Christian values while stressing the ideals of critical, rational thought; independent, responsible inquiry; novel, creative expression; and sensitive, reflective morality.

01d   In keeping with its motto, "Education for Service," the University emphasizes application of knowledge and skills in an increasingly complex world including specialized masters degrees in nursing, accounting, business administration, health science, and occupational therapy along with doctoral degrees in health science, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and psychology train students for professions of service.

02a   University of Indianapolis offers degree programs in more than 65 fields of study, including 9 associate, 70 bachelor, 22 master, and five doctoral degree programs.

02b   The University of Indianapolis programs serve a broad range of students from traditional aged* (*parameters not defined in portfolio) to adult learners, as well as both resident and commuter students.

02c   Academic programs are offered in full- and part-time formats and in full-term, weekend and accelerated formats. Web-based and distance learning courses are available at all levels.

03a   The University of Indianapolis has a total of 4,462 students (3,361 undergraduates and 1,101 graduates). Twenty-nine percent of the undergraduate students are part-time; and 61% of graduate students are part-time.

04a   The University of Indianapolis seeks partnerships at city, state, national and global levels by focusing on three key collaborative areas: the first is through the development of internships, clinical training, field placements, and service learning; the second is through the development of the centers of excellence (Center of Excellence in Leadership and Learning (CELL), which works with area school districts, and Center for Aging and Community (CAC)); the third collaborative area is international partner sites.

06a   The University of Indianapolis has 222 computers in nine labs available for students, and it uses Blackboard as a teaching tool. Technology is an important part of campus- based offerings through the extensive use of web-enhanced course offerings (although it does not offer any degree programs completely online at this time).

06c   In addition to accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission, the University Senate of the United Methodist Church accredits the University and individual programs are accredited by their professional organizations.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Indianapolis's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 1, Helping Students Learn.

Item   S/O   Comment

1C1-1C2	S	The University of Indianapolis clearly articulates two sources for learning goals (eight general education learning goals and four University-wide learning goals).
1C2	O	The University of Indianapolis states that its learning goals directly align with the institution's mission and purposes, but does not publish the actual mission or purposes statements within the portfolio, making the relationship between the learning goals and the mission difficult to discern.
1C3a	S	The portfolio indicates that technology plays an important role in all teaching strategies and learning environments.
1C3b	S	Eighty-five percent of the University of Indianapolis's student body participates in hands-on applied student learning experiences (e.g., clinical training, internships, service learning, and study abroad experiences).
1C3c	O	While there is utility to a listing of the degrees offered by college, a more meaningful assessment of "key programs" (e.g. actual enrollments or degrees offered) might be considered.
1C4a	S	The University of Indianapolis identifies five strategies to promote and create a welcoming diverse campus: (1) the Bridge program targeting first generation and underrepresented groups of students; (2) diversity training (university-wide multi-cultural committee); (3) off-campus International studies and Exchange programs; (4) international branch campuses in four countries; and (5) various student organizations, (e.g. The Pride, focused on promoting understanding of diverse sexual orientations).
1C4b	O	It is unclear how various student learning styles are met within the institution's learning strategies.
1C5	S	The Faculty Handbook states that the University of Indianapolis abides by the guidelines of the American Association of University Professors wherein the principle of academic freedom is articulated.
1P1a	S	Development of learning goals involves multiple units and levels within the University. An AQIP subcommittee and the Faculty Senate facilitated the establishment of learning goals; the College of Arts and Sciences and the graduate and undergraduate curriculum committees of the Faculty Senate provide oversight; the goals are reinterpreted by faculty in specific

		majors and programs in keeping with any accreditation concerns. Relevant stakeholders appear to be engaged in the process.
1P1b	S	Faculty are responsible for aligning program objectives with learning competencies required by professional accreditation bodies.
1P1-1P2	O	The University of Indianapolis refers to the broad processes used to build or make changes to curriculum, but no specific processes are documented.
1P2a	S	New academic programs can originate from support of outside stakeholders (e.g., corporate employers or school districts), from an academic unit (determine fit, viability, and need), or an off-campus site.
1P2b	O	The portfolio does not address how long it takes to develop and implement programs, and whether or not these programs are ready on a timely basis to meet student and employer needs.
1P2c	O	Faculty Senate Involvement in the process for offering new programs may come at a stage that diminishes faculty influence.
1P3a	S	Both faculty and staff, including the Director of Admissions, are involved in setting undergraduate admissions standards. Each student is required to take a placement test to appropriately place them in their English, Math, and Modern Languages.
1P3b	O	Despite the commonality of learning goals and the common process for arriving at them, the establishment of requirements for admission to the university appear to be based solely on individual departments.
1P4	S	The University of Indianapolis articulates an extensive array of programs to communicate placement and program expectations to students.
1P4-1P5	S	Various web-based and paper materials and a required five-week New Student Experience Course play a significant role in communicating learning expectations to students.
1P5	S	The University of Indianapolis is adopting a student mentoring model for faculty advising, which includes career counseling and recommending use of other campus resources, and should help students select programs of study and address problems related to different student group needs (non-traditional students, first-generation college etc).
1P6a	S	The Faculty Affairs Committee determines the course evaluation system which is implemented by the Vice President for Research, Planning and

Strategic Partnerships. This should allow for faculty input and objective analysis and ensure feedback.

1P6b	S	There is an annual self-evaluation process for individual faculty members which includes preparation of a personal development plan and administrative and peer feedback, which becomes a part of the individual's portfolio for promotion and tenure. Beyond individual and course evaluation, each program undergoes a periodic program review.
1P6c	S	Through the IDEA system, a nationally-normed instrument, The University of Indianapolis provides data on effectiveness of teaching and learning including trends, comparisons within the university, and national benchmarks which are shared with faculty during Faculty Senate sessions.
1P6d	O	The institution appears to rely totally on assessments of perceived learning to determine effectiveness without employing behavioral methods. To rely heavily on retention and graduation data ignores the specific behavioral manifestations of real learning.
1P7-1P9	S	The University of Indianapolis supports instruction through its Center for Instructional Technology and through a campus-wide delivery platform, Blackboard. An office for teaching and learning is planned. The BUILD program provides special support to students with learning disabilities.
1P7	O	Through the recently created position – Education Coordinator for Adult Learning – the University of Indianapolis has opportunity to provide support to adjunct faculty in course design and faculty development. As well as providing professional development, this should provide recognition of the adjunct faculty's role in teaching and learning.
1P8a	O	Process for change and/or discontinuation of programs is not standardized and is unclear.
1P8b	S	By allowing savings from discontinued programs to revert to the department, the institution has developed a process for ending programs that does not create a disincentive to departments for doing so.
1P9a	O	A Center for Instructional Technologies will potentially "provide support to faculty in teaching assessment, teaching strategies and educational research" and will "promote a learning culture."

