AQIP Update
Strategic Planning Retreat
November 13-15, 2006
Linda Delunas and Robin Hass Birky

I. **Update on Category Working Groups & SPT Prioritization of Recommendations**:

After reviewing the feedback for the Systems Portfolio as related to the respective categories, each Category Working Group was asked to do two things: 1) collect information about things we are already doing that were not reported or that had originated after the report date and/or 2) make recommendations in response to the feedback. Because of the tight timeline, each group chose to and was able to accomplish one or the other of these two—data collection or recommendation:

A. Category I Working Group recommended:
- develop a campus assessment structure with an assessment coordinator reporting to Academic Affairs who will coordinate the development of systematic assessment policies and procedures (see Action Project 4);
- report the progress to date on General Education, and discuss faculty development efforts further as well as describe the system-wide processes for program and course approval;
- develop a central IR/Assessment website that houses data documents and process descriptions;
- process map the scheduling process, and have the VCAA and deans develop a system that provides coherency across units and for longer periods of time;
- develop goals and assessment mechanisms for co-curricular student learning outcomes (VCSA), and align those co-curricular outcomes with curricular counterparts (VCAA and VCSA); and
- collect alumni data, possibly reinstituting alumni surveys.

B. Category 2 Working Group focused on editing and revising the section of the Systems Portfolio, adding elements that were not initially reported. The group made the following recommendation:
- provide outcome data for the Strategic Outcomes.

C. The Category 3 Working Group provided a combination of reporting and recommending. Included in their recommendations, they suggest
- Related to NSSE, the institution may need to document the process providing (1) analysis of the data, (2) distribution of the data to appropriate agencies, (3) reviewing the response, (4) determining appropriate action steps, (5) implementation of the action steps and (6) follow up with the next and continuing years survey results to determine if

the action taken is resulting in improvement or if not returning to step (1) and beginning the process again,

- We need to collect this data related to the professional schools' identification and measurement of student academic needs as well as the schools' response to those needs and the corresponding actions as a result of the surveys,
- IU Northwest needs to identify processes for measuring whether the needs of faculty, staff, and administration, alumni, donors, friends, local businesses, media, and elected officials have been met, and
- Data collection and assessment needs to be centralized, a process that would answer many of the questions posed about whether or not particular entities collect data already.

D. Category 4 Working Group developed a series of questions to collect data to assess current practices, and they will summarize their findings by December 15th.

E. Category 5 Working Group made the following recommendations:
- In order to address succession planning, IU Northwest commits to developing and implementing a process to identify individuals interested in leadership/management positions and then to offering leadership/management training..
- To detail the process of decision making and communicate this broadly across the campus, IU Northwest commits to completing process-mapping and to developing policy statements for significant campus procedures such as identifying positions for recruitment, strategic planning, budget planning designing new programs, program termination, salary increase allocations, etc.
- IU Northwest commits to developing and consistently applying policies and procedures for the evaluation of Vice Chancellors, Deans, Directors and Department Chairs.

F. Category 6 Working Group reported A LOT of data, which we recommend be incorporated into the revisions of the Systems Portfolio and which we feel should be posted on any data or assessment website we produce so that the information is more readily accessible to the campus and accrediting team. This Category Working Group repeatedly referred to Action Project IV as action taken and as a necessary response to the AQIP feedback.

G. Category 7 and 8 Working Group also repeatedly referred to Action Project IV as a necessary and central response to the AQIP feedback. The group recommended that

- Action Project IV be given priority,
- An assessment person be hired or designated to coordinate campus-wide assessment efforts, and
- A website be developed to house or site-map to data.

- We need to revisit and update progress on retired 2002 Action Projects,
- The campus needs to redesign IU Northwest websites for better navigation and ease of locating information. This should be done in conjunction with a representative committee of faculty and with Marketing and Communication; and
- IU Northwest planning process (graphic) needs to be updated to better reflect feedback loops and to reflect linkages to unit goals.

H. Category 9 Working Group recommended that we:
- prioritize outreach project based on the Vision,
- utilize media outlets to develop a plan for outreach,
- develop/enhance recruitment processes,
- create and staff an office of Institutional Research,
- benchmark aspects of outreach efforts,
- develop a year-end outreach-reporting template for the units, and
- articulate the plan used by the Strategic Planning Team to identify targets for improvement.

II. Update on Action Projects:
- General Education Reform
- Student-Centered Decision Making
- Diversity
- Institutional Effectiveness

III. **Preparation for the Quality Check Up**: A Quality Checkup is a condensed site visit that occurs a year or two before each AQIP institution's Reaffirmation of Accreditation. The Quality Checkup is conducted by AQIP Reviewers, who visit the campus for two or more days. The goals of these Checkups include system portfolio clarification and verification, systems appraisal follow-up, accreditation issues follow-up, federal compliance review, organizational quality commitment, and institutionally unique goals. As IUN submitted the Systems Portfolio in November (2005) and received our Systems Appraisal Feedback Report in April (2006), IU Northwest is at the appraisal stage of the AQIP process. We are in the process of analyzing and using the feedback from this report, and we will attend a Strategy Forum in January 2007. Our Quality Check Up will occur between August 2007 and September 2008 (See Quality Check Up document provided by Kathy Malone).

IV. **Assessment of the effectiveness of the Strategic Planning Processes**: Are we assessing the effectiveness of our processes? If so, how? If not, what mechanisms would be appropriate? Do we have explicit processes, and are they concretely articulated and shared with the whole campus?