

Systems Portfolio

University of Indianapolis

5/30/2019

Introduction

The University of Indianapolis (UIndy), was founded in 1902, is affiliated with the United Methodist Church, and is a private, comprehensive institution located on the southside of Indianapolis. The University's mission is *to prepare its graduates for effective, responsible, and articulate membership in the complex societies in which they live and serve, and for excellence and leadership in their personal and professional lives.*

UIndy enrolls approximately 6,000 students at all levels with professional and liberal arts programs of which 4065 are full-time undergraduates, 443 are part-time undergraduates, and 1427 are graduate students (2018 Census). UIndy has three additional locations, two in China and one within Indianapolis.

The University offers 5 Doctoral, 40 Masters, 108 Bachelors, 8 Associate degree programs. Programs are offered face-to face, online, and hybrid. The faculty include 294 full-time and 317 part-time, and staff include 451 full-time and 120 part-time (2018 Census).

UIndy has participated in four Strategy Forums since joining AQIP in 2002. Four Action Projects have been successfully concluded since 2016. Four Strategic Challenges were identified in the 2014 Systems Appraisal and have been subsequently addressed.

Category 1 Overview

Assessment processes and results for University Learning Goals and General Education have matured, with one four year cycle of assessment completed for GE and two years of assessments for ULGs. The University has matured to an aligned level in its 5 Step Assessment Process with all established programs participating. All academic programs have completed program reviews on a 5 year cycle. These processes are aligned with specialty accreditation expectations, as required, and licensure pass rates.

Category 2 Overview

Processes related to Category Two can be defined as systematic to aligned in maturity levels, with respect to identifying and meeting changing student and stakeholder needs, retention and completion tracking, complaint collection. Processes for determining the needs of alumni and other external stakeholders are systematic with the use of consistent measures for determining and meeting those needs.

Results for Category Two reflect a systematic maturity level with retention and student satisfaction measures. Select measures include items from the benchmarked NSSE, First Destination Survey and alumni data, student services surveys, and internal data compiled from Banner. Internal targets are set and benchmarks are identified when available.

Category 3 Overview

The University strives to attract and retain high-quality employees. The hiring process is aligned with institutional priorities. Processes for evaluating faculty, staff, and administrators are aligned with departmental and strategic plan goals, and linked to personal developmental goals. A robust recognition system is in place with a comprehensive benefits package that values employees. Development opportunities for all employees is available through numerous internal and external opportunities utilizing HR, departmental, individual faculty, and provost funds.

Results for the hiring processes, evaluation, and development are systematic. Data are regularly collected and analyzed. Internal targets have been identified, but external benchmarks remain an opportunity.

Category 4 Overview

Numerous improvements have taken place in Category Four in recent years such as an inclusive, systematic process for information/input gathering, and planning in three major areas: academic life, student life, and professional life. These processes have been ongoing since 2017 and are now in the final stages of planning for future implementation in the Strategic Plan 2019-24. A draft Strategic Plan derived from Vision 2030 was recently presented to UIndy's Board of Trustees at its May 2019 meeting. Processes in Category Four are systematic to aligned. Results are systematic.

Category 5 Overview

Operational and strategic reporting processes have achieved alignment status for decision-making across all areas in support of strategic and operational functions. While some results within knowledge management such the development of the IR Website are systematic including UIndy's information request process, other results such as the development of business intelligence dashboards and the Data Dictionary initiative are approaching an aligned stage of maturity.

Modifications to the way that operational and capital budgets are constructed, changes to the budget cycle, improved coordination, and a focus on strategic priorities have increased the maturity level for Category Five for processes related to resource stewardship to aligned. UIndy's technology and physical operations processes are more clearly defined with goals at a systematic maturity level.

Results within facilities and management and technology management remain at the systematic stage of maturity, while results within fiscal management and risk management are approaching an aligned stage of maturity.

Category 6

UIndy's culture of quality has grown in the four years since the last Systems Portfolio. UIndy's alignment of strategic planning, development, budgeting, and implementation processes across both academic and non-academic units illustrates the University's commitment to data-driven decision-making and open and effective processes for improvement. Category Six shows an overall aligned maturity level.

1 - Helping Students Learn

1.1 - Common Learning Outcomes

Common Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills and abilities expected of graduates from all programs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

1P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated common learning outcomes, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Aligning common outcomes (institutional or general education goals) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (3.B.1, 3.E.2)
- Determining common outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.4)
- Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.1)
- Incorporating into the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve the outcomes (3.B.3, 3.B.5)
- Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)
- Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes (4.B.2)
- Assessing common learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

1R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected at each degree level? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.B.3)

Responses

1P1 Processes

- ***Aligning common outcomes to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution. (3.B.1, 3.E.2)***

The first set of common outcomes is four [University Learning Goals](#) (ULGs) as described and defined within the Academic Catalog: Critical Thinking, Creativity, Performance and Social Responsibility. The goals apply to all UIndy students, graduate and undergraduate, and they link educational and co-educational experiences together. **(3.E.2)**

The ULGs align broadly with the University mission as indicated by their insertion below:

The [University's mission](#) is to prepare its graduates for effective, responsible, and articulate membership in the complex societies in which they live and serve (*social responsibility*), and for excellence and leadership in their personal and professional lives. The University equips its students to become more capable in thought, judgment, communication, and action (*performance*); to enhance their imaginations and creative talents (*creativity*); to gain a deeper understanding of the teachings of the Christian faith and an appreciation and respect for other religions; to cultivate rationality and tolerance for ambiguity; and to use their intellect in the process of discovery and synthesis of knowledge (*critical thinking*).

The four ULGs are embedded across the curriculum and addressed, when applicable, within the annual assessment reports of academic programs. For example, a [review of 2017-18 assessment reports](#) showed that programs across the six academic colleges, both graduate and undergraduate, aligned with the goal of *social responsibility*. Also *social responsibility* encompasses the goals of student affairs and co-curricular programming to foster self-directedness, self-sufficiency, and the promotion of leadership development. *Social responsibility* aligns the curricular through service learning and the co-curricular through volunteerism; meeting the University's motto, *Education for Service*.

The ULGs align with the learning objectives for general education. A cross-walk document developed by the General Education Core Committee (GECC) mapped the ULGs to each required area of the General Education (GE) Core when it was designed in 2011. The four ULGs were adopted by faculty vote in 2005, approved by the BOT in 2006, and included in the respective Academic Catalogs. The ULGs are part of the 2018 planning document for an Academic Master Plan where the University will "develop university learning goals that represent our mission and academic vision and that appropriately cross all academic programs." As a first step in this review, the University Assessment Committee ([UAC reviewed the ULGs in September 2018](#)) and provided feedback to the Academic Master Plan Committee. **(3.B.1)**

The ULGs are renewed and communicated annually through the [University Series](#) which selects one or more learning goals as the theme for the campus-wide series of speakers and events each year. Speakers are intended to appeal to both undergraduate and graduate students, and presentations are open to members of the wider community. **(3.E.1, 3.E.2)**

A second set of the University's common outcomes are the learning objectives of the GE Core, which are completed as part of all undergraduate degrees, and which inform the liberal arts foundation for all graduates. All adult degrees complete the same GE Core with the exception of Spring Term, First

Year Seminar, and Lecture Performance Series. **(3.B.1)**

- ***Determining common outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.4)***

Common outcomes in the GE Core were determined by a collaborative task force in 2011 based on best practices, mission, and the nature of the University. The first cohort of undergraduates entered the current core in fall 2013. The requirements for GE are summarized and shared in a [curriculum guide](#) and published in the Academic Catalog. GECC reviews course proposals related to GE to ensure that course objectives are aligned with the GE templates; for example, see the [First-Year Seminar template](#). GECC is also responsible for updating or revising the GE requirements based upon insights from assessment and proposals to the committee. Curriculum committees submit reports for review and approval to the Faculty Senate on a monthly basis, and for approval in full faculty meetings three times a year. **(3.B.2, 4.B.4)**

- ***Articulating the purposes, content, and level of achievement of the outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.1)***

The processes for articulating the purposes, content, and level of achievement for the common outcomes (GE) have been led by the GECC, and the UAC for the ULGs. For example, the GE Core was designed to be sequenced across students' years of study from the First-Year Seminars to the Senior Capstones. Evaluation of implementation of the Core, through [a study after the third year](#), determined adequate course availability, completion in the expected sequence, and at the anticipated rate. Assessment of GE is undertaken by a subcommittee of the GECC. **(3.B.2)**

UAC serves as the coordinating body for the [assessment of the ULGs](#) as a result of the AQIP Action Project, *Establishing a Comprehensive Model for the Distributed Responsibility of Campus Assessment* (2016). The first goal assessed was *critical thinking* in 2016-17, and the second was *social responsibility* in 2017-18. The assessment involves a broad look at the extent to which these goals are embedded as part of curricular and co-curricular programs. **(4.B.1)**

- ***Incorporating in the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve the outcomes (3.B.3, 3.B.5)***

The GE Core is designed to challenge all undergraduate students to synthesize their knowledge across disciplines; apply critical thinking and inquiry skills to scholarship and creative works at various levels of complexity. Key experiences include different outcomes for [first-year seminars](#), [writing and speaking](#) designated courses for sophomores and juniors, and required [capstone](#) courses for seniors, and, for some students, Honors College. There are placement exams in Foreign Languages, Mathematics and English Composition; information and scores from these exams allow for appropriate entry into the GE Curriculum. Two additional requirements contribute to an enriched educational experience: a [spring term](#) course provides the opportunity for unique courses including international travel and a lecture performance series of University sponsored events. **(3.B.3)**

The GE Core contains a [New Student Experience](#) for entering first-year students as an orientation. At the graduate level there are program specific orientations. New in 2018, the University implemented a summer "recovery" course, Achieving Academic Success, for students on academic probation to increase their academic performance, overcome barriers, and support continued eligibility. For fall 2019 the University is planning a three-day Student Success Institute for entering first-year students identified as at risk. These students are identified through the admission process, placement testing, and the advising process. (See 2.P.1) **(3.B.5)**

Every student is engaged in inquiry or creative work at all degree levels with a culminating experience. The GE core requires a capstone in the major as a culminating experience for Baccalaureate degrees. The [Honors Program](#) and [Research Fellows](#) program support intellectual inquiry and scholarly activity for high performing undergraduates. All graduate programs have requirements for research that are guided by faculty, with many research collaborations possible with faculty. **(3.B.3, 3.B.5)**

- ***Ensuring the outcomes remain aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)***

In 2017-18 the University initiated a major planning process focused on exploring intellectual life and developing an Academic Master Plan. This process involved numerous internal and external stakeholder focus groups to ensure currency of program outcomes. One focus was how well students were prepared with 21st century skills which broadly included the ability to communicate and work with diverse populations. The GE Core provides exposure to diverse thinking and cultures while the application, with capstones or graduate student professional experiences, provide engagement with diverse communities. **(3.B.4)**

The University uses results from the [First Destination Survey](#) and an [Alumni Survey](#) to gather feedback on levels of student readiness and attainment of employment, or pursuit of advanced degrees; these results are gathered at the time of graduation by the First Destination Survey, and at one year and five years after graduation with the Alumni Survey. Also advisory boards assist academic programs by providing feedback and guidance on common skills needed by professionals in the field as well as the content on academic programs. Engineering receives input from its community partners for its applied experiences. **(3.B.4)**

- ***Designing, aligning, and delivering co-curricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)***

Co-curricular support is provided through a number of offices and through various processes on campus that include, as examples, the Academic Success Center for success strategies and advising, the Professional Edge Center for career development and placement opportunities, and the Chaplain's Office for spirituality and religious life. In addition, all athletic teams engage in community service projects, and some student organizations including College Mentors for Kids and Circle K, thereby supporting the goal of *social responsibility*. Non-academic program reviews aligns to the mission and help to ensure identified learning outcomes are being met. **(3.E.1, 4.B.2)**

- ***Selecting tools/methods/instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes (4.B.2)***

Institutional Research recommends the survey tools to assess the attainment of common learning goals at the institutional level. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is administered on an annual basis. As a part of this survey, Institutional Research has selected additional modules: for example, the 2018 NSSE results included a module for diversity and inclusion which relates to the University's mission to foster "...an appreciation and respect for other religionsand tolerance for ambiguity" and which relates to the ULG of *social responsibility*. **(4.B.2)**

In 2016-17 the ULG of *critical thinking* was assessed by UAC as planned and as presented in the results section below. In 2017-18, the UAC coordinated the assessment of *social responsibility* with the decision to focus on course embedded assessments, measures for community engagement, and student surveys for service learning.

Assessment of General Education is conducted through a [four year cycle of rotation](#), and the tools and methods used represent a balance of direct and indirect measures. The method and choice of tool is made by the GECC based upon the research questions to be addressed. The GECC works with two associate provosts to complete assessment projects, bring forward results for discussion, and identify next steps. Annually the GECC reviews the assessment grid, adds any modifications, and confirms the assessment work for the year. For example, in September 2018 the GECC added a request for information about the completion of English composition as a prerequisite or co-requisite for the First Year Seminars.

A summary schedule with sample instruments, designated managers, suggested time frame and method of communication for the assessment of the ULGs, and GE requirements and competencies is shown in [TABLE 1.1.1](#).

- *Assessment of common learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)*

The GECC is responsible for assessing GE, and using assessment results to propose needed changes to the learning objectives of the core.

Common learning outcomes, which include the four ULGs and the GE Core Curriculum, are assessed by departmental faculty through embedded course assessments. At the campus level, assessment responsibilities are defined in committee charters, annual committee work plans, rotational grids established by committees, and through support from the Office of Accreditation (OA). (4.B.1, 4.B.4)

The UAC has responsibility for assuring assessment of the ULGs. Two ULGs have been reviewed as scheduled in the rotational grid. Also co-curricular annual assessments and program review links to the ULGs. To reinforce these assessment responsibilities, the position of Associate VP of Accreditation was redefined in fall 2018 as the Associate Provost of Accreditation, Assessment and Educational Innovation. This redefinition serves to centralize oversight of assessment with the Office of Accreditation. (4.B.2)

1R1 Results

- *Summary results of measures*

Selected results from 2017-18 for the ULG of Social Responsibility were reported to the UAC as shown in [TABLE 1.1.2](#).

See [overview of GE assessment results for 2013-2018](#).

Selected results for learning objectives from the GE Core (2013-17) are highlighted below; the full reports are posted to the GECC site on the UIndy intranet. Sample results are as follows:

- Satisfactory evidence of critical thinking in the First Year Seminars [TABLE 1.1.3](#)
- Critical thinking with the Writing/Speaking requirement [TABLE 1.1.4](#)
- Re-alignment of courses and activities within the required five distribution areas; revisions to the learning objectives based on departmental assessments [TABLE 1.1.5](#)
- Capstones across the curriculum incorporating the expectations for a culminating experience and academic rigor [TABLE 1.1.6](#)

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

Undergraduate experience is measured through student responses at first year and as seniors in the [2014-2018 National Survey of Student Engagement](#) (NSSE). Note that scores for 2016 on engaging with diverse others for first-year students led to the decision to administer the NSSE Topical Module on Inclusiveness and Diversity in both 2017 and 2018. These results provided more granular data for first-year students.

In the Topical Modules for Inclusiveness & Engagement with Diversity, UIndy is generally at or above peers for 2017 and 2018. In 2017, there were five of 27 items for inclusiveness and diversity for which first-year students scored below comparable Great Lakes Private Peers; for seniors all scores were at or above the peers. In 2018, there were 29 items on which first-year students scored at or above the Great lakes Private Peers; for seniors only one item was below peers. Findings indicate a strength to be engaging students with diverse others and viewpoints. **(1.C.2)**

- ***Interpretation of results and insights gained***

UAC found that various sources of assessment data supported the findings that *critical thinking* and *social responsibility* are demonstrably a focus of the curriculum and that students perform at satisfactory levels in identified course embedded activities.

There is evidence that GE is meeting established objectives as indicated by the results for student learning, completion rates for GE, and survey results. One insight relates to the benefits of the systematic review cycle for the GE Core. This annual assessment work has resulted in stabilization of the GE curriculum with documented improvements.

With respect to the NSSE Engagement Indicators for First Year and Seniors (2014-18), UIndy is strongest in promoting collaborative learning, student-faculty interactions, and a supportive environment. These strengths parallel the needs of UIndy's entering first year students for a student-centered and nurturing environment. The three areas in which the University scored below peers were for reflective integrative learning, discussions with diverse others, and quality of interactions. However, these lower scores did not reflect a pattern; instead a lower score appeared for one year here or there for either first-year students or seniors. The University will continue to monitor these areas of NSSE.

III Improvements

Implementation of the Academic Master Plan should result in growth of graduate education, continued commitment to adult education, addition of new professional programs, and increased demand for online programs. The ULGs will systematically be reviewed to ensure applicability to all student groups.

The four-year cycle for reviewing the GE Core has been a successful process with expectation of continued improvements. As examples, in 2017-18, revisions to the learning objectives of three distribution areas were recommended by the GECC to the Faculty Senate for approval, and the *local/global theoretical* and *applied* requirements of the core were redeveloped and clarified as two distinct sets of courses renamed *experiencing cultural differences* and *global awareness*. A new focus, beginning 2019, is on the First Year Seminars and the role of this course with student retention. **(4.B.3)**

Sources

- 2017 Alumni Survey
- Academic catalog 17-19 Honors Program p. 101-102
- Academic Catalog 2017-19 Mission p. 4
- Academic Catalog 2017-19 University Learning Goals p. 5
- Assessment Overview for General Education Jan 2018 (1)
- Capstone Template
- Core Completion Study
- Faculty Affairs Minutes March 2018 Syllabi
- First Destination Survey
- FYS Template
- General_Education_Core_Guide
- New Student Experience Course Objectives Approved by GECC (1)
- NSE Syllabus
- NSSE Observations from Review of Five Years of Summary Snapshots.docx
- Overview of Gen Ed Assessment 2013-2018
- Overview of Program Goals - Social Responsibility.docx
- Spring Term Template
- STUDENT RESEARCH SUPPORT
- TABLE 1.1.4 General Education Assessment Overview 2014-15
- TABLE 1.1.1 Assessment of Common Learning Outcomes.pdf
- TABLE 1.1.2 Assessment Social Responsibility
- TABLE 1.1.3 Assessment Overview 2013-14
- TABLE 1.1.5 General Education Assessment Overview 2015-16
- TABLE 1.1.6 General Education Assessment Overview 2016-17
- UAC Assessment Overview for UWLG
- UAC Charter
- UAC Minutes Sept. 2018.docx
- University Series
- Writing and Speaking Template

1.2 - Program Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills and abilities graduates from particular programs are expected to possess. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

1P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated program learning outcomes and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Aligning learning outcomes for programs (e.g., nursing, business administration, elementary teaching, etc.) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (3.E.2)
- Determining program outcomes (4.B.4)
- Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (4.B.1)
- Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)
- Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes (4.B.2)
- Assessing program learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

1R2: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected in programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Overall levels of deployment of the program assessment processes within the institution (i.e., how many programs are/not assessing program goals)
- Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained

1I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.B.3)

Responses

1P2 Processess

- ***Aligning program learning outcomes to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution. (3.E.2)***

Program learning outcomes (PLOs) are developed to reflect UIndy's mission, “to prepare its graduates for effective, responsible, and articulate membership in the complex societies in which they live and serve, and for excellence and leadership in their personal and professional lives.” The University combines academic specialization and professional preparation across four degree levels with a liberal arts focus on critical thinking and a faith-related tradition of service. **(3.E.2)**

Course outcomes and PLOs are mapped to General Education (GE) outcomes and University Learning Goals (ULGs) that reflect the mission. Processes ensure alignment including the program review, the 5 Step Assessment, new program approval, and curriculum review. Also all planned academic programs must align with UIndy's Strategic Plan. **(3.E.2)**

The program review process requires academic departments to define the fit with UIndy's mission, to identify curriculum and degree requirements, and to show that faculty qualifications are appropriate to the degree levels. In the 5 Step Assessment process, PLOs must be differentiated and assessed at each degree level. **(3.E.2)**

All programs have [identified learning outcomes](#) posted on the public website which is monitored for currency and accuracy by the Office of Accreditation (OA). Annually each department submits its [5 Step Assessment report](#) that requires the confirmation of current or the identification of new or revised outcomes for the department's programs at each degree level. When new or revised outcomes are submitted, the OA updates the public website.

UIndy has a [program request process](#) that requires the new program to be aligned with mission and resources and demonstrate program demand. The Provost's Office considers the alignment as one of the key stages in the proposal process. A [chart of new programs](#) under development is posted to the Faculty Senate agenda each month and is discussed by the Associate Provost at Senate meetings. Any new academic program must be approved by the full faculty in one of its three meetings of the year. Following approval, new degrees and academic programs are brought by the EVP and Provost to the Intellectual and Academic Life Subcommittee of the BOT, which then recommends approval to the full BOT. **(4.A.4)**

Curriculum committees of the Faculty Senate include the Graduate, Undergraduate, and GE, which approve new programs, new courses, and changes to programs and courses. In this review process, faculty determine that curricula are appropriate to the mission, compatible with existing educational offerings, and represent offerings at the appropriate degree level. Each of the three Senate curriculum committees has available forms and appropriate [flow charts](#) posted on the internal website to indicate the respective paths for curriculum review.

The Curriculum Committees work closely with the Registrar, whose maintains the record of the curricula and the Academic Catalog. In 2018, DegreeWorks was implemented for improved curriculum mapping and degree audits. The Registrar led the establishment of a [Dual Degree \(4+1, 3+2\) policies and procedures](#) task force. The limited number of undergraduate [dual degree courses](#) offered at high schools are determined by academic leadership, tracked by the Registrar's Office; faculty qualifications for teaching in dual degree courses are monitored by the OA. **(4.A.4)**

- ***Determining program outcomes (4.B.4)***

All faculty are required to engage in assessment at course and program levels as stated in the [Faculty Handbook](#). Co-curricular staff also participate regularly in program and departmental assessments. Assessment methodologies reflect good practice in higher education and include internal surveys of student satisfaction, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), end-of-course evaluations, shared rubrics for writing, and standardized assessments such as major field tests, and practice professional exams, etc. Assessment processes reflect the systematic collection, analysis, reflection, and use of results for course and program improvements reflected in the next evaluation period.

(4.B.1, 4.B.2)

Faculty through curriculum committees, design programs, and develop courses and learning outcomes that align with disciplinary and professional standards. UIndy seeks specialized accreditation for new programs when available. Program faculty research accreditation benefits for students and the program resulting in a recommendation to the EVP and Provost. Program-level accreditation is supported in the budget and licensure rates are monitored by the OA. The alignment of PLOs with GE outcomes are monitored by the GE Curriculum Committee (GECC) and the alignment with ULGs are reported to the OA in annual assessment reporting. **(4.B.4)**

PLOs focus on the knowledge, skills and abilities expected of graduates and align with course learning outcomes (CLOs). Course level [learning outcomes in syllabi was affirmed by the Faculty Senate](#) in 2018 to require all syllabi to state CLOs and identify common CLOs across multiple sections of the same course. Syllabi are standardized to include leveled student learning outcomes. A [faculty development workshop](#) was offered on November 9, 2018 focusing on development and assessment of CLOs. Syllabi are collected each semester and samples reviewed for consistency by the OA. **(4.B.4)**

- *Articulating the purposes, content, and level of achievement of these outcomes (4.B.1)*

PLOs and degree requirements are clearly articulated in institutional and program documents on [the public website](#). The learning outcomes for ULGs and GE are published in the online Academic Catalog. The public website lists learning outcomes for all academic programs. Licensure information related to pass rates is collected and tracked by the OA and posted to appropriate web pages for public disclosure. **(4.B.1)**

The purpose, content and level of achievement of outcomes are defined by program faculty. Departments report learning outcomes, measures for outcomes, and level of achievement in the 5-Step Assessment reports. Reports are reviewed by the dean, the OA and the University Assessment Committee (UAC). OA tracks reporting of PLOs and forwards information to the UAC. There are also [23 accrediting bodies](#) that review, approve and provide specialty accreditation for academic programs. **(4.B.1)**

- *Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs (3.B.4)*

Each department systematically reviews its curriculum and requirements as part of the 5-Step Assessment and program review process for workplace expectations and success of graduates. To ensure that PLOs remain relevant to the workplace, professional programs, such as social work, nursing, business, physical therapy and teacher education, regularly update curricula to incorporate new professional standards. For example, since 2015, the School of Education's faculty members have participated in ongoing county and statewide STEM education conversations. As a result, the Elementary Education Teacher preparation program was redesigned with an emphasis on STEM.

(3.B.4)

Programs respond to feedback from graduates through exit surveys and employers through placement and field experience reports and surveys. Across the curriculum, course projects engage students directly with the community and industry. As examples: design projects in engineering, student-led public relations agency in communications, applied research in the Community Research Center for Sociology, and the newly established finance lab. In junior and senior years, students have bridging experiences that connect them to employers and communities. Graduate students in professional programs have advanced placements that further their professional credentials. Advisory boards are used to keep the curriculum relevant and current. **(3.B.4)**

Service learning is a key component of the curriculum that ensures outcomes remain aligned with societal needs; and, the University's motto, "Education for Service." The Service Learning Council established an assessment subcommittee to document service learning outcomes within identified courses, retain student work samples, and recommend a standardized survey tool to measure students' attitudes towards civic engagement for implementation in 2019. The standardized tool will build upon and replace the internal survey utilized from 2015-2018. Also part of the Council's work, a survey of faculty about service learning offerings and assessment was administered in 2015 and 2017. **(3.B.4)**

- ***Designing, aligning, and delivering co-curricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)***

One key co-curricular activity to support learning is volunteerism, outside of the curriculum, linked to "Education for Service." Goals for volunteerism include creating an awareness of community needs. The experiential component of volunteerism may occur as part of campus life activities including "Super Saturday of Service" and service projects on Martin Luther King Day, as the focus of student organizations such as Circle K and College Mentors for Kids; and as an annual requirement for all athletic teams. Feedback is gathered from undergraduate students through surveys and reports, and through graduate association reports for graduate students. Service hours may be reported on student transcripts. **(3.E.1, 3.E.2, 4.B.2)**

An equal focus of the co-curricular is on the development of leadership. The First Year Leadership Experience (FYLE), Registered Student Organization monthly trainings, National Society for Leadership & Success (NSLS), and Police Cadet program are examples. Additionally, student employment opportunities, intramural referees, and orientation leaders train students in areas of communication, conflict resolution, and group dynamics. Feedback is gathered via surveys and performance evaluations. Student & Campus Affairs program tracks attendance, number of programs, and offerings each semester. **(3.E.1, 4.B.2)**

Residence Life created and implemented learning outcomes for its programming in Fall 2018 to include student leadership training. Resident Assistants (RAs), Assistant Residence Directors (ARDs), and Apartment Community Assistants (ACAs) training was revamped to focus on learning objectives and integrating them into existing activities. Learning objectives are measured using annual surveys for input into staff and departmental evaluations. Survey results are used to inform ongoing training and make improvements in lower scored learning outcomes. **(3.E.1, 3.E.2, 4.B.2)**

- ***Selecting Tools/methods/instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes (4.B.2)***

Tools and instruments to assess PLOs are determined by department faculty and shared through the

department's annual update on the 5-Step Assessment; and are reflected upon in the department's program review every five years. PLOs for curricular and co-curricular are annually assessed and included in the cycle of program review. (See 2P1). **(4.B.2)**

Institutionally, tools used for assessment are selected by faculty with input from IT and approval by academic leadership. This includes a new LMS to be implemented in 2020 with access to an electronic portfolio to align with CLOs. Also streamlining of assessment software for evaluation of clinical and field experiences has occurred. Finally, a change to SmartEvals for course evaluation will begin summer 2019. **(4.B.2)**

The First Destination Survey, approved by the administrative VP in collaboration with Institutional Research, replaced the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS) Alumni Survey used prior to 2015. The determination was made, as part of an AQIP Action Project to better reflect undergraduate and graduate outcomes. The Action Project had cross-campus stakeholders represented in the decision-making and implementation. **(4.B.2)**

- ***Assessment of program learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)***

UIndy has SLOs identified for each course, program, GE and ULGs that are mapped and aligned. Achievement of SLOs is measured at course completion and annually for programs. GE and ULGs are embedded in CLOs and assessed at course completion. The end-of-course evaluations feed into program evaluation. GE learning outcomes are assessed in a cycle described in 1P1 and ULGs are assessed as part of the annual 5 Step Assessment Process, which links PLOs to CLOs. Annual assessment reports, archived in OA and summarized for the UAC. **(4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)**

The 2014 Systems Appraisal noted the 5 Step Assessment process, but stated it needed greater maturity. Since then reports from 2015-18 have been used to make annual improvements. Assessment reporting and a summary of the level of attainment of SLOs are provided in 1R2. Assessment workshops are offered by OA in concert with the Faculty Academy. An AQIP [annual Assessment Fair](#) is held to showcase posters reflecting the outcomes of assessments for PLOs, GE and CLOs. Posters from the fairs are archived and serve as models for future years by OA. **(4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)**

1R2 Results

- ***Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized***

The 5 Step Assessment report template is used annually for submission of assessment reports. As seen in the 5 Step Assessment reports, SLOs at the program and course levels are measured through various instructional tools representing different pedagogical strategies. The annual AQIP Assessment Fair has displays of assessment results and program improvements. The program review template prompts departments to reflect upon their annual 5 Step Assessment reports that span the five year period of review.

Service learning courses are also assessed with course-embedded tools and strategies identified by faculty in the surveys from 2015 and 2017. In addition to assessing service learning outcomes, the Center for Service learning and Community Engagement measures numbers of service learning courses, rates for student participation in service-learning activities, and numbers of community partners engaged with service learning projects.