1P9b	S	Student learning is supported through the BUILD program, tutoring, student internship experiences, the Honors College program, study abroad programs and the New Student Experience.
1P10a	O	The University of Indianapolis does not detail a process for aligning co-curricular with curricular learning objectives.
1P10b	S	University of Indianapolis's Student Affairs Division participates in shared planning, committees, and governance to align curricular and co-curricular learning objectives.
1P11	S	The processes of student assessment are being developed by the AQIP subcommittee as a part of its action projects and include a student satisfaction survey, the NSSE, an Honors portfolio and senior project and other course assessment.
1P11-1P13	OO	The University of Indianapolis does not articulate a university-led effort to assess student learning outcomes, instead relying on course, program, and unit levels. The University's general education core is not explicitly mentioned.
1P12	S	The University of Indianapolis articulates a grant-funded alumni community initiative allowing interaction with alumni over critical issues of concern (e.g. adequacy of preparation for graduates). The University of Indianapolis also uses a system of field placements and employer surveys to gather information.
1R1-1R4	S	Based on IDEA data, University of Indianapolis has met or exceeded national benchmarks on each of 12 learning objectives, even though over half of its undergraduate students are first generation college students and the University is the largest user of state need-based student aid.
1R1a	S	The GPA for student-athletes is above 3.0, and their retention and graduation rates are higher than those for the general student body.
1R1b	S	The institution gathers and analyzes carefully its data on completion and retention and shows that it meets its performance objectives.
1R1c	O	In many cases, the increases or decreases over the three-year trend period are not statistically significant to suggest a real upward or downward trend in improvement data for the University of Indianapolis students. In addition, seventeen of the twenty figures in this section are from the IDEA instrument. More varied measures would lead to a fuller assessment.

1R1d	S	Data from the IDEA assessment show consistent strength relative to national norms for perceived learning and satisfaction. The respectable retention and graduation rates are further evidence of student satisfaction.
1R1e	OO	While including norm references, IDEA does not represent a system for direct assessment of student learning outcomes. Though informative, course completion and retention data lacks precision as an estimate for assessment of student learning outcomes.
1R1f	O	The University of Indianapolis does not appear to assess the effectiveness of its process for discontinuing programs.
1R2, 1I1	O	The University of Indianapolis acknowledges the fact that pass rates on professional examinations have not always met targets (e.g. ASN program). The University of Indianapolis has made program revisions, offered review courses and mock exams and is struggling with making changes for improvement.
R2a	O	Although the University of Indianapolis has collected data on how students in certain professional programs perform on national exams; the portfolio does not indicate that University of Indianapolis collects data for the many fields for which exams do indeed exist (e.g. the eight GRE subjects).
1R2b	S	Results of its comparisons with state and national data in professional program performance show consistent strength relative to those norms.
1R2c	S	The institution maintains that its learning goal of having students apply their learning is being addressed as exemplified by the data on student pass rates in nursing and occupational therapy (pp 1.11) and on the CFA and CPA exams in business (p 1.12).
1R2d	O	Processes for assessing the effectiveness of the orientation course do not appear to be in place.
1R3-1R4	O	The University of Indianapolis does not articulate a comparative analysis of direct measures of student learning outcomes assessment, instead relying on NSSE as a proxy of student learning effectiveness.
1I1a	S	In recent years, the University has planned a significant number of new processes and systems for helping students learn (e.g., an Academic Success Center, the New Student Experience Course, revisions designed

to increase retention in the Honors Program, a center for teaching and learning, changes in the International Division, and a revised orientation program for new faculty).

1I1b	O	Data on the Honors Program (referred to elsewhere in the portfolio as a college) shows "…the number of students who progress to the end of the program [is] quite low." (1.13)
1I1-2	O	While the University of Indianapolis rightly self-identifies many important areas for improvement, they notably do not include any initiative that documents and shares best practice in learning assessment, a priority not only of the University of Indianapolis, but for all programs accredited through HLC. The University of Indianapolis also does not articulate a specific plan for sharing targets in these important areas.

AQIP CATEGORY 2: ACCOMPLISHING OTHER DISTINCTIVE OBJECTIVES

Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives addresses the processes that contribute to the achievement of your institution's major objectives that complement student learning and fulfill other portions of your mission. Depending on your institution's character, it examines your institution's processes and systems related to identification of other distinctive objectives, alignment of other distinctive objectives, faculty and staff roles, assessment and review of objectives, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Indianapolis that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 2, Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives:

Item   Critical Characteristic

01a   The University of Indianapolis (founded in 1902) is a private, nonprofit, coeducational, residential institution of higher education affiliated with the United Methodist Church.

01c   The University's curriculum reflects a commitment to Christian values while stressing the ideals of critical, rational thought; independent, responsible inquiry; novel, creative expression; and sensitive, reflective morality.

01d   In keeping with its motto, "Education for Service," the University emphasizes application of knowledge and skills in an increasingly complex world including specialized masters degrees in nursing, accounting, business administration, health science, and

occupational therapy along with doctoral degrees in health science, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and psychology train students for professions of service.

01f   There are two sources articulating the common learning goals for the university: the general education and the assessment plan.

02b   The University of Indianapolis programs serve a broad range of students from traditional aged* (*parameters not defined in portfolio) to adult learners, as well as both resident and commuter students.

04a   The University seeks partnerships at city, state, national and global levels by focusing on three key collaborative areas: the first is through the development of internships, clinical training, field placements, and service learning; the second is through the development of the centers of excellence (Center of Excellence in Leadership and Learning (CELL), which works with area school districts, and Center for Aging and Community (CAC)); the third collaborative area is international partner sites.

O4b   The University of Indianapolis operates a 65 acre campus located on the south side of Indianapolis. The campus consists of 30 buildings, including residence halls. The University has international partner sites.

04c   The University has a number of strategies for creating a diverse, accepting learning community.

06b   The University operates a public radio station broadcasting in high definition, a television studio, an observatory and a museum.

07a   The University identifies its competition as: Butler University, Indiana University Purdue, University Indianapolis, and Ball State University. There is no degree program offered that is unique to the university, so it must differentiate itself from the competition in other ways (unique formats, class sizes, and quality instruction).

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Indianapolis's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 2, Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives.

Item	*S/O*	*Comment*
2C1-2C2	SS	The University of Indianapolis illustrates the alignment of programming and planning with the mission, vision, and philosophy of the institution. The Lantz Center and the Ecumenical and Interfaith Programs Office, as well as The Center for Business Partnerships and the Institute for the Study of War and Diplomacy, are a direct extension of the University's mission.

2C2	O	Although initiatives like CAC, service-learning, and international education are distinctive and worthy objectives, there is little data presented to substantiate successful results. Consequently, it is not clear how and to what extent the initiatives align with the stated mission "to gain a deeper understanding of the teaching of Christian faith and an appreciation and respect for other religions."
2P1- 2P2	S	The University of Indianapolis is in the process of institutionalizing the forums and advisory bodies needed to determine and assess University-wide initiatives. Having established a combined Cabinet and council that integrate academic leadership, the University of Indianapolis uses strategy committees to keep the Faculty Senate informed on strategic initiatives. Faculty members and administrators lead and staff centers and initiatives, and are connected to faculty and staff through committees and cross appointments. The staffing arrangements of the centers promote integration with the rest of the university.
2P3a	O	The University of Indianapolis uses faculty and staff from academic departments to run its centers and institutes, which may introduce conflicting priorities with the academic mission of the institution and impact staff effectiveness. It is unclear how faculty and staff are involved in international programming.
2P3b	O	Faculty and staff receive mini-grants, and vocational exploration funds are offered to assist employees, but it is unclear how this relates specifically to the University of Indianapolis's other distinctive objectives.
2P4	S	The University of Indianapolis's Scorecard reports and site visits are used to offer feedback to committees and administrators about distinctive objectives and programs. The University of Indianapolis collects and analyzes key institutional indicators (e.g. Crossing Project Outcomes) and strategic planning outcomes in relation to evaluating their distinctive objectives.
2P4	O	Although the University of Indianapolis reportedly uses scorecard reports in monitoring and adjusting objectives, it is not entirely clear how the collection of data gets translated into institutional action or how administrators or faculty utilize such data.
2P5	OO	The University of Indianapolis utilizes a scorecard to measure and report key indicators and collects both quantitative and qualitative data to measure distinctive objectives. It is unclear how key indicators and

scorecards are used and what processes lead to assessment and review of objectives. For example, there appears to be no process in place to judge whether the objectives for the following units are being achieved: The Lantz Center for Christian Vocations and Formation, The Center for Aging and Community, The Center for Emerging Careers, The Center for Business Partnerships, The Institute for the Study of War and Diplomacy, and the Crossings Project. Similarly the portfolio mentions "matrix and rubric instruments," but these are not identified.

2R1a	S	Figure 2-3 provides evidence that the University of Indianapolis excels at getting students involved in activities which enhance spirituality. The University of Indianapolis students score above the national average in their participation in activities to enhance spirituality.
2R1b	OO	Although the University of Indianapolis has an intentional focus on service-learning, NSSE data in Figures 2-1 and 2-2 do not indicate an especially high rate of participation by students in community service through courses or as volunteers.
2R1c	O	Efforts to increase the diversity of educational experiences and to foster interracial and intercultural interactions among students have had mixed results. Results show that students perceive diverse viewpoints in class with more frequency as they move to higher levels (fig. 2.7). The University of Indianapolis students, in general, are below the national average in frequency of serious conversations with students of other racial and ethnic backgrounds. The chart illustrating student opinions regarding diversity issues is unclear.
2R1d	O	Each of the centers of excellence has developed a scorecard, but only the scorecard for CELL is provided in Appendix B, and that scorecard reports more on goals and benefits than on results.
2R1e	O	While the general trend in earned international credit is up, it would be helpful if the University of Indianapolis would more clearly define "direct credit international student enrollment" (Figure 2-5) and explore the decrease which occurred between 2003 and 2004. It would also be helpful if University of Indianapolis explained who the students are at international sites, why there have been significant swings in enrollment in Athens, and why the direct credit program in Cyprus was terminated.

2R2f	S	The University of Indianapolis benchmarks its NSSE results on other distinctive objectives against national averages. For example, University of Indianapolis students show a significant increase in recognition of diversity as they move from their freshman to senior years; and while entering the University of Indianapolis students begin below the national average, seniors are above the national average.
2R2g	O	"Currently, centers and institutes do not benchmark and compare results and best practice results with peer institutions in terms of distinctive objectives." The University of Indianapolis recognizes its opportunity for improvement in developing distinctive objectives, benchmarks and comparisons with peer institutions and comparable community organizations.
2R3a	S	The University of Indianapolis's attention to social transformation and diversity are used in a variety of ways to strengthen the institution. The University of Indianapolis has strengthened its enrollment and reputation and improved and developed key relations with its community and region through grant, partnership development and service learning projects in areas such as services and employment for the aging adult.
2R3b	O	The results associated with distinctive objectives of the Centers and Institutes could contribute to the University of Indianapolis's reputation and provide opportunities for research, service, and networking.
2R3c	O	Although anecdotal evidence is given, no quantitative data are supplied to document claims that the University of Indianapolis is building a national reputation, meeting community needs, providing networking opportunities, etc. Reports of national and regional reputation provide substantiation in the portfolio given the lack of sophisticated external benchmarking.
2I1	OO	The University of Indianapolis correctly views its opportunity to benchmark assessment results against other institutions as a priority, stating in the portfolio: "…further work is needed to connect objectives, feedback, and improvement in a systematic way."
2I2	O	While most centers and institutes try to accomplish stated objectives, the University of Indianapolis recognizes the challenge of communicating current results and improving priorities for their distinctive objectives to their various stakeholders, admitting that many administrators do not analyze the results for improvement beyond the establishment of initial objectives.

AQIP CATEGORY 3: UNDERSTANDING STUDENTS' AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS' NEEDS

Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs examines how your institution works actively to understand student and other stakeholder needs. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to student and stakeholder identification, student and stakeholder requirements, analysis of student and stakeholder needs, relationship building with students and stakeholders, complaint collection, analysis, and resolution, determining satisfaction of students and stakeholders, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Indianapolis that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 3, Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs:

Item   Critical Characteristic

01b   The University of Indianapolis is governed by a Board of Trustees comprised of members selected from the community, United Methodist Church, alumni, and at-large representation from the state and nation.

01c   The University's curriculum reflects a commitment to Christian values while stressing the ideals of critical, rational thought; independent, responsible inquiry; novel, creative expression; and sensitive, reflective morality.

01f   In keeping with its motto, "Education for Service," the University emphasizes application of knowledge and skills in an increasingly complex world including specialized masters degrees in nursing, accounting, business administration, health science, and occupational therapy along with doctoral degrees in health science, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and psychology train students for professions of service.

02b   The University of Indianapolis programs serve a broad range of students from traditional aged* (*parameters not defined in portfolio) to adult learners, as well as both resident and commuter students.

02c   Academic programs are offered in full- and part-time formats and in full-term, weekend and accelerated formats. Web-based and distance learning courses are available at all levels.

25

03a   The University has a total of 4,462 students (3,361 undergraduates and 1,101 graduates). Twenty-nine percent of the undergraduate students are part-time; and 61% of graduate students are part-time.

03b   Eighty-four percent of traditional aged undergraduates are from Indiana; twelve percent are from out-of-state; four percent are international students. Students in the School of Adult learning are from the Indianapolis metropolitan students are part-time; and 61% of graduate students are part-time.

04a   The University seeks partnerships at city, state, national and global levels by focusing on three key collaborative areas: the first is through the development of internships, clinical training, field placements, and service learning; the second is through the development of the centers of excellence (Center of Excellence in Leadership and Learning (CELL), which works with area school districts, and Center for Aging and Community (CAC)); the third collaborative area is international partner sites.

06c   In addition to accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission, the University Senate of the United Methodist Church accredits the University and individual programs are accredited by their professional organizations.