Licensure rates and programs' standing with specialty accreditors for professional programs are tracked by OA. Letters addressing the status of programs with their accrediting bodies are collected and archived in the OA.

Professional schools and colleges are adopting the CORE Experiential Learning Management System (ELMS) to track and store assessment information for clinical and field placements; this tool was first piloted in 2016 by the School of Occupational Therapy. Now the Krannert School of Physical Therapy, the College of Applied Behavioral Sciences, and the School of Nursing, are adopting CORE ELMS in Spring 2019; this decision to share fieldwork and placement software will decrease the number of assessment programs and provide opportunities for sharing expertise and comparing results when appropriate.

The School of Engineering has adopted the Assessment, Evaluation, Feedback & Intervention System (AEFIS) as its assessment system in order to align with the requirements of the Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology (ABET) for their planned review for initial accreditation in 2020.

At the institutional level, student placement rates at graduation and post-graduation are tracked through two university surveys. The First Destination Survey measures student placement outcomes at the time of graduation and within a few months following graduation. A second institutional survey, the Alumni Survey, is given to former students at year one and year five after graduation. Results from the 2017 Alumni Survey show graduates' placement outcomes and overall satisfaction with their educational experience. (see 2P3)

- ***Overall levels of deployment of assessment processes within the institution***

UIndy has campus-wide, curricular and co-curricular annual assessment [TABLE 1.2.1](#).

- ***Summary results of assessments***

The submission rate for 5 Step assessment reports from all programs (n=98) for 2017-18 is 100%. All programs in existence for three years or more are expected to have results to report in their 5 Step reports. Accordingly, 90 programs reported results for SLOs for 2017-18. At the same time in 2017-18, eight programs are new or significantly revised with newly established learning outcomes (Step 1), with curriculum mapped (Step 2), and assessment activities aligned (Step 3). These programs are not at the point of being able to report results for their outcomes (Step 5).

In 2018, OA began scoring the extent to which learning outcomes are reported as met, partially met and not met. An internal target was set by the University Assessment Committee (UAC) that 80% of programs, in existence three years or more, would achieve a score of "Met" for the attainment of learning outcomes.

- For 2017-18, 79 programs reported results and achieved the target of 80% "Met."
- The remaining programs reported partially met learning outcomes or not meeting their learning outcomes; it is these programs where the focus on action steps and improvements are centered.

[TABLE 1.2.2](#) shows samples of results for 5 Step Assessment Reports where learning outcomes are considered to be "met" from 2017-18.

[TABLE 1.2.3](#) shows two examples of "partially met" and one example of "not met" with action plans from 2017-18.

Assessment results for service-learning drawn from campus-wide surveys collected from 2015 to 2017 (N=330) indicated students' perceived benefits to service learning. In response to the survey questions:

- "The community participation of the project helped me to see how course material that I learned can be used in everyday life," 86% of students strongly agreed and agreed.
- "Partnering in service learning assisted me to better understand the materials from my lectures and readings," 73.3% strongly agreed and agreed.
- "Service-Learning made me more aware of the roles of other professions besides my own," 89.5% strongly agreed and agreed.
- "I will probably volunteer or continue community service after this experience," 82.7% strongly agreed and agreed.

Curricular community engagement participation rates were determined through the 2017 service learning survey results [TABLE 1.2.4](#).

Assessment results for the First Destination question, "Please select the category that BEST describes your 'PRIMARY STATUS' after graduation"; students had 16 options from which to select. For the purpose of presenting a more comprehensive status of outcomes, those 16 options were as grouped follows: Seeking Employment, Furthering Education, Employed and Other. The comparison to data from the 2017 Report from the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) is provided in [TABLE 1.2.5](#), however this is estimated comparison as data was not submitted to NACE for inclusion in its reporting.

Results for the Alumni survey show that students have gained employment or pursued graduate education at higher rates than those reported at the time of graduation in the First Destination Survey. (see 2P3)

- 94% of alumni are working full-time, part-time or furthering their education after one year of graduation. After five years of graduation this percentage increases to 97%.

Results are gathered and analyzed at the program level to determine if programs are meeting the needs of students, employers and society. For example in the Doctor of Physical Therapy program, 100% of employers responded that graduates (Classes of 2015, 2016, and 2017) met or exceeded their expectations in response to "The graduate is sensitive to cultural, emotional, and interactional aspects of patient care", "The graduate demonstrates effective professional writing skills", and "The graduate demonstrates effective and culturally competent oral and written communication skills." The graduates surveyed in the past 3 cohorts responded to "Upon graduation, I was able to demonstrate effective and culturally competent oral and written communication skills" with 100% choosing "strongly agree" or "agree".

As reported on the School of Business Accreditation site, an average of 97% of students completing their degrees indicated in the annual 2013-2017 senior exit surveys that they had received a quality education. An average of 96% of the graduating seniors indicated their business courses were suited to their educational needs, and 95% reported the business courses prepared them for their career. Also the School of Business faculty assure student learning with relevant business skills and knowledge by direct participation with business partners within the Indianapolis area. Students (often in teams) in 2016-2018 completed 34 different projects in conjunction with 59 different business partners. This partnership assures student learning is aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs.

- ***Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks***

All program licensure rates meet or exceed national pass rates. See [TABLE 1.2.6](#).

- ***Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained***

The UAC sets expectation that 80% of all program reports demonstrate “met” learning outcomes in 2017-18 reports. The assessment process allows programs that have achieved a desired level of quality ("met") to focus on maintaining and continuing that quality. The assessment process also focuses on developing measures and results of student learning for new programs, and establishing action plans for those with "partially met" or the few that have "not met" their targets.

Licensure rates and specialty accreditations are recognized strengths. Results show that all licensure pass rates are at or above national rates and all accredited programs are in good standing with their accrediting bodies. OA provides support and oversees the programmatic self-study processes leading to accreditation.

A comparison of results from the 2017 First Destination data show similar trends and generally align with results reported by the National Association for Colleges and Employers (NACE). However, one area of difference is with those seeking higher education where the University shows a higher rate at 29% compared to the NACE rate of 17.5%. One insight relates to the large array of graduate programs in fields where students are already studying as undergraduates at UIndy; the University consistently retains more of its undergraduates as graduate students. In 2008, 184 UIndy graduating undergraduates entered UIndy graduate programs; this increased to 309 graduates by 2018 as shown in [Table 1.2.7](#).

An insight gained from the analysis of a campus-wide faculty survey on service learning was that faculty would benefit from an online hub and web resource to archive and share service-learning syllabi, faculty resources, assessment tools, and other supportive material. A second insight for the Service Learning Council is that while the survey results from the internal survey instrument were very positive, this tool is not valid or reliable by research standards.

1.1.2 Improvements

UAC will continue to track the number and percentage of programs reporting improvements, encourage individual programs to raise expectations when feasible, and to work with the Faculty Academy on an annual workshop focused on student learning outcomes. The greatest opportunity for growing the quality of the 5 Step assessment reports is with the final step (#5) that addresses “action plans” and “improvements.”

Individual programs have implemented action plans that lead to [improvements based on their assessment activities](#). Examples of these improvements are drawn from all colleges and schools.

As a result of survey feedback, a central web “hub” was initiated by the Service-Learning Council in 2018 to be maintained by the Center for Service-Learning and Community Engagement. The hub was identified as a project to benefit many faculty and allow a space to centralize all information relating to curricular service experiences from across the curriculum, including materials developed by the service-learning, multidisciplinary faculty cohorts.

A new service learning survey instrument was adopted by the Service-Learning Council in January 2019 and was implemented for testing in semester II 2018-19. After the initial review and any

necessary revisions, the tool will be fully implemented in all academic units in semester I 2019-20.

In the next few years, integration of assessment options with the new LMS, the expansion and shared use of CORE for experiential learning and field placements, and the adoption of SmartEval for the evaluation of teaching are key improvements. There is now an articulated process for the vetting of academic software systems that connects IT, OA, and the Faculty Academy thereby aligning acquisition, implementation, training, and continued support.

Improvements related to the administration of the First Destination are discussed further in 2P3 and include administration of the survey through new software, submission of data to the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) for benchmarking, and the development of additional sources of information to complement survey results.

Sources

- 4+1 policy considerations and recommendations 2018-2019
- 5 Step Process Diagram
- Accreditation Schedule
- Curriculum Flow Charts
- Dual Credit Courses offered by University of Indianapolis
- Faculty Development Workshop Agenda
- Faculty Handbook 2018 p. 43-44
- Improvements_AQIP 5-Step Process_2017-18
- Learning Outcomes for web site Oct. 2018
- Licensure Exam Pass Rates
- NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL and APPROVAL PROCESSES 2018-2019
- New Programs Chart
- Proposal Approval Flow Chart and Guidelines
- Senate Minutes - Syllabi
- TABLE 1.2.1 Overall Deployment of Assessment Processes within the Institution
- TABLE 1.2.2 Samples of Student Learning Outcomes from 5 Step Reports for 2017-18
- TABLE 1.2.3 Student Learning Outcomes from 5 Step Reports for 2017-18 for
- TABLE 1.2.4 Community Engagement Hours by Course Embedded Service Learning
- TABLE 1.2.5 2017 First Destination Report and Comparison
- TABLE 1.2.6 University of Indianapolis Licensure Examinations Pass Rates 2012-2017
- Table 1.2.7 Uindy graduates to graduate programs
- University of Indianapolis Mail - [fs] Come to the AQIP Fair Wednesday May 16th

1.3 - Academic Program Design

Academic Program Design focuses on developing and revising programs to meet stakeholders' needs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.C. and 4.A. in this section.

1P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for ensuring new and current programs meet the needs of the institution and its diverse stakeholders. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)
- Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)
- Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders' needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs
- Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary (4.A.1)

1R3: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if programs are current and meet the needs of the institution's diverse stakeholders? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

1P3 Processes

- *Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)*

The overarching process for connecting academic programs to student stakeholder groups and their educational needs occurs through strategic planning. The next Strategic Plan, 2019-2024, will

incorporate an Academic Master Plan to guide growth, organization and array of academic programs aligned to the mission; anticipate future student and stakeholder needs, and recognize changing societal needs and shifting demographics. Further, the [Academic Master Plan](#) will address organizational structures for the growing needs of graduate students and adult learners. **(1.C.1, 1.C.2)**

An Inclusion and Equity Council (IEC) was established in 2018 institutionalizing multiple campus initiatives around diversity, under the leadership of the Office of Inclusion and Equity. Among the Council's working groups, one was created for Diversity in the Curriculum/Co-Curriculum, which focused on expanding culturally inclusive content in existing courses ([TABLE 1.3.1](#)) and promoting new programs and experiences related to intercultural, international and multicultural topics. One example of a new course supported by the Sociology Department and IEC, and offered twice in 2018-19, is Social Inequality. This course counts for the major as well as it meets a requirement in GE, thereby engaging more students. **(1.C.1, 1.C.2)**

Helping to assure diversity awareness are requirements set by specialty accrediting bodies. For example, in two recent program self-studies submitted in spring 2019, to the American Psychological Association and to the Council on Social Work Accreditation, competencies related to knowledge and skills that support work with diverse clients, and recruitment and retention strategies for a diverse faculty and student body were required areas to address. Further, UIndy understands its role to prepare students to live and work in a multicultural society. UIndy hosts a monthly guest lecture series on diverse current topics and musical events that are also open to the public. International travel, such as the biannual medical mission trips and themed travel, are available with grant money to partly support and encourage student and faculty travel abroad. Numerous service learning and volunteerism activities are other ways students are engaged in the multicultural society. **(1.C.1, 1.C.2)**

A key process that supports the development of academic programs that will meet the needs of the institution and its diverse stakeholders is the [new program proposal and implementation process](#). The second major process is the [program review](#) which ensures the systematic review of current academic programs. **(1.C.2)**

- ***Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)***

With the integration of adult programs into academic departments, non-credit programs were moved to a new organizational structure, now called Sease Institute. The institute will serve a continuing education role providing custom programs and trainings that meet workplace needs and workforce development. (see Cat. 2.P.3) **(1.C.1, 1.C.2)**

- ***Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders' needs. (1.C.1, 1.C.2)***

A wide array of academic programs, which include associate to doctoral degrees, address the diverse educational needs of residential, commuter, and adult students through learning formats that are face-to-face, hybrid, and online. (See 1.P.4 for distance education) Students' educational needs are informed by advisory groups, prospective students, alumni, and employer and student surveys. Feedback and results from these sources are included in program review reports. Each program review involves a discussion of program enrollments in the context of an environmental scan and competitive analysis in order to project future needs and demand for the program. As a result of the program review, decisions can be made to maintain, grow or close existing programs. **(1.C.2)**

The School for Adult Learning (SAL) programs were experiencing declining enrollments due to decreased demand for existing programs, not meeting student interests, and increased external competition. In fall 2018, adult education programs were transferred to other academic departments with SAL discontinuing. A new Office of Graduate and Adult Enrollment was established along with a dedicated office for student services for adult learners prompting review and revision to programs and syllabi for consistency across traditional day and accelerated adult sections. The Academic Master Plan recommends developing an Accelerated Adult Program Council with a clear charge and wide representation from academic departments to oversee adult programs. **(1.C.1, 1C.2)**

Advisory groups, key stakeholders and external consultants inform the University of unmet program need and can help direct efforts in targeting new student groups. For example, UIndy created a new school in 2017-18, the R. B. Annis School of Engineering, with six new undergraduate majors using an advisory board. The programs meet the need of a growing field of interest and align with the strategic objective of innovative undergraduate curricula that give students a competitive advantage in the workplace. Another example is the creation of the Masters in Management in 2017-18 that addresses the Education Advisory Board's recommendations for enhanced communication and business skills. **(1.C.2)**

- ***Selecting the tools/methods/instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs***

The template for the program review report addresses program currency and effectiveness.

A new process was introduced in 2018-19 for determining the strength of market demand and extent of institutional competitiveness for current and future graduate and adult programs. This involved the engagement of consultants, Gray Associates for a Program Portfolio Strategy to assist in deciding which programs to “Start, Stop, Sustain, or Grow” by analyzing institutional and external comparative data including Integrated Postsecondary Educational Data System. Extensive sets of external data are combined with the University's historical data and internal projections to inform program review and plans for future programs. On January 8-9, 2019 over 40 campus leaders participated with [Gray Associates](#) in a two-day planning event.

- ***Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary (4.A.1)***

Reviewing the viability of academic programs occurs through the [program review process](#) in which the five-year trend of past enrollment and a projection of future demand are discussed. As a result of a program review, or in intervening years based upon low enrollment trends or other factors, a dean may decide to make a program inactive, which means that no new enrollment will be sought. It is possible that a program will be made inactive due to changes in the external environment, such as state licensing or professional standards, as was the case with the decisions to close the nurse midwifery program and the associate degree program in nursing. The inactive status provides a period for teaching out a program. **(4.A.1)**

[Reviews of programs are scheduled](#) across a five-year cycle with each existing program and new programs assigned a slot three to five years following implementation. Guidelines define the program review process and a report template. See [TABLE 1.3.2](#) for an overview of the program review template. An orientation meeting is held each semester for programs scheduled for review at which time the process and data for five years are identified. IR supports data needs. Program review is centered in the Office of Accreditation, which supports programs in their work, provides feedback on

drafts, facilitates review of submitted reports, and archives completed reports. **(4.A.1)**

Program review reports are evaluated for further review at two levels. The first is by dean and provost who provide direct feedback to the respective unit from within the framework of Academic Affairs about quality, efficiency, competitiveness, and proposed action plans. The second digest of program review reports occurs with the University Assessment Committee (UAC), which looks across reviews, to determine issues that are common, indicating an opportunity for institutional improvement and reports any insights to the provost. **(4.A.1)**

Viability of courses is tracked through annual enrollment reporting and viability is viewed in light of program and degree requirements and the policy on minimum class sizes with consideration of faculty load. Program directors and deans determine the schedule of course offerings and work to balance both student demands with needs for institutional efficiency. A course may be made inactive or removed through the formal curriculum process. **(4.A.1)**

1.R.3 Results

- *Summary results of assessments*

The University approved 19 new programs and 11 collaborative programs involving joint engineering degrees from 2014-17. For 2018-19, 16 new or substantially revised programs have been proposed and slated for approval at multiple levels. These approvals are followed by various implementation steps which are tracked in the [New Programs Planning document](#). This planning document shows at a glance where new and substantially revised programs are in the review and implementation process.

UIndy also seeks approval to offer new programs when appropriate through the Commission's Substantive Change process. In 2016 to 2018, five programs were submitted and successfully approved through the HLC Substantive Change process including: Bachelors of Science in Industrial Systems Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Software Engineering; Masters of Social Work; and the Master of Arts in Addictions Counseling. In February 2019, two additional new programs were submitted through the Substantive Change process, the Master of Arts in Public Relations and Master of Science in Exercise Science.

All academic departments participated in the 2013-18 program review cycle and all have been scheduled into the next cycle for 2019-2024. An 18 tab spreadsheet of [data and a retention report](#) are shared by IR with each department slated for review. These data are used in the review along with other requested information.

- *Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks*

The two-day collaborative [workshop with Gray Associates](#) analyzing institutional data along with external data sets resulted in the following recommendations: 1) Consider a total of 29 (+4 "parked") potential new programs, 2) Grow 10 current programs, 3) Sustain 29 current programs, 4) Fix 6 current programs, and Review and potentially stop 7 current programs. These recommendations will be considered as part of the Academic Master Plan.

- *Interpretation of results and insights gained*

An assessment of department program review reports by the Provost's Council revealed that all

departments perceive they can grow their programs with additional institutional investment. This internal sense of potential, however, needs to be examined in light of external benchmarks and data. For this reason, the University took the step of partnering with the consulting firm, Gray Associates, to create a systematic basis for when to grow new programs, maintain, fix, and review current programs incorporating program level analyses.

An insight related to the results developed by Gray Associates is that the suggested array of programs will need to be incorporated and aligned with objectives through the planning process; rather than the consulting process. Involvement of Gray Associates was to complement the new program proposal process by providing key data for proposals. For example, the Gray Associates data and scoring for the proposed Master of Arts in Public Relations showed a stronger national market for it as an online program rather than for a traditional face-to-face program. With this information, a program director with the ability to take the program online within three years is under consideration.

A second insight resulting from the program review process is that enrollment is a complex factor; departments need to address both initial and terminal majors. Some programs are strong as initial majors drawing students to the University, but do not retain students who are not competitive in the major. Other majors show strength with the terminal majors attracting major-changers, when they may have had fewer students select their majors initially. This insight has enriched the conversation around enrollment and program strength. An important addition to the tracking of majors has been the tracking of minors and concentrations as a way of demonstrating strength in program enrollments.

The third insight related to program review is that the University's Alumni Survey rarely yields results that are meaningful beyond the school or college level at the program level. An alternative for tracking the placement of graduates that could yield data at the program level is now planned for future administrations of the First Destination Survey.

A fourth insight is that the need for facilities was largely met with the 2013-18 strategic plan and campus master plan. Only in the case of Art and Design, Music, and Engineering are space and facilities a critical issue given the growth of these programs and their current limited space. This finding fits the visioning for the next strategic plan for 2019-2024, where the focus will be on the quality of programs and faculty rather than the widespread need for space.

An insight related to the [program review of Experience Design](#) was that involving external reviewers created rich feedback, especially for this small interdisciplinary program that is unlike any other program at the University. A plan for continuing to develop Experience Design following national models was developed as part of the program review process as a result of engaging national-level reviewers.

113 Improvements

The new program approval process has been in place since 2015, but it has been significantly improved by: 1) the creation of the New Program Implementation Committee, and 2) by contracting with an external consulting firm, Gray Associates, for market research and competitive analyses. Contracting with external consultants has provided an external tool for validating internal projections about future demand and for tailoring searches from government and labor market sources, as well as competitive analysis, to each proposed program.

A second improvement to the new program process has been the development of a tracking tool to create greater transparency around new programs; this tool is shared with all stakeholders, including the Faculty Senate. Following initial program approval by the Executive Vice President and Provost, this tool tracks proposed program through subsequent approvals, including curriculum committees of the Faculty Senate, the Board of Trustees, and the Higher Learning Commission, and through to program implementation. With the tracking tool, one can see where any new program is in “the pipeline” at a given point. The joint review of the New Program Implementation Committee also ensures that no program is initiated without HLC approval when such approval is required.

An improvement to the program review process is the use of external reviewers when requested. The involvement of external reviewers has occurred in two cases, both interdisciplinary, with the reviews of Experience Design (2017) and Honors (2019). Both reviews involved academics from nationally recognized programs or from a national body that provided feedback on the program. A third external review for Sports Marketing also occurred in spring 2019 by request of the program.

An improvement that has been initiated and needs to be built upon further is the incorporation of interdisciplinary programs into the program review process. The reorganization of Interdisciplinary programs with oversight by the Provost’s Office will lead to a more systematic development and review of interdisciplinary majors, minors, concentration and programs. Similarly Interprofessional programs are being developed with plans for a parallel integration in university processes.

Sources

- AMP Final Report
- EXD Curriculum Review
- Flowchart Program Review Process
- Gray Associates Program Portfolio Workshop
- NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL and APPROVAL PROCESSES 2018-2019
- New programs
- Program Review Data Documents
- Program Review Schedule
- TABLE 1.3.1 Human and Cultural Diversity
- TABLE 1.3.2 Topics Addressed in the Program Review Template

1.4 - Academic Program Quality

Academic Program Quality focuses on ensuring quality across all programs, modalities and locations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.A. and 4.A. in this section.

1P4: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for ensuring quality academic programming. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses and learning they will pursue (4.A.4)
- Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia and dual-credit programs (3.A.1, 3.A.3, 4.A.4)
- Awarding prior learning and transfer credits (4.A.2, 4.A.3)
- Selecting, implementing and maintaining specialized accreditation(s) (4.A.5)
- Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels (3.A.2, 4.A.6)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities

1R4: RESULTS

What are the results for determining the quality of academic programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I4: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

P4 Processes

Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses, and learning they will pursue. (4.A.4)

Needed preparation for students is determined by program faculty and is communicated through pre- and post-admission advising, web information, marketing materials, publications, catalog, and handbooks. Advisors interact with prospective students at the programmatic and institutional level to

communicate program requirements and preparation needed. **(4.A.4)**

- *Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia, and when offering dual-credit programs. (3.A.1, 3.A.3, 4.A.4)*

All locations and modes of delivery of programs, are designed, delivered, and assessed by the same program faculty. Program learning goals and program quality are consistent across modalities and locations and evidenced through the 5-Step Assessment process. Currency of programs is also through the annual assessment and the program review process. Expected levels of performance of students is consistent with the degree level through leveled course and program outcomes. (see 1P3) **(3.A.1, 3.A.3, 4.A.4)**

Reviews of programs are scheduled across a five-year cycle along with the annual submission of the 5-Step assessment report; these processes serve to ensure rigor, verify that prerequisite courses prepare students for the major, and ensure program resources for all locations and modalities. There are [11 online and hybrid graduate programs](#) and one online undergraduate program, which is the RN-BSN. Also individual courses from traditional undergraduate programs are offered selectively online; these include GE courses. For 2017-18, 388 online courses represented 8.8% (388/4373) of all course offerings. The decision to offer a new program online is made through the new program approval process. (see 1P3) **(3.A.3, 4.A.4)**

All online and hybrid programs [maintain and evidence quality](#) through course embedded assessments, end-of-course surveys, faculty orientation, development and mentoring of faculty, and faculty oversight. Program directors and deans monitor programs and courses with expectations for quality instruction, sustained student-faculty interaction, and appropriate assignments and assessments. Expectations for quality teaching, inclusive of online teaching, are described in the Faculty Handbook and provided at New Faculty Orientation. Additional tools that specifically address teaching expectations exist: two examples are the [agreement developed with adjunct faculty who teach online in the Doctor of Health Science program](#) and the School of Nursing [online/hybrid course peer review form](#). **(3.A.3)**

The Faculty Academy provides instructional design using [Quality Matters™ standards](#), leadership for technology innovation, training on instructional pedagogy, and the LMS. The Office of Accreditation (OA) ensures that course evaluations are administered, analyzed and returned to deans, program directors and faculty to support the improvement of courses, and teaching and learning. **(3.A.1, 3.A.3, 4.A.4)**

UIndy has three additional locations: one in-state with a corporate partnership for the Master of Business Administration and two international partnerships in China. Feedback from the 2019 Multi-locations Visit report recommended the rating of “acceptable” in all categories. UIndy participates in the [State Authorization and Reciprocity Agreement](#) and State Authorization Network to remain informed about changes in the regulatory environment and to benchmark best practices. Communications and Marketing review websites for accuracy on an ongoing basis. **(3.A.3)**

[Dual credit courses](#) were offered at three area high schools in 2018-19. Collaborations are guided by the University’s expectations for dual credit including instructor qualifications, admissions and grading policies, and relationship with the high school. The University tracks and reports instructor qualifications for those teaching dual credit courses, who are mostly UIndy full-time faculty, and verifies HLC requirements are met. **(3.A.3, 4.A.4)**

- ***Awarding prior learning and transfer credits (4.A.2, 4.A.3)***

Evaluation of prior learning credit is consistent through the Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) process available to adult learners for up to 30 credit hours. Students are notified of the option to apply for PLA credit through advising and the Adult Programs website. Students meet with the Prior Learning Assessment Coordinator, a master's certified professional in prior learning assessment, who provides guidance in the process and conducts the assessment. (4.A.2)

[Transfer policies](#) are stated in the catalog. The review of transfer credits is through the Office of the Registrar and consultation is made with the academic units, as needed. A coordinator ensures consistency of interpretation and compliance with statewide transfer agreements. Articulation agreements exist with Ivy Tech Community College and Vincennes University. [Articulation agreements](#) also are developed to facilitate the transfer of students from international sites. These international agreements comply with the transfer policy and are approved by program faculty and the International Sites Advisory Oversight Committee of the Faculty Senate. (4.A.2, 4.A.3)

- ***Selecting, implementing, and maintaining specialized accreditation (4.A.5)***

Programmatic accreditation is decided by academic leadership in concert with program faculty. Accreditation is sought for every program where accreditation is needed for licensure or certification, and in other cases it is sought when the accreditation will stand as a mark of quality thereby enhancing the reputation of the program. The [Office of Accreditation tracks specialized accreditations](#) and provides resources to programs seeking new or reaffirmation of accreditation. Three engineering programs (industrial and systems engineering, mechanical engineering, and software engineering) will be applying for initial accreditation to the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) in spring 2020. It is planned for all engineering programs to be ABET accredited. (4.A.5)

- ***Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels (3.A.2, 4.A.6)***

Assessment of student learning outcomes is described for ULGs and GE in 1P1-1R1 and for academic program outcomes in 1P2-1R2 with leveled learning outcomes for each course, program, and degree. Graduate and undergraduate programs are all assessed annually for learning outcomes. In addition, program assessments by specialty accreditors help ensure standardized outcomes and measures across modalities. Also assessments for international sites involve comparisons of students enrolled at the China sites who then enroll at the Indianapolis campus to complete their degrees. Tracking grades and academic progress between sites contributes to the assurance that instruction is consistent and rigorous. Finally, full time faculty teach at additional locations along with adjuncts to further assure consistency of student outcomes. (3.A.2, 4.A.6)

- ***Selecting the tools/methods/instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities***

Program assessment tools and learning goals are consistent across modalities. As examples, the School of Business delivers the same curriculum, activities and assessments across locations with limited customization. In the case of the RN-BSN online program, the courses are standardized across the on-ground and online delivery for comparison of student cohorts. Additional assessments occur for online courses involving independent Quality Matters instructional reviews, recordings of emails, chats and virtual sessions for subsequent review, online peer and mentor reviews, and use of blended modalities to increase engagement in measurable activities. (3.A.3)

1R4 Results

- *Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized*

The selection of tools/methods/instruments to assess rigor are consistent across multiple offerings of a program, however programs may incorporate additional measures reflective of the delivery modality. Outcomes and measures tracked include:

- Specialty accreditation standards contained in accreditation reporting
- Standings with specialty accreditors
- Grades across modalities
- The success of students who are transfers from international sites
- Portfolios for Prior Learning Assessment
- Course evaluation using a standardized survey instrument, IDEA,
- Comparison of IDEA Scores for Online and Face-to-Face 2017-18
- Faculty training in Quality Matters that is followed-up with a survey about the impact on teaching.
- Online policies and practices benchmarked with the State Authorization Network.

- *Summary results of assessments*

Some programs assure quality by [blending delivery modalities](#), for example, the Doctor of Health Science Program has 100% of its coursework online, but includes three on-campus sessions for in-depth study and sustained interaction. The Master of Educational Leadership is hybrid and blends six full-day Saturday sessions with online assignments and coursework.

The [comparison of D/W/F](#) grades across online and traditional face-to-face courses show slightly higher rates of D/W/F for both graduate and undergraduate online courses.

[International students](#) who have transferred from the China sites graduate at higher rates than other transfer students or those School of Business students who began at the Indianapolis campus.

Prior learning assessment hours awarded generally average 3 to 6 credit hours, and from 2014 to 2019, there have been only 29 students who have attempted this option, with only 21 students completing their portfolios for credit.

A comparison of courses from 2017-18 using the [IDEA](#) course evaluations showed comparable levels of satisfaction on two overall measures of satisfaction. Scores were within .02 when comparing online and on ground (4.1 and 4.2; 3.7 and 3.9) for ratings.

[Results](#) from a [Faculty Academy survey](#) on how faculty have used the Quality Matters training to improve their courses include numerous examples, most commonly citing that the training supported a greater sense of community, meaningful assignments and an enhanced use technology.

UIndy hosted a [consultant who led a workshop](#) on April 18, 2018 for academic leadership to review compliance with SARA regulations for distance education and to learn more about requirements for notification related to professional licensure. A comparison of institutional practices determined that the University follows recommended good practices.