07a   The University identifies its competition as: Butler University, Indiana University Purdue, University Indianapolis, and Ball State University. There is no degree program offered that is unique to the university, so it must differentiate itself from the competition in other ways (unique formats, class sizes, and quality instruction).

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Indianapolis 's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 3, Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs.

Item	S/O	Comment
3C1	S	The University of Indianapolis has a detailed classification system for its students and other stakeholders that will make assessment of improvement more efficient. However, the "non-traditional" student classification may not sufficiently capture the important differences that exist within this group today.
3P1-3P3	S	Figure 3.3 defines a comprehensive circular process (including feedback) to identify, collect, analyze and respond to student and stakeholder needs.
3P1	O	The role of the faculty in the identification and analysis of student needs is unclear.

3P2a	S	The University of Indianapolis lists a range of methods for building and maintaining relationships with students, most of which are utilized in many other institutions.
3P2b	S	The University of Indianapolis gives its students opportunities to study at more than one campus. Bringing students from the international sites to the main campus helps connect them to the home institution.
3P2 c	O	It is not clear how student - institutional relationships are enhanced for part-time students.
3P3	O	The University of Indianapolis provides little detail about how its process for analyzing stakeholder needs varies for diverse stakeholders.
3P4	S	The University of Indianapolis uses a variety of means to communicate with internal and external stakeholders.
3P5-3P6	S	Comprehensive institutional forums, data collection methodologies and external contacts are in place to determine and assess and address stakeholder needs and complaints.
3P5b	O	Although the University of Indianapolis lists several ways in which it attempts to identify new stakeholder groups, it is unclear who has the responsibility for initiating contact with stakeholders and how the information gathered is used to determine which groups should be addressed.
3P5c	O	An opportunity exists for the University of Indianapolis to consider additional means for examining the totality of stakeholder needs (e.g., using the concept of environmental scanning).
3P6	O	The University of Indianapolis collects complaint information through the same processes it uses for identifying and analyzing student needs, but there is little detail on how complaints in particular are analyzed and how a course of action regarding complaints is determined and communicated.
3P6	SS	The University of Indianapolis demonstrates transparency in its dealings with stakeholders by publicizing the minutes of meetings of governing bodies.
3P7	S	The University of Indianapolis conducts an annual benchmarking survey for residential living, evaluates New Student Experience classes,

		evaluates courses and programs through IDEA, and uses Walker Information for student and employee satisfaction surveys.
3R1a	O	According to the Walker Student Survey, used to measure loyalty to the university, just over half (57%) of students are "truly loyal," and 20% are "high risk." There is no comparable data offered from other institutions.
3R1b	O	According to the University of Indianapolis analysis, NSSE data shows mixed results. Freshmen are not more likely than the national average to rate their educational experiences positively or indicate that they would attend the same institution again, and the University of Indianapolis is not doing as well as other schools in making a good impression on first year students, but seniors appear to be more pleased with the University of Indianapolis.
3R1c	O	The University of Indianapolis provides only survey data in the results section of Category 3, suggesting strong dependence on survey data. Utilizing other quantitative data will further legitimate assessment measures.
3R1d	O	Clarification of the components of the Performance Index Score on the Walker Student Survey will assist the University of Indianapolis in positioning itself in relation to its competitors.
3R2	O	The NSSE Survey data between 2004 and 2005 declines slightly in several areas including the relationships between students and students, students and faculty, and students and administrators. The portfolio does not offer assessment of the situation nor processes for addressing the issue.
3R3-3R4	O	Although the University of Indianapolis is beginning to study stakeholder satisfaction and gathers information from potential students on campus visit day, it would benefit from additional and more precise information from a range of stakeholders.
3R5	O	The University of Indianapolis does not present comparable benchmark data from other institutions regarding external stakeholder satisfaction or needs.
3I1	O	Although the report does not address how the University of Indianapolis improves processes for understanding stakeholder needs, it does report changes made in residential life, financial aid and career services as a result of feedback.

| 3I2a | O | Although the University of Indianapolis does target specific areas for improvement for their students (parking and tuition costs), the portfolio does not suggest how these targets were developed or the results shared with stakeholders. |
| 3I2b | O | A marketing campaign was launched as a result of student cost concerns, but no efforts to control tuition costs were discussed. |

AQIP CATEGORY 4: VALUING PEOPLE

Valuing People explores your institution's commitment to the development of your employees since the efforts of your entire faculty, staff, and administrators are required for institutional success. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to work and job environment; workforce needs; training initiatives; job competencies and characteristics; recruitment, hiring, and retention practices; work processes and activities; training and development; personnel evaluation; recognition, reward, compensation, and benefits; motivation factors; satisfaction, health and safety, and well-being; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Indianapolis that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 4, Valuing People:

Item   Critical Characteristic

01b   The University of Indianapolis is governed by a Board of Trustees comprised of members selected from the community, United Methodist Church, alumni, and at-large representation from the state and nation.

01c   The University's curriculum reflects a commitment to Christian values while stressing the ideals of critical, rational thought; independent, responsible inquiry; novel, creative expression; and sensitive, reflective morality.

O4b   The University of Indianapolis operates a 65 acre campus located on the south side of Indianapolis. The campus consists of 30 buildings, including residence halls. The University has international partner sites.

05a   The University of Indianapolis employs both full- (166) and part-time faculty (250), full and part-time non-exempt staff (162), and full-time exempt staff (153).

05b   In 2004, the institution established a governance structure based on an elected faculty

Senate.

07a   The University identifies its competition as: Butler University, Indiana University Purdue, University Indianapolis, and Ball State University. There is no degree program offered that is unique to the university, so it must differentiate itself from the competition in other ways (unique formats, class sizes, and quality instruction).

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Indianapolis's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 4, Valuing People.

Item	S/O	Comment
4P1	O	In the hiring process for non-student positions, there does not appear to be consistency across the institution in the screening of applicants. It is unclear how stakeholders beyond the work unit are involved.
4P2	O	The recent raising of staff pay scales and the enhancing of hiring and training procedures are commendable; however, it is not evident how positions are advertised, whether diversity is a consideration, and if there is planning for future staffing needs. Moreover, there is no mention of faculty compensation or of the training and orienting of new faculty.
4P3a	S	It is commendable that since 2003, external grant money has been pursued and received for initiatives such as the Institute of Emerging Careers, the Center for Aging and Community, and CELL.
4P3b	O	Although the University of Indianapolis recognizes that improvements in governance and personnel practices are needed and has made some recent changes, such as the creation of a Faculty Senate, opportunity still exists for the normalization of fair governance practices.
4P4	O	It is not clear how performance is evaluated and compensated.
4P5	O	Although faculty development and collaboration planning are supported by internal grants, it would seem logical for critical efforts like these to be standard and included in the budget.
4P6	O	While evaluation systems were developed with input from faculty and staff and contain an element of self-evaluation, the implementation and use of these systems is unclear. In addition, the utility of the IDEA form for faculty evaluation is limited because it is primarily a report of students' perceptions, not a measure of learning outcomes.

4P7a	S	The recent public initiatives taken to recognize service to the institution are commendable.
4P7`b	O	Opportunity exists to include faculty in the establishment of current linkage of merit pay to student feedback to ensure that they perceive it as fair.
4P8a	S	The President's Faculty Advisory Committee provides an effective venue to alleviating the tension that often exists between the administration and professors.
4P8b	O	There is no indication how key issues are identified in the many formal and informal meetings that take place on campus.
4P10	O	It appears that the institution relies primarily on surveys to measure how well it values its people. In addition to incorporating multiple and varied measures, the institution would benefit by specifying the variables being measured, how the data is analyzed, and how the results are disseminated.
4R1	O	The University of Indianapolis has had mixed results in creating a work environment which gives employees a sense of well-being and in creating a good physical work environment, effecting the results of the loyalty survey and the perception of fairness in the workplace.
4R1a	O	The portfolio indicates faculty development has been assessed through only one avenue: instructional technology training. Other areas of professional growth could be measured.
4R1b	S	The university shows two good examples of how it values people: the "Train the Train" series and the growth of tuition discounts.
4R2a	S	The University of Indianapolis has generally demonstrated success in motivating and empowering its employees and in getting them to cooperate.
4R2b	O	The portfolio demonstrates a clear need for improved communication between staff and supervisors (Fig. 4-14).
4R3	OO	The drop in all measures of faculty scholarship since 1998, the inability of the university to determine if the data for the 2002-2003 are complete, and the lack of data for 2004 and 2005 warrant assessment and evaluation.

31

4R3	S	Grant writing and awards have generally increased, but the institution has not made any faculty dependent on soft money for their employment.
4R4	OO	The University of Indianapolis does not present results on how it values people and the results it claims to have gathered are from service industries, not institutions of higher learning. It might seek data to compare with its identified competitors.
4I1	S	The University of Indianapolis has identified two action projects that relate to valuing people. Initial steps have been taken to implement these projects and future assessment will indicate their success.
4I2a	S	The University of Indianapolis approaches the setting of priorities in a collegial fashion by involving both faculty and administrators.
4I2b	O	It is unclear how the AQIP committee functions to coordinate the priority-setting process.

AQIP CATEGORY 5: LEADING AND COMMUNICATING

Leading And Communicating addresses how your institution's leadership and communication structures, networks, and processes guide your institution in setting directions, making decisions, seeking future opportunities, and building and sustaining a learning environment. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to leading activities, communicating activities, alignment of leadership system practices, institutional values and expectations, direction setting, future opportunity seeking, decision making, use of data, leadership development and sharing, succession planning, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Indianapolis that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 5, Leading and Communicating:

Item   Critical Characteristic

01b   The University of Indianapolis is governed by a Board of Trustees comprised of members selected from the community, United Methodist Church, alumni, and at-large representation from the state and nation.

05a   The University of Indianapolis employs both full- (166) and part-time faculty (250), full and part-time non-exempt staff (162), and full-time exempt staff.

05b   In 2004, the institution established a governance structure based on an elected faculty
        Senate.

**Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Indianapolis's most
important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes
encompassed by Category 5, Leading and Communicating.**

Item	*S/O*	*Comment*
5C1a	S	The luncheon meetings of the Board of Trustees with representatives from major campus groups and the monthly meetings of the Cabinet and Council promote exchange of ideas and concerns.
5C1b	O	The University of Indianapolis is in the process of institutionalizing a new governance structure which may better define their concept of shared governance (including the role of the Faculty Senate) and further clarify responsibilities in University of Indianapolis's system of shared decision-making.
5P1a	S	The University of Indianapolis has a multi-tiered process for setting directions in keeping with its mission and strategic plan.
5P1b	O	The portfolio does not clearly describe how the University of Indianapolis leaders set strategic directions, exactly which mid-range committees are involved in processes, or how the needs and expectations of the stakeholders (including the Faculty Senate) fit into processes.
5P2	O	Although enrollment management, institutional research and assessment data are assembled, it is unclear how this data contribute to and sustain the learning environment.
5P3	S	Appendix C, "Groups and Decision Making," denotes the activity and responsibility of committees and other groups involved in decision making.
5P3a	O	According to Appendix C, the role of the International Studies and Multicultural Affairs Committee is yet to be defined.
5P3b	O	The decision making authority of the Faculty Senate and the extent to which senior University officers must act upon recommendations coming from the Senate are unclear.
5P3	S	The posting of Cabinet and Council meeting minutes promotes transparency and fosters communication.

5P4a	S	The University of Indianapolis utilizes benchmarked results from surveys, course comparisons from IDEA, and various financial performance indicators to measure their successes related to learning.
5P4b	O	There is little specific information on how leaders use information and results from surveys, IDEA, and financial performance indicators in decision-making.
5P4c	O	Based on information presented in the portfolio, the University of Indianapolis evaluates success and quality largely in terms of enrollment growth, graduation rates, retention, and other income producing indices related to tuition generation. This might suggest that administrators responsible for enrollment and finance have more influence than academic administrators and would be consistent with the fact that the AQIP office does not report to the Provost.
5P5d	S	The University of Indianapolis depends primarily on committee structures to convey mission, performance expectations, continuous improvement and other institutional business. Communication occurs through Blackboard, internet, a weekly newspaper and other standard means; and twice each semester the President's Faculty Advisory Council meets for discussion with the President about areas of concern.
5P6	O	The University of Indianapolis's response to the question of how leaders communicate mission, vision, values and expectations refers to committee and other groups meetings (Appendix C) and an institute that occurs at the beginning of each year. Presumably, there are other venues for communicating the important information referred to in the question.
5P7a	S	The University of Indianapolis uses fairly standard methods for identifying and cultivating employees with leadership potential and has a succession plan that provides a period of orientation and mentoring of new administrators by previous administrators.
5P7b	O	Neither formal nor informal mentoring practices themselves nor any assessments of those practices are presented. The extent to which the University of Indianapolis offers staff opportunities for advancement is not clear.
5P8	S	Six-year term limits for Trustees promotes renovation and discourages the entrenchment of power.

5P9   O   Measures of leadership and communication are primarily derived from surveys and the annual evaluation process. Little is stated in the portfolio about these matters.

5R1a-5R2a   O   Faculty and staff report in the constellation survey and the Walker Employment survey that the University of Indianapolis has become more impersonal and competitive and that communication is a concern, especially as it relates to upper administration. It is hoped that the new president and provost will be able to improve perceptions of leadership and communication.

5R1b-5R2b   O   Communication remains a challenge, as it does in many institutions, despite all the forums and instruments reportedly in place to facilitate communication. This may be attributed to a focus on form more than substance. Alternatively, communication issues may reflect a perception by many that the University of Indianapolis is a hierarchical organization, administered by several key individuals from the top down, where influence and power is held by those responsible for managing enrollment and business-related concerns. If so, reality may not match the rhetoric supporting inclusive decision, and those who are lower in the hierarchy may feel uncomfortable challenging the status quo.

5I1   S   The University of Indianapolis reports efforts to create cross-linkages, improve communication and transparency and the orientation of new employees; and it has created a Faculty Senate and a combined Cabinet and Council to allow for shared governance.