- *Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks*

All School of Nursing (SON) programs, both online and on-ground, are expected to meet the national benchmarks for retention which are set by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) at 80%; these benchmarks were exceeded in the past three years. The SON tracks quality improvement measures through the Continuous Improvement in Nursing Education (CINE) format across modalities. As another example, the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) has reviewed the business programs across locations and determined that they meet expectations.

All University programs are in good standing with specialty accrediting bodies as indicated in the [table of accreditation](#), which is displayed in the section on internal targets and external benchmarks.

- ***Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained***

Assessment results show satisfaction with online and hybrid delivery of programs with consistency in quality achieved across sites. The move to a new end-of-course evaluation system, SmartEvals, should allow for greater consistency and ease of comparison between online and on-ground courses. The current IDEA system has been limited in the formats to which it was applicable. Also the 2018-19 comparison of D/W/F rates across modalities has not yet been fully explored and is still under discussion.

One insight is that the current LMS (Sakai) is insufficient to support new features in online course design or to incorporate the desired level of communication and media use. Further there are new options for assessment with the new LMS, Brightspace, which includes course and program portfolios that have not been available with Sakai. It is anticipated that the new LMS, combined with the new course evaluation tool, SmartEvals, will allow for better comparison of outcomes between online and on-ground modalities, customization of questions for course section comparison, and for consistency in the administration of the survey instrument.

114 Improvements

The opportunity to further improve online programs and courses will be presented with the transition to the new LMS, Brightspace, anticipated for course delivery in 2021. The increased functionality of the site, along with the integration of a [new online course evaluation survey](#) from SmartEvals, should allow for improved communication, engagement and feedback on courses. UIndy will move to an integrated, smart system that is mobile friendly and integrates survey request into the LMS. Future online and on-ground trainings will focus on the utilization of the new features of the LMS incorporating meaningful feedback through SmartEvals and continuing with Quality Matters.

[Online service learning](#) experiences are being piloted in courses and will be made available as exercises on the new online hub established by the Service Learning Council. In this way, a key educational experience at the University, service-learning, can be made available to students who are online or are enrolled in hybrid courses.

The quality of services provided to students at the international sites has improved with the consolidation of all international functions (study abroad, international sites and partnerships, and international student services) into a new Center for Global Engagement under the supervision of the Associate Provost for International Engagement and Chief International Officer. Additionally, two admissions officers focusing on international recruitment have offices in the center. Since the establishment of the center, the number of students applying to the program in China has grown significantly.

Sources

- Accreditation Schedule
- Articulation Agreement
- Conversation with Ann Tornese 4.1.8.2018
- Course evaluation message
- DFW
- Dual Credit Courses offered by University of Indianapolis
- IHAS Online Adjunct Faculty Member Agreement
- Online hybrid graduate programs
- Online Teaching Service Learning Guidelines
- Overview of Quality Matters
- Quality Matters Survey
- SARA Renewal Confirmation Letter
- SON_OnlineHybridCoursePeerReviewForm
- TABLE 1.4.1 Distance Education
- TABLE 1.4.2 Comparison of IDEA Scores
- TABLE 1.4.3 Quality Matter Survey Results
- Transfer Graduation Rates Tables
- Transfer policy

1.5 - Academic Integrity

Academic Integrity focuses on ethical practices while pursuing knowledge. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.D. and 2.E. in this section.

1P5: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for supporting ethical scholarly practices by students and faculty. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice (2.D., 2.E.1, 2.E.3)
- Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students (2.E.2, 2.E.3)
- Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty (2.E.2, 2.E.3)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity

1R5: RESULTS

What are the results for determining the quality of academic integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures where appropriate)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I5: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R5, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

1P5 Processes

- *Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice (2.D., 2.E.1, 2.E.3)*

The Faculty Handbook and Faculty Guide addresses issues of [academic freedom](#), issues of [grievance procedures](#), [faculty-student relationships](#), and [FERPA](#) compliance. The [IRB Office](#) provides policies and oversight to student and faculty research practices and ensures integrity through scheduled protocol reviews. The [Freedom of Expression](#) is currently in the Student Handbook. All resources are available on the internal website. Further, the University is developing a broad Freedom of

Expression policy that will apply to all faculty, staff and students. The process of review, [draft policy](#) and [draft committee](#) are provided to show the current level of development. **(2.D, 2.E.1, 2.E.3)**

- ***Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students (2.E.2, 2.E.3)***

Students are directed to the internal campus website for the [Student Handbook p.18-21](#) section on academic misconduct with policies on plagiarism and copyright. Faculty also reference those same student policies in syllabi and give expectations at the beginning of each course. Procedures for reporting [academic misconduct](#) are made available to faculty. The Faculty Affairs Committee in May 2019 developed an [academic misconduct flowchart](#) that includes the student appeal process to assist faculty with reporting and counseling students. Internet tools and anti-plagiarism detection have become widely employed by students as required by the faculty. The University subscribes to Turnitin. Students engaged in undergraduate or graduate research involving human subjects are expected to secure the approval of the IRB. **(2.E.2, 2.E.3)**

The Krannert Memorial Library (KLM) resources include a website with a policy on [Copyright and Fair Use](#) to guide information use. Also discussed in 2P1, the library provides classroom presentations and orientations to help inform undergraduate and graduate students of resources and assistance available. Library Guides exist for most academic departments as a research resource. The library also has liaisons who are assigned to work with each academic department to determine student and faculty needs for resources and training. **(2.E.2, 2.E.3)**

- ***Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty (2.E.2, 2.E.3).***

Faculty determine course content by aligning it with disciplinary standards, professional competencies, and sound pedagogical practice. Faculty also share courses and activities for peer review as part of the curriculum approval, annual evaluation, and promotion and tenure processes. UIndy maintains a faculty tenure system grounded in academic freedom and adherence to the principles of the American Association of University Professors. UIndy is affiliated with the United Methodist tradition, as articulated in the mission statement, realized by the focus on ethical reasoning, and an appreciation of the role of faith. UIndy distinguishes itself within the Methodist tradition by emphasizing ecumenism, hospitality to all religions, and affirmation of human diversity, as indicated by the University's 2019 statement distinguishing itself from the church body on the interrelated issues of sexual orientation, marriage equality and ordination. **(2.D)**

The Faculty Academy supports ten faculty members a year with a stipend to serve as [Teaching Fellows and will add ten Scholarship Fellows](#) in 2019. Fellows are selected for their expertise and skill in teaching and serve to mentor new faculty and contribute to an ongoing series of faculty development workshops. In this way, the advancement of teaching is recognized as being within the primary authority of faculty. **(2.D)**

[Ethical processes in faculty research](#) practices are detailed in the Faculty Handbook, "Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research;" in accordance with the Department of Health and Human Services; and the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects. The University maintains a registered IRB. UIndy requires all members of the research team complete human protections training. Software to support integrity in research includes research software Qualtrics, statistical analysis software SPSS and SAS, qualitative software such as Dedoose, and experiential learning management software through CORE, ELM. Support for institutional and site licenses opens access to all faculty to incorporate best research practice tools and methodologies. **(2.E.1, 2.E.3)**

- ***Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity.***

Recently a more deliberate system to track student academic misconduct has been developed to better report patterns in this behavior. In addition, the Office of the Provost maintains all records on faculty personnel issues; these records would also contain information about student complaints or difficulties with institutional policies related to personnel issues. The IRB Manager tracking system allows the Office of Institutional Planning and Research (OIPR) to track the numbers of research proposals using the appropriate protocols.

- ***Outcomes/measures tracked within evaluations***

The types and frequency of incidents of academic misconduct are tracked and centralized within the Office of the Provost. The IRB coordinator tracks the frequency of events undertaken by the IRB, the types of reviews, and monthly and annual activity.

1R5 Results

- ***Summary results of measures***

See [TABLE 1.5.1](#), [TABLE 1.5.2](#), and [TABLE 1.5.3](#).

- ***Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks***

The internal target for academic-based complaints is less than 1% occurrence per student population per semester, or fewer than 54 incidents per semester. Results for academic student complaints have met the internal benchmark of less than 1% for the past three years. External benchmarks have not been identified for comparison of student misconduct and IRB activity.

- ***Interpretation of results and insights gained***

[Table 1.5.1](#) displays the types and frequency of incidents of academic misconduct over a six-semester period. The small number of cases are insignificant in comparison to overall total course enrollments with no widespread or frequent misconduct incidents occurring. Some faculty mitigate cases without using the reporting form, however, there has been greater emphasis on using the form to track the possibility of repeat offenses. While the process of reporting academic misconduct has been strengthened by systematizing and publicizing it, there is a sense that more needs to be done by making greater use of available software technologies that are anticipated in the new LMS.

Results in IRB reported activities show relatively stable number of protocols reviewed over time.

Records for the number of [CITI trainings](#) completed for human subjects protection in research has increased as more undergraduates and graduate students completed the training, along with an increased number of faculty.

1I5 Improvements

The implementation of Turnitin and greater emphasis by faculty on academic integrity through statements in syllabi has resulted in process improvements. In addition, the campus has instituted a more formal process to monitor reporting and resolution of academic complaints.

Faculty recognize a gap between the incidence of reported cheating nationwide and the rates reported at UIndy. UIndy plans to increase active learning strategies to engage students in unique and measurable activities that do not allow for purchased or copied works. Online programs are exploring proctoring software and verifying identities that extend beyond the unique password and login verification currently employed.

A new initiative planned for 2019-20 by the Faculty Academy in partnership with the Human Protections Research Program is to create a Scholarship Fellows program to accompany the Teaching Fellows program. Scholarship Fellows will support faculty learning in areas related to research and scholarship so experienced faculty will mentor novice faculty in their development as scholars. The increase in Faculty Fellows for both teaching and scholarship has been approved by the EVP and Provost for implementation May 2019.

Recent feedback for research involving human subjects indicated the lack of research protocol for an exempt status. This prompted a clarification of that particular protocol and increased training in preparing exempt proposals.

Sources

- Academic Freedom
- Academic Misconduct Flowchart
- Academic Misconduct Form
- Copyright and Fair Use
- Faculty Complaint and Greivance Policy
- Faculty Fellows Application
- Faculty Student Relationships
- FERPA
- Free Speech and Expression Policy
- IRB website
- Research Involving Human Participants
- Student Handbook 2018-19 Acad. Misconduct p. 18-21
- Student Handbook 2018-19 Free Speech p. 10
- TABLE 1.5.1 Academic Integrity Summary AY2015-16 AY2017-18
- TABLE 1.5.2 IRB Report
- TABLE 1.5.3 CITI Training
- UIndy Speech and Expression Committee Charter

2 - Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs

2.1 - Current and Prospective Student Need

Current and Prospective Student Need focuses on determining, understanding and meeting the academic and non-academic needs of current and prospective students. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 3.D in this section.

2P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for serving the academic and non-academic needs of current and prospective students. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Identifying underprepared and at-risk students, and determining their academic support needs (3.D.1)
- Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs (3.D.2)
- Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry (3.C.5)
- Determining and addressing the learning support needs (tutoring, advising, library, laboratories, research, etc.) of students and faculty (3.D.1, 3.D.3, 3.D.4, 3.D.5)
- Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services
- Meeting changing student needs
- Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs (e.g., seniors, commuters, distance learners, military veterans) (3.D.1)
- Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful (3.D.2)
- Ensuring staff members who provide non-academic student support services are qualified, trained and supported (3.C.6)
- Communicating the availability of non-academic support services (3.D.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs
- Assessing the degree to which student needs are met

2R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if current and prospective students' needs are being met? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

2P1 Process

- *Identifying underprepared and at-risk students, and determining their academic support needs (3.D.1)*

Three key student groups are identified through enrollment data: undergraduate/traditional full-time, adult learners, and graduate student. Within undergraduate and adult learner groups are subgroups of underprepared and at-risk students. These subgroups are identified through student retention data (see Cat. 2P2).

At-risk students are identified as Pell Grant/State Aid recipients, advised and contingent admit students. Retention research verifies residential students are retained at higher rates than commuters, so to increase retention of contingent and advised admit students are required to live on campus freshman year. Students admitted contingently are required to participate in an individualized program through the Academic Success Center (ASC) first semester. Advised admit students are invited to enroll in the [Learning, Exploration, & Academic Development \(LEAD\)](#) program for mentoring, and academic and non-academic support during the first semester. Students receiving Pell Grants and State Aid have access to all support services and receive email information about student services on a monthly basis. **(3.D.1)**

[Students' academic progress](#) is tracked each term by the Registrar and Financial Aid Office. Identified at-risk students, based on cumulative GPA and course completion, are notified and support services are provided through a probation program and Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) interventions. **(3.D.1)**

Support services are driven by identified student need to include the following services and programs: Services for Students with Disabilities, a New Student Experience course, online and graduate orientation, Graduate and Adult Learning Community, BUILD Program, Bridge Scholars Program, Professional Edge Center (PEC), Student Counseling Center, the Inclusion and Equity Office, Student Affairs Office, and the International Services Office. **(3.D.1)**

UIndy will be moving to a new early warning system for Summer 2019 from the former MapWorks. A cross-campus retention group monitors student academic progress at midterm and end of semester to initiate a rapid response intervention to connect the student to support services (see Cat. 1P5). Faculty, Staff, and fellow students [make referrals](#) through an online Student Concern Form for academic and non-academic concerns. These concerns are forwarded to appropriate areas.

- *Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs (3.D.2)*

Student learning support is provided through the Writing Lab, Math Lab, individual tutoring through the ASC, Center for Advising and Student Achievement (CASA) sessions, use of Undergraduate Curriculum Guides, library tutorials and guides, IT HelpDesk for LMS support and other technology help student success in courses and programs. **(3.D.2)**

First-time degree seeking students are required to submit an official ACT or SAT score prior to enrollment. Undergraduate students are expected to demonstrate competency in both English and mathematics. Competency in each area also may be demonstrated through transfer approved college courses. Students are placed into either ENGL 100 or ENGL 101. Proficiency examinations in French, German and Spanish are also administered. All new and transfer students who do not demonstrated math proficiency are required to take the online test through ALEKS prior to registration. Proficiency for MATH 090, 105, 108, 150, 180 or 190 must be demonstrated through a satisfactory score to enroll in the designated courses. Academic and faculty advisors utilize placement scores to assist students in developing academic schedules. (See Cat. 1P1 and 1R1). Students are [enrolled in appropriate development coursework](#). **(3.D.2)**

A Secrets of Success Workshop is held each semester to provide academic and personal growth skills for student success. All students are invited to attend. Undergraduate, first-time students are required to take INTD 101, an extended orientation course and a departmental New Student Experience (NSE) course for a successful transition to higher education.

All graduate programs hold orientation sessions. The orientation provides an introduction to various campus services such as the library, writing lab, and PEC. In addition, graduate students meet with their program faculty advisor. A Graduate Student Survey is administered regularly to all enrolled graduate students. **(3.D.2)**

Adult learners are required to enroll in The Return to Learning NSE Class in first semester. The course consists of a series of personal, academic, and campus success sessions designed to help students make a successful transition. The course covers topics relating to the mission, ULGs, degrees offered, academic and non-academic support services, diversity, prior learning assessment, and career services.

- ***Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry (3.C.5)***

Full-time faculty are expected to be accessible for student inquiry a minimum of three (3) hours each week preferably at different times on different days; the office hours are to be posted, as noted in the [Faculty Handbook 2018 p. 59](#). Online faculty are expected to be accessible to and engage with students through virtual office hours, chat sessions, video conferencing, and with a 24 to 48-hour response to email. Office hours are communicated to students through postings on office doors, listed in all syllabi and contained in course announcements for online students. **(3.C.5)**

- ***Determining and addressing the learning support needs (tutoring, advising, library, laboratories, research, etc.) of students and faculty (3.D.1, 3.D.3, 3.D.4, 3.D.5)***

Support services are driven by identified student need to include the following services and programs: disabilities, a New Student Orientation, online and graduate orientations, Graduate and Adult Learning Community, BUILD Program, Bridge Scholars Program, PEC, CASA, the Inclusion and Equity Office (IEO), Student Affairs, and International Services. **(3.D.1)**

CASA provides a [centralized, integrated program of advising](#) and mentoring through advisors knowledgeable in specific academic areas and introduces students to faculty and other offices for further assistance. A four-year academic plan of integrated curricular and co-curricular activities is developed for each student to help ensure on-time graduation, empower decision-making, and for a more robust educational experience. CASA examines transcripts, confirms credits for transfer students and informs the transfer student about graduation requirements. CASA provides exploration

of majors, academic planning, registration help, transcript evaluations, and graduation audits. Most full-time faculty have assigned students to advise within the major. Academic Advisors are assigned to each discipline to advise transfer students and support faculty advising along with providing annual training for faculty. **(3.D.3)**

Faculty needs are expressed through faculty development surveys, faculty evaluation development plans, Faculty Senate, IT requests for training on the LMS, and new software and educational resources. A survey of faculty is conducted every other year, at the end of workshops, or through faculty and administrator's communication of particular training needs. Development workshops, book groups, Teaching Squares and other sessions are aimed best teaching practices. The Faculty Academy's Strategic Plan and campus initiatives are used to develop workshops. (see Cat. 3.3) **(3.D.4)**

IT provides regular training in the use of new software, systems and processes. This includes a document on how to use various technologies inside and outside of the classroom. The LMS contains student and faculty tutorials and the Helpdesk is available for support. Assistance is available in the Faculty Academy for course design using Quality Matters guidelines. A variety of student academic and non-academic support services are available to support learning and provide an enriching college experience including the library and various student organizations. **(3.D.4)**

The 2018 [Student Handbook p.18-21](#) contains an academic misconduct section with policies on plagiarism and copyright. The library website contains a policy on Copyright and Fair Use to guide information use. Library classroom presentations and orientations help inform undergraduate and graduate students of the resources and assistance available. Research help is available by a library appointment and through online Library Guides. The library also has liaisons assigned to each academic department to determine student and faculty needs. **(3.D.5)**

Faculty communicate expectations for ethical use of information in syllabi with a scholarly work or research component. UIndy's Institutional Review Board (IRB) website contains presentations, links to CITI training, [policies and procedures and other resources](#). All faculty, staff and students engaged in research are required to complete modules on the Responsible Conduct of Research every five years and the Research Modules on Human Protections every two years. Once a proposal is submitted, the Director ensures that ethical training is completed before approval of the final proposal and then monitors ongoing compliance while the research is active. **(3.D.5)**

- ***Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services***

New student groups are targeted for educational programs and services through input from program reviews, advisory groups, professional groups, and workforce data. Cabinet and the BOT approves new educational and service offerings after review of a business plan and determination that it aligns with the mission and Strategic Plan. For example, UIndy created the Diversity and Inclusion Office in 2016 as a result of student feedback and an increase in diversity of the local community representing potential students. Adding new campus apartments for traditional and upper-class students was a strategic initiative. Workforce data, local employers and professional trends informed the recently created Engineering School. (see Cat. 1P3).

- ***Meeting changing student needs***

UIndy identifies the needs of students and designs actions to meet changing needs. Program-level information on changing student needs is generated by academic and student support programs; it

includes composition and demographic background of the student body, and needs expressed by students gathered through various tools. Data are systematically collected, analyzed, and reported for use in decision-making to inform strategic objectives for these programs. Institutional-level data is provided to key groups across campus for decision-making. Decisions are then implemented and communicated for changes in the short term or strategic goals subsumed within the Strategic Plan.

[Non-academic program reviews](#) use a [standardized template](#). [Student Development](#), [Residence Life](#), [Title IX](#) and [Financial Aid](#) have departmental tools to collect, analyze, and disseminate data, providing information to meet the changing needs of students. Student retention, progression, and graduation rates are used across campus for both program and institutional-level decision-making. Course evaluations and exit program surveys are other common measures (see Cat. 1P1) to determine the changing needs of students.

Student organizations, such as the Indianapolis Student Government, provide another format for students to express their needs. A number of student representatives participate in university and program-level committees or serve on student advisory groups that provide opportunities for input. Other ways UIndy connects students to service and builds relationships with students:

Prospective Students: communication links and plans implemented for each student; ongoing relationships with Indiana high schools, transfer articulation agreements with Indiana community colleges, plus regular visits; and, International partnerships encourage and support transfer students from multiple locations.

Undergraduate Full-Time Students: surveys from NSE and the First Year Seminar courses; financial aid counseling; over 60 student organizations, lectures, programs, intramurals, and volunteer opportunities; Residence Life programming

Graduate Students: information and orientation sessions; mentorships for practicum and research; focus and advisory groups; communicating academic plans implemented for each student

Adult Learner Students: Return to Learning Seminar; focus and advisory groups **(3.D.1)**

- ***Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs (e.g., seniors, commuters, distance learners, military veterans) (3.D.1)***

UIndy identifies subgroups of students through the admission process. Identified subgroups constitute a significant proportion of graduate and undergraduate students. Subgroups include prospective students, distance learners, adult learners and commuter students. UIndy has a very small population of seniors and veterans whose needs are met through individualized services in the various student support offices by designated personnel. **(3.D.1)**

Admissions determines the needs of *prospective students* through high school guidance counselors, high school and 2-year college visits, and correspondences from inquiries. Needs of *distance learners* are assessed through Helpdesk inquiries, assessment and orientation to online learning and by online course faculty. Adult learners' specific needs are identified through the admissions and advising processes. Needs are supported through curriculum design, course delivery and format, and support services. Classes are held in an accelerated and traditional format, both online and on campus. Financial aid and advising services are available after normal business hours. **(3.D.1)**

First-year students who *commute* attend an orientation luncheon to ensure awareness of campus

resources. Commuters can meet with the staff member who serves as the commuter support contact. The Hound commuter lounge has signage with contact information and how to join the UIndy Commuter Facebook Group. **(3.D.1)**

- ***Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful (3.D.2)***

A wide array of support systems is in place to meet the needs of all groups of students and help them to be successful. Every new full-time and transfer student attends New Hounds Day or Transfer Day for advising and class registration. A required orientation introduces new students to a variety of services and offices including Financial Aid, CASA, ASC, Study Abroad, Campus Ministry, Service Learning, Inclusion and Equity, Health Counseling and Wellness, PEC, library services and Campus Life. New adult learners and online students complete a required orientation also. **(3.D.2)**

UIndy is over 60% residential, with several housing options. Food service is readily available to meet the needs of residential and evening students. The bookstore collaborates with faculty to make its services accessible online and on-campus, with expanded hours to accommodate evening students. The library has extended hours during the week, regular weekend hours and a robust website for online assistance. **(3.D.2)**

- ***Ensuring staff members who provide non-academic student support services are qualified, trained and supported (3.C.6)***

Non-academic support staff are carefully screened upon hire to ensure the education, skills, and knowledge meet qualifications in the position description. Staff members are required to be credentialed in financial aid and career services. All professional staff leadership positions require a minimum of a master's degree. The annual staff evaluation ensures that [staff members remain current \(TABLE 2.1.1\)](#) and continue to be qualified in their positions (see Cat. 3.3). **(3.C.6)**

HR offers a variety of required and optional training for all employees through the online EverFI Law Room including: managing bias, ethics and code of conduct, FERPA, Title IX, diversity, conflict of interest, and [emergency preparedness](#). Staff are encouraged to obtain credentialing or advanced education while employed. A generous tuition support program, numerous campus training opportunities, and support for attendance at off-campus conferences help to maintain high quality student services. All departments have development funds and provide trainings as changes are implemented based on new initiatives or policy changes. HR conducts a new Employee Orientation each semester. Each department has an orientation process for new staff. A comprehensive benefits package is available to full-time staff members. Other support for staff includes the Health Wellness Center, staff meetings, and participation opportunities on a variety of committees including the Professional Life Review Committee. **(3.C.6)**

- ***Communicating the availability of non-academic support services (3.D.2)***

During new student orientation, students are introduced to student support services including the Counseling Center and provided with the Guidebook app about services and upcoming programs. The My UIndy website lists all student services; faculty frequently recommend services to their students. Other communication to students include: web pages for CASA, PEC, Admissions, Financial Aid, Student Government, Student Affairs web page listing student organizations; and program-specific orientation, emails, marketing materials, social media, the Ellucian GO app, and digital screens in four key buildings. **(3.D.2)**

- ***Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs***

Tools and measures are selected by cabinet and departments to assess stakeholder needs. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is one tool selected because it is benchmarked. Tools such as the Admitted Student Questionnaire, Campus Visit Survey, Graduate Survey, and various student services data collection by surveys including the Writing Lab, and the ASC are tracked annually to assess broad needs of undergraduate and graduate students. Beyond departmental satisfaction surveys, student focus groups are used to improve services at the departmental level. Program evaluation data is collected by the Office of Student Affairs for attendees at New Hounds Day and administered through the mobile application Guidebook.

- ***Assessing the degree to which student needs are met***

Scheduled assessments are conducted through the academic (see Cat. 1P3) and non-academic program review process, and NSSE and departmental surveys to assess the degree to which student needs are met. In addition, the committee structure includes student representatives and the Student Senate also provides informal validation that needs are being met.

UIndy also uses tools like course evaluations, program evaluations, the Graduate Survey and departmental surveys. Units and departments collect and analyze data regularly on student satisfaction and how well needs are being met through program reviews and annual assessments (see Cat. 1P3). The Program Review process provides common data to assess student needs and provides for informed decision-making.

2R1 Results

- ***Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)***

2017-18 focus groups of commuter students reported dissatisfaction with commuter parking availability. Between 2017-19, 15 commuter programs were offered with about 750 students in attendance. Attendance and anecdotal feedback show social gatherings for commuters are not popular however, informational lunches have consistently had good attendance. Focus groups conducted with staff and students in residence halls and commuter/graduate students determined the demand and capacity for building new apartments.

[Diagram 2.1.1 Satisfaction with New Hounds Day Advising Experience 2018](#)

[TABLE 2.1.3 Center for Advising and Student Achievement Advising Session Evaluation](#)

- ***Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks***

A comparison of NSSE results for senior students and academic advising are included in TABLES 2.1.10 and 2.1.11:

[TABLE 2.1.10 Comparison Results of NSSE for Senior Students](#)

[Table 2.1.11 NSSE Academic Advising Module Selected Results](#)

[TABLE 2.1.2 Comparison Results for Changing Needs of Prospective Students](#)

[TABLE 2.1.4 New Student Experience Course Pass Rates 2016-2017](#)

[TABLE 2.1.5 Math Placement Results and Course Success 2017-2018](#)

[TABLE 2.1.6 Writing Lab Cumulative Response 2014-2018](#)

[TABLE 2.1.7 Student Development Programming Data 2014-2018](#)

[TABLE 2.1.8 Satisfactory Academic Progress \(SAP\) - Undergrad Students Analysis](#)

[TABLE 2.1.9 Graduate Survey Results 2014 and 2018](#)

Supplementing the NSSE reports are internal post-advising session surveys that are distributed to students who meet with an academic advisor in CASA. Though the recent response rate was low, each result exceeds the target of 4.5 on a 5.0 scale. The current survey was adapted in 2018 from a prior version. Results shows consistently high scores, with an average score of over 2.5 for satisfaction on a 1-3 scale.

- ***Interpretation of results and insights gained***

Table 2.1.2 The results for 2014 and 2015 changing student needs did not meet the target of informing students about educational offerings. More emphasis was placed on this area and the 2017 results showed improvement and meeting the target. Campus visit results met expectations. The SAT results for UIndy exceeded the target and benchmarked data from national and state. Over the last six years, FAFSA filings increased from 58% to 65%. During that same period, the number of FAFSA filers increased by 70.6% while the total number of admitted freshmen went up only 58%.

Diagram 2.1.1 Indicates the satisfaction level for academic advising on New Hounds Day was at 98% for 2018. This met the expectation of 95% and exceeded the overall student evaluation results. Feedback from academic and faculty advisors is solicited after each New Hounds Day which informs training for the next summer orientation.

Table 2.1.3 Internal post-advising session surveys are distributed to students who meet with an academic advisor in CASA. Though the recent response rate was low, each of the results exceeds the internal target of 4.5 on a 5.0 scale. This current survey was adapted in 2018 from a prior version. A review of those results shows consistently high scores, with an average score of over 2.5 for satisfaction on a 1-3 scale.

Table 2.1.4 shows the NSE classes met or exceeded the target with the exception of EDUC 110 in the 2017 academic year. The lower student success was likely the result of a new instructor for the course. Subsequent success rates have increase in 2018 with the same instructor.

Table 2.1.5 for Math placement scores show a positive correlation between the ALEKS placement score and pass rate in the initial mathematics course. There was concern for students with ALEKS scores between 1 and 11 since there is a significantly lower pass rate than the other ALEKS score ranges. Only 2.2% of students with an ALEKS score between 1 and 11 opted to retake the placement exam.

Table 2.1.6 Expectations were exceeded in student and faculty satisfaction with the services of the Writing Lab. While still meeting the target, the faculty rating of motivation was lower than the other ratings with a much higher “no response” rate. Interpretation of this item is that it may be difficult for faculty to judge the student’s motivation with a single assignment.

Table 2.1.7 Bridge Scholars program experienced a 31% increase in enrollment in 2018 and a 42% graduation rate for the 2014 cohort. BUILD programming changed in 2016 which resulted in exceeding retention targets. BUILD students graduate at a higher rate than the target for advised students. Students with disabilities who receive services has increased by 48% over the past six years. The NSE course consistently receives 95% instructor satisfaction and meeting of learning outcome goals.

Table 2.1.8 SAP data shows in the last five years, an average of 332 students were placed on warning due to not meeting grade point average or course completion requirements under federal satisfactory academic progress requirements. An average of 23% of students (77) subsequently were denied aid as deficiencies in progress continued. One insight is that these students could benefit from an academic recovery program.

Table 2.1.9 Graduate Survey showed graduate programs appear to be preparing students effectively and are responsive to student needs. Negative comments reflect the nature of the graduate student who associate with their program and typically do not use traditional student services, which may have led to not feeling a part of the total campus.

Table 2.1.10 NSSE results indicate that benchmarks were exceeded for overall student experience and met for student services. Advising did not meet benchmark for 2014, 2016 and 2017. These results sparked updates to the advising system. One insight is that the NSSE results reflect various advising sources from academic and faculty advisors to peers and family members.

In 2014, the CASA was formed to centralize professional advising. Student confusion occurred during 2014 with the change. UIndy also instituted multi-term registration in 2016-17. Students did not benefit from the multi-term advising process with less connection to advisers as noted in the NSSE Table 2.1.11. Secondly, in 2017-18, responsibility for advising of student-athletes was assumed by the academic department which resulted in large caseloads. Lastly, while the number of academic advisors has been constant, a trending increase in enrollment meant higher caseloads and longer than ideal wait times.

Student feedback in the Vision 2030 process found that Campus Apartments were aging and were no longer viable for operation. Additionally, it was clear from student feedback that a demand for new/renovated apartments on the campus for both upper-class and graduate students existed.

2I1 Improvements

In 2017-18 there were increased coordinated efforts between admissions, financial aid, and marketing for outreach including parent newsletters, FAFSA filing postcards, and emails.

Based on 2018 survey results, student commuter programming in 2018-19 will be themed monthly lunches with student guiding the topics. Also, the "Hound Pound" commuter lounge was remodeled. Parking was revamped and a temporary shuttle service was implement based on focus group feedback.

One objective in the Strategic Plan is to build a vibrant community on and surrounding the campus. To address the plan, more campus activities were implemented. UIndy constructed new student apartments that opened in 2017 for upper class students and have operated at full capacity. A new apartment complex called University Lots is planned for January 2019. Additionally, the city of Indianapolis is constructing a rapid transit system that includes a stop at UIndy to be completed in

2019, connecting the campus to downtown.

Students with ALEKS math scores less than 11 are required to complete seven hours of remediation and retake the exam prior to enrolling in the first course. The goal with this improvement is to develop a better mathematics foundation.

Student Development staff developed a proposal, approved by Faculty Senate for student success and persistence. In 2018-2019, a revised Academic Ineligibility Policy will allow students two semesters to work on GPA recovery, rather than one summer term. (See [Academic Probation Eligibility Policy Proposal](#) and [Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes](#) April 17, 2018.

CASA implemented single-term registration cycles in Fall 2018 for additional contacts between students and advisors for quicker follow-up to concerns. In January 2019, a new degree planning and audit software system, DegreeWorks, was made available to students. Finally, the Office of Intercollegiate Athletics hired an additional academic advisor.

The Graduate Leadership Team will discuss follow-up to the Graduate Survey in Summer 2019. With the growing number of graduate programs and students, there is discussion of a new graduate structure that was presented to the Provost in Spring 2019.

Sources

- Academic Probation Eligibility Policy Proposal
- Copy of SAP Warning Report and Analysis - Final V4 Undergrad only (2)(2441)
- Determining Incoming Students Academic Needs Flowchart
- Diagram 2.1.1 Satisfaction with New Hounds Day Advising Experience 2018 (1)
- Emergency Management Plan
- Faculty Handbook 2018 p. 59
- Faculty Senate Minutes April 17_ 2018 - Academic Probation Eligibility Proposal
- LEAD PROCESS Flowchart
- Making Student Concern Referrals Flowchart (1)
- New Student Advising Flowchart
- Non Academic Program Review 5-year Cycle
- Non Academic Program Review Template_
- Residence Life _ Housing Program Review
- Student Development Program Review_
- Student Handbook p. 18-21
- Student Research screenshot
- Student Satisfactory Academic Progress Policy 2017
- TABLE 2.1.1 University Staff Certifications and Training
- TABLE 2.1.10 Comparison Results of NSSE for Senior Students (1)
- TABLE 2.1.11 NSSE Academic Advising Module Selected Results (1)
- TABLE 2.1.2 Comparison Results for Changing Needs of Prospective Students (1)
- TABLE 2.1.3 Center for Advising and Student Achievement Advising Session Evaluation (1)
- TABLE 2.1.4 New Student Experience Course Pass Rates 2016-2017 (1)
- TABLE 2.1.5 Math Placement Results and Course Success 2017-2018 (1)
- TABLE 2.1.6 Writing Lab Cumulative Responses 2014-2018 (1)
- TABLE 2.1.7 Student Development Programming Data 2014-2018 (1)

- TABLE 2.1.8 Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP)- Undergrad Students Analysis (As of 6_19_2018) (1)
- TABLE 2.1.9 Graduate Survey Results 2014 and 2018 (1).pdf
- Title IX Program Review
- University Staff Degrees and Training

2.2 - Retention, Persistence, and Completion

Retention, Persistence and Completion focuses on the approach to collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion to stakeholders for decision making. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 4.C. in this section.

2P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Collecting student retention, persistence and completion data (4.C.2, 4.C.4)
- Determining targets for student retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1, 4.C.4)
- Analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion
- Meeting targets for retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess retention, persistence and completion (4.C.4)

2R2: RESULTS

What are the results for student retention, persistence and completion? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.C.3)

Responses

2P2 Processes

- *Collecting student retention, persistence and completion data (4.C.2, 4.C.4)*

UIndy regularly collects and analyzes data on retention, persistence and completion rates. To collect consistent data for traditional undergraduate day students, Admissions and Enrollment Research use the institutional student information systems, EMAS Pro II and Banner, to identify each cohort of incoming, first-time students. The University uses IPED definitions.(4.C.2, 4.C.4)

UIndy continues to track many different groups within the information systems however, four key undergraduate student groups were specifically identified to be tracked over the past three years as having traditionally lower retention, persistence and graduation rates. These four groups are classified as: Unmet Need, State Aid, Advised, and Athletes. **(4.C.2)**

Graduate and Adult Learning Enrollment and Enrollment Services use Banner and Radius to identify incoming students. Incoming students are flagged as a cohort in the systems providing the ability to track retention, persistence and completion using a variety of attributes. Data is reviewed at the program level. Both adult and graduate student reports are compiled along with the undergraduate data and brought to the [Enrollment Management Committee](#) for discussion and recommendations then are forwarded to cabinet for decision-making. **(4.C.2, 4.C.3)**

- ***Determining targets for student retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1, 4.C.4)***

Targets for student retention, persistence, and completion are determined by the entire campus through the strategic planning process with a “stretch” goal for freshmen student retention set at 78%, sophomore retention 68.6% and 6 year completion rate of 60%. Each department creates initiatives for progress toward the target. Targets and initiatives are accessible and reviewed continuously across campus via department reports. UIndy designs opportunities for campus-wide input on specific initiatives based upon the target goal. For example, over the past several years, the entire campus participated in First Year Student discussions where students, faculty, and staff were invited to open meetings to review, discuss and create initiatives to meet target goals. **(4.C.1, 4.C.3, 4.C.4)**

Since the last Systems Portfolio, graduate programs have established a process for gathering year over year and semester over semester retention using the [Graduate and Adult Learners Retention Tracking Flowchart](#). This allows review and a response to retention and persistence trends earlier. Targets are set on a program by program basis. **(4.C.1, 4.C.3)**

- ***Analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion***

All academic and some non-academic departments analyze retention, persistence, and completion data. The institution’s aim is inclusivity in analyzing, sharing, and receiving feedback on goals and retention, persistence, and completion initiatives. In addition to posting results on the campus intranet, the following groups or tracking tools actively analyze and share data: Enrollment Management Committee, Retention Committee, cabinet, Academic Affairs Leadership, Admissions, Financial Aid, Student Affairs and academic departments. **(4.C.3)**

- ***Meeting targets for retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1)***

UIndy focused on the 78% freshmen retention target as a way to increase completion. Every program, initiative, and activity is centered on retention, persistence, and completion of students. Curricular and co-curricular initiatives include: Residential Life programming, financial aid counseling, raising scholarship monies to support students in need, Student Development/Academic Success Center support, athlete guidelines, etc. Although UIndy has not reached the 78% retention target, gains have been made in the past three years. **(4.C.1)**

- ***Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess retention, persistence and completion (4.C.4)***

Technology allows UIndy to comprehensively assess retention. The EMAS Pro II/Banner captures information from admissions through graduation while maintaining a complete record on a student (i.e., grades, curriculum tracking, graduation audits, etc.). Residential Management System software (RMS) manages residential assignments, judicial process, and merges with the student information systems. **(4.C.4)**

UIndy uses key benchmarks from IPEDS in reporting to various agencies and groups including US News, Standard and Poors, and HLC. IPEDS enrollment, financial aid, HR, and key financial data are used to evaluate the institution each year in annual audits. UIndy benchmarks through the Independent Colleges of Indiana (ICI). Peer and [comparison institutional data from IPEDS](#) is used for student:-faculty ratio, graduation rates, enrollment trends, standardized test scores, as well as key financial data points. **(4.C.4)**

The Adult and Graduate Programs track retention, persistence and completions rates through the specific courses or programs using Banner and Cognos reports. In addition, Adult Programs uses the Council on Accelerated Programs (CAP) as a best practice model. **(4.C.4)**

2R2 Results

- *Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)*

[TABLE 2.2.1 Measures Tracked for Retention_ Persistence_ Completion](#)

[TABLE 2.2.5 Graduate Graduation Rates as of February 18 2019](#)

- *Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks*

The following comparison of results are included in these three tables:

[TABLE 2.2.2 Comparison of Results for Last Three Years of all Student Groups](#)

[TABLE 2.2.3 Freshman Retention Comparisons: National & Indiana](#)

[TABLE 2.2.4 Student Development data 2014-2018](#)

[TABLE 2.2.6 Persistence Outcomes](#)

[TABLE 2.2.7 Retention Pell Comparison Report ~ 4-23-18](#)

- *Interpretation of results and insights gained*

Table 2.2.2 Retention rates have remained relatively flat, falling just below the target in 2017. Retention among high need students has increased and consistently met or exceed targets. One insight is that regular electronic newsletters to students and parents provided additional support and resources to the “at risk” population. **(4.C.3)**

Improvements in persistence are noted with graduation rates. Both sophomore to junior rates and six-year graduation rates have inched up and have exceeded targets. One insight is that efforts to help keep students on-time for graduation have allowed them to keep financial aid. **(4.C.3)**

Aided athletes meet or exceed both retention and graduation rates. Outcomes for adult learners have been a concern regarding enrollment declines. One insight was that more institutional competitors

entered the adult learner market bringing major competition.

Since most of the masters programs are less than three years in length, retention rates are reported semester to semester rather than year to year. Students in smaller graduate programs often have less flexibility in moving through the program, which may contribute to the overall lower retention rates. Retention rates across the five doctoral programs are strong, but a similar opportunity to improve rates exists.

Table 2.2.3 UIndy has historically attracted a higher percentage of first generation, low income students. In most instances institutions with very high retention rates have a much lower percentage of first generation lower income students than UIndy. Another insight is that data collected can be benchmarked with peer universities to better inform retention of students

Table 2.2.4 Students advised or contingently admitted and who participate in the LEAD program are retained at a significantly higher rate than those who do not participate in the voluntary support program. A key insight is that First year students who engage with the 21st Century Scholar Specialist are retained at a higher rate than other state aid recipients. Seventy eight percent of students on SAP and 74% of probation students are retained the following semester as a result of meeting with an Academic Success Associate.

2I2 Improvements

New leadership in Enrollment Services and Academic Affairs has increased reporting data on retention efforts campus-wide, where gaps and overlaps exist, and a more efficient campus-wide approach to solving retention issues. The Academic and Student Life Master Plans create a more campus-wide student success structure.

The restructuring of adult learning programs was completed in 2018 and efforts are in place to deliver many of these courses online to meet the demand for this convenient delivery method and advising for adults has also been moved to CASA. UIndy is setting targets and collecting benchmark data on adult programs for retention, persistence and graduation for the 2019-20.

The process for identifying new graduate students has been enhanced to allow for the semester by semester reporting at the program level.

Pell/state aid recipients and parent newsletters were created in Fall 2018 to provide timely information that they may miss during traditional communications.

Sources

- Graduate and Adult Retention Flowchart (1)
- graduate graduation rates as of February 18 2019
- Peer and Comparison institutes-1
- Retention Committee Minutes May 2018
- Retention Pell Comparison Report ~ 4-23-18 (1)
- TABLE 2.2.1 Measures Tracked for Retention_ Persistence_ Completion
- TABLE 2.2.2 Comparison of Results for Last Three Years of All Student Groups (1)
- TABLE 2.2.3 Freshman Retention Comparisons_ National _ Indiana
- TABLE 2.2.4 Student Development data 2014-2018 (1)

- TABLE 2.2.5 Persistence Outcomes

2.3 - Key Stakeholder Needs

Key Stakeholder Needs focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of key stakeholder groups, including alumni and community partners.

2P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for serving the needs of key external stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Determining key external stakeholder groups (e.g., alumni, employers, community)
- Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership
- Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs
- Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met

2R3: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if key stakeholder needs are being met? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

2P3 Processes

- *Determining key external stakeholder groups (e.g., alumni, employers, community)*

Cabinet determines key stakeholder groups to include alumni, donors, employers, and the local community. UIndy leadership analyzes gaps in institutional capacity to determine external stakeholder needs and delivers related services to the local community, alumni, employers, workforce partners, and donors. A Special Advisor to the President for External Relations was recently hired with the goal of advancing the level of engagement. A collaboration between the offices of Alumni Engagement (OAE), Development, Professional Edge (PEC) and Community Relations identifies, evaluates, and provides services to external constituents. External stakeholders have specific

constituent codes and are managed in the Raisers Edge database.

The PEC vets employers seeking to engage students through a review of their website, conversations with current/past employees who are alumni, and review of their mission to ensure alignment. Finally, feedback received from either the student or employer is navigated through the appropriate channels depending on the nature of the feedback.

Consistent with Vision 2030, UIndy continues its mission to serve as an anchor institution for the southside of Indianapolis and supports private business near campus. UIndy understands it is an economic driver for the area and collaborates beyond the physical boundaries of campus.

The Center for Service Learning and Community Engagement (CSLCE) focuses on the development of curricular service experiences, where faculty and students are matched with projects in the community. Determining community partners includes a needs assessment to identify current curricular needs of faculty and student and establishes service experiences. CSLCE determines current social needs for projects that meet the needs of the organization and students/faculty. The Agency Evaluation form that students complete after each experience provides feedback to determine if the partner and UIndy's needs were met. The center also works directly with the Faculty Academy to host workshops where new partners can connect directly with faculty from diverse academic departments.

- ***Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership***

Advancement is always looking to identify new stakeholders. New strategic projects help identify new partnerships that are cultivated for philanthropic support. This effort ensures that the new partners' philanthropic interests align with funding priorities of the University's Strategic Plan and mission.

The Special Advisor to the President for External Affairs engages the community, municipal leaders and serves as a campus liaison among the surrounding neighborhoods. For example, recently, a request to slow the speed of traffic on a main thoroughfare through campus was received. The appropriate municipal department was contacted to explore solutions that resulted in additional markings on the roadway and a slower speed limit.

The determination of new collaborations for service learning is driven by the needs of faculty and the community agencies. The CSLCE aims to create new collaborations as needed, build upon and sustain current ones to maintain reciprocity. In new service learning collaboration the site is visited, key individuals are interviewed, and a SWOT analysis is prepared.

- ***Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders***

UIndy engages key stakeholders to determine their changing needs. [Alumni are engaged](#) through email, alumni surveys, advisory boards, social media, and campus events. Employers are engaged through employer surveys, partnerships and internships, program specific events, and social media. Community members are engaged through the University's participation in local community groups such as the Chamber of Commerce, and through representation at community events. Identifying changing needs of external stakeholders include: direct communication and development of partnerships via email, phone, in person meetings, .

Advancement has been responsive to the changing needs of alumni by creating the OAE to

strategically align engagement through enhanced communications with alumni, increase engagement opportunities, greater involvement with non-fundraising revenue generation, and develop new marketing strategies. UIndy data and current industry practices led to new crowdfunding programs with 10% increases year after year and a record number of annual donors.

Academic units determine changing needs of external stakeholders through contractual arrangements, advisory boards, surveys and direct interaction as faculty participate in various activities such as clinical, practicum and fieldwork supervision and professional meetings. (see Cat. 2P5)

CSLCE actively assesses the needs of community partners through Informal meetings, email or phone and partner events throughout the year to give updates on current needs and opportunities. Conversations occur before, during and after a semester of placing service-learning students, creating new service-learning experiences, or matching faculty with projects.

- ***Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs***

Cabinet selects tools such as the Alumni and the First Destination Surveys. Other data collection tools are determined by the specific departments. For example, the Office of University Advancement conducted a feasibility study involving individual interviews with donors. Each semester students, instructors, and preceptors complete surveys about the clinical/fieldwork/ practicum site experience. Engagement needs of alumni was assessed by a comprehensive alumni survey conducted in 2018. PEC, in partnership with the OAE, captured graduates' data and first careers through the First Destination Survey followed by a survey to be sent one and five years after graduation.

UIndy uses various tools to measure service learning. A semi-annual questionnaire is sent to capture an overview of a community organization. The CSLCE also utilizes a community partner database questionnaire sent semi-annually to capture the organization's contact information, service opportunities, and the academic area to fulfill their needs. The community partner database is updated throughout the year as needs and personnel change.

- ***Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met***

Systematic evaluation is in place for determining stakeholder needs through collaboration between Alumni Engagement, PEC, and CSLCE. UIndy staff communicate regularly with stakeholders to assess the degree to which their needs are met. In addition, results from surveys are reviewed by appropriate divisions and the President's Cabinet on a regular review cycle.

OAE staff interacts regularly with donors, and tracks, through a "contract report," their degree of satisfaction along with philanthropy and satisfaction with institutional stewardship. Development meets with supporters to ensure relationships are strong and send an annual statement of their giving with an opportunity to communicate needs.

Alumni Relations' planning process with the Alumni Association Board of Directors contribute to an Alumni Strategic Plan. Focus groups are hosted to determine how alumni needs can be better identified and met. The OAE meets three times a year with the Alumni Board to share updates and respond to concerns. Multiple data points are tracked including number of alumni donors, number of event attendees, number of scholarship referrals, and overall alumni engagement.

The PEC is organized in a industry clusters whereby each team member is responsible for a subset of

the student population that matches the industry(s) they represent. The team members also cultivates employers to develop talent pipelines for maximum benefit to employers and the institution.

In determining if community partners needs are met, the CSLCE actively communicates, arranges meetings, and site visits. After hosting service-learning students, the agency supervisors are asked to complete an evaluation detailing where they rate the student service delivery and overall impact of the student experience.

2R3 What are the results for determining if key stakeholder needs are being met?

- *Summary results of measures*

[Table 2.3.1 Alumni Survey 2017-18: Comparison of 1 and 5 years](#)

[Table 2.3.2 Alumni Survey 2013-14: 1 Year Post Graduation](#)

[Table 2.3.3 Alumni Survey 2013-14](#)

[Table 2.3.4 First Destination Employer Target List](#)

[Table 2.3.5 Service Learning Survey 2018](#)

- *Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks*

The institution has set internal targets, but have not found appropriate external benchmarks. Internal comparison of the [First Destination Survey](#) results show [students](#) increase their employment and education placement rates at one year and five years after graduation to 94% and 97%.

- *Interpretation of results and insights gained*

Tables 2.3.1-2.3.3: The 2017-18 Alumni Survey has a higher response rate than the 2013-14 survey. The earlier survey examined the connection to and satisfaction with preparation, faculty, and responsiveness. The latter survey was revamped to focus on alumni services and connection to UIndy. Limited comparisons can thus be made. The full-time employment status has remained steady at about 65% and in both surveys about 25% are continuing for higher degrees at UIndy. One insight is that graduates are likely under reporting their placements at the time of graduation because the First Destination Survey is given once at graduation day.

Table 2.3.4 One insight for PEC is the strength of the labor market may have helped UIndy only receive positive feedback from employers on their hires. In the event that feedback is not positive UIndy will triage the comment and address via appropriate channels. The First Destination Employer Target List identifies employers that hired UIndy students for an opportunity to establish partnerships with each.

Table 2.3.5 The CSLCE has built a strong foundation of collaborative service initiatives that have proven to be mutually beneficial for students, faculty, staff and community partners. One insight is that projects for Joy's House could be more substantial.

2I3 Improvements

Alumni Services made an improvement by creating a Traditions Committee and Traditions Center

and plans to create new opportunities for alumni (and others) to support scholarships, UIndy Fund, and academic department funding.

PEC improved how it brings employers and students together. UIndy now partners with 11 other colleges in the state to co-host "Indiana Means Business" in the fall and "Collegiate Career Expo" in the spring. The diversity and number of companies has increased with the 2018 spring fair drawing over 300 UIndy students or 60% of total student attendees. PEC is planning to expand attendance by offering shuttle transportation to the event and targeting mid sized companies to develop partnerships and talent pipelines.

First Destination Survey data focused on the number of students who utilized the PEC (see Cat. 1). In summer 2018, a series of career preparation seminars for student cohorts across their four years was initiated. This career readiness series is part of the Academic Master Plan. UIndy also plans to track placement outcomes for graduating students with multiple data sources (social media, direct outreach to graduates, employer reports) to identify student outcomes.

Through collaborative research, assessment of student learning outcomes, and the impact of indirect services to partners, CSLCE plans to develop more substantial projects. The Service-Learning Council will conduct a Student Learning Objective Survey and a Community Partners Survey for next year.

Sources

- Campus Alumni Engagement Network[4419]
- TABLE 2.3.1 Alumni Survey 2017-18_ Comparison of 1 and 5 years (1)
- TABLE 2.3.2 Alumni Survey 2013-14_ 1 Year Post Graduation (1)
- TABLE 2.3.3 Alumni Survey 2013-14 (1)
- TABLE 2.3.4 First Destination Employer Target List (1)
- TABLE 2.3.5 Service Learning Survey 2018 (1)
- TABLE 2.3.6 Students who Completed the Survey and Visited Professional Edge (1)

2.4 - Complaint Processes

Complaint Processes focuses on collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students or key stakeholder groups.

2P4: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students and stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Collecting complaint information from students
- Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders
- Learning from complaint information and determining actions
- Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution

2R4: RESULTS

What are the results for student and key stakeholder complaints? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I4: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

2P4 Processes

- *Collecting complaint information from students*

Students, faculty, and administration commit themselves to the highest level of ethical conduct. UIndy expects faculty and students to protect the validity of intellectual work. Complaints/concerns and corresponding reporting and collection procedures are posted on the [University website](#).

Policies and procedures are defined in both the [Student Handbook](#) and [Faculty Handbook](#) to address alleged instances of academic misconduct. The complaint type and corresponding reporting and

collection procedures are identified in the [complaint process flow chart](#). Undergraduate and graduate levels have additional policies in program handbooks and statements in syllabi. In addition, plagiarism training and use of anti-plagiarism detection software are routinely used. [Complaint information](#) is collected and tracked at the department level, and if not resolved, forwarded to the Office of the Provost for resolution.

Non-academic complaints are guided by the Student Misconduct Process, Bias Incident process, Title IX process, and the Grievance Process that are published in the *Student Handbook* which is made available to every student and also on the University website. General complaints are tracked and received at the vice presidential level or higher, or forwarded through the chain of command.

- ***Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders***

Complaint information from other key stakeholders are reviewed, revised, and managed by different personnel depending on the nature of the complaint. For example, Student Services, including the campus police handle complaints from the surrounding neighborhood. Community stakeholder complaints involving student misconduct are tracked through Residential Management System (RMS) for issues of misconduct and Clery reporting statistics. Outside vendors, contractors, or campus visitor complaints are addressed by University legal counsel.

UIndy created a Donor Relations and Stewardship Coordinator position that responds to donors' minor concerns. Larger complaints are handled on a case-by-case basis. Most are resolved through individual contact by the development staff or the VP for Advancement. This contact report is recorded in the database and flagged with a "conflict resolution" code.

- ***Learning from complaint information and determining actions***

Review of complaint information from campus stakeholders is divided into academic, non-academic, bias incident, Title IX and external categories. Recurring themes of [complaints are reviewed](#) and resolved by cabinet and their representatives to evaluate revisions and changes.

The process for [tracking academic misconduct](#) is through a centralized office of the Associate Provost who forwards complaints to the appropriate department. Academic misconduct reports are reviewed each semester to determine improvements needed. Many programs require students to complete a plagiarism tutorial. (see Cat. 1P5)

Each year the social misconduct and Clery statistics are reviewed and compared with previous years to identify violations and determine if additional education is needed for students or staff. Additionally, policies and procedures are reviewed and updated each year. Orientation leaders and resident assistants receive policies and procedures training. The Student Handbook is reviewed annually by academic and student affairs representatives for updates.

The Office of University Advancement reviews all contact reports monthly, including those coded as a "problem resolution." A regular meeting is also held with the VP of Advancement and the AVP for Alumni Engagement to review past contacts, future strategies, and new or changed policies are considered.

- ***Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders***

Standards for communication are published in the student, employee, and faculty handbooks and on the website. Communication of actions taken following complaint procedures are by email, letter, or

a face-to-face meeting depending on the established procedures. In the case of academic misconduct, a student receives a written decision sent to their UIndy email. In the case of discrimination and Title IX actions, the respondent is informed in writing of the finding and any recommendation for sanctions or corrective action. Alumni and donors are contacted directly by a development officer either by phone or a face-to-face visit. UIndy uses a donor Bill of Rights.

- ***Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution***

Tools and instruments are selected by Academic and Student Services personnel based on their effectiveness and accuracy for tracking the data. Tools used to track student non-academic and academic complaints include use of the Residential Management System (RMS), Clery Report document, and a spreadsheet. These tools have been effective in tracking, trending, reporting, and documenting resolution of complaints. The Raiser's Edge database for alumni provides tracking needs for the resolution of problems with alumni and donors. NSSE is used to track a supportive environment that allows student to express themselves regarding concerns, complaints or grievances.

2R4 Results

- ***Summary results of measures***

The following tables reflect measures tracked for academic and non-academic student and key stakeholder complaints. [TABLE 2.4.1](#) display general judicial statistics of violations and general complaints by calendar year that were received and resolved at the VP or presidential level.

[TABLE 2.4.2](#) provides an example of the general complaint [themes received](#) via phone call, email, or Tweet and resolved in the Office of Student Affairs over a two-month period.

Academic integrity issues from stakeholders is reported in Cat.1P5.

The number of reported complaints to the University Advancement office is statistically insignificant. Approximately one to three complaints may be submitted annually over the phone or in person. Any concerns expressed are resolved or addressed with department staff.

- ***Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks***

The institution's target is to address 100% complaints in a timely manner, following policies and procedures.

[TABLE 2.4.3 NSSE results](#)

- ***Interpretation of results and insights gained***

Table 2.4.1 shows that the majority of complaints received in the president's office and reviewed by legal council consist of lost keys, alcohol related incidents, Miscellaneous issues and visitor issues. Themes are discussed at cabinet meetings with one insight being that the alcohol issues are higher than expected and require more education for faculty and staff.

Table 2.4.2 Food service and parking, as with many universities, are usually the highest areas of complaints and are service-specific. Multiple outlets for feedback are provided on an ongoing basis. When resolutions are not possible, explanations are given so the complainant might better understand the situation.

TABLE 2.4.3 NSSE results indicate a supportive environment that exceeds the comparison group for both freshmen and seniors. Trend data from 2016, 2017 and 2018 on a supportive environment show consistency in UIndy's results. One insight is that the online complaint process, revamped in 2014, may be providing students with greater access and convenience in expressing concerns or complaints.

2I4 Improvements

Based on 2018-19 student feedback, parking lots and spaces have been added. The University is also exploring how the new city Red Line will impact and improve student transportation and parking. Convenience store hours have also been expanded for students to get grab & go food. Crimson Cash is now accepted at a local restaurant, giving students more options for dining.

Sources

- Complaint Issue and Resolution
- Complaint Process Flowchart
- Complaint Responsibility
- Copy of Food Service Quest Survey
- Faculty Handbook 2018 p. 72-77
- Student Grievance Process- October 2018
- Student Handbook p. 18-22
- TABLE 2.4.1 General Judicial Statistics for Last Three Years (1)
- TABLE 2.4.2 Common Complaint Themes Filed in Student Affairs 2018 (1)
- TABLE 2.4.3 NSSE Supportive Environment

2.5 - Building Collaborations and Partnerships

Building Collaborations and Partnerships focuses on aligning, building and determining the effectiveness of collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution.

2P5: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for managing collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Selecting partners for collaboration (e.g., other educational institutions, civic organizations, businesses)
- Building and maintaining relationships with partners
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness
- Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective

2R5: RESULTS

What are the results for determining the effectiveness of aligning and building collaborations and partnerships? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I5: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R5, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

2P5 Processes

- *Selecting partners for collaboration (e.g., other educational institutions, civic organizations, businesses)*

Suggestions for new stakeholder groups are brought to cabinet for discussion based on compatibility with the mission and Strategic Plan. The relationship must add value to both the stakeholder group and UIndy and (1) advance the Strategic Plan; (2) align with the mission both educationally and financially; (3) be a sustainable partnership; and (4) have an evaluation plan. For example, the nursing program formally partnered with IVY Tech School of Nursing to offer concurrent enrollment of associate degree nursing students into the RN-BSN program. Potential contractual arrangements

with new outside vendors are brought to Cabinet for discussion and decision-making. Legal council reviews all contracts before a final decision is made by cabinet.

When services are outsourced, a Request for Proposal is issued to outline the desired services, scope of work, and timeline for making a decision. Proposals are reviewed and approved by an ad-hoc committee. Campus directors are identified to oversee the vendors, monitor the services and ensure adequate service is provided. For instance, with the food service provider, satisfaction surveys are issued each semester. Targets are set with each vendor and are monitored on an annual basis for budget and service goals.

- ***Building and maintaining relationships with partners***

Once a potential partner is identified, business models are developed to determine feasibility and sustainability of projects, and letters of understanding are drafted to detail the standards by which success will be measured. The AVP for Community Relations cultivates community connections as do deans, faculty, and staff. Local partnerships, such as with the Community Hospital Network (CHNW), help fulfill the goal of being a sustainable community anchor and UIndy gains additional teaching and clinical resources for its academic mission. Each semester program faculty review feedback about the clinical/practicum/fieldwork experience from preceptors, instructors and students to determine if learning outcomes were met. For example, the School of Nursing annually sends faculty representatives to fall clinical update meetings held with various healthcare facilities to assess if student and clinical partner needs are being met.

Maintenance of relationships occurs through numerous advisory boards, [community associations](#), and governmental meetings that are attended by the AVP for Community Relations. In addition, one-on-one interactions by administrators, faculty, and staff with community partners provide ongoing relationships and evaluation of effectiveness.

The Professional Edge Center established an interdisciplinary student internship program to work with Citizens Energy to find efficiencies in the Perry K Steam Plant in Indianapolis. Seven students were selected from various majors. The budget was \$5,000 paid by a grant from the Lilly Endowment. The internship program directly improved efficiencies in data processing, and water and energy usage and gave students real-world project experience. Both the University and Citizens Energy wrote press releases highlighting the positive impact of the internship.

UIndy holds membership in over two dozen organizations. Faculty serve as peer reviewers for the HLC and other organizations and regularly attend professional conferences. Additionally faculty are well represented on elected and volunteer positions in professional organizations at the local, state and national levels.

UIndy is engaged with the [Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce](#). The VP for Advancement is appointed as the representative to the Chamber Board, four current Trustees serve on the Chamber Board. Past engagements with the Chamber of Commerce have been to host approximately 100 members every other year at a lunch on campus where the University President gives campus updates.

- ***Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness***

UIndy selects measures that evaluate the effectiveness of partnerships using program evaluations, community surveys, formal evaluations completed by clinical sites, and program satisfaction of

academic partnership cohorts. The Quest Survey is used to determine satisfaction with UIndy's food vendor. Also UIndy collects community impact data and participates in the annual Independent Colleges of Indiana (ICI) Survey.

- ***Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective***

Health profession units routinely evaluate program and [clinical site evaluations](#) to determine effectiveness. The Dean's Council also evaluates the data of academic partnerships for effectiveness. The President's Cabinet reviews data from community and governmental organizations for the effectiveness of ongoing involvement. Data collected from one vendor is contained in the annual Quest Survey. Other assessments for collaborations and partnerships are contained in Cat. 2P3.

2R5 Results

- ***Summary results of measures***

Regular and [ongoing evaluation](#) occurs with practicum, fieldwork and clinical sites and partners. In the concurrent ASN-RN-BSN program with IVY Tech there have been 18 students enrolled from 2015-2018. Twelve of these students have completed their BSN with four more finishing May 2018. This represents an 89% completion rate with the target set at 85% completion rate for concurrent students which is being exceeded.

The program review for the [partnership with CHNW](#) established in 2016 shows active involvement by both UIndy and CHNW. (Partnership with CHWN 2017-18 report).

The [Quest Survey](#) results shows mixed responses for satisfaction with food services on campus.

- ***Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks***

UIndy is a major employer of nearly 1000 faculty and staff. In 2011, UIndy spent \$36.5M on goods and services, \$23.1M stayed in Marion County or 63%. Another \$4M was spent in Indiana or 74% of total in Indiana and Marion Co. The ICI reported in 2018 that independent colleges in Indiana had a total economic impact of \$5.1B with 1.5B contributed in salaries, wages, and benefits, \$2.8B contributed in institutional expenditures, and 21,600+ Hoosiers employed by ICI institutions.

- ***Interpretation of results and insights gained***

The concurrent RN-BSN program has had good success, but low numbers of students participating. Planning will need to occur to recruit more students and continue the partnership. Funding by Indiana's Work Force One is a critical source of financial support for these student and could be a determining factor whether students can afford to enroll in a concurrent program.

UIndy has a positive impact as a community partner and is an important southside anchor in Indianapolis. One insight is that UIndy could track its own reported data to ICI on a regular basis.

The Quest Survey provides insights into preferences of faculty, staff and students for food service. There is a need to provide more healthy choices and sufficient food to last throughout the dining times. The survey did not meet the target set for 60% satisfied/very satisfied with only a rating of 31%.

2I5 Improvements

There is a new initiative being discussed for a Regional Talent Plan, where the University will be asked to partner with the Chamber of Commerce to promote our students staying in Indianapolis upon graduation.

There are plans in place to respond to the Quest Survey with a wider menu selection of healthy foods.

Academic and business partnerships opportunities through internships such as Citizens Gas are continuing to grow.

Sources

- clinical evaluation sample
- Fall 2018 UIndy Survey
- Indy Chamber Letter
- NURB 460 course summary Sem. I 2017-18[2421]
- Partnership with CHNW 2017. document 2.5.1
- University Heights Neighborhood Meeting July 2017

3 - Valuing Employees

3.1 - Hiring

Hiring focuses on the acquisition of appropriately qualified/credentialed faculty, staff and administrators to ensure that effective, high-quality programs and student support services are provided. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. in this section.

3P1: PROCESSES

Describe the process for hiring faculty, staff and administrators. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Recruiting, hiring and orienting processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills and values (3.C.6)
- Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual and consortia programs (3.C.1, 3.C.2)
- Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities (3.C.1)
- Ensuring the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

3R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if recruitment, hiring and orienting practices ensure effective provision for programs and services? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

3I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 3R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

3P1 Describe the process for hiring faculty, staff, and administrators.

- *Recruiting, hiring, and orienting processes that result in staff and administrators who*

possess the required qualification, skills and values (3.C.6)

In order to recruit and hire staff, faculty, and administrators who possess the requisite skills and values, HR has put [various practices](#) into place. HR has updated and revised the [Recruitment & Selection Guide](#), which outlines the hiring procedures and gives recommendations to the hiring manager and search committee. A [Recruitment Flowchart](#) is also available for hiring managers. HR reviews each candidate prior to an interview to ensure that he or she meets the minimum criteria set forth in the job description and appears to be a fit with the University mission. Official transcripts are reviewed for all new hires. Hiring processes, policies and procedures are contained in Employee Handbooks with the Equal Employment Opportunity Policy and other policies that maintain compliance with employment laws. The University is committed to recruiting and retaining faculty, staff and administrators of color. To provide leadership for the commitment to diversity, UIndy hired a Vice President of Inclusion and Equity in 2017. **(3.C.6)**

The [Faculty Guidebook](#) includes academic personnel policies that guide determinations of and procedures for faculty rank, tenure, and promotion. The handbook also includes policies and procedures for faculty complaints and grievances. The [Staff Handbook](#) contains guidelines for new hires, and policies and procedures for promotions and departmental transfers for staff employees. The Staff Handbook also includes procedures for complaints and grievances. (see Cat. 2P3) **(3.C.6)**.

New Hire Orientation (NHO) is managed by HR and includes facilitators from various other departments that is held every other week. Orientation has been strategically planned to welcome the new hire, introduce him/her/them to the university's culture and the roles of executive leadership, and share other important information. In addition to HR, representatives from Campus Police, IT, Title IX, and the Registrar's Office facilitate information sessions.

- ***Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual and consortia programs. (3.C.1, 3.C.2)***

The Faculty Senate, in collaboration with administration, establishes expectations for promotion and tenure, adding or modifying expectations as needed following review. Basic credentials for faculty appointments are established by the [Faculty Qualification Policy](#), which is consistent with HLC policy and guidelines. The policy applies to all faculty including dual credit instructors. A [systematic audit](#) of faculty credentials is in place to ensure ongoing compliance with faculty qualifications. The Associate Provost for Graduate Programs and the Office of Accreditation share responsibility for overseeing and [assuring appropriate faculty credentials](#). Adjunct faculty are hired through departments using the same HR processes and meeting the same basic credentials listed in the Faculty Handbook. This ensures sufficient faculty for the continuance of high-quality teaching and the preservation of small class sizes. All full-time faculty oversee the curriculum through committees. Faculty also assume other roles such as academic advising, serving as faculty liaisons for student organizations, and various committee services at the departmental and university levels. There are adequate faculty to fulfill these roles effectively. **(3.C.1, 3.C.2)**

The University does not have contractual programs. UIndy belongs to the Online Consortium for Independent Colleges and Universities (OCICU) since summer 2013; students, particularly adult learners, may take courses through OCICU. Courses within OCICU are carefully screened prior to approval and qualified faculty are selected by the hosting institution, with monitoring through Regis University which provides OCICU leadership. **(3.C.2)**

- ***Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and***

non-classroom programs and activities. (3.C.1)

Growth over the last five years has required hiring additional faculty to maintain desired student to faculty ratios and a need to redefine [faculty load](#). In redefining faculty load, the University intends to monitor the instructional hours taught by full-time versus part-time/adjunct faculty to maintain the percent of instructional hours taught by full-time faculty as compared to adjunct faculty at a 2:1 ratio. Also the Academic Master Plan includes specific action steps to implement new faculty types, including traditional tenure track faculty; teaching intensive and research intensive faculty; and professors of practice. Concurrent with these new position descriptions are efforts to provide consistency and equity across departments regarding release for non-teaching responsibilities as well as establishing centralized supplemental pay policies. **(3.C.1)**

• ***Ensuring the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services.***

University leadership considers the need for additional student support staff on an annual basis to ensure sufficient numbers of qualified staff (see 2P1 on staff qualifications). As part of the annual budgeting cycle, emerging best practices for student success are considered and the capacity of current support staff is evaluated. Other data used include enrollment trends, demographic information, non-academic program review findings and student surveys. For example in the Financial Aid Office efficiencies have been gained through automation. Staffing needs in Student and Campus Affairs are determined both by considering campus growth and the needs of students, best practices in the field, and benchmarks against similar institutions. For example, Student Activities was reorganized, resulting in the elimination of “Director of Student Activities” and the creation of two Assistant Directors for different areas of Student Activities. Additionally, two Assistant Directors for Residence Life were added for two new student housing communities to support the growing needs of the residential population.

• ***Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools***

The IR Steering Committee has oversight over the functional experts who provide ongoing data for the IR website, including information about faculty and staff. These data are updated on an annual basis, typically in the Fall when annual student enrollment data is collected.

Annual and ongoing review of faculty credentialing standards is accomplished through a collaboration between staff and administrators within Graduate Programs and the Office of Accreditation through the annual credentialing audit process.

Maintaining an appropriate number of faculty and staff with the expertise to effectively serve the students is monitored on an annual basis and presented in the Institutional Review portion of myUIndy.

The HERI faculty survey with items on workload and faculty activities is measured every three years.

3R1 What are the results for determining if recruitment, hiring and orienting practices ensure effective provision for programs and services?

• ***Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)***

The faculty gender mix has shifted slightly towards more females, with 59% female faculty in 2019 compared with 56% in 2014. Deliberate efforts to increase diversity among faculty has yielded results, moving from only 8% faculty of color in 2014 to 15% faculty of color in 2019.

[TABLE 3.1.1 Faculty Comparison 2014-2015 to 2018-2019](#)

[TABLE 3.1.2 Faculty Staff](#)

[2017-18 Audit of Faculty Credentials](#)

- ***Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks***

The proportion of full-time faculty has increased. In 2014, the total number of faculty was 545, with 243 or 45% full-time. In 2018, the total number of faculty is 636, with 296 or 47% full-time to keep pace with student enrollment increases. Staff hiring has also kept pace with student enrollment, with a 13.5% increase in staff during the 2014-2018 time frame.

[TABLE 3.1.3](#) HERI Survey on satisfaction pertaining to workload and other activities.

- **Interpretation of results and insights gained**

The University has kept pace in hiring faculty and staff during a time of growth in student numbers as evidenced by the stable student-faculty ratio and the percent increase of staff as compared to students. The average student-to-faculty ratio remains very stable at 13:1, with no change between 2014 and 2018. During a time frame when student growth increased by 11.1%, the number of faculty increased by 16.7%, with an increased student headcount of almost 600 students during that time frame, faculty hiring has kept pace.

The 2017-18 audit of faculty credentials for undergraduate faculty shows that 575 faculty out of 599 faculty (full-time and part-time) meet the qualifications with 24 adjunct files still under review. None of the 24 will be rehired in 2019-20 until qualifications are established. The graduate faculty meet the requirement at 99%. The target is 100% within the framework of the established faculty qualifications policy.

The HERI faculty survey indicates scores lower than the comparison group with 119 faculty responding to the 2016 survey on items related to workload and faculty activities. Two items pertaining to satisfaction with workload and increased responsibilities were lower than the comparison group. One item is positive compared to peers which is flexibility of the work schedule. This information is being used in formulating a new faculty workload plan subsequent to redefining faculty positions. It is anticipated that improvements will be shown on the next administration of the HERI Survey.

3I1 Based on 3R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

University's ability to meet new needs with a redeployment of staff or the reorganization of existing resources has improved effectiveness and efficiencies. The need for improved graduate admissions resulted in the establishment of a new centralized office of Graduate and Adult Learning Enrollment; this change redeployed existing staff with only the addition of a new Associate VP in Enrollment Management.

The University hired a cabinet-level Officer for Diversity & Inclusion and created the Office of Inclusion & Equity (OIE) as a formal structure for managing and leading institutional diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. The OIE developed a mission statement that serves as a university-wide statement for diversity, equity, and inclusion. UIndy will remain diligent in efforts to improve

diversity in employees through hiring practices.

The recent hiring of an Academic Affairs Business Analyst with dual reporting to the Executive Vice President and Provost and Controller is another strategic initiative effort to improve data-driven decision-making related to staffing and resources that support the academic enterprise.

The Academic Master Plan includes specific action steps to implement new faculty types and to address faculty workload. The goal is to begin hiring new faculty types for Fall 2020, with approvals by the Faculty Senate, Full Faculty, President and Board of Trustees. A study to reduce workload by three credit hours is underway.

Sources

- 2017-18 Faculty Qualifications
- Decision Tree Fac Qual Provost Council
- Faculty Guidebook 2.1 Search and Screen Process pp. 13-15
- Faculty Qualifications Audit Flowchart
- Faculty_Qualifications_Policy
- FacultyLoadWorkingGroup
- Recruitment Flowchart
- Recruitment_Selection Guide
- Staff Handbook Index
- TABLE 3.1.1 Faculty Comparison 2014-2015 to 2018-2019
- TABLE 3.1.2 Faculty_Staff Numbers
- TABLE 3.1.3 HERI Survey Workload and Activity Items final

3.2 - Evaluation and Recognition

Evaluation and Recognition focuses on the assessment and recognition of faculty, staff and administrators' contributions to the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. within this section.

3P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes that assess and recognize faculty, staff and administrators' contributions to the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees
- Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff and administrators
- Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services
- Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all faculty, staff and administrators (3.C.3)
- Establishing employee recognition, compensation and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance
- Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

3R2: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if evaluation processes assess employees' contributions to the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

3I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 3R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

3P2 Describe the processes that assess and recognize faculty, staff and administrators' contributions to the institution.

- *Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees*

All employees receive annual performance evaluations. An initial performance evaluation is conducted following a new employee's four- or six-month introductory period. Following that review, evaluations are conducted annually or as-needed.

[Faculty](#) complete a self-evaluation and suggest goals for the future in alignment with the ULGs, institutional strategic initiatives, and department goals; and, reflects criteria-based progress toward promotion and tenure. A review of student evaluations of teaching are included as part of the annual faculty evaluation. A new evaluation system, SmartEvals, is being implemented and piloted in summer 2019. Annual goals for performance are set and training or developmental resources are identified for supporting those goals. Evaluations are conducted by the program director or chair, with review by the dean.

Deans complete a self-evaluation and suggest goals for the future in alignment with college/school and institutional plans for review by the Provost. With the recent update to the dean's role by the Provost, a [new evaluation tool](#) was implemented in 2019 for faculty to use in the evaluation of their dean.

Staff may complete a self-evaluation prior to meeting with their immediate supervisor for the [annual evaluation](#). Supervisor and staff member collaboratively discuss strengths and areas for improvement, future performance expectations, and set goals that reflect departmental goals and institutional strategic initiatives.

Administrators annual evaluations are completed similarly to others across the institution including a self-evaluation followed by a 1:1 meeting with their direct supervisor. Goals for administrators are linked to department and institutional objectives and strategic initiatives.

- ***Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff and administrators***

Employee Affinity Groups are voluntary groups of employees who provide input on diversity, inclusion and equity, recruitment, retention and development of employees. These groups help increase morale, provide insights, and enhance institutional engagement. Faculty and staff provide input through a variety of university committees. Specifically, Faculty Senate provides input into faculty roles and needed teaching credentials, including promotion and tenure expectations. Staff provide input on expectations committees and departmental meetings.

The Bylaws, Faculty Handbook, New Faculty Orientation and performance appraisal are ways expectations for faculty are clearly communicated. Departments meet monthly. Deans and chairs communicate expectations and solicit feedback from faculty in these meetings. Academic departments have representation on the Faculty Senate. The Executive Senate members communicate directly with the Executive VP and Provost to share faculty input.

The Staff Handbook, staff orientation process and the performance appraisal communicate expectations to staff. Staff members are represented on various university committees that present opportunities to learn new initiatives and provide feedback. Non-academic departments meet frequently, share information and solicit feedback. In addition, the president holds open forums for all employees twice a semester.

Expectations for administrators are contained in departmental policies, the Bylaws and performance appraisals linked to strategic planning and administrator orientation. BOT responsibilities are outlined in the Bylaws and the Board Orientation Manual. BOT subcommittees receive quarterly

reports from the President's Cabinet. Administrators provide 2-way communication through departmental meetings. The President's Cabinet and the Provost's Council meet jointly each month to plan and coordinate strategic initiatives. The University Planning Committee meets twice a semester for discussion and decision making on strategic planning and other key issues.

An intensive effort was made during 2017 to better understand the quality of the [professional experience](#) for staff members. The eight-month study was executed in three phases and discussions were convened to hear staff views regarding: 1) PEOPLE 2) WORK 3) CULTURE and 4) REWARD AND COMPENSATION. Staff members took advantage of several opportunities to provide feedback: 30 departmental meetings with 330 staff attending, 230 staff completed an online survey, 400+ staff attended town hall discussions, and 200+ participated in sessions at the Faculty-Staff Institute.

- ***Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services***

All annual personnel evaluations reflect departmental and/or institutional objectives. Faculty evaluation forms contain an expectation for scholarship linked to an institutional objective to increase scholarly productivity. Expectations for non-instructional staff are tied to various institutional objectives, reflecting high-level student services, creating a campus community anchor, and a hub for student activities. (3.C.3)

- ***Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all faculty, staff, and administrators (3.C.3)***

Processes and procedures for annual employee evaluations (staff, faculty, and administrators) are published in the Faculty and Staff Handbooks. As the dean's role has been better defined, a new evaluation tool has been created that aligns with the role. HR manages and coordinates the staff performance evaluation process and updates for the [Staff Handbook](#). The [Faculty Handbook](#) includes the evaluation process and updates. It is managed through the Office of the Provost in consultation with Faculty Senate and various functional offices including HR. (3.C.3)

- ***Establishing employee recognition, compensation and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance***

UIndy has a robust recognition program. Employee Service Awards acknowledge and recognize full-time employees' years of service milestones. The presentation of service awards for staff employees is at the Staff Picnic. At an annual May celebration dinner, retiring employees are honored. Another service award given annually is the Peter's Good Neighbor award.

Although a strong faculty awards process existed for many years, in 2017-2018, the Faculty Achievement Awards Program was aligned with strategic priorities. The Provost's Council developed and implemented [new categories](#) for awards and a new process for selection. These awards were initiated at the annual Faculty/Staff Institute. Nominations are solicited and awards are given out annually as is the Teacher of the Year Award.

The Staff Achievement Awards Program is based on nominations received from across campus for the following awards: 1) Unsung Hero Award 2) Emerging Leader Award 3) Enhancing the Student Experience Award 4) Spirit of UIndy Award 5) Beyond UIndy Award 6) Inclusive Excellence Award 7) Collaborative Spirit Award. These awards are presented (with a plaque and monetary award) at

the annual Faculty/Staff Institute.

- ***Faculty, staff, and administrator compensation rates are reviewed annually in conjunction with the budget process.***

Increases in compensation at UIndy are based upon merit. Merit increases are not automatic and there has been only one year in the past 30 in which no merit increases were awarded to employees. In 2009, there was broad campus support for using the merit pool to replace funds for students that were lost when the State of Indiana reduced need-based aid levels just prior to the 2009/2010 academic year.

Comprehensive medical, disability, life insurance, and retirement benefits are available, with competitive employer contributions. The University Benefits Committee made up of faculty and staff annually reviews the benefit package and recommends changes to the CFO, Benefits Manager, and Director of HR. A portion of the salary increase pool was set aside for salary adjustments to assure that salary ranges were competitive as identified through the market pricing study. Further adjustments were made in Fall 2018 and salary ranges for new positions were developed for each position.

[Workload for faculty](#) (administrative load, special projects, extensive committee service) has been recognized through stipends or release time. As part of the Academic Master Plan ([Goal IIIA](#)) compensation is being reviewed. An evaluation of faculty types, faculty load, release time, and compensation will be based on the data being gathered.

- ***Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement***

UIndy promotes employee satisfaction through competitive salary, complete benefits package, wellness program, opportunities for engagement on committees, personal and departmental development funds, leadership opportunities, tuition reimbursement and tuition exchange programs, celebratory activities like the annual Christmas dinner, annual spring recognition dinner and summer staff picnic. Additionally there are opportunities for leadership training (see 3.P.3). In addressing satisfaction levels, communication among departments and employees have been enhanced with the addition of the weekly email newsletter, presentations at Faculty-Staff Institute, and various focus group sessions pertaining to strategic planning (see Cat. 4.2).

Efforts to promote satisfaction and engagement include the hiring of a full-time staff member to work with faculty to promote wellness through screenings and exercise classes. Ongoing Affinity Groups have also been developed and include groups for Faculty and Staff of Color and LGBTQ. A support group for faculty and staff caregivers was started with the assistance of HR and in partnership with Joy's House Adult Day Center located on campus.

- ***Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools***

The market pricing study for staff positions and faculty salary comparisons inform annual compensation decisions. Surveys are used to measure broad satisfaction with compensation and benefits, and these include the professional life staff survey and the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) faculty survey. During 2018-2019, a campus climate survey was conducted through the Office of Inclusion & Equity (administered every two years).

During the 2016-2017 academic year, Faculty Senate created a task force charged with reviewing

tools for the evaluation of teaching by students.

3R2 What are the results for determining if evaluation processes assess employees' contributions to the institution?

- *Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)*

[TABLE 3.2.1 Staff Satisfaction Survey](#)

[TABLE 3.2.2 Release Time as Part of Faculty Load](#)

- *Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks*

[TABLE 3.2.3 Climate Survey Part 2](#)

[TABLE 3.2.4 Market Pricing Study-staff 2016](#)

[TABLE 3.2.5 Faculty Salary Comparison by Rank](#)

[TABLE 3.2.6 HERI faculty satisfaction survey on compensation and benefits](#)

- *Interpretation of results and insights gained*

The Professional Life Study included recommendations and action plans based upon the results of the Staff Satisfaction Survey. (TABLE 3.2.1)

The TABLE 3.2.2 showing release time as part of faculty load, is a piece of the larger project studying faculty load to determine how to best allocate load to cover instructional, administrative and service activities performed by faculty. One insight is that there may be inequities in the way that load is assigned as the guidelines are established at the unit level.

Comparative results of the Campus Climate Survey (TABLE 3.2.3) showed participation in events in most areas declining from 2016 to 2019. Specifically, volunteer work declined 10% and participation in a leadership event declined 8%. Review of these areas is planned for Fall 2019. One insight is that the results need to be interpreted in light of the number of new employee with whom a culture of participation may be a factor.

The Staff Market Pricing Study (TABLE 3.2.4) showed that 142 out of 416 employees were below comparative salary minimums. All of the 142 identified positions have been moved closer to their target levels, and approximately two thirds have been moved completely into their ranges with only 53 requiring continued support in forthcoming adjustments. UIndy acknowledges that financial resources are needed for budget managers to continue to use their funds to close this gap.

TABLE 3.2.5 shows over the last five years, significant effort has been made to improve faculty salaries in relation to Midwest Masters Large institutions. In 2013-2014, salaries at UIndy were below the average in 3 of 4 faculty categories. By 2017-2018, that improved to above average in all four categories, with percent improvements. There is an opportunity to continue to meet the comparative salary range for all levels.

TABLE 3.2.6 HERI Survey indicates that results for faculty compensation and benefits are near the comparison group. Retirement benefits exceed the benchmark. One insight on retirement benefits is

that the results may reflect the activities of the cross-representational Benefits Committee.

3I2 Based on 3R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

In efforts to address satisfaction with benefits as a part of total compensation, UIndy has implemented since 2014 best practices to contain medical costs such as offering high deductible health plans, implementing spousal carve-out, and encouraging the use of a price transparency tool. Voluntary offerings were broadened with the addition of pet, home, and auto insurance and access to a knee and hip surgical center of excellence.

The Faculty Academy is taking the lead in providing training for faculty in how to best implement the new evaluation system, SmartEvals, and interpret results that are obtained.

For 2017-18 the BOT approved \$1.57 million, and for 2018-2019 approved \$1.2 million, to be used to support merit, promotion, retention, and market compensation adjustments for staff whose salaries were below target levels in the Market Pricing study. All of the 142 identified positions that were below the minimum benchmark, all have been moved closer to their target levels, and two thirds have moved completely into their ranges.

Sources

- 2018 Faculty Evaluation Form
- AMP Goal IIIa 4-3 - Support Faculty
- Evaluation of Deans 2018-19_Full Survey
- Faculty Award Categories
- Faculty Handbook Evaluation Process P. 42-43
- Faculty Satisfaction
- Faculty_Handbook_Section_3.13_Workload
- FacultyLoadWorkingGroup
- Professional Life
- ProfessionalLife_report2018
- Staff Handbook p. 38-39 Performance Management
- TABLE 3.2.2 Faculty Compensation Comparison (1)
- TABLE 3.2.3 Campus Climate Survey_Fac-Staff_Comparative Results 2016-2019(6419)
- TABLE 3.2.4 Market Study 2016 Staff
- TABLE 3.2.5 Midwest Masters AY 2013-14 and 2017-18
- TABLE 3.2.6 HERI Salary final
- Visual Course Load and Release - AY17 and Proj AY18

3.3 - Development

Development focuses on processes for continually training, educating and supporting employees to remain current in their methods and to contribute fully and effectively throughout their careers at the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 5.A. in this section.

3P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for training, educating and supporting the professional development of employees. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Providing and supporting regular professional development for all employees (3.C.4, 5.A.4)
- Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes (3.C.4)
- Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of expertise (e.g. advising, financial aid, etc.) (3.C.6)
- Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

3R3: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if employees are assisted and supported in their professional development? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

3I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 3R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

3P3 Describe the processes for training, educating and supporting the professional development of employees.

- *Providing and supporting regular professional development for all employees (3.C.4, 5.A.4)*

[The Faculty Academy, formerly called the Faculty Learning and Design Studio](#), has responsibility for faculty development and professional training accomplished through a team, consisting of one faculty

and two instructional design specialists, and an IT support person that function as coaches for teaching online. Development opportunities emanate from survey data that has identified needs leading to workshops on the use of technology and best teaching practices in online learning. Each full-time faculty has individual funds of \$600 annually to maintain currency in their fields and teaching roles. Faculty can also access \$700 in support, through an application process, from the Executive VP and Provost to support travel to conferences. Department chairs, program directors and deans attend [Leadership Training](#) offered annually. **(5.A.4, 3.C.4)**

Professional development for staff is through departmental, institutional and external opportunities. (see Cat. 2.1). Online training is provided for all employees around drug free workplace, FERPA, managing bias and Title IX. Department and role-specific professional development is supported to maintain certifications or credentials. All new employees receive information regarding Title IX guidelines during New Employee Orientation. All employees are required to complete an online Title IX training module annually. Additionally, all employees have opportunities for programs pertaining to safety and ethical practices. Spaces are reserved for UIndy employees at the continuing education offering of the [Supervisory Institute](#). **(5.A.4., 3.C.4)**

- ***Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes (3.C.4)***

Deans and department chairs/directors review teaching assignments each semester to validate that instructors assigned to a course are qualified and current in educational content and pedagogical processes. Additionally student evaluations of instruction, peer review classroom observations, self-assessments by faculty and the annual performance evaluation help ensure alignment of faculty to assigned courses. **(3.C.4)**

Academic departments also provide specific training for faculty, as needed and determined by deans, directors and faculty. The Faculty Academy runs new faculty orientation for all new full-time faculty with a focus on effective teaching and learning approaches and resources. The Adult Programs Office provides multiple trainings for adjunct instructors on best teaching and learning practices. Also noted previously Quality Matters and LMS training are held each semester for current pedagogy. **(3.C.4)**

- ***Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of expertise (e.g. advising, financial aid, etc) (3.C.6)***

Student support staff have access to departmental funds and numerous opportunities for internally and externally provided development. As examples:

- Financial Aid staff employees receive professional certifications from the National Association of Financial Aid Administrators and participate in the following professional development activities including Indiana Student Financial Aid Association, Midwest Association of Financial Aid Administrators, Federal Student Aid Conference, Ellucian (Banner) Users Conference, National Association of Financial Aid Administrators webinars, internal training on a monthly basis via staff meeting, and an annual staff retreat. **(3.C.6)**
- Student Affairs staff participate in regional and national conferences (ACPA, NASPA, GLACUHO. ATIXA), local and regional as professional development activities. Additionally, Student and Campus Affairs conducts monthly division lunches with guest speakers. The group holds three annual division retreats. Many of the staff in Student & Campus Affairs have also

received Title IX Certificate training through the national Title IX organization, ATIXA.

(3.C.6)

- The Academic Success Center staff receive department-specific training that includes internal training on best practices, policies and procedures, confidentiality, and demographics. All staff attend weekly and monthly meetings. Staff retreats and planning meetings are scheduled bi-annually. Additional training resources included webinars and attendance at state, regional, and national conferences as budgets allow. **(3.C.6)**
- Annually academic advisors participate in webinars sponsored by NACADA, the Global Community for Academic Advising. At least two staff members attend the Annual NACADA conference yearly. Additionally, regular internal training sessions are conducted in the domains of technology tools, advising practices and concepts, and updated informational items from the academic departments and programs. **(3.C.6)**
- IT collaborates with departments to offer the following training, as needed and/or requested: Banner and Cognos, computer applications, cross training within departments, training on various support services topics. As examples, complete online training of new staff administered by United Student Aid Funds and annual training offered by Indiana Student Financial Aid Association. **(3.C.6)**
- *Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives.*

Since 2012-13, an ongoing alignment of development activities to strategic initiatives has occurred. One example is in 2018, onsite training was conducted for several employees to become Intercultural Development Inventory Qualified Administrators. Additionally, the University administered a [Campus Climate Survey in April 2019](#) to ascertain employee perceptions on diversity and inclusion to inform training and development. This survey follows one administered in 2016.

Academic and non-academic departments have strategic plans that are aligned with institutional priorities. Faculty, staff and administrators' development plans are in alignment with departmental plans, and individuals are held accountable through the annual performance evaluation.

- *Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools*

Various [course evaluation tools](#) underwent a three-year process to determine and the preferred instrument for student evaluation of teaching (SET) at UIndy and to inform faculty development and training.

The Faculty Academy began collecting data on faculty participation in development activities in 2015-2016, the same year that the current Director came on board.

Data is collected by HR in the recently initiated Law Room, an online training system for required training topics for faculty and staff.

The HERI faculty survey is also used to assess satisfaction with teaching support.

3R3 What are the results for determining if employees are assisted and supported in their professional development?

- *Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)*

In May 2018, an ACE [Leadership Conference](#) for Deans, Chairs and Program Directors occurred. Topics covered included budgeting, conflict resolution and change management. The conference was very well received and the Provost's Office continues to conduct leadership training on a regular basis.

[TABLE 3.3.1](#) shows the completion rate on required trainings.

- ***Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks***

Participation in faculty development activities as shown in [TABLE 3.3.2](#) has increased steadily over the last several years.

[TABLE 3.3.3](#) HERI survey reports faculty perceptions on the value and support for teaching.

- ***Interpretation of results and insights gained***

Completion rates for required training are at the target level for faculty, but slightly below the 90% target for staff. One insight is that some non-exempt staff are not likely to access computers and see the notices for training or do not understand these are required for them. This could account for a lower percent of training of staff members. Further communication is needed.

The expansion of development offerings and participation of approximately one third of faculty is an improvement showing the increased outreach of the Faculty Academy. In [TABLE 3.3.1](#), the 2017-2018 numbers represent 110 unique attendees which is 37.4% of the full-time faculty. Thirty-one workshops were delivered and evaluated, up from 16 in the previous year. This is in part due to the new "Faculty Fellows" program. Fellows are responsible for delivering workshops as well as holding office hours for faculty requesting coaching on the fellow's area of expertise. It is an expectation that all faculty and staff participate in development activity yearly, however this development may occur on campus through various venues and external opportunities.

The HERI Survey indicates UIndy is just below (92.1%) the comparison group (92.3%). One insight is that faculty development was less coordinated under the former programs of the center. As the new Faculty Academy, it is anticipated that greater support and formal mentorship will increase faculty satisfaction for the next HERI administration.

Campus Climate Survey survey results have just been analyzed in May 2019 and will be interpreted and discussed in the upcoming fall.

- ***Based on 3R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?***

Annual training will continue to expand, based on the recommendations of the "Employee Training Team," a team convened by the VP and Secretary to the University with representation from various administrative areas. The Team meets regularly to review current mandatory training and make recommendations about content and implementation of the next year's mandatory training.

Coordinating and collaborating on development activities for faculty across the Faculty Academy, Human Research Protections Program Office and the Center for Service Learning and Community Engagement will ensure that offerings span the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. The Academic Master Plan proposes enhanced just-in-time resources for faculty as well as a tiered

curriculum to assure that faculty development offerings include advanced training for seasoned teachers and researchers.

The Faculty Academy has expanded the Fellows Program to include Scholarship Fellows as well as Teaching Fellows to increase support for research and creative scholarly activities. Also starting with fall 2019, Faculty Fellows will be assigned as mentors for the new faculty. New faculty will continue to participate in monthly meetings to prepare them for successful careers at UIndy and will also be connected to mentors.

The online training Law Room was recently initiated by HR. Additional communication is planned to increase the completion rate of required trainings.

Sources

- Academic Affairs Leadership Workshop Agenda
- Campus Climate Survey_Fac-Staff_Comparative Results 2016-2019
- Faculty Development Guidelines pp. 36-39
- Faculty Handbook pp. 48-50 Faculty Development
- Leadership Workshop Presentation 2018
- SmartEvals Implementation
- Supervisory Institute 2018
- TABLE 3.3.1 Law room Training Completion Rates(6431)
- TABLE 3.3.2 Faculty Development Participation
- TABLE 3.3.3 HERI Survey on Teaching and Support
- TABLE 4.3.2 ACE/Academic Affairs Leadership Survey Results

4 - Planning and Leading

4.1 - Mission and Vision

Mission and Vision focuses on how the institution develops, communicates and reviews its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.A., 1.B. and 1.D. within this section.

4P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Developing, deploying, and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values (1.A.1, 1.D.2, 1.D.3)
- Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values
- Communicating the mission, vision and values (1.B.1, 1.B.2, 1.B.3)
- Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution's mission (1.A.2)
- Allocating resources to advance the institutions mission and vision, while upholding the institution's values (1.D.1, 1.A.3)
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. brand studies, focus groups, community forums/studies and employee satisfaction surveys)

4R1: RESULTS

What are the results for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

4I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 4R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

4P1 Processes

- *Developing, deploying, and reviewing the institution's mission, vision, and values (1.A.1, 1.D.2, 1.D.3).*

UIndy's mission is to “prepare its graduates for effective, responsible, and articulate membership in the complex societies in which they live and serve, and for excellence and leadership in their personal and professional lives. The University equips students to become more capable in thought, judgment, communication, and action; to enhance their imaginations and creative talents; to gain a deeper understanding of the teachings of the Christian faith and an appreciation and respect for other religions; to cultivate rationality and tolerance for ambiguity; and to use their intellect in the process of discovery and synthesis of knowledge.”

The University's vision, mission, and values are set forth in its mission statement. The core [mission statement](#) was ratified by the Board of Trustees in 2000 as part of the strategic planning process in preparation for the university's centennial celebration in 2002. It is reviewed regularly as a part of each strategic planning process, and last reviewed by the [BOT](#) and President's Cabinet in Fall 2018 with no recommendations for changes. The budget process and strategic planning initiatives were realigned with the mission for greater focus on academic programs, to create a vibrant campus, and support for the local community. **(1.A.1)**

Additionally, the mission was reviewed at the time of revision to the General Education (GE) Core in Fall 2013 to align new GE goals with the mission. The result was an added emphasis on global/local awareness as one of the GE distribution areas and clear alignment with the four ULGLs. UIndy's educational responsibilities are clearly embedded in the mission and Strategic Plan. Planning process provide one of many avenues in which internal and external stakeholders are widely engaged. (see 4.2) The mission continues to guide practices, access for students, affordability that shape admission and financial aid policies, and budget allocation. **(1.A.1, 1.D.2, 1.D.3)**

UIndy identifies external stakeholders, communities of interests, United Methodist Church (UMC), potential employers, and organizations whose missions align with the University. The ongoing relationship with the [UMC](#) consists of many touch points including the recent self-study and subsequent reaffirmation of affiliate status. UIndy convenes conversations with representatives of the UMC congregation on an annual basis. The School of Education in partnership with the Center for Excellence in Leadership of Learning annually host a series of gatherings for school superintendents in order to foster communication related to trends in education. Input from these groups contributed to the recent planning process with more than 50 focus groups held during the 2017-2018 academic year. **(1.D.3)**

- *Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values*

The mission is embedded in student learning outcomes associated with the four ULGs: critical thinking, creativity, social responsibility, and performance, and implemented through specific [mission-driven values](#). Originally adopted in 2006, these values were reviewed alongside the mission in 2018. UIndy values:

- student learning in all aspects of university life
- faculty and student interaction
- international experiences for students, faculty, and staff
- engagement with religious traditions

- purposeful [engagement](#) with the city
- ethical, responsible, and professional behavior
- individual contributions of all members of the University community toward advancing our mission.

Commitment to mission, vision, and values is through promotion of service-learning and volunteerism. Volunteerism or course-embedded service learning activities saw students contributing more than 200,000 [hours of service](#) in Indianapolis and beyond. Real-world application through internships, clinicals, and field experiences exist in many of the academic programs to exemplify the mission of student preparation for a diverse and rapidly changing society. Students have received national attention for service work in the [Texas borderlands](#). Since 2013, students have been working to identify the remains of immigrants.

- *Communicating mission, vision and values (1.B.1, 1.B.2, 1.B.3)*

Articulation of the mission is visible through the vision, values, planning, and budgeting processes. The context of strategic planning is grounded in the mission, vision, and values. The culmination of this strategic planning process is the five-year financial plan approved by the BOT in May 2019. **(1.B.1)**

The mission statement is posted on the external and internal UIndy website, available in multiple publications, referred to in many other documents, and on MyUIndy (e.g. **Academic Catalog**; student, staff, and faculty handbooks; and BOT Orientation Manual). UIndy communicates these foundational philosophies broadly to the campus community and all stakeholders. Examples include the alumni magazine published two times annually, monthly [Mission Matters](#), [Five things to know about this week](#) sent via email, and the monthly internal faculty/staff newsletter among others. (see: [Mission Matters – Common Good](#), [Mission Matters – Key People](#), **(1.B.1)**)

The mission, vision and values documents are current and regularly reviewed. The mission speaks to areas of focus “membership in the complex societies...more capable in thought, judgment in personal and professional lives...an appreciation and respect for other religions, and to use their intellect in the process of discovery and synthesis of knowledge.” Undergraduate programs require GE courses that focus on communication, writing, civic responsibility, religious tolerance, critical thinking and research introduction. Courses in the undergraduate major and graduate program build on this foundation and focus on creative work, research, and application of skills within the discipline. **(1.B.2)**

The mission, vision and values statements also describe the nature and scope of the University and enrolled students. For example, the values emphasize faculty and student interaction, international experiences, engagement with religious traditions, purposeful engagement with the city of Indianapolis, and ethical, responsible, and professional behavior. Student experiences such as service learning, travel courses, collaborative faculty/student research, and ethics and religion courses support the values and speak to the nature of the University. Services provided include research support through the IRB and library, ACS, Inclusion and Diversity, PEC, Ecumenical Services, Service Learning, and Athletics Offices that support the mission and values for an enriched learning experience. The liberal arts tradition and focus on professional programs are the basis for programs and services offered. **(1.B.3, 1.A.2)**

- *Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution’s mission (1.A.2)*

The GE core features courses to enhance student skills in the 21st century, "seeking to prepare its graduates to meet the challenges in an ever-more complex world". Writing and speaking across the curriculum, emphasizes critical thinking and experiencing cultural differences as learning goals. Curricula feature applied learning that aligns educational programs with mission, vision, and values. UIndy is responsiveness to community needs with new academic programs. Co-curricular examples of alignment of mission and community needs include the University Series, which features speakers and programs linked to the ULGs and discussions on pressing societal issues. **(1.A.2)**

- ***Allocating resources to advance the institution's mission and vision, while upholding the Institution's values (1.D.1, 1.A.3)***

The BOT regularly reviews the five-year plans to ensure alignment with mission and values with respect to operational and capital budgets. In 2013, the board approved a five-year capital budget focused on advancing the first Vision 2030 Strategic Plan with a particular emphasis on physical structures and building capacity for program development. To date, UIndy has realized the majority of its projected goals related to this first Strategic Plan. (see Cat. 5.C) **(1.A.3)**

Five strategic comprehensive processes are converging to assess and direct improvements and planning for the next phase of the University's development: professional life, student life, academic life, campus/facilities, and financial master plans. (see 4.2) Each of these planning documents is mission-driven and includes university values to guide appropriate and consistent programs, services, and allocation of resources. **(1.A.3)**

Related to needs of internal and external constituents, UIndy understands its educational role and commitment to its public obligation. The University launched a new Master of Arts program and certificate in addictions counseling in Fall 2018. These programs were developed to be responsive to the University's public obligation to prepare professionals working with a growing number of our citizens dealing with addictions. Also begun in Fall 2018 is the Master of Science in healthcare management which prepares students to plan, direct, and oversee medical care and services. **(1.D.1)**

- ***Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools***

In Fall 2018, a short survey directly related to UIndy values was administered to the University Planning Commission (UPC). Surveys used by the University that also include questions about mission, vision or values are drawn from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) faculty survey, the Great Colleges to Work For Survey, and internal surveys including the Professional Life Survey and the Alumni Survey. [TABLE 4.1.1](#) shows measures related to Mission, Vision and Values.

4R1 Results

- ***Summary results of measures***

[2018 survey of the UPC](#)

[TABLE 4.1.2](#) Results Alumni

- ***Comparison of results to internal targets and external benchmarks***

[TABLE 4.1.3](#) HERI Results Faculty

[TABLE 4.1.4](#) NSSE Results Students

[TABLE 4.1.5](#) Results Employees

• ***Interpretation of results and insights gained***

The survey of the UPC related to UIndy values found several areas in which purposeful engagement is tied to curricula: fieldwork, clinical, and internships accounted for 43% of responses; volunteer activities 27%; project-based activities 18%; and other activities were 12%.

Alumni results demonstrate a strong and ongoing interest in UIndy happenings. Alumni responses indicated interest in following UIndy updates via various media including the *Portico*, email, social media, ongoing connections with faculty and staff, participation in events and activities. High alumni attendance at UIndy events such as Homecoming and Pack the House Nights and a dedicated yearly theater performance are examples.

Service-learning and community engagement have high scores by students (NSSE) exceeding peers institutions for first-year students (78% vs 54%) and seniors (82% vs 64%). Instilling a commitment to community service Allied health-related programs are core strengths of UIndy's offerings, which may also underscore these emphases on community outreach and service.

NSSE student data continue to highlight the value of high impact practices (HIP). The last three years of NSSE surveys show that UIndy compares favorably in several instances outperforming its peer group for research with faculty, service-learning and engagement, and course content featuring diverse perspectives. All these areas are directly tied to UIndy's GE emphases and the mission.

Faculty perceptions of importance to mission and values (HERI) showed a mean of 3.11 as compared to other private universities' mean of 2.84 in 2016/17 results. HERI results from the 2016/17 survey show that faculty rate favorably in commitment to community service, ability to evaluate reliable information, teaching tolerance, and respect for different beliefs and cultures.

Employees clearly feel a strong connection to the mission with 91% reporting the work that they do as important. A departmental culture of value and inclusiveness is also evident based on survey results.

4.1.1. Improvements

Planning, budgeting and shared governance processes ensure that academic programs and services remain aligned with mission, vision and values. Allocation of resources are aligned with mission, vision, values and support assessments of the academic enterprise. Implementation of a new LMS (Brightspace) and a new course evaluation system (SmartEvals) are two improvements in the coming budget cycles demonstrate a commitment to assessment and the educational mission.

The University has invested resources in the University Heights United Methodist Church located adjacent to the campus to ensure its financial viability. In the near future there are plans to co-locate university programs and services within the church to build on this historic relationship.

Sources

- Alumni Survey UPC 2018
- AQIP Values Engagement 2018
- BOT Minutes May 2018 page 3
- BOT Slides Fall 2018
- Changing Culture of HE Pres Office April 2019
- Community Engagement Report
- Five Things_Intercom_12.9.18
- Mission Matters
- Mission Matters - Common Good
- Mission Matters- Key People
- Mission Statement Approval February 2000 (1)
- Notification Letter UMC February 2019
- Service Hrs AY17-18
- TABLE 4.1.1 Measures Related to Mission, Vision and Values
- TABLE 4.1.2 Alumni
- TABLE 4.1.3 Faculty
- TABLE 4.1.3 HERI Institutional Priorities
- TABLE 4.1.4 Students
- TABLE 4.1.5 Employees
- TexasBorderlands_story
- Values

4.2 - Strategic Planning

Strategic Planning focuses on how the institution achieves its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 5.B. and 5.C. in this section.

4P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution's plans and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning (5.C.3)
- Aligning operations with the institution's mission, vision and values (5.C.2)
- Aligning efforts across departments, divisions and colleges for optimum effectiveness and efficiency (5.B.3)
- Capitalizing on opportunities and institutional strengths and countering the impact of institutional weaknesses and potential threats (5.C.4, 5.C.5)
- Creating and implementing strategies and action plans that maximize current resources and meet future needs (5.C.1, 5.C.4)
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. achievement of goals and/or satisfaction with process)

4R2: RESULTS

What are the results for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution's operational plans? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

4I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 4R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

4.P.2. Processes

- *Engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning (5.C.3)*

[Vision 2030](#) is a living document of institutional relevance and a strategy to define UIndy's

aspirational self that was crafted using input from all stakeholder groups across campus and beyond. This document draws attention to the future, while also providing results of the first five-year Strategic Plan 2013-2018. UIndy continued this process of engaging external stakeholders during the second phase of the Vision 2030 strategic planning process. For example, as part of the Academic and Student Life Planning Processes, 11 of the 54 focus groups were conducted with external stakeholders (neighborhood, faith community, local employers/workforce, donors, community partners, & alumni). **(5.C.3)**

UIndy launched a communications strategy in 2016 to advance awareness of institutional priorities by effectively connecting with external and internal stakeholders' expectations while enhancing the ability to capture outcomes for these efforts. External stakeholders include the general public, prospective students and parents, prospective and current donors, partners, elected officials, and media. Stories of student success, faculty collaborations and community partnerships are featured prominently on digital communication channels. [Intercom](#), the internal news site launched in May 2017, is designed to enhance awareness of faculty and staff activities as well as community engagement. These communications supported the goals of the Academic Master Plan by increasing Intercom page views by 44% and an 18% increase in unique users during 2018. **(5.C.3)**

- *Aligning operations with the institution's mission, vision and values (5.C.2)*

The mission was reviewed by President's Cabinet at the initiation of the 2018 strategic planning process and reaffirmed. The budget process and strategic planning initiatives were realigned with the mission to provide greater focus on support for academic programs and student learning outcomes. For example, launching the [R.B. Annis School of Engineering](#) required an alignment of operations and resources to hire a new associate dean, hire new faculty, purchase new equipment and renovate facilities, and secure curriculum approvals. As part of the alignment of operations and resources, a significant naming gift for over six million dollars was secured for engineering. **(5.C.2)**

Student learning outcome data and operational performance data are integral to the planning and resource allocation for programs and services. For example, a new Finance Lab has been built to increase business students' achievement on relevant learning goals. Operational performance tied to strategic initiatives was enhanced through the creation of the Diversity and Inclusion Center. Both of these examples demonstrate alignment of the mission, values, learning outcomes and operational effectiveness used to make strategic decisions and allocate resources. **(5.C.2)**

The first Strategic Plan of Vision 2030 focused on developing capacity, updating physical structures, and generating new programs. The second Strategic Plan 2019-2024 is focused on people and [programs](#). Planning processes included professional, student, academic, campus/facilities, and financial. Anticipating emerging factors and capitalizing on strengths these planning processes were launched in 2017 for the next phase of Vision 2030. **(5.C.2, 5.C.4)**

Five sub-plans (described below) comprise the 2019-24 Strategic Plan, and these were presented to the BOT in May 2019 for feedback. The final Strategic Plan, incorporating feedback from the Board, will be presented to the Board for approval at the fall 2019 meeting. Strategic initiatives and resources are directed at and aligned with prioritized objectives including excellence in teaching and learning. **(5.C.2)**

Student Life: The Division of Student and Campus Affairs continues vital work of transforming the campus community through service, engagement, and inclusion for active global citizenship. In May 2019, a new student life plan and accompanying financial strategy will be implemented to include

proposals for new housing options and student engagement opportunities. Faculty, staff, and students will prioritize initiatives for strengthening relationships with local, national, and global partners to create transformative student experiences.

Academic Life: Framed around institutional identity, distinctiveness, competitiveness, future students and their needs, securing additional resources, and assessment data from program learning outcomes. Numerous interviews and surveys were completed in Fall 2017 with an array of stakeholders to explore future academic programs. Transcripts of these interviews were analyzed and summarized into themes. **(5.C.2)**

Professional Life: In order to better understand the quality of professional experience for staff members, a committee launched a focused study in March 2017. The eight-month study had discussions convened to hear staff views regarding people, work, culture, reward and compensation.

Campus/Facilities: UIndy continually evaluates its physical infrastructure against current and future needs to advance its educational mission and strategic priorities. The Facilities Operational Plan 2020-2024 is closely linked to capital and operational budgeting processes. The plan identified several overarching goals to guide space-related decisions including: developing physical spaces that promote student engagement, aligning physical space with recruitment needs, improving connectedness of campus to the local community, controlling costs, and maintaining a physical plant that is safe, functional, and attractive. **(5.A.1)**

Financial Master Plan: Ensures the University meets its financial obligations and remains true to its mission. A rolling five-year forecast of the operating budget assists in determining the viability and timing of various initiatives being considered for funding. The plan establishes realistic enrollment and other revenue targets; aligns resources to support revenue targets and strategic initiatives; ensures planning results are in line with current debt ratings and financial ratio expectations; and, ensure operating margins are sufficient to cover debt service and capital needs while increasing the cash position. **(5.C.2, 5.C.4)**

- ***Aligning efforts across departments, divisions and colleges for optimum effectiveness and efficiency (5.B.3)***

Pursuing Vision 2030 and associated changes has afforded UIndy the opportunity to adapt structures to meet the evolving needs of a dynamic institution. This has meant rethinking departmental structures, personnel positions, and leveraging resources to best meet goals. The following three examples highlight different approaches to this process. **(5.B.3)**

Creation of the Global Engagement Center was to achieve goals related to creating and developing international programs and education. A number of international functions (study abroad, immigration services and federal compliance, international series, international recruiting, et al.) were decentralized and limited the ability to take full advantage of synergies. Hence, all areas involved in an international focus will be consolidated into a single reporting structure under the Associate Provost for International Engagement. **(5.B.3)**

In an intentional effort to distribute expertise and connect two critical areas of campus, a new position of business analyst in accounting was created to collaborate with academic affairs. The new business analyst will develop information and data to strengthen academic affairs input into the University's five-year forecast of capital expenditures and operating expenses, annual operating plans for each academic department, forecasts of tuition and fees based on enrollment projections,

operational performance metrics, and financial modeling in support of new academic program development. Efficiencies were also realized by realigning campus resources under different leadership structures including the recent change of the Copy Center's reporting to the Chief Technology Officer to take advantage of expertise and resources in the Department of Information and Technology. **(5.B.3)**

Academic requirements and policies and procedures are established collaboratively with administration through significant input from faculty and staff including Faculty Senate, academic departments, Admissions, and the Academic Success Center. Academic policies are approved by the BOT. Academic requirements, policies and procedures are brought to the Faculty Senate through the curriculum committees. Administration reviews and approves the policies, procedures and requirements then forwards policies to the board for approval. University Bylaws outline the roles and responsibilities that support collaboration and engagement of various campus groups. Students are actively involved through Student Senate and representation on various committees. **(5.B.3)**

- ***Capitalizing on opportunities and institutional strengths and countering the impact of institutional weaknesses and potential threats (5.C.4, 5.C.5)***

Planning is based on the capacity to grow programs and services in alignment with the mission and Strategic Plan. UIndy uses a [risk analysis](#) to [determine threats](#), and identify opportunities for improvement when planning. As a tuition-driven institution, enrollment is a major factor as is the health of the endowment that are both factored in to the planning. **(5.C.4, 5.C.5)**

UIndy recognizes mission, vision, and values are at the forefront of communications and planning. Highlighting the ongoing connection with the mission, the VP for University Mission issues [Mission Matters](#) pieces throughout the academic year. These regular publications are enhanced by an annual seminar, available to all employees, focused on developing a more mature understanding of ways to engage the mission. These efforts in addition to initiatives described in Cat. 4.1 recognize the ongoing challenge of effective communication as part of institutional planning and change. **(5.C.4)**

A portfolio of new programs is planned to further diversify offerings and to be more comprehensive and competitive. New program planning has focused on developing and expanding in areas that are consistent with the mission, vision, and values. In addition, new programs are established that meet the needs of traditional, adult, and graduate students; while looking to meet the needs for professionals in the workforce. Examples include the creation of the R.B. Annis School of Engineering and the Masters in Addictions Counseling in the last several years. Also, targeted retention efforts including a recovery course piloted during Summer 2018 for students at risk of academic ineligibility demonstrates another mechanism to ensure that programs are in place to help ensure the success of admitted students to UIndy. **(5.C.4, 5.C.5)**

A strength of the University has been in maintaining and increasing student enrollments in an environment of increased competition. In 2016, UIndy implemented an integrated marketing and communications strategy. This effort focused resources to capture digital footprints and to influence stakeholder engagement through media relations, social media, public relations, marketing, and digital advertising mix. The new strategy provided increased opportunities to (1) monitor and assess engagement aligned with institutional goals, priorities, and initiatives, and (2) provide new methods to disseminate information to deans and program directors in customized dashboards and reports. UIndy launched a new brand platform in 2017 including a new website, media and social media strategy and creative expression. Results associated with these new strategies can be found in the [Annual Media Report](#) showing a positive impact to student enrollment. **(5.C.4)**

Shifting demographics and needs of prospective college students are challenges that inform planning processes. UIndy recognizes a need to focus less on increasing enrollment and more on controlling discount rates, increase retention, develop creative recruitment strategies, and expand efforts to engage graduates and adult students. Conversations are occurring across campus including with the BOT, departmental meetings and are led by the president addressing the future landscape of higher education and the impact on the University ([president presentation](#)). (5.C.4)

- ***Creating and implementing strategies and action plans that maximize current resources and meet future needs (5.C.1, 5.C.4)***

Results of the first five-year Strategic Plan for Campus & Facilities show a positive physical footprint with plans to include new buildings for the School of Engineering and the Department of Art and Design. A campus extension is planned to the north for new student housing. Leadership consistently looks for opportunities to support academic programs and the UIndy community and enhance the overall student experience. (5.C.4)

Action plans and strategies to continue maximizing current resources and meet future needs are being developed as part of Vision 2030 phase two (2019-24) including possible new uses of existing spaces, new student housing options such as living and learning communities, and the conversion of university-owned houses from rental properties into affinity housing for students. Additionally, increased efforts are being made to capitalize on the use of physical space to generate revenue through expanded camps and conference offerings. (5.C.1)

4R2 Results

- ***Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized (e.g., achievement of goals and/or satisfaction with process)***

The practice of being participatory and collaborative, a hallmark of Vision 2030, has continued during the planning process (2017-2019), in preparation for the second Strategic Plan. This planning process included five components of planning: student life, academic life, professional life, campus/facilities, and financial master plans. (see methods for collecting stakeholder input during these planning processes in results).

Specific methods by which internal and external stakeholders were involved in providing feedback are outlined in [Table 4.2.1](#). A variety of communication channels have been used to provide updates and receive feedback including presentations at the Faculty/Staff Institute (2017 & 2018) and to the BOT ([September 2018](#), February 2019, May 2019); updates at [Faculty Senate meetings](#), the UPC, cabinet meetings, Provost Council meetings, department meetings, and town hall meetings. When the BOT adopts a new five-year strategic plan in May the results will be disseminated to the campus and beyond.

- ***Summary results of measures and comparison with benchmarks***

A summary of the results of the first phase, 2013-18, of the Vision 2030 Strategic Plan are provided in [Strategic Initiatives Update](#). Results for the second phase of the Vision 2030, Strategic Plan 2019-24, show the inclusive nature of the process and the emphasis placed upon communication. As the goals and initiatives are finalized for the second phase of the comprehensive five year plan, there will be a set of measurable outcomes identified for each goal.

[TABLE 4.2.1 Vision 2030 Phase Two](#)

[TABLE 4.2.2 Revenue Camps Conferences](#)

[Media Report 2018](#)

- **Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks**

[TABLE 4.2.3 HERI Faculty Survey](#)

- ***Interpretation of results and insights gained***

The Strategic Initiative Update indicates that most initiatives from phase one (2013-18) of Vision 2030 were accomplished.

The results of planning for phase two (2019-24) for Vision 2030 indicate an importance placed on meaningful collaboration with all stakeholders. One goal is focused on developing new faculty types that incorporate teaching, scholarship and service in new ways and exploring issues related to faculty load and compensation within the Academic Master Plan. This goal has further highlighted a need to work closely with faculty as new faculty types are connected to promotion and tenure pathways.

The results for camps and conferences show increased efficiency and utilization of campus facilities that serve to both link the campus more closely to the surrounding community and external stakeholders as well as to generate revenue. One of three strategic lenses in Vision 2030 is to serve as an anchor that supports the surrounding community.

Communications & Marketing provided crucial support for the institution's ability to reach faculty, staff, students and others to engage, inform and encourage participation. One insight is that key strategic initiatives to promote professional life, academic life, student life and other aspects of the *Vision 2030* campaign have been successful.

Integral to assessing the impact of the integrated marketing and communications strategy was a focus on measurable outcomes. Through state-of-the-art media monitoring tools, the University noted unprecedented media relations growth in 2018, with a 195% increase in earned media and a 232% increase in total media exposure. Faculty appearances in the media increased by 106% and the number of media outlets featuring the University improved by 35%. One insight realized was that the enhanced media relations strategy expanded awareness and appreciation for the institution, faculty expertise, community engagement, student and alumni stories, new programs and initiatives. Such efforts demonstrate the success of marketing, communications and public relations campaigns to grow awareness of the University's achievements.

The HERI Survey of faculty shows that the internal target and benchmark was exceeded in the three items related to institutional priorities. One insight is that the collaborative planning processes used to formulate the strategic priorities have provided buy-in and commitment on the part of faculty.

4I2 Improvements

Advancement has had an impact on the University's resources through the Campaign for the University of Indianapolis. The [campaign](#) was originally launched with a goal of \$40 million that was revised to \$50 million, and most recently revised to \$75 million with more than \$63 million raised to date in 2019.

In addition to more traditional ways of increasing university resources, UIndy has been exploring alternative methods of recruiting and retaining students through expansion of student life experiences. Two examples that are in the early stages of development include an expansion of club sport offerings and conversion of rental properties to be used as affinity houses for student groups on campus.

Content of the next five-year strategic plan is being shaped by conversations occurring related to professional, student, and academic life on campus. A series of focus groups have been held (59 internal and 11 external) between 2017-2018. These conversations have been widespread, collaborative and will culminate in reports that are accessible for the campus to review. The need to continue to collaborate and communicate widely about the Strategic Plan is recognized.

Sources

- 2018_09_18_Final Senate Agenda
- AdvancementInfographic
- AMP Goals with Model
- BOT Slides Fall 2018
- Campaign update_wrap
- Changing Culture of HE Pres Office April 2019
- Figure 4.1.1 VISION 2030
- Intercom
- Media Report 2018
- MIssion Matters- Key People
- New Programs Planning
- Notification Letter UMC February 2019
- PRES_18_BoardPPT_May_Improvements
- Professional Life report 2018
- Strategic Initiatives Update (1)
- TABLE 4.2.1 Vision 2030 Phase Two
- TABLE 4.2.2 Revenue Camps _Conferences
- TABLE 4.2.3 HERI Institutional Priorities(2)
- UIndy Risk Approach
- UIndy Risk Identification Jan 2019

4.3 - Leadership

Leadership focuses on governance and leadership of the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.C. and 5.B. in this section.

4P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for ensuring sound and effective leadership of the institution, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Establishing appropriate relationship between the institution and its governing board to support leadership and governance (2.C.4)
- Establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board (2.C.3, 5.B.1, 5.B.2)
- Maintaining board oversight, while delegating management responsibilities to administrators and academic matters to faculty (2.C.4)
- Ensuring open communication between and among all colleges, divisions and departments
- Collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards (5.B.3)
- Providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders (2.C.1, 2.C.2)
- Developing leaders at all levels within the institution
- Ensuring the institution's ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision (2.C.3)
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

4R3: RESULTS

What are the results for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

4I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 4R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

4.P.3 Process

- *Establishing appropriate relationship between the institution and its governing board to support leadership and governance (2.C.4)*

The BOT is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of financial and academic policies and practices, and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities. BOT Bylaws establishes the relationship among the university administration, faculty and staff, the board and the governance functions therein. [Table 4.3.1](#) shows the sub-committees of the BOT their primary function and membership. Faculty are delegated responsibility for academic matters as further discussed below. **(2.C.4 , 5.B.2)**

The Bylaws recognize the distinction between oversight and management of the University. The board promotes and protects the mission assuring a sound financial, legal and strategic basis for operating. The day to day management and execution of strategic and operational plans are delegated to the president and administration. As an example, the president and campus propose an annual operational budget and a rolling five year financial plan. The BOT then receives, reviews, and approves proposed plans. The execution of the operational budget is assigned to the president as the CEO and administration as outlined in the budget process. In turn, the President's Report back to the board is an overview of the operational budget compared to the actual performance. This report back allows for a more in depth conversation and understanding regarding the operational budget which takes place during the Finance Committee of the board during each board meeting. **(2.C.4)**

- ***Establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board (2.C.3, 5.B.1, 5.B.2)***

UIndy is governed by a BOT (see [BOT Organizational Chart](#)) that operates with established [Bylaws](#) and committee structures. The BOT's operations are independent of any external entity and are not influenced unduly. [Table 4.3.1](#) depicts how the governance structure engages internal stakeholders in a shared governance system. Students are represented on many departmental committees and have a Student Senate that provides regular input to various university committees who relay information to the BOT subcommittees. As noted above, through the subcommittee structure of the BOT, ongoing communication and knowledge sharing occurs among campus leaders and the BOT. **(2.C.1, 2.C.3, 5.B.1, 5.B.2)**

- ***Maintaining board oversight, while delegating management responsibilities to administrators and academic matters to faculty (2.C.4)***

The BOT delegate academic matters through the Bylaws to the faculty. Faculty representatives from each department serve on legislative committees of the Faculty Senate to ensure that curricula meet standards, that these standards are followed, and that they are aligned with ULGs, mission and values. Key legislative committees of the Faculty Senate include Academic Petitions Committee, Admissions Committee, General Education Core Committee, Graduate Curriculum Committee, and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Faculty is comprised of all ranked members as defined in the [Constitution of the Faculty](#), subject to the approval of the BOT as exercised through the President. Faculty have primary authority over the integrity and structure of all academic programs and educational policies. An elected Faculty Senate exercises the legislative and policy-making powers assigned to the faculty. [Faculty](#) meet as a whole and are presided over by the president of the senate. **(2.C.4)**

The BOT delegates the day-to-day management to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters. The day-to-day operations of the campus are supported not only by these governing bodies (see [Table 4.3.1](#)), but also by the development and addition of leadership resources as needed. For example, to accommodate the changing demands and capitalize on the opportunities within academic affairs, the EVP and Provost recently restructured the [Provost's Office](#). In addition

to changing the portfolios of each associate provost, a new position was created: special assistant/advisor to the provost for faculty and shared governance. **(2.C.4)**

- ***Ensuring open communication between and among all colleges, divisions and departments***

Frequent opportunities exist for communication to occur across campus. [Faculty-Staff Institute](#) is the opening semester meeting for all employees to receive an update on institutional priorities. Full- (all faculty) Faculty meetings are held three times per year and department-representational Faculty Senate and subcommittees meet at least monthly. Staff members are frequently invited to attend academic departmental meetings. Faculty, staff and administrators serve on various university committees and strategic work groups for sharing information. Faculty collaborate in teaching development programs, book discussions sessions, peer reviews and other collaborative work such as interdisciplinary simulations. Finally, common areas on campus support communication among employees.

To support the overarching leadership of the BOT, the University relies on the following [governing bodies](#): The President's Cabinet, Provost's Council, and Faculty Senate. These entities meet on a regular basis to carry out the day-to-day operations of the University. These bodies [communicate](#) in a variety of ways. The President's Cabinet sets the agenda for the University Planning Committee meetings, and sponsors multiple campus conversations throughout the year; Provost's Council provides critical information distributed throughout Academic Affairs, using the regular department structure for dissemination; the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate distributes a monthly agenda for [Faculty Senate](#) meetings and for Full-Faculty Meetings. **(5.B.3, 2.C.2)**

- ***Collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards (5.B.3)***

Collaboration is widely practiced at UIndy as noted by the cross-representational committee structure (described above), strategic work groups, AQIP projects, interdisciplinary activities and Employee Affinity Groups as examples. Two examples depicting BOT knowledge are the approval to offer an MS in Exercise Science and an MA in Special Education. Approvals took place at the May 2018 board meeting. These resolutions demonstrate collaboration among the BOT, administration and faculty to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards. Both programs also align well with the university's mission and its motto of *Education for Service*. **(5.B.3)**

Faculty representatives from each college or school, academic administrators and other staff representatives serve on legislative committees of the Faculty Senate to ensure that curricula meet standards, standards are followed, and are aligned with ULGs, mission and values. Key legislative committees of the Faculty Senate that address academic standards and curriculum include: Academic Petitions Committee, Admissions Committee, General Education Core Committee, Graduate Curriculum Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The committee structure along with specialized accreditation and industry standards helps to ensure maintenance of high academic standards and quality programs. **(5.B.3)**

- ***Providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders (2.C.1, 2.C.2)***

To provide effective leadership, the BOT meets with the president, the President's Cabinet and various other campus members regularly (three times a year and in sub-committee meetings). The president is evaluated annually by the board. The organizational structure of the University is defined by position and is available in various handbooks, publications and online (e.g. Faculty Handbook).

All employees participate in the annual performance evaluation (see Cat. 3.2). [Roles of the Deans](#), was created under the leadership of the provost. This document was used as the basis for a 360° evaluation of the deans implemented in May 2018. The provost will discuss results with each dean as part of the regular review process. **(2.C.2)**

The BOT considers input from both internal and external stakeholders primarily through the planning and budgeting processes and subsequent decision-making as noted above in communications and collaborations with the campus. Also noted above, the BOT, governed by the Bylaws, acts in accordance of the best interests and mission of UIndy. **(2.C.1, 2.C.2)**

- ***Ensuring the institution's ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision (2.C.3)***

The BOT signs a [Conflict of Interest](#) policy. New board members are provided an orientation manual with content that addresses ethical behavior. There are no external influences, such as shareholders, affecting board decision-making. Deliberations of the BOT are mission-driven. There is no superordinate entity which owns the University nor to which the University reports. **(2.C.3)**

- ***Development of leaders at all levels of the institution***

UIndy actively supports the development of leaders through a variety of mechanisms both formal and informal. Formal approaches to developing leaders within Academic Affairs includes the work of the Faculty Academy, the provision of professional development funds for all faculty, and training for current or emerging leaders by the Leadership Academy presented in conjunction with the American Council on Education (ACE) in 2018. The ACE program was designed based upon analysis of needs gathered via survey of those in leadership positions throughout Academic Affairs. Other resources are available to develop leadership abilities (see Cat. 3.3) including leadership opportunities on departmental committees, senate (Faculty and Student), UIndy committees and work groups. Leadership training and educational opportunities are made available to all employees. Full tuition is provided for full-time employees who enroll for undergraduate and master degree courses. UIndy also provides non-credit professional development opportunities including spaces at the semi-annual Supervisory Institute. Specific departments may supplement these resources through providing professional development funds.

- ***Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools***

Tools include a survey offered at the conclusion of a leadership institute. The survey provided feedback to ascertain the need for additional training and the relevance of the two day program offered May 2018. Committee meetings of the BOT, [Faculty Senate](#) and [Full-Faculty](#) demonstrate communication, collaboration and leadership. The BOT completes a general "board evaluation" qualtrics survey every other year and has completed the third one (discussed at the May 2019 board meeting). Finally, the Higher Education Research Institute(HERI) survey is used for comparison data. The HERI measures faculty perspectives and is administered every three years.

- ***Summary results of measures on leadership development***

Results of the May 2018 [Academic Affairs Leadership Institute](#) presented by the American Council on Education (ACE), in which department chairs, program directors and deans from across Academic Affairs participated (more than 60 in attendance) show that those in attendance found the content to be informative and beneficial to them in their roles as leaders.

A selection of committee meetings, Faculty-Staff Institute and correspondences verify communication, collaboration and leadership are actively occurring on campus.

- ***Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks & Interpretation of results and insights gained***

As the Academic, Student, and Professional Life Master Planning groups complete their work, the goals identified will be linked to specific and measurable outcomes. The Academic and Student Life planning processes are still finalizing goals; however, the [Professional Life](#) group has articulated the three focal points for future work to include on-boarding, mentorship, and social engagement. To further develop those three focal points into targets with appropriate benchmarks, three working groups have been established (with 35 staff members participating in total) with the intent of delivering actionable paths forward in those three areas to the Professional Life group in May 2019.

[TABLE 4.3.3 HERI Survey](#) results on campus leadership for years 2010, 2013 and 2016.

- ***Interpretation of results and insights gained***

Evaluation of the Leadership Institute topics indicates that the session was a success in terms of learning gained by participants. One insight is that this institute should be offered annually based on solicited topics from administrators. Furthermore, sample committee minutes and other communications mentioned above demonstrated a robust level of collaboration and leadership.

Results for the [HERI survey](#) indicate a mostly positive trend in perceptions by faculty of empowerment in policy-making, decision-making and advancement, but all items are lower than the comparison group. One important trend was the increase between 2013 and 2016 in the item, "administration considers faculty concerns when making policy," from 1.88/4.0 to 2.49/4.0. One insight is that the trends reflect the changes that occurred in upper administration with deans, VPs, the president and provost offices since 2012.

4I3 Improvements

Three examples of improvements that have been developed in the past few years are: [Roles of the Deans](#) - outlines specific roles and expectations across all colleges and schools, (evaluations for AY18/19 common *Faculty Annual Evaluation System* (Faculty Senate Project) (see Cat. 3.2), and the [Office of the Provost](#) document that outlines specific roles and areas of oversight for members of the provost's office team.

Stabilization has occurred in the President's Cabinet and Dean's Council with several retirements and some turnover. A new provost joined the University in 2017. UIndy is expecting the next administration of the HERI survey in 2019 to show a more positive perception on these three leadership items.

Sources

- 2018_09_18_Final Senate Agenda (1)
- 2018-09-25 Full Faculty Agenda Final
- BOT Org Chart April 2019
- Constitution of the Faculty

- FACSTAFF_PPT
- Faculty Handbook 2018 Appendix A
- Faculty Handbook 2018 p. 13-14
- Faculty Handbook November 2018
- Letter to Senate Executive Committee_11-26-18 (1)
- Office of the Provost
- Professional Life report 2018
- Roles of the Deans December 2018
- TABLE 4.3.1. Governing Entities
- TABLE 4.3.2 ACE/Academic Affairs Leadership Survey Results
- TABLE 4.3.3 HERI Faculty Survey on Leadership
- UIndy Board of Trustees Orientation Manual Conflict of Interest

4.4 - Integrity

Integrity focuses on how the institution ensures legal and ethical behavior and fulfills its societal responsibilities. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.A. and 2.B. in this section.

4P4: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for developing and communicating legal and ethical standards and monitoring behavior to ensure standards are met. In addition, identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Developing and communicating standards
- Training employees and modeling for ethical and legal behavior across all levels of the institution
- Operating financial, academic, personnel and auxiliary functions with integrity, including following fair and ethical policies and adhering to processes for the governing board, administration, faculty and staff (2.A.)
- Making information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships readily and clearly available to all constituents (2.B.)

4R4: RESULTS

What are the results for ensuring institutional integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

4I4: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 4R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

4P4 Process

- *Developing and communicating standards*

UIndy is committed to fostering legal, ethical, and fair behavior as noted in the faculty, staff and student handbooks and BOT Bylaws. Important information on policies related to integrity is shared in a number of ways including the resources shown in [TABLE 4.4.1](#). Development of standards

occurs through the committee structure (as mentioned below), in compliance with external requirements, and best practices. Legal and ethical standards are communicated in orientations of new staff, faculty, administrators and BOT.

- ***Training employees and modeling for ethical and legal behavior across all levels of the institution***

Employee training for ethical and legal behavior, required of all employees, is comprised of self-guided online training modules through EverFI LawRoom (see Cat. 3.3). Furthermore, supervisors at all levels are expected to model ethical and legal behavior. The performance evaluations for all employees reflect expected ethical and legal behavior. An annual Title IX training program is available to students and faculty/staff. UIndy used the Haven Title IX courses. These courses provide a unique learning experience regarding important sexual assault/violence prevention skills and strategies. Students, faculty, and staff received periodic email messages that provides access and requirements for training. (2.A)

- ***Operating financial, academic, personnel and auxiliary functions with integrity, including following fair and ethical policies and adhering to processes for the governing board, administration, faculty and staff (2.A)***

Financial integrity is ensured by the Finance Committee of the BOT and Audit Subcommittee, Financial Aid Policies Committee, and the Financial Aid Petitions Committee. Other committees also uphold standards for academic and personnel integrity including the Academic Petitions Committee, Curriculum Committees, Grievance Review Board, Equity and Inclusion Council, Title IX Coordinators, the Internal Risk and Compliance Committee, Crisis Response Teams, Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), and the Seminar for Administrators and Staff focused on mission and operational integrity. (2.A)

PAC is linked to the Risk and Compliance Committee of the board to [develop, review, revise and publish policies](#) on the public web site. This [systematic approach](#) contributes to mitigating risk and ensuring compliance campus-wide. Academic policies are published in the Academic Catalog. UIndy maintains faculty, staff, student and handbooks that are readily available on the external and internal website. Administration ensures adherence to policies, ethics and standards by operationalizing them in related processes and procedures. [Table 4.4.1](#) provides a sample of ethical and legal standards with which the campus is expected to comply; including conflict of interest, nondiscrimination, drug-free workplace, and FERPA. Standards for expected behavior are reflected in all personnel evaluations to monitor compliance with standards. (2.A)

- ***Making information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships readily and clearly available to all constituents (2.B.)***

UIndy's external web pages provide policies, student consumer information and student outcomes. The consumer information site contains completion rates, job placement rates, degree completion rates, accreditation relationships, and licensure exam pass rates. The site also links to the College Navigator site maintained by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for IPEDS data. General information related to programs offered and [cost of attendance](#) can also be found on the external site via the Office of Admissions pages. The [Students' Right to Know](#) information is sent to all enrolled students on an annual basis from the Dean of Students on behalf of the Office of Financial Aid. The Office of Accreditation coordinates and verifies that the UIndy website lists

current specialized and HLC accreditation information and SARA participation. Accreditation information is also provided in the Academic Catalog. (see 1P5) **(2.B)**

4R4 Results

- *Summary results of measures*

Results of the PAC can be found in the [Completed Policy List PAC, January 2019](#). The employee training is comprised of self-guided training modules hosted online through EverFI LawRoom, In 2018, the percentage of employees who completed each of the training modules is as follows: Drugs & Alcohol At Work Training Module: 91.55%; Managing Bias Training Module: 89.28%; Harassment and Discrimination Training Module: 89.19%; FERPA Training Module: 89.59%. The target is for 90% completion.

- *Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks*

The Internal Risk and Compliance Committee meets with offices and departments across campus helping to identify areas of risk and develops strategies for mitigating risk. Areas are invited to benchmark themselves against available external standards and best practices as part of an internal audit. This review focuses attention on areas which could be strengthened with action plans. This information is reported to the BOT Risk and Compliance Committee. The following policies and guidelines were reviewed this spring based on best practices at other universities in relation to the Center for Global and Engagement Risk Matrix. As examples:

- Policy on when a student would be dismissed from international travel program and sent home
- Policy on how a dismissed student makes travel arrangements home, pays for return flight, University's role if student has no funds to pay for return trip
- Protocol for ensuring dismissed student arrives back in US safely - does University have to send a chaperone home with student?
- Protocol on participant refusal to depart when dismissed
- Policy Regarding Transportation Overseas (are leaders and students allowed to drive overseas?)

- *Interpretation of results and insights gained*

Results of the required trainings show faculty and staff to be largely compliant. One insight is that access to online training may be a barrier to certain employees. UIndy also recognizes that expectations for required training could be better communicated. Students are required to complete Title IX training as part of the fall orientation. Results of the Internal Risk and Compliance Committee have yielded the greatest insights for proactively preparing for areas of risk as the result of emerging trends and critical incidents. The Internal Risk and Compliance Committee has shifted from a reactive to proactive approach for opportunities to strengthen policies, procedures and customary practice.

4I4 Improvements

Improvements related to oversight include the establishment of two positions focused on promoting integrity including the VP for Inclusion and Equity (VPIE) and the VP and Secretary of the University (VPSU) who focuses on issues of risk and compliance. Resulting from the work of the VPIE is the development of bias incident protocol (see [Bias Incident Protocol document](#)). Close collaboration between these two positions created a policy for establishing employee Affinity Groups

(see [Employee Affinity Groups Policy](#)), including one for LGBTQI and one for employees of color. The VPSU provided leadership for the creation of the PAC; the establishment of a policies website; the identification and prioritization of future policy work; and the launch of employee training in the areas of FERPA, bias, harassment, and substance abuse.

Another improvement was the monitoring of university contracts and agreements through the Office of General Counsel. This position has grown to become a valuable part of daily operations. Through a ticketing system, submissions to General Counsel can now be tracked and reviewed. The addition of a paralegal has increased the responsiveness to campus needs as requests have grown.

The Internal Risk and Compliance Committee will continue to develop policies around international travel based on the recent review of best practice policies at other universities.

Sources

- Bias Incident Protocol
- Completed Policy List PAC January 2019
- Cost of Attendance August 2018 (1)
- Employee Affinity Groups - Policy (1)
- Policy Reference 2018
- Policy_Development_FAQ_new
- PolicyProcess
- Students_ Right to Know September 2018
- TABLE 4.4.1 Policy References

5 - Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship

5.1 - Knowledge Management

Knowledge Management focuses on how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution.

5P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for knowledge management, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process improvement and decision making
- Determining data, information and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively
- Making data, information and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning and improvements
- Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of the institution's knowledge management system(s) and related processes
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (including software platforms and/or contracted services)

5R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

5I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 5R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

5P1 Processes

- ***Selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process improvement and decision making.***

Knowledge management components are operational and strategic reporting and outcomes evaluation. The operational and strategic reporting component ([Figure 5.1.1](#)) is managed by a cross-functional committee of data managers, the Decision Support Team (DST). The committee collects and distributes internal and external data used by academic and administrative departments to perform routine operations and to engage in long-term planning. Reports are delivered on-demand to institutional leaders for outcomes evaluation through the data request process or through the searchable Cognos report inventory. ([Figure 5.1.2](#)) Key reports are also delivered via email to operational and strategic leaders according to predetermined schedules.

- ***Determining data, information and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively***

Knowledge management is a networked process centered on providing strategic and operational leaders with the critical data, business intelligence and performance results needed to advance the mission of the institution. Within UIndy's networked model, knowledge management assets are embedded within functional departments (i.e., executive administration; academic administration; enrollment management; co-curricular administration; business and finance; alumni and development administration) to facilitate the flow of strategic and operational information needed to support planning and operations.

The knowledge management structure ([Figure 5.1.3](#)) highlights [data integrity](#) and [securing data](#). Data integrity is managed by the Data Integrity & Standards Committee (DISC) ([Figure 5.1.4](#)) composed of data stewards, who set policy and procedure to guide data managers, that perform day-to-day management of information.

The pinnacle component of UIndy's knowledge management structure is key aggregate campus data, managed by the IR Steering Committee. ([Figure 5.1.5](#)) The revamped IR website ([Figure 5.1.6](#)) provides the campus with aggregated internal reporting data as well as outcome evaluation data.

- ***Making data, information and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning and improvements***

Data and performance results are made available to department leaders through a number of modalities. A substantial amount of data is readily available within the Cognos ([Figure 5.1.2](#)) repository. In addition, aggregated institutional data and external survey reports are available to the campus community via the IR website. ([Figure 5.1.7](#)) Many Cognos reports are delivered to campus stakeholders via email on standardized schedules.

UIndy undertook the UIndy Data Dictionary action project during the 2017-2018 academic year. Utilizing Data Cookbook as the enterprise tool, the project provides documentation and shared definitions of institutional data elements and report specifications through a workflow approval process.

Data requesters have multiple options for obtaining information through UIndy's data request

process.([Figure 5.1.8](#)) Aggregated information is on the IR website including a listing of key institutional reports and external survey data. The requestor may submit a query via the request link on the IR website. ([Figure 5.1.9](#)) Requests are routed to the data manager within the appropriate functional area. Data managers determine the appropriateness of the request and if resources exist to fulfill the request. The data manager may point the requestor to the report or sends it directly; if not available. the data manager will queue the request. If there exists any questions about the appropriateness of the request, the data manager consults with the IR Steering committee ([Figure 5.1.5](#)) prior to fulfilling the request. The IR Steering Committee monitors requests and determines whether routine requests should be made available via the report menu in Cognos or via the IR website.

- ***Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of the institution’s knowledge management system(s) and related processes***

Accuracy, timeliness and reliability of UIndy’s knowledge management structures and processes is under the purview of DISC. ([Figure 5.1.4](#)) DISC ensures fidelity of the information stored within and extracted from Banner and related systems in accordance with [institutional data standards page 9-25](#)). Common understanding of the definition of data elements is communicated via the Data Dictionary. ([Figure 5.1.10](#))

Security of UIndy’s knowledge management structures and processes is under the purview of the Network, Systems & Security division of IT. Data security is governed by the [Security Roadmap page 4-5](#)). A summary of data security measures appears in [Table 5.1.1](#).

- ***Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (including software platforms and/or contracted services)***

The University uses a number of internally generated reports and externally administered surveys to gather data and track progress over time. Key strategic and operational reports and their uses are shown in [Table 5.1.2](#). Key surveys regularly administered are shown in [Table 5.1.3](#).

5R1 Results

- ***Summary results of measures***

Over the last four years, a number of initiatives have resulted from UIndy’s networked knowledge management approach:

As stated in the [Data Dictionary Project Summary page 9](#), the progress on definitions, as well as the extent of participation, exceeded the original projections for the project. The formal project was completed on time.

The University implemented a two-prong IR initiative during 2018-2019: (1) the IR revised website for key aggregated campus data; and (2) the IR Steering Committee charged with oversight of aggregated data. The IR Steering Committee monitors requests for data made through the Data Request Form on the IR website and makes determinations regarding the release of aggregated data to individual requesters or as a data set on the [IR website](#).

Both the relaunch of the IR website and the reporting dashboard initiative are relatively new and only have preliminary usage information. Success of the IR website will be measured over time in terms of use, number of requests, timeliness in filling requests, and accuracy. Success of the dashboards

initiative will be measured in terms of regular use after creation for each specific area.

- *Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmark*

No external comparative data are available at this time. Trends in [Cognos use](#) have been positive.

- *Interpretation of results and insights gained*

The IR website was noted to have low campus usage which led to the relaunched in October 2018 for a current and well organized site. Prior to the rollout, feedback on the components and functionality of the IR website from campus leaders was overwhelmingly positive.

Feedback from HLC in 2014 from the Systems Portfolio provided insight in how to better manage data. The Data Dictionary was rolled out to data stewards beginning Summer 2018. During its first year of implementation, the Data Dictionary proved valuable to DST in standardizing reports and [developing a shared understanding of the data](#) housed within Banner and associated systems.

The Cognos inventory and number of reports continues to grow, thus the DTS has created accessible information, standardization of reports, and utilization of data to inform operational and strategic decisions. DST has planned a Cognos cleanup initiative for folder organization and the archiving of outdated reports. DST plans creation of dashboard reports modeled on the Admissions Dashboards as its key strategic priority going forward.

5I1 Improvements

The newly-relaunched IR website overseen by the IR Steering Committee is expected to benefit both functional data managers who extract and share data as well as institutional leaders who utilize data to make decisions. Ideally, this site will streamline the request process by creating a single, simplified, point of entry for anyone on campus to request data.

One expected benefit of the UIndy Data Dictionary project is an increased institutional understanding of commonly utilized data elements, for standardization, and data fidelity. In addition, the Data Dictionary project is expected to actively engage data stewards in data integrity initiatives, providing a convenient, workflow-powered means to develop common data definitions.

Enhancements have been made to the data and report inventory available to campus decision-makers via Cognos. The DST has recently undertaken efforts to standardize Cognos reports. The development of meta-reports (Figure 5.1.11) are a strategic priority. Admissions staff and other campus leaders now have access to an integrated Admissions Dashboard Report for more efficient recruitment decisions. Based on the success of the Admissions Dashboard, the DST is developing a dashboard report template of critical comparative information for academic administration.

The Cognos report inventory standardization initiative by the Decision Support Team will make information more readily identifiable and accessible for data to make decisions. Similarly, the expansion of dashboard reports for the academic deans such as those already utilized by the Admission Office is expected to provide critical, integrated, just-in-time business intelligence in a view that is easy to digest.

Sources

- Admissions Daily Freeze with Dictionary info - Decision Support Team
- Banner_Authorization_Form - Data Integrity Standards Committee
- Data Dictionary Action Project - Accreditation Assessment Educational Innovation
- Figure 5.1.1 Functional Reporting Alignment
- Figure 5.1.10 Data Dictionary
- Figure 5.1.11 Meta-Report
- Figure 5.1.2
- Figure 5.1.3
- Figure 5.1.4
- Figure 5.1.5
- Figure 5.1.6
- Figure 5.1.7
- Figure 5.1.8
- Figure 5.1.9
- Table 5.1.1 Data Security Measures
- Table 5.1.2 Key Strat. and Oper. Reports
- Table 5.1.3 Key Surveys
- Table 5.1.4 Data Dictionary Prelim. Results
- Table 5.1.5 IR Website Prelim. Results
- Table 5.1.6 Cognos Evolution
- UIndy Information Security Program - IT
- UIndy_DataStandards_v23 - Data Integrity Standards Committee

5.2 - Resource Management

Resource Management focuses on how the resource base of an institution supports and improves its educational programs and operations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for managing resources, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Maintaining fiscal, physical and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations (5.A.1)
- Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs (5.A.3)
- Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected (5.A.2)
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

5R2: RESULTS

What are the results for resource management? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

5I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 5R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

5P2 Processes

- *Maintaining fiscal, physical and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations (include evidence of 5.A.1)*

UIndy's processes for maintaining the resource base are grounded in advancing the educational mission, with a budgeting process that balances opportunities and risks with flexibility; systematic, forward-thinking analysis of current and future needs; leveraging new technology while ensuring interoperability with existing solutions; and attending to critical issues such as performance and

security. UIndy's audited [operating budget](#) for Fiscal Year 2018 shows 50.6% [allocation to teaching and learning](#) and an 24.8% allocation to student services ([Operating Expenses - FY18 Operating Fund Actual - Accounting](#)) **(5.A.2)**

The Simplified Budget Process ([Figure 5.2.2](#)) illustrates resource management at UIndy. The budgeting process begins with the Controller sharing initial budget forecasts with cabinet, who review forecasts in light of known operational and capital needs supplied by budget managers. The Controller simultaneously shares the initial budget with the Academic, Operations & Finance Committee (AOFC), who review the forecast in light of known institutional obligations, opportunities and strategic priorities. Based on feedback from the cabinet and the AOFC, the Controller updates the initial budget forecast before passing it back to the AOFC; who prepare a finalized budget before presenting it to the BOT for final authorization. At each step of the budgeting process, cabinet and the AOFC operate strategically, balancing decisions about resource investments with institutional mission and vision, known fiscal obligations, and opportunities. **(5.A.1)**

UIndy continually evaluates its physical infrastructure against current and future needs to advance its educational mission and in accordance with strategic priorities. Current and future plans for physical resource enhancements are folded into the [Facilities Operational Plan](#), which is closely linked to capital and operational budgeting processes and incorporates regular "refresh cycles." Oversight for campus spaces is under the purview of the Space Allocation Committee, comprised of some members of the Academic, Operations & Finance Committee as well as leaders from Academic Affairs and Facilities. The Space Allocation Committee maintains an inventory of all current academic and administrative spaces as well as a catalog of space requests and makes space investment decision in accordance with strategic priorities and operational reality. **(5.A.1)**

The technical infrastructure continues to evolve in step with industry standards. IT maintains the physical campus network by using a rotation of leased equipment, this ensures that network hardware is refreshed regularly. UIndy IT maintains an operational budget dedicated to refreshing all desktop hardware on a four-year cycle as well as maintaining software licenses. The operational budget is dedicated to maintaining server infrastructure in the campus datacenter as well as cloud services used for off site backup and redundant core services. For the past four years, IT has focused on redundancy and security of core services to improve overall service availability. ([Figure 5.2.3](#)) ([Figure 5.2.4](#)) **(5.A.1)**

- *Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs (include evidence of 5.A.3).*

UIndy's budgeting structures and processes connect the strategic goals informed by the institutional mission with internal realities (e.g., finite fiscal, physical and technological resources), external need, and emergent opportunities. For example, in 2013 the mission-driven [Vision 2030](#) project led to the identification of 32 specific strategic initiatives. During the first five years of implementation, the operating and capital expenditures necessary to advance those initiatives were identified through the budgeting processes. Examples of resource investment include new student housing to meet growing enrollment and DegreeWorks, a technology solution for advising and degree planning. Beginning in 2017-2018, UIndy embarked on another strategic goal-setting project, the [Academic Master Plan](#). Fiscal, physical and technical resources address the goals of the Academic Master Plan through the institutional budgeting process spearheaded by the AOFC. **(5.A.3)**

- *Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected (include evidence of 5.A.2)*

Vision 2030 and the Academic Master Plan are the primary drivers of resource allocation at UIndy within the AOFC. In addition, the inclusion of the provost on the AOFC ensures the primacy of the educational mission in the budgeting and resource allocation process. One example of a resource allocation decision made in service to the academic mission was the dissolving of the School for Adult Learning. While a number of factors drove this decision, one primary factor was the desire to better align institutional resources with the departments who oversee adult programs. Resource allocation is not impacted by any external influence or superordinate entities. **(5.A.2)**

- ***Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools***

Resource allocation for the past 5 years has been guided by the 2013-2018 strategic plan that was built off Vision 2030. Resource allocation over the next several years will be governed by 5-year Strategic Plan. Various planning documents that comprise the 2019-2024 plan will give guidance to the resources needed in various areas to complete stated goals. ([Table 5.2.1](#))

5R2 Results

- ***Summary results of measures***

Over the last four years, a number of initiatives have resulted from UIndy's resource management processes that are closely tied to advancing the educational mission. Below are a few illustrative examples **(5.A.1)**:

In early 2018 UIndy acquired two new buildings to serve as the future home for courses in the R.B. Annis School of Engineering and in the Art department. The decision to acquire these physical resources was the result of space, equipment, and technology needs analysis for both programs; anticipated enrollment growth in the School of Engineering, and accreditation considerations for [Engineering](#) and [Art](#).

UIndy has invested in two student housing initiatives over the last four years to accommodate growth and student needs. Greyhound Village offers UIndy upperclassmen and graduate students apartment-style housing adjacent to campus. University Lofts will add an additional 300 beds for graduate and undergraduate students beginning the fall of 2019.

Opened in fall of 2018, the Finance Lab was the result of the [Space Task Force planning](#). The report of the Space Task Force spelled out the need for an aesthetically-pleasing physical space that meets the educational needs of the 21st century undergraduate and graduate business student and the larger business community.

As part of IT's ongoing relationship with the Faculty Senate's Learning Resources (LRC) subcommittee, annual conversations have been conducted to examine the state of learning technology. In 2016-2017 the LRC collaborated with IT on a review of the current learning management system.

Departments identified the need to move away from CAPP (Curriculum, Advising, and Program Planning) to a more robust product for undergraduate students to have better visibility into their degree path. Challenges in existing processes including the lack of a centralized and predictive data to assist departments in course scheduling were cited as some of the critical needs. Approved for the FY18 capital budget, Degreeworks began implementation in June 2017.

Recognizing opportunity in the marketplace, UIndy became the first institution in the state to field NCAA Division II men's and women's lacrosse teams beginning NCAA competition in 2016.

- ***Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks***

Construction of Greyhound Village/University Lofts, and construction of the School of Business Finance Lab began as anticipated and were finished on time.

The process for LMS recommendation was completed in time to be presented to the AFOC prior to the 2017-2018 academic year allowing the recommendation to be vetted further before 2020.

[Degreeworks](#) implementation was completed in time for the preferred launch to freshman and sophomore students in January 2019.

The Lacrosse program has been in place long enough to warrant measurable comparisons. With an initial recruiting goal of 45 male and 35 female athletes, the first year recruiting resulted in 32 male and 22 female athletes. Totals for 2018-19 are 46 males and 35 females.

- ***Interpretation of results and insights gained***

The opening of the Shelby Street buildings for courses in the R.B. Annis School of Engineering and the Art department will not occur until Fall of 2020. It was determined more resources would be needed than originally planned. The addition of Greyhound Village and University Lofts is anticipated to provide educational and competitive advantages. Program reviews from the School of Business helped identify a need for a Finance lab with space for the business leaders who provide graduate student instruction and executive education; networking opportunities; internships; job placement assistance; and financial support.

Results from the review of the current LMS provided insights into faculty needs and functionality of other systems. ([Figure 5.2.5](#)). A new LMS was recommended. During the implementation of Degreeworks, peer institutions were used as benchmarks. New insights were gained based on the review and a plan created. The plan included convening focus groups with students to get feedback about functionality and documentation, and training sessions for faculty and advising staff. The professional advising staff reviewed all data for accuracy and had input on settings that determined the final functionality of the product.

One insight gained was the recognition that lacross teams could add to student diversity. Expectations for team numbers and the student diversity were realized.

5I2 Improvements

Opening in the of Fall 2020, t, the engineering classrooms in the Shelby Street Building will include the technology required to meet both the educational needs of engineering students as well as the ABET accreditation body. The acquisition of the Shelby Street buildings also addresses facility issues raised by the NASAD. The move of art courses into the Shelby Street buildings will free space in Christel DeHaan for the growth and enhancement of the music department.

The opening of Greyhound Village in 2016 followed by the opening of University Lofts in 2019 improves our ability to compete with peer and aspirant institutions, our ability to accommodate increased student enrollment, and our ability to meet student demand for state-of-of the art, apartment style housing on or close to campus.

The investment in the Finance Lab is anticipated to bring the School of Business and the institution at-large a number of benefits. As outlined in the 2012-2013 [Space Task Force recommendations](#), an “incubator space” aligns UIndy with competitors’ business schools and meets the educational needs of undergraduate and graduate business students for relevant, experiential-based education, and a space to engage local business leaders. Finally, an “incubator space” for engaging business leaders, networking opportunities, internships, and job placement for business students will be created.

Using feedback from faculty, students, and key administrative areas, a final recommendation for D2L’s Brightspace platform was submitted to the Provost in the spring of 2018. The proposed launch of Brightspace was targeted for the fall semester of 2020.

With the official launch of Degreeworks in January of 2019, the transfer equivalency module is planned to be online within the next year. Additionally, students will have the ability to review their transfer credits before meeting with an advisor. The ability to ensure availability of degree critical courses will be fully functional in three years. Additionally, having both current and predictive information about students’ degree paths should allow for early interventions, when needed.

The decision to launch Indiana’s first NCAA Division II men’s and women’s lacrosse team brought UIndy a number of benefits, including a competitive advantage among peers and a more diverse student body.

Sources

- AD-2018-19-Handbook-FINAL-12-17-2018 - NASAD
- AMP Final Report - Academic Affairs
- DegreeWorks Project Plan Phase 1 and 2 - IT
- E001-16-17-EAC-Criteria-10-20-15 - ABET
- Facilities Operational Plan 2020-2024 - Facilities
- Figure 5.2.1
- Figure 5.2.2
- Figure 5.2.3
- Figure 5.2.4
- Figure 5.2.5
- Operating Expenses - FY18 Operating Fund Actual - Accounting
- Operating Expenses - FY19 Operating Fund Budget - Accounting
- PRES_18_BoardPPT_May_Improvements4v2 - President
- Space Task Force 12-13_SchoolOfBusiness Recommendations - President
- Table 5.2.1
- Vision2030_update - President

5.3 - Operational Effectiveness

Operational Effectiveness focuses on how an institution ensures effective management of its operations in the present and plans for continuity of operations into the future. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for operational effectiveness, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals
- Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets (5.A.5)
- Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly
- Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly
- Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

5R3: RESULTS

What are the results for ensuring effective management of operations on an ongoing basis and for the future? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

5I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 5R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

5P3 Processes

- *Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals*

The Annual Budget Cycle ([Figure 5.3.1](#)) centers on dynamic forecasting of revenues and expenses and continuous monitoring of internal and external fiscal environments to accomplish strategic goals. The budgeting process starts with updating the 5-year financial model and an initial projection of revenue forecast (e.g., projected enrollment by program, projected tuition and fees). From there, projected expenses (e.g., merit increases, benefits) and debt service obligations are factored in to

create budgeting assumptions. Then allocation decisions regarding investment in operational and capital resources are made, and the budget for the fiscal year is developed. Upon final approval by the BOT ([Figure 5.3.1](#)), the budget is populated in the Banner system for budget managers to implement. **(5.A.5)**

Over the last four years, the shift to revenue forecasting based on projected enrollment has led to improved fiscal health. From FY14 to FY18, UIndy was able to increase its asset position while simultaneously decreasing liabilities, while making significant strategic investments in initiatives that advance the educational mission.

- ***Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets (include evidence of 5.A.5)***

As illustrated in the [Annual Budget Cycle document](#), adjustments to the budget model are made based on continuous monitoring of favorable/unfavorable conditions throughout UIndy's budgeting cycle. One example of continuous monitoring on the revenue side is the reconciliation between projected and actual tuition/fee revenue. These revenue projections are continually updated based on actual enrollment throughout the budget cycle. On the expenses side, one example of continuous monitoring is reconciliation between projected and actual healthcare costs. As actual healthcare costs for the fiscal year become clear, budget assumptions are updated, thereby altering UIndy's ability to invest in additional operating and capital resources. In addition to revenue and expense monitoring, budget managers are provided monthly budget reports to use in continuous monitoring of their units' financial position. **(5.A.5)**

- ***Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly***

IT has pursued several improvement initiatives in the past four years as part of the [Security Roadmap](#) and reviews its [processes](#) annually. While increasing [security and redundancy](#) results for a campus infrastructure, a more reliable and user-friendly system enhancement occurred. Since 2015, IT has used a process of [postmortem incident review](#) for every major service disruption. Reports allow IT to review what caused the incident, work to correct, and prevent future similar incidents. IT is led by the VP and Chief Technology Officer, who is a member of the cabinet. For purposes of planning and collaboration, IT maintains memberships on a number of committees including University Planning Committee, Internal Risk and Compliance Committee, Policy Advisory Committee, Program Implementation Team, and Ad Hoc Space Planning Committees. IT is ex officio members of the Learning Resource Committee of the Faculty Senate for direct feedback from faculty about technology issues impacting teaching and to incorporate needs into annual and future forecast planning.

- ***Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly***

In summer of 2015, Facilities Management and the CFO compiled a comprehensive, prioritized list of current and projected facility maintenance items. The list was recently converted into a 5-year [Facilities Operational Plan](#). The plan is updated annually and adjusted for newly identified needs or projects that can not be deferred. The Facilities Operational Plan provides an accurate prediction, proactive updates, and flexibility for priority changes during the course of the year. As of November 2018, Facilities Management began reporting to the COO to ensure that facility and space planning processes occur in concert with other high level planning.

- ***Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness***

In 2015, several strategic changes to risk management were made after research into best practices at other institutions and corporations. The Risk and Compliance Committee, a standing committee of the Board of Trustees, was created and three campus committees were formed. The Internal Risk and Compliance Committee and the Policy Advisory Council were created to establish updated campus processes for identifying and addressing critical items around [risk](#), compliance, and [policy](#). A third committee, the Emergency Preparedness and Safety Committee, was created to enhance cross-departmental collaboration for campus safety and security. In addition, a comprehensive website for [non-academic policies](#) was launched in 2017 to serve a repository resources. Risk management's highest priority areas have been updated based on code, compliance, liability and other best practices. If areas of concern arise, projects are defined to mitigate the specific issue. Recently Campus Police authored an updated [Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan](#).

- *Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools*

UIndy uses various [planning documents and committees](#) to guide and track operational effectiveness.

5R3 Results

- *Summary results of measures*

[Fiscal Infrastructure](#) - during FY18, UIndy revenues have outpaced budgeted expenses.

[Technological Infrastructure](#) - shows various benchmark data used to track expansion of infrastructure over time.

- *Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks*

Fiscal Infrastructure- UIndy has always earned an unqualified opinion in its [financial audit](#). Also, the University has consistently been in compliance with [NCAA agreed-upon procedures](#). There have been no findings of violations, investigations, or adverse actions taken by the NCAA. Additional fiscal measures are listed in [Table 5.3.3](#). UIndy's three-year official 2015 default rate is 7.4%, compared to the national default rate among all private, nonprofit four-year colleges of 6.6% and the overall national average of all colleges at 10.8%. Changes in the way bond ratings are calculated have impacted the rating that the University has received since 2016.

Technical Infrastructure - While the number of postmortem reports generated per year has remained relatively constant, [documented disruptions](#) evolved from major service outages to more specific services with a decrease in unplanned major outages. Investment in a secondary internet connection following a different physical path to campus has resulted in zero unplanned campus-wide internet outages since it's installation in February 2018.

Physical Infrastructure - In adherence to the current [Facilities Operational Plan](#), 29 capital projects were approved for FY 2019, with an additional 20 capital projects approved for FY20.

Risk Management - As part of the charge of the new [Internal Risk and Compliance Committee](#), a comprehensive list of all areas on campus and a matrix that outlined the priority of review and review findings for each area was created. Fourteen (14) areas of campus have been reviewed and ranked, and sixty (60) remediation projects have been implemented as of January 2019. The [Policy Advisory Committee](#) has reviewed and approved thirty (30) new policies since 2017. Fifty six (56) additional policies have been identified for future review along with actively tracking requests.

- ***Interpretation of results and insights gained***

Fiscal Infrastructure - Enhancements made to budgeting structures and processes over the last five years have helped UIndy meet a number of internal targets in the area of operational effectiveness. In addition, the placement of business analysts within the Office of the President and the Office of the Provost has facilitated more informed operational decision-making. One insight was that the five-year budget model needed to provide for more timely faculty hiring. Finally, monthly comparison budgets has allowed for continuous monitoring of expenses.

Technological Infrastructure - Projects related to the Security Roadmap have been completed. One insight is that the roadmap has provided the flexibility to reprioritize resources. Most recently, UIndy IT completed a series of upgrades to the perimeter firewall and releasing a secure, encrypted wireless option. Additionally, investment in load balancing technology has allowed for increased server capacity during class registration and resulted in a dramatic decrease in calls by students about registration problems during Fall 2018 compared to previous registration events.

Physical Infrastructure - The most recently completed project was renovation of Good Hall, the University's oldest building. The renovation focused on creating spaces for departments in the Shaheen College of Arts and Sciences and a new office location for the dean. This decision consolidated the location of academic departments that often work together, and provided spaces for student and student/faculty collaboration. Facilities management now uses a monthly budget review process for the operational budget to determine where overages or surpluses may exist. One insight was for the Director of Facilities Management to have discretion to reallocate operational funding to cover overages or approve projects that would be covered by surpluses. The result has been a more nimble and predictable Facilities budgeting process. Space allocation and planning has also been retooled for more effective use of space.

Risk Management - Safety and Security were cited as an area of focus in both the Vision 2030 document and the first 5-year Strategic Plan. One insight was the need to enhance risk management, by creating a standing committee of the board, an internal committee, and Management Office to better address concerns and build sustaining processes. The internal committee identified a model and has set annual review goals.

5I3 Improvements

Fiscal Infrastructure - Budgeting processes and structures at UIndy have undergone substantial enhancements over the last five years. Structurally, the Budget Committee was elevated to the Academic, Operations & Finance Committee. Two new analysts provide administrators with critical data related to the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats associated with maintaining existing programs and pursuing new initiatives. UIndy has shifted the timing of posting for new faculty hires for a more highly qualified candidate pool. The move to a dynamic 5-Year Budget Model in 2014 facilitated more precise revenue forecasting. The shift to monthly comparative budgets based on historical trends in 2017 allowed budget managers to more closely track expenses and academic leaders to more closely forecast year-end result. Additionally, income and expense reports have been introduced to deans with the intent of gaining insight into program performance. This process will be expanded to all departments by 2019-20.

Technical Infrastructure - UIndy will continue to regularly review and utilize the security roadmap to prioritize resources. Items that will be targeted in the next few years include: business continuity and disaster recovery, leveraging computer policy control to enforce screen timeouts with passwords

required, segmentation of the network for personally owned devices from university owned devices, creating redundancy for Banner, and requiring two-factor authentication. Implementation of new practices, like the two-factor security, require the education of students, faculty and staff for the transition to be viewed as successful.

Physical Infrastructure - UIndy will continue to regularly review and utilize the Facilities Operational Plan to prioritize needs to align with available resources and funding. Items that will be targeted in the next few years include retrofitting the newly-acquired Shelby Street buildings to meet the needs of the School of Engineering and the Art & Design department. Additionally, Facilities Management will make other improvements to student living and learning spaces, including updates to residence halls.

Risk Management - UIndy will continue to regularly review and utilize the Risk Management Approach to ensure that all areas of campus are evaluated. The goal moving forward is to continuously evaluate areas on campus and enhance the culture of safety. An initiative to build a granular Business Continuity Plan was launched in 2018. A Worker's Compensation Safety Committee has recently been created for the purpose of monitoring and increasing workplace safety.

Sources

- Facilities Operational Plan 2020-2024 - Facilities
- Figure 5.2.4
- Figure 5.2.5
- Figure 5.3.1
- Figure 5.3.2
- Figure 5.3.3
- Financial Update - Oct 2018 (Public) - CFO
- Fiscal 2018 Audit Summary - Accounting
- Information Security Roadmap - Roadmap Detail - IT
- Policies Website
- Policy List PAC - Policy Advisory Committee
- PRES_18_BoardPPT_May_Improvements4v2 - President
- Table 5.3.1
- Table 5.3.2
- Table 5.3.3
- Template Postmortem - yyyy-mm-dd - brief description of incident - IT
- UIndy Risk Identification Jan 2019 - Internal Risk Compliance Committee
- UIndy_Emergency_Management_Plan - Campus Police
- UIndyIT Backup and Disaster Recovery - IT
- University of Indianapolis NCAA AUP report 6.30.2017 - Accounting

6 - Quality Overview

6.1 - Quality Improvement Initiatives

Quality Improvement Initiatives focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) initiatives the institution is engaged in and how they work together within the institution.

6P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for determining and integrating CQI initiatives, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Selecting, deploying and evaluating quality improvement initiatives
- Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums

6R1: RESULTS

What are the results for continuous quality improvement initiatives? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared.

6I1

Based on 6R1, what quality improvement initiatives have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

6P1 Processes

- *Selecting, deploying and evaluating quality improvement initiatives.*

Quality initiatives originate at all university levels like the four AQIP Action Projects derived from HLC feedback and the strategic planning process. An example is the standardized Data Dictionary. This Action Project originated from feedback received in the 2017 Strategy Forum, the 2016 Comprehensive Quality Visit, and the 2014 Systems Appraisal. This project was initiated to address a need to better integrate data management, access, and analysis in operational planning and decision-making. **(5.D.1)**

AQIP Action Projects undergo comprehensive selection and review process ([Action Project Flowchart](#)). Project progress and results are reviewed and assessed by the AQIP Committee each semester. The AQIP Committee consists of representatives from each academic department, a student representative, administration, and staff. The committee works collaboratively with the Associate

Provost of Accreditation and Assessment (APAA) to coordinate solicitation of project ideas, oversight of Action Team's progress, digesting HLC feedback and responding with new Action Projects. Work of the committee is documented on the website and reported out at various campus meeting on a quarterly basis. **(5.D.1)**

Additional quality initiatives are derived from the Strategic Plan. These quality initiatives may be proposed by campus leadership, Student Senate, Staff groups or Faculty Senates. The second phase of the Vision 2030 strategic planning process involved determining priorities and goals across three areas: [Academic Life \(Master Plan\)](#) , [Professional Life](#), and [Student Life](#) (see Cat. 4). An example is the selection of a new LMS, which originated within the Learning Resources Committee and has been approved by the Provost Council and the Finance Committee for implementation in 2020. [Quality initiatives](#) are vetted first by their department, then referred to the appropriate committee or task force for review before being referred to the Senate, Provost Council, Cabinet, and the Board. **(5.D.1)**

Academic and non-academic departments may identify quality [improvement initiatives specific to their areas](#). If quality initiatives can be funded internally, these initiatives are reviewed and deployed by a departmental task force. Assessment of these initiatives occurs through surveys, focus groups and in the 5-Step Process of annual assessment. An example is the implementation of a second weekly chapel time in the African American church tradition after a survey of students found that some of the songs sung in chapel felt inauthentic and did not resonate with them. **(5.D.1)**

- ***Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums***

The APAA oversees and coordinates all AQIP activities. Action Projects are designed specifically to address feedback from the Systems Appraisal, CQR, Strategy Forums, and the strategic planning process. The Systems Portfolio is generated by a [collaborative committee](#) consisting of six teams with representatives from across academic and administrative areas with expertise in each category. The APAA communicates feedback from the Systems Appraisal, CQR, and Strategy forums, as well as the results generated by Action Projects, directly to the University Planning Committee (UPC), Cabinet, and to the campus, Faculty Senate, department meetings, full faculty meetings, and at the annual AQIP Fair.

6R1. Results

UIndy completed four AQIP Action Projects in this cycle ([Table 6.1.1](#)). Each of these improved the ability to collect and manage data, and then deploy those data for decision-making.

The [Academic Master Plan](#), [Professional Life](#), and [Student Life](#) work groups identified goals and objectives/recommendations for quality improvements to be implemented into the second phase of the Vision 2030 Strategic Plan. The [goals](#) were reviewed by the campus community, Provost Council, cabinet, and president in 2018-19 and approved by the BOT in May 2019.

A new Monday chapel service [Semester I](#) and [Semester II](#) 2018-19 in the African American church tradition.

6I1 Improvements

The quality improvement process has resulted in improvements across all university levels. The

integration of the Academic Master Plan, Professional Life Plan, and Student Life Plan into the second phase of the Vision 2030 strategic plan reflects the University's commitment to identifying and resourcing quality improvement across all areas. Robust campus engagement in strategic planning and budgeting are illustrated by the broad representation of the three working groups. Each group sought input from a wide range of stakeholders both on and off campus.

Observed declines in weekly chapel attendance last year led to a survey of student attendees and implementation of a second weekly chapel structured in the African American church tradition, designed to address student concerns.

The UIndy website and the web curation of documents, particularly those housed on the MyUIndy intranet have been improved in conjunction with the Data Dictionary. Focus the past four years was on improving the public website's functionality for external users. The focus now is shifting to improving the internal website for currency, availability and accuracy of information for the campus community.

Sources

- Action Project Flowchart
- AMP Vision and Goals
- AMP Working Groups
- AQIP Committee Charter
- Copy of Monday Chapel Semester 1 2018
- Improvements Specific to Departments
- Monday Chapel Semester II 2019
- Professional Life Study
- Professional Life Working Group
- Quality Initiatives
- Student Life Review
- Student Life Working Group
- Systems Portfolio Committee
- Table 6.1.1
- Table 6.1.2
- Vision 2030 Diagram

6.2 - Culture of Quality

Culture of Quality focuses on how the institution integrates continuous quality improvement into its culture. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.D. in this section.

6P2: PROCESSES

Describe how a culture of quality is ensured within the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality
- Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations (5.D.1)
- Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives (5.D.2)
- Reviewing, reaffirming and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution

6R2: RESULTS

What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P2. All data presented should include the population studied, the response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared.

6I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 6R2, what process improvements to the quality culture have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

6P2 Processes

- *Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality*

UIndy emphasizes development of quality initiatives that align with institutional strategic goals. These goals are defined in the Strategic Plan and resources are allocated via the budgeting process to support a culture of quality. Quality initiatives are identified across campus through the assessment process. Specifically, Action Project ideas are forwarded to OA and the AQIP Committee, then sent on for approval. (see [Quality Assessment Workflow](#)).

- *Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations*

Engagement of multiple campus stakeholders in quality initiatives has steadily increased since 2014

with much greater acknowledgement of quality efforts across campus. Alignment of quality initiatives to operational performance documented in annual progress reports on the Strategic Plan and monthly monitoring of key performance indicators provides evidence of the quality culture. (see Cat. 4). Performance is also documented, evaluated, and communicated pertaining to quality improvements including: [surveys](#) , AQIP 5 Step Process, Action Projects, engaging [stakeholders](#) in strategic planning, [poster fair](#), and [campus conversations](#). (5.D.1, 5.D.2)

- *Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives*

UIndy built processes to review and reflect on quality initiatives both internally and externally. The annual AQIP Poster Fair is one example of widely sharing results on initiatives and Action Projects and soliciting campus input for institutional learning. The 2018 poster fair was expanded to include department and campus-wide initiatives related to the [strategic Planning process](#). Externally the campus receives feedback from key stakeholders, HLC and external consultants. (5.D.2)

The Vision 2030 Strategic Planning process is designed to roll out in multiple phases that incorporate annual feedback and assessment. Feedback obtained from campus conversations, faculty meetings, and other sources led to a shift in emphasis from infrastructure to people and creation of three working groups focused on developing goals to improve academic, professional and student life on campus (see [Vision 2030 Diagram](#)) (5.D.1, 5.D.2).

- *Reviewing, reaffirming and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution*

Although the AQIP Pathway is phasing out, UIndy has gained significant value in ongoing initiatives and Action Projects that have strengthened assessment processes, use of data for decision-making, and closing the loop with measured effectiveness of key processes. UIndy continues to support and maintain a campus culture of quality.

6R2 Results

Resources support [quality processes](#) in all components of strategic planning. The AQIP Committee and the three Working Groups tasked with developing goals for the second phase of the Vision 2030 Strategic Plan had [representation](#) across units. In addition, the campus uses a program review process that links both academic and nonacademic units (Cat. 1 & 2). Departments have scheduled reviews and reflect on insights drawn from results and develop new goals in alignment with department and institutional goals. This review is completed by faculty and staff members across departments and feedback is provided by the Dean, Provost, and APA. (5.D.2)

The University has scheduled assessments of the GE Core. For example, the Global/Local distribution areas were assessed in 2016. After review, it was revised to become the Global Awareness and Experiencing Cultural Differences distribution areas. This improvement resulted in enhanced, course embedded learning assessments and better reflected the original intent of this distribution area as confirmed in the 2017 reassessment.

6I2 Improvements

Working groups developed goals that are integrated into the Strategic Plan to improve planning process and evidence a culture of quality. Over the next 5 years, the second phase of the Strategic Plan will be implemented with annual progress reports. Alignment of individual goals, departmental

strategic plans, Phase 2 of Vision 2030, and budgeting processes have improved informed decision-making and enhanced the quality culture.

The creation of a [Quality Steering Committee to replace the AQIP Committee](#) will provide a mechanism to continue to ensure that a culture of quality thrives. This Committee will be recreated and a charter developed in Fall of 2019.

Sources

- AMP Poster Presentation
- AMP Stakeholders
- Campus Conversation
- Improvements Specific to Departments
- March 28 2019 AQIP Meeting Minutes
- Quality Assessment Workflow
- Quality Initiatives
- Vision 2030 Diagram