5I2a   O   The portfolio does not discuss how specific targets for improvement have been identified and prioritized.

5I2b   O   The University of Indianapolis is investigating a faculty leadership development program and possible enhancements for communicating information about faculty committee, Faculty Senate and Cabinet and Council meetings but does not indicate how these priorities were set.

AQIP CATEGORY 6: SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS

Supporting Institutional Operations addresses the variety of your institutional support processes that help to provide an environment in which learning can thrive. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to student support, administrative support, identification of

needs, contribution to student learning and accomplishing other distinctive objectives, day-to-day operations, use of data, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Indianapolis that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 6, Supporting Institutional Operations:

Item   Critical Characteristic

02c   Academic programs are offered in full and part-time formats and in full-term, weekend, and accelerated formats. Web-based and distance learning courses are available at all levels.

03a   The University has a total of 4,462 students (3,361 undergraduates and 1,101 graduates). Twenty-nine percent of the undergraduate students are part-time; and 61% of graduate students are part-time.

04c   The University has a number of strategies for creating a diverse, accepting learning community.

05a   The University of Indianapolis employs both full- (166) and part-time faculty (250), full and part-time non-exempt staff (162), and full-time exempt staff (153).

06a   The University has 222 computers in nine labs available for students, and it uses Blackboard as a teaching tool. Technology is an important part of campus-based offerings through the extensive use of web-enhanced course offerings (although it does not offer any degree programs completely online at this time).

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Indianapolis 's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 6, Supporting Institutional Operations.

Item	*S/O*	*Comment*
6C1-2	S	The University of Indianapolis has an array of key measures for support: admissions, accounting, financial aid processes, career services, and information systems which are the major focus for Category Six.
6P1a	S	Each academic and support services area has its own way of collecting data about students. The admissions staff attempts to identify prospective students; accounting uses feedback from students to determine needs; the Office of Student Affairs conducts satisfaction surveys; the Student Information Service (SIS) keeps track of student records; On Course is

		used for academic advising and a part of student auditing; students access information through Student Web Information Services (SWIS); and financial aid staff evaluate workflow processes.
6P1b	O	It is not always clear whether these efforts (issues above) are actually identifying support service needs of students and other significant needs.
6P1c	S	The University of Indianapolis recognizes that graduate students have their own service needs, for example: the admissions process differs from those of undergraduates.
6P2	O	The University of Indianapolis revisits the topics of admission, financial aid, and information services, but much of the discussion seems only indirectly related to the process of identifying stakeholder needs. For example: a discussion of the creation of a scholars program to support enrollment management's efforts to achieve recruitment goals does not seem to address the question posed in 6P2.
6P3	S	Key student and administrative support processes are documented and supported by longitudinal tracking in their SIS system, process and policies and procedures manuals, calendar of tasks, plans, and various meetings.
6P4	O	Information regarding admissions, accounting, and financial aid is being collected. However, "who" is responsible for doing "what" with the data is less clear. In other words, there appears to be a gap, between data collection and analysis and changing institutional behaviors, in light of what is collected and analyzed.
6P5	OO	The University of Indianapolis lacks specificity in much of its discussion of measures of support service processes it conducts and analyzes. Questions about library and computer facilities should be included.
6R1a	S	As reported on the National Survey of Student Engagement, students report that the University of Indianapolis is doing an adequate job of supporting them academically and socially.
6R1b	O	The University of Indianapolis has discovered from its data analysis that at risk students have a low retention rate but does not report a strategy for addressing the problem.
6R2	O	Figure 6-7 shows that University of Indianapolis students believe they are receiving adequate, but not excellent, academic advising. Similarly,

		Figure 6-8 indicates that there is room for improvement in the area of residence life. In the portfolio, data about safety, physical comfort, and parking is sparse.
6R2	O	There appears to be some institutional angst related to perceptions of inadequate compensation. The University of Indianapolis is growing and shared governance, as well as formal classification and compensation systems, are not yet in place. The institution appears to be aware that development in HR areas (academic and staff) is needed.
6R3	S	Although data are not presented, it is reported that the University of Indianapolis has fared well in standardized measures compared to other schools and in meeting standards of external accrediting bodies.
6I1	S	Institutional assessment, faculty development, and the processes to translate the collection of data into institutional action are in their infancy. That being said, all of the correct issues are identified, and there appears to be recognition that the institution must address these concerns.
6I2	O	Although it is appropriate that the President and all units in the University will be involved in setting targets and priorities, the University of Indianapolis does not appear to have a very definitive plan.

AQIP CATEGORY 7: MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS

Measuring Effectiveness examines how your institution collects, analyzes, and uses information to manage itself and to drive performance improvement. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to collection, storage, management, and use of information and data – at the institutional and departmental/unit levels; institutional measures of effectiveness; information and data alignment with institutional needs and directions; comparative information and data; analysis of information and data; effectiveness of information system and processes; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Indianapolis that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 7, Measuring Effectiveness:

Item   Critical Characteristic

01a   The University of Indianapolis – University of Indianapolis - (founded in 1902) is a private, nonprofit, coeducational, residential institution of higher education affiliated with the United Methodist Church.

01c   The University of Indianapolis's curriculum reflects a commitment to Christian values while stressing the ideals of critical, rational thought; independent, responsible inquiry; novel, creative expression; and sensitive, reflective morality.

02a   The University of Indianapolis offers degree programs in more than 65 fields of study, including 9 associate, 70 bachelor, 22 master, and five doctoral degree programs.

02c   Academic programs are offered in full- and part-time formats and in full-term, weekend and accelerated formats. Web-based and distance learning courses are available at all levels.

02e   The institution holds internationalization of its campuses to be a high value. The institution sees its international partner sites as central to its mission and operation.

03a   The University of Indianapolis has a total of 4,462 students (3,361 undergraduates and 1,101 graduates). Twenty-nine percent of the undergraduate students are part-time; and 61% of graduate students are part-time.

04a   The University of Indianapolis seeks partnerships at city, state, national and global levels by focusing on three key collaborative areas: the first is through the development of internships, clinical training, field placements, and service learning; the second is through the development of the centers of excellence (Center of Excellence in Leadership and Learning (CELL), which works with area school districts, and Center for Aging and Community (CAC)); the third collaborative area is international partner sites.

06c   In addition to accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission, the University Senate of the United Methodist Church accredits the University and individual programs are accredited by their professional organizations.

07a   The University of Indianapolis identifies its competition as: Butler University, Indiana University Purdue, University Indianapolis, and Ball State University. There is no degree program offered that is unique to the university, so it must differentiate itself from the competition in other ways (unique formats, class sizes, and quality instruction).

08   The University of Indianapolis is a growing institution, and it faces all the accompanying challenges of a growing institution.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Indianapolis's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 7, Measuring Effectiveness.

Item	*S/O*	*Comment*
7C1-7C2	O	The University of Indianapolis's AQIP Office serves as the central repository for institutional data. The institution is planning to integrate key data into the Banner system, giving it the opportunity to establish data over time to make possible trend comparisons. The portfolio exhibits University of Indianapolis's understanding for evaluation of the need for institutional research to address a number of institutional needs.
7C1-7C2	OO	The University of Indianapolis measures its effectiveness in ways that primarily involve stakeholder perception. These measures, while useful, do not track actual performance and can thus be misleading.
7P1	OO	"Data is [sic] selected based on need for key information," and need "is determined by a variety of sources," but the University of Indianapolis does not clearly explain how it selects, manages and uses information for support of student learning and key objectives. Data are apparently selected on a need-to-know basis rather than on a systematic basis tied into strategic objectives.
7P1	OO	Although the University of Indianapolis is responsible for providing data to a variety of accreditation agencies and as a result must collect significant data on its performance, none of the data are apparently used in the AQIP process. In departments where there are no accreditation or certification requirements, it is not clear how or to what extent data are being used to demonstrate effectiveness in helping students learn.
7P2a	S	The work by the Faculty Affairs Committee to find best models of teaching and the future establishment of an office of Faculty Development and Assessment demonstrate an institutional commitment to quality teaching and its evaluation.
7P2b	OO	The Faculty Affairs Committee and the Office of Faculty Development and Assessment for Teaching Excellence both explore planning issues. But the Portfolio does not actually describe how it determines needs for information, and the University apparently has yet to define and adequately utilize institutional measures in many departments.

7P3a	S	The University of Indianapolis's AQIP Office is collecting benchmarking data from a variety of sources with which to compare its results.
7P3b	O	Results of the benchmarking data are not sufficiently reported in the portfolio.
7P3c	OO	The AQIP Office has a plan to use targets and benchmarks; requests for comparative data come from various sources in the university; and departments determine their own needs. Processes are being established for the collection and use of trend data, but there does not yet appear to be an organized process for determining needs and priorities for comparative information.
7P4	O	Although data are collected and analyzed in a variety of settings on campus, including the Enrollment Management Committee, Financial Aid and Policies Committee, the International Advisory Committee, and the Dean's Council, processes for analyzing and sharing information on overall performance and effectiveness are not described.
7P5a	S	The University of Indianapolis has adopted a useful tool – IDEA – to track performance in relation to its learning goals. Its action project concerning student learning goals allows improved alignment with the IDEA course evaluation system (Figure 7-3).
7P5b	O	While the University of Indianapolis has defined distinctive objectives; there is not a convenient and accessible process for ensuring that data needs and analysis result in continuous improvement in all areas of the institution. The process of data alignment, analysis and sharing might benefit from more coordination and common policies and practices.
7P6	S	The University of Indianapolis has organized its information systems well to determine needs, support services, and priority data needs. In its Information Systems, University of Indianapolis has in place appropriate security measures.
7P6	S	Information systems issues are addressed by a technology group along with an AQIP subcommittee. They meet regularly to monitor and support improved hardware, software, and security issues. In addition, they work with the Technology and Learning Committee to manage utilization of Banner and Blackboard.

7P7a	S	Various audits, satisfaction ratings, and studies of effectiveness are used to measure effectiveness; and numerous internal means are employed to carry out discussion of enrollment data (section 7C1-2).
7P7b	O	Administrative and business functions, particularly those involving enrollment, are measured more routinely than many academic functions involving faculty activities and student learning.
7R1	S	The University of Indianapolis makes use of benchmarking data sets that provide the basis for comparison with other institutions and will guide the institution's development. Several examples of the results from measuring the effectiveness of its programs and services are presented including its business plan and financial practices data.
7R1a	O	Although the University of Indianapolis reports that it has been successful in meeting many of its key objectives, little evidence is presented.
7R1b	O	Appendix D of the Portfolio contains 15 tables/charts. A brief prose discussion of these data would help the readers understand the data and would help the institution digest the information.
7R2a	O	Although Figure 7-4 shows that the University of Indianapolis is consistent with itself over the two-year period of 2005 and 2006, data from earlier years should be considered and some numerical comparisons with peer institutions should be presented.
7R2b	O	Although the University of Indianapolis presents data on variables monitored by the U.S. News and World Report of colleges and universities, it does not include comparable data from other institutions. Moreover, the data from U.S. News and World Report is of a consumer nature. Academic benchmark data should also be presented.
7I1a	O	The University of Indianapolis recognizes the need for continuous improvement through future development of a marketing plan and branding. Attention to unified marketing strategies will improve the image of University of Indianapolis and aid in successful communication of its mission and identity.
7I1b	OO	The University of Indianapolis's marketing plans and the need for a unified brand to increase visibility do not appear to be responsive to the question about improving processes and systems for measuring effectiveness.

| 7I2 | OO | The University of Indianapolis has set a laudable goal of serving underrepresented and first generation college students but it is unclear how they set up targets for improvement in relation to this goal. |
| 7I2 | O | The University of Indianapolis is focusing on Internet communications to reach their target market. The opportunity exists to use the same methods to ensure adequate communication for all stakeholders |

AQIP CATEGORY 8: PLANNING CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Planning Continuous Improvement examines your institution's planning processes and how your strategies and action plans are helping you achieve your mission and vision. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to institutional vision; planning; strategies and action plans; coordination and alignment of strategies and action plans; measures and performance projections; resource needs; faculty, staff, and administrator capabilities; measures; analysis of performance projections and results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Indianapolis that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 8, Planning Continuous Improvement:

Item   Critical Characteristic

01b   The University of Indianapolis is governed by a Board of Trustees comprised of members selected from the community, United Methodist Church, alumni, and at-large representation from the state and nation.

02d   A five-year business plan (adopted in 2003), springing from the Strategic Plan, gives explicit objectives to establish recognized centers of excellence on both regional and national levels by 2007.

04c   The University has a number of strategies for creating a diverse, accepting learning community.

05b   In 2004, the institution established a governance structure based on an elected Faculty Senate.

08   The University of Indianapolis is a growing institution, and it faces all the accompanying challenges of a growing institution.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Indianapolis 's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 8, Planning Continuous Improvement.

Item	S/O	Comment
8C1	O	The University of Indianapolis intends to be the university of choice for students who value applied and professional service, but it does not articulate a five to ten year vision.
8C2	O	The University of Indianapolis's Strategy Grid (Appendix E) details their strategic planning and quality improvement effort. However, many strategies, goals, problem statements, and plan statements are missing.
8P1	O	The University of Indianapolis articulates its commitment to continuous improvement planning through two pathways, but does not actually describe either planning process or the schedule followed.
8P2	O	Rather than discussing their process for selecting strategies, the University of Indianapolis comments on how strategies are reviewed. It is not clear how conflicts between short- and long-term strategies are resolved, and no examples are provided to clarify the process.
8P3	S	The Constellation Index and the Organizational Fitness Profile are used in identifying action plans. Stakeholders are involved in action planning but processes could benefit from ongoing input.
8P4	O	The University of Indianapolis utilizes a multi-level planning process involving several stakeholders. However, goal expression appears to flow downward and reporting flows upward, with little evidence of vertical or horizontal strategic alignment. It is not clear how stakeholders' input is transformed into planning activities (Figure 8-1).
8P4	O	No evidence is provided of the involvement of the new faculty Senate in the overall planning process.
8P5a	O	The University of Indianapolis establishes performance projections via individual performance plans and its strategic business plan. It is unclear how measures are established and communicated and how data are evaluated to strategically assist the university.
8P5b	S	Several measures have been identified for tracking how the institution is doing on achieving its 5-year Strategic Business Plan. The IPEDS report is not explained anywhere in the document.

8P5c	O	Every institution determines its own structure, but presumably information is passed up to the Board of Trustees so that it can establish performance projections, rather than the Board setting projections and passing them down, as implied in the portfolio.
8P5d	S	Figure 8-2 describes a fairly concise process of selecting measures and performance projections for the institutional strategies and action plans.
8P5e	O	Measures and projections appear primarily to be used for business/enrollment related process and are less in evidence for academic and governance related matters. It is not clear how such measures are utilized, if at all, for compensation for faculty and staff.
8P6a	O	Resources are aligned to meet strategic institutional needs through the annual budget building process. However, no specific, systematic alignment process is articulated.
8P6b	S	A two-tier system is in place to prioritize and allocate resources for program development and implementation, assuring that a healthy section of the administration is involved in the decision making-process.
8P7a	S	Professional development is tied to specific action plans in order to educate and prepare the faculty and staff for future needs of the institution.
8P7b	O	The University of Indianapolis's process to ensure faculty, staff, and administrative development is in its formative stage.
8P8a	O	Student learning, retention, and employee performance are listed as core goals of the university's continuous improvement efforts. Process measures relating to action projects are mentioned, but no results are provided in 8R1 or 8R2. There is not a link between measurements of strategy, which is indirect in many cases, and change.
8P8b	O	Although student learning is given as the primary goal of the university's continuous improvement efforts, only indirect measures of learning (based on perception) are in plan to be gathered.
8R1a	OO	The University of Indianapolis utilizes a scorecard system (Appendix D) to monitor and evaluate goal-related performance. However, no results of process effectiveness are presented.
8R1b	O	Appendix F contains Action Projects within four areas. The inconsistencies in formatting make reading difficult. It appears that the

University of Indianapolis achieved most of its goals for the 2003-4 academic year, but that many of the goals for 2004-5 year were yet to be accomplished at the time the portfolio was written.

8R2	O	The University of Indianapolis is nearing completion of action projects involving improvement of desktop support and creating university-wide learning goals. It expects to begin work on a project designed to integrate stakeholder feedback into curriculum development. The University of Indianapolis provides limited results related to retiring action projects, and no measures (or specific process for consideration) for future action projects are articulated in 8P8.
8R3	S	The University of Indianapolis is making use of significant benchmarks with peer institutions in business-related areas. University of Indianapolis may realize additional benefit by benchmarking other processes and reporting results related to their action projects (i.e. desktop support, learning goal development) and core strategic goals (i.e. improving leadership, increasing research).
8R4	O	While limited feedback from action project review is provided in Figure 8-4, the University of Indianapolis does not evidence satisfaction with continuous improvement processes. Figure 8-5 is blank.
8I1	S	Requiring plans for assessment before approval of any new funding ensures accountability to project goals and targets.
8I2	O	The University of Indianapolis is aware that communication and involvement of key constituencies is central to continuous improvement. However, University of Indianapolis does not specifically detail how targets are established, communicated, or prioritized for improvement.

AQIP CATEGORY 9: BUILDING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Building Collaborative Relationships examines your institution's relationships – current and potential – to analyze how they contribute to the institution's accomplishing its mission. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to identification of key internal and external collaborative relationships; alignment of key collaborative relationships; relationship creation, prioritization, building; needs identification; internal relationships; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of University of Indianapolis that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 9, Building Collaborative Relationships:

Item   Critical Characteristic

01b   The University of Indianapolis is governed by a Board of Trustees comprised of members selected from the community, United Methodist Church, alumni, and at-large representation from the state and nation.

01d   In keeping with its motto, "Education for Service," the University emphasizes application of knowledge and skills in an increasingly complex world including specialized masters degrees in nursing, accounting, business administration, health science, and occupational therapy along with doctoral degrees in health science, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and psychology train students for professions of service.

02d   A five-year business plan (adopted in 2003), springing from the Strategic Plan, gives explicit objectives to establish recognized centers of excellence on both regional and national levels by 2007.

02e   The institution holds internationalization of its campuses to be a high value. The institution sees its international partner sites as central to its mission and operation

04a   The University seeks partnerships at city, state, national and global levels by focusing on three key collaborative areas: the first is through the development of internships, clinical training, field placements, and service learning; the second is through the development of the centers of excellence (Center of Excellence in Leadership and Learning (CELL), which works with area school districts, and Center for Aging and Community (CAC)); the third collaborative area is international partner sites.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as University of Indianapolis 's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 9, Building Collaborative Relationships.

Item   S/O   Comment

9C1   S   The mission and institutional direction is supported through collaborative partnerships, both domestically and internationally, and are in alignment with strategic plans.

9P1a   O   It remains unclear what role is being played by the faculty and academic administration in the prioritization of external relationships.

9P1b	O	The portfolio's exclusion of the University of Indianapolis's relationship with the United Methodist Church within Category 9 is notable, as this relationship is a key identifying factor.
9P1c	O	There are several examples of how university units create relationships with outside groups, but there does not appear to be any institution-wide coordination of these efforts.
9P2	O	An institution-wide committee reviews opportunities for international partnerships in keeping with its strategic plan, and the School of Business leads the Center for Business Partnerships, but there is little information on other relationships.
9P3	O	Although the combined meetings of the Cabinet and Dean's Council demonstrate important internal collaboration, there are many other opportunities for relationships, such as interdisciplinary curricular cooperation, that are not mentioned in the portfolio.
9P4	O	"The AQIP Office, which reports to the Vice President of Research, Planning, and Strategic Partnerships, has responsibility for maintaining and integrating institution-wide data into reports and other feedback tools for the wider campus community." The portfolio seems to lack evidence of how the AQIP Office systematically conducts their data collection and how their processes yield results.
9R1a	O	While various academic departments and programs are involved in maintaining data (Category 9 and Appendix B), and identifying objectives and goals and their benefits, it appears that actual results related to building relationships are not present.
9R1b	O	It is unclear how scorecards are coordinated with institutional goals and how partnerships and collaboration are monitored.
9R1c	S	The centers have developed scorecards for measuring progress on key objectives, and CELL has demonstrated success in partnering with area schools and in obtaining extramural funding.
9I2a	OO	Although targets are established for the centers, and improvement plans for the international sites exist, the portfolio lacks evidence of improvement efforts, and some of the information presented relates more to image than improving student learning.
9I2b	S	The University of Indianapolis demonstrates a comprehensive and data-driven approach to its improvement